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## Genealogy K

### Modernity

#### Altermodernity is the only way to overcome modernity – antimodernity dooms us to being caught up in the power struggles that modernity desires

Michael Hardt, and Antonio Negri, 2011 (Michael Hardt is a Professor of Literature and Italian at Duke University. Antonio Negri is an independent researcher and writer. He has been a Lecturer in Political Science at the University of Paris and a Professor of Political Science at the University of Padua., “common wealth”, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press :)

#### Up to this point we have explored antimodernity as a form of resistance internal to modernity in at least three senses. First, it is not an effort to preserve the premodern or unmodern from the expanding forces of modernity but rather a struggle for freedom within the power relation of modernity. Second, antimodernity is not geographically external to but rather coextensive with modernity. European territory cannot be identified with modernity and the colonial world with antimodernity. And just as the subordinated parts of the world are equally modern, so too antimodernity runs throughout the history of the dominant world, in slave rebellions, peasant revolts, proletarian resistances, and all liberation movements. Finally, antimodernity is not temporally external to modernity in the sense that it does not simply come after the exertion of modern power, a reaction. In fact antimodernity is prior in the sense that the power relation of modernity can be exercised only over free subjects who express that freedom through resistance to hierarchy and domination. Modernity has to react to contain those forces of liberation. At this point, however, especially after having recognized the savage, excessive, monstrous character of liberation struggles, we run into the limits of the concept and practices of antimodernity. In effect, just as modernity can never extricate itself from the relationship with antimodernity, so too antimodernity is finally bound up with modernity. This is also a general limitation of the concept and practices of resistance: they risk getting stuck in an oppositional stance. We need to be able to move from resistance to alternative and recognize how liberation movements can achieve autonomy and break free of the power relation of modernity. A terminological cue from the globalization protest movements shows us a way out of this dilemma. When large demonstrations began to appear regularly at the meetings of leaders of the global system across North America and Europe in the late 1990s and the first years of the new millennium, the media were quick to label them “antiglobalization.” Participants in these movements were uncomfortable with the term because, although they challenge the current form of globalization, the vast majority of them do not oppose globalization as such. In fact their proposals focus on alternative political process – and the movements themselves constructed global networks. The name they proposed for themselves, then, rather than “antiglobalization,” was :”alterglobalization” (or altermondialiste, as is common in France.) The terminological shift suggests a diagonal line that escapes the confining play of opposites – globalization and antiglobalization – and shifts the emphasis from resistance to alternative. A Similar terminological move allows us to displace the terrain of discussions about modernity and antimodernity. Altermodernity has a diagonal relationship with modernity. It marks conflict with modernity’s hierarchies as much as does antimodernity but orients the forces of resistance more clearly toward and autonomous terrain. We should note right away, though, that the term alterrmodernity can create misunderstandings. For some the term might imply a reformist process of adapting modernity to the new global condition while rpeserving its primary characteristics. For others it might suggest alternative forms of modernity, especially as they are defined geographically and culturally, that is, a Chinese modernity, a European modernity, an Iranian modernity, and so forth. We intend for the term “altermodernity” instead to indicate a decisive break with modernity and the power relation that defines it since altermodernity in our conception emerges from the traditions of antimodernity – but it also departs from antimodernity since it extends beyond opposition and resistance. Frantz Fanon’s proposition of the stages of evolution of “the colonized intellectual” provides an initial guide for how to move from modernity and antimodernity to altermodernity. In Fanon’s first stage the colonized intellectual assimilates as much as possible to European culture and thought, believing that everything modern and good and right originates in Europe, thus devaluing the colonial past and its present culture. Such an assimilated intellectual becomes more modern and more European than the Europeans, save for the dark skin color. A few courageous colonized intellectuals, however, achieve a second stage and rebel against the Eurocentrism of thought and the coloniality of power. “In order to secure his salvation,” Fanon explains, “in order to escape the supremacy of white culture the colonized intellectual feels the need to return to his unknown roots and lose himself, come what may, among his barbaric people.”61 It is easy to recognize too a whole series of parallel forms that antimodern intellectuals take in the dominant countries, seeking to escape and challenge the institutionalized hierarchies of modernity along lines of race, gender, class, or sexuality and affirm the tradition and identity of the subordinated as foundation and compass. Fanon recognizes the nobility of this antimodern intellectual position but also warns of its pitfalls, in much the same way that he cautions against the dangers of national consciousness, negritude, and pan-Africanism. The risk is that affirming identity and tradition, whether dedicated to past suffering or past glories, creates a static position, even in its opposition to modernity’s domination. The intellectual has to avoid getting stuck in antimodernity and pass through it to a third stage. “Seeking to stick to tradition or reviving neglected traditions is not only going against history, but against one’s people,” Fanon continues. “When a people support an armed or even political struggle against a merciless colonialism, tradition changes meaning.”62 And neither does identity remain fixed, but rather it must be transformed into a revolutionary becoming. The ultimate result of the revolutionary process for Fanon must be the creation of a new humanity, which moves beyond the static opposition between modernity and antimodernity and emerges as a dynamic, creative process. The passage from antimodernity to altermodernity is defined not by opposition but by rupture and transformation.

#### Using a strategy of altermodernity allows us to focus on the alternatives to modernity, rather than simply resistance to modernity – this is essential overcome modernity

Michael Hardt, and Antonio Negri, 2011 (Michael Hardt is a Professor of Literature and Italian at Duke University. Antonio Negri is an independent researcher and writer. He has been a Lecturer in Political Science at the University of Paris and a Professor of Political Science at the University of Padua., “common wealth”, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press :)

#### Modernity is always two. Before we cast it in terms of reason, Enlightenment, the break with tradition, secularism, and so forth, modernity must be understood as a power relation: domination and resistance, sovereignty and struggles for liberation.1 This view runs counter to the standard narrative that modernity emerged from Europe to confront in the colonies the premodern, whether that be conceived as barbaric, religious, or primitive. “There is no modernity without coloniality,” claims Walter Mignolo, “because coloniality is constitutive of modernity.”2 It is constitutive insofar as it marks the hierarchy at modernity’s heart. Modernity, then, resides not solely in Europe or in the colonies but in the power relation that straddles the two.3 And therefore forces of antimodernity, such as resistances to colonial domination, are not outside modernity but rather entirely internal to it, that is, within the power relation. The fact that antimodernity is within modernity is at least part of what historians have in mind when they insist that European expansion in the Americas, Asia and Africa be conceived not as so many conquests but rather as colonial encounters. The notion of conquest does have the advantage of emphasizing the violence and brutality of European expansion, but it tends to cast the colonized as passive. Moreoever, it implies that either the previously existing civilization was wiped out and replaced by that of the colonizer, or that it was preserved intact as an outside to the colonial world. This traditional view portrays colonial Indian society, for example, as Ranajit Guha writes, “either as a replication of the liberal-bourgeois culture of nineteenth-century Britain or as the mere survival of an antecedent pre-capitalist culture.”4 Modernity lies between these two, in a manner of speaking – that is, in the hierarchy that links the dominant and the subordinated – and both sides are changed in the relation. The notion of encounter highlights the two-ness of the power relation and the processes of mixture and transformation that result from the struggle of domination and resistance. Working from the standpoint of colonial encounters, historians document two important facts: precolonial civilizations are in many cases very advanced, rich, complex, and sophisticated; and the contributions of the colonized to so-called modern civilizations are substantial and largely unacknowledged. This perspective effectively breaks down the common dichotomies between the traditional the modern, the savage and the civilized. More important for our argument, the encounters of modernity reveal constant processes of mutual transformation. Long before the Spanish arrive in central Mexico, for example, the Nahua (that is, the inhabitants of the Aztec realm who speak Nahuatl) constructed highly developed cities, called altepetl, roughly the size of Mediterranean city-states. An altepetl is organized according to a cellular or modular logic in which the various parts of the metropolis correspond to an orderly cyclical rotation of labor duties and payments to the sovereign. After Cuauhtémoc surrenders to Cortés in 1521, the altepetl is not simply replaced by European urban forms through the long process of Hispanization, but neither does it survive intact. All the early Spanish settlements and administrative forms – the encomienda, the rural parishes, Indian municipalities, and the administrative jurisdictions – are built on existing altepetl and adapted to their form.5 Nahua civilization does not survive unchanged, then, but neither does the Spanish. Instead along with urban structures and administrative practices, music, language, and other cultural forms are progressively mixed, flowing through innumerable paths across the Atlantic in both directions, transforming both sides.6 Well before the formation of the United States, to give another, more directly political example, the Iroquois developed a federalist system to manage the relations among six nations – Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Tuscaroras, and Senecas – with checks and balances, separation between military and civil authorities, and other features later included in the U.S. Constitution. Iroquois federalism was widely discussed and admired in the eighteenth-century United States among figures such as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. The material aid of Native Americans to European settlers – how to plant crops, survive harsh winters, and so forth – has been incorporated into national mythology, but U.S. political forms are usually presented as being of purely European origin.7 The point of such examples is simply to demonstrate the mixture and mutual transformation that characterize the encounters of modernity. The problem with these examples, however, is that they do not emphasize the violence and unequal power relation of modernity. The dominant forces of modernity encounter not mere differences but resistances. What colonial historiography primarily accomplished and what needs to be countered, as Ranajit Guha explains, “is a conjuring trick to make resistance disappear from the political history of India under British rule.”8 There is something psychotic about the idea that modernity is a purely European invention, since it constantly has to deny the role in the construction and functioning of modernity of the rest of the world, especially those parts of it subordinated to European domination. Rather than a kind of psychic repression, we might better think of this denial as an instance of foreclosure in the psychoanalytical sense. Whereas the repressed element or idea, psychoanalysts explain, is buried deep inside, the foreclosed is expelled outside, so that the ego can act as if the idea never occurred to it at all. Therefore whereas when the repressed returns to the neurotic subject it rises up from the inside, the foreclosed is experienced by the psychotic as a threat from the outside. The foreclosed element in this case is not only the history of contributions to modern culture and society by non-European peoples and civilizations, making it seem that Europe is the source of all modern innovation, but also and more important the innumerable resistances within and against modernity, which constitute the primary element of danger for its dominant self-conception. Despite all the furious energy expended to cast out the “antimodern” other, resistance remains within.9 To insist that forces of antimodernity are within modernity, on the common terrain of encounter, is not to say, of course, that the modern world is homogeneous. Geographers rightly complain that, despite constant talk about space, contemporary theoretical discussions of postcoloniality and globalization generally present spaces that are anemic, devoid of real differences.10 The center-periphery model is one framework that does capture well in spatial terms the two-ness of modernity’s power relation, since the dominant center and subordinated peripheries exist only in relation to each other, and the periphery is systematically “underdeveloped” to fit the needs of the center’s development.11 Such geographies of modernity go awry, however, when they conceive resistance as external to domination. All too often Europe or “the West” is cast as homogenous and unified, as the pole of domination in this relationship, rendering invisible the long history of European liberation struggles and class struggles.12 And correspondingly many analyses neglect the forms of domination and control located outside Europe, conceiving them merely as echoes of European domination. This error cannot be corrected simply by multiplying the centers and peripheries – finding centers and peripheries within Europe, for instance, as well as within each subordinated country. To understand modernity, we have to stop assuming that domination and resistance are external to each other, casting antimodernity to the outside, and recognize that resistances mark differences that are within. The resulting geographies are more complex than simply the city versus the country or Europe versus its outside or the global North versus the global South. One final consequence of defining modernity as a power relation is to undermine any notion of modernity as an unfinished project. If modernity were thought to be a force purely against barbarism and irrationality, then striving to complete modernity could be seen as a necessarily progressive process, a notion shared by Jürgen Habermas and the other social democratic theorists we discussed earlier.13 When we understand modernity as a power relation, however, completing modernity is merely continuing the same, reproducing domination. More modernity or a more complete modernity is not an answer to our problems. On the contrary! For the first indications of an alternative, we should instead investigate the forces of antimodernity, that is resistances internal to modern domination.

### AT: “Latin America” Bad

#### Ending the use of the term “latin America” is bad – disavows cultural developments

Ardila ’96 (Ruben Ardila- Colombian psychologist, he received a BA in Psychology at the National University of Colombia and later a PhD in Experimental Psychology at Nebraska University; “Political Psychology: The Latin American Perspective”; June 1996; Political Psychology, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Jun., 1996), pp. 339-351; available Jstor @ http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3791814.pdf?acceptTC=true)

Social identity in Latin America has been a very complicated issue since the beginning and has awakened great interest in many researchers in this region. What does it mean to be Latin American? What are the differences with the Anglo-Ameri- cans? What are the factors that Latin American nations share with the rest of the world? Does racial mixture (white, black, and indigenous) convey positive or negative implications? Are we a "global race" (a mixture of all races), or are we condemned to be second-class citizens without making any legacy to universal culture? In reality, we Latin Americans are part of Western, Judeo-Christian culture, inherited from Spaniards and Portuguese who colonized this part of the world 500 years ago. We are also members of the indigenous cultures and subcultures, rooted in this continent many centuries before the arrival of the Europeans, and we are descendants of the black slaves brought to America to work in the gold mines and plantations. We are the result of a mixture of different cultures and ethnic groups, a new culture that is manifested in every nation of Latin America, from Mexico to Patagonia, a culture that has many characteristics in common, despite the differ- ences that are observed among the various countries and within them. These points of convergence are more relevant than those of divergence, and are related to language, history, tradition, philosophy of life, and social conscience.

#### The term “Latin America” isn’t linked to coloniality

Holloway ‘08 (Thomas H.- author of “A Companion to Latin American History”; “Latin America: What’s in a Name?”; January 2008; http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-1405131616.html>)

Historically, the first use of the term Latin America has been traced only as far back as the 1850s. It did not originate within the region, but again from outside, as part of a movement called “pan-Latinism” that emerged in French intellectual circles, and more particularly in the writings of Michel Chevalier (1806-79). A contemporary of Alexis de Tocqueville who traveled in Mexico and the United States during the late 1830s, Chevalier contrasted the “Latin” peoples of the Americas with the “Anglo-Saxon” peoples (Phelan 1968; Ardao 1980, 1993). From those beginnings, by the time of Napoleon III’s rise to power in 1852 pan-Latinism had developed as a cultural project extending to those nations whose culture supposedly derived from neo-Latin language communities (commonly called Romance languages in English). Starting as a term for historically derived “Latin” culture groups, L’Amerique Latine then became a place on the map. Napoleon III was particularly interested in using the concept to help justify his intrusion into Mexican politics that led to the imposition of Archduke Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico, 1864-67. While France had largely lost out in the global imperial rivalries of the previous two centuries, it still retained considerable prestige in the world of culture, language, and ideas (McGuinness 2003). Being included in the pan-Latin cultural sphere was attractive to some intellectuals of Spanish America, and use of the label Latin America began to spread haltingly around the region, where it competed as a term with Spanish America (where Spanish is the dominant language), Ibero-America (including Brazil but presumably not French-speaking areas), and other sub-regional terms such as Andean America (which stretches geographically from Venezuela to Chile, but which more usually is thought of as including Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia), or the Southern Cone (Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay) (Rojas Mix 1991).

## Afropessimism K

### AT: Kritik

#### This ability allows us to move past traditional leftist movements that have failed and create new political spaces for change – their alternative necessarily creates a static identity that fails

Manuel Callahan, Professor of Race relations at Humboldt State University, 2005, “Why not share a dream? Zapatismo as Political and Cultural Practice,” http://www.jstor.org/stable/23263123

While we should not abandon the responsibilities and challenges of sincere solidarity work, taking our cues from the EZLN, we might suggest that Zapatismo invites people to become part of "the struggle" in their own manner, at their own pace, and without being measured by any specific model of "conscientization" or a political program specified by "the organization." However, the effort at encuentro challenges us to interrogate the limitations and contradictions of more traditional solidarity activism. Zapatismo reveals the political tensions of building a movement based only on single issue campaigns, on behalf of a specific constituency, and relying on short-lived fragile coalitions often over-determined by the most immediate crisis. In many cases those solidarity efforts that fail to escape a liberal mold can unwittingly promote possessive individualism, celebrating a single leader, often considered the best and the brightest of the group, who is expected to state the group's issues, history, strategies and goals. The result is a single model, plan, or program dominated by an elite. Consequently, a narrowly defined solidarity effort can easily reproduce paternalism and hierarchy within the organization and between the organization and the constituency being "served." Echoing Holloway's warning in this volume, traditional solidarity projects fall into the trap of defining, representing, and speaking for the struggle(s) of others, while at the same moment insisting on "the progress" of those being aided, making solidarity efforts resistant to modifications and slow to adapt to shifting contexts. Solidarity projects that represent, define and speak for the struggle (s) of others presuppose the progress of those being aided and not the transformation of those pro viding the aid. Moreover, aide workers operating in a narrow solidarity mode are less likely to acknowledge or celebrate the transformations that have already taken place in "targeted" com munities, inadvertently facilitating an insidious imperialism. Professional well-funded NGOs, for example, "can become shadow bureaucracies parallel to Southern nation state administrations."30 Ultimately, a bureaucratic model of social change will not be able to prioritize and promote the transformation of those pro viding the aid. Although there may be valid concerns we must interrogate regarding the challenges of "solidarity," the political practice examined here does not seek to impose a rigidly defined alternative practice. The Zapatistas have been consistent in keeping with what they have argued is the task of an armed movement: to "present the problem, and then step aside."31 As critical catalysts in posing problems they have deliberately not posed solutions on other groups or spaces. "But it is already known that our specialty is not in solving problems, but in creating them. 'Creating them?' No, that is too presumptuous, rather in proposing. Yes, our specialty is proposing problems."32 The Zapatista provocation insists that rights emerge from collective identities and communal needs expressing collectively articulated obligations and not the competing interests of individual need.33 Rather than emphasize networks as our only organizing objective, we might also imagine the movement in solidarity with the Zapatistas as an imagined community, a collective effort to define obligations that are rooted in a locally placed culture generating knowledge about what works across generations. The very act of provocation undertaken has been a bridge manifest in a new international, not an international based on rigid party doctrines or dogmas of competing organizations but "an international of hope." The new international is defined by dignity, "that nation without nationality, that rain bow that is also a bridge, that murmur of the heart no matter what blood lives it, that rebel irreverence that mocks borders, customs and wars."34 "Instead of a new bureaucratic apparatus, for the world coordination of a political movement expressing universal ideals and proposals," Esteva explains, "the International of Hope was created: a web constituted by innumerable differentiated autonomies, without a center or hierarchies, within which the most varied coalitions of discontents can express themselves, to dismantle forces and regimes oppressing all of them."35 The process of creating political space for dialogue between a diverse number of constituencies occupying a particular space suggests that community is neither homogenous nor static. Rather than speak of "the community," Zapatismo strives for a notion of community embodying a multiplicity of histories, experiences, resources, and obligations. The pursuit of new political relationships underscores the need to re-discover strategies to collectively define obligations of and within a community through dialogue based on respect. Political projects and proposals need to emerge organically—not imposed either by an individual (caciquismo) or a cabal (protagonismo). As the Frente Zapatista de Liberacion Nacional (FZLN) have warned, people organizing themselves must begin "with the situation in which they find themselves, not in the one which we might desire to be found."36 In new political spaces all voices, all proposals must be responded to with respect. Democracy, as Marcos suggests, is a gesture "to decide upon the dominant social proposal." Liberty implies the freedom necessary to pursue one action over another, the expression of desire for the fulfillment of hope and dignity. Free from oppression, fear or persecution liberty sustains diversity and the choice, "to subscribe to one or another proposal."37 "It is," writes Marcos, "the same desire: democracy, liberty, and justice. In the heroic delirium of the Mexican southeast, hope implies a name: Tachicam, the unity of long ing for a better future."

### Perm

#### Perm solves – Zapatismo can link up with other struggles effectively

Jeffery Popke, East Carolina University Professor, 06-xx-04, “The face of the other: Zapatismo,

responsibility and the ethics of deconstruction,” <http://myweb.ecu.edu/popkee/social%20and%20cultural.pdf>

Although it is undoubtedly important to assess, and support, the reform process in the domain of ‘political realism’, I want to focus my attention here on the messianic tenor of Zapatista discourse, on what Huntington (2000) has called their ‘politics of poetic resistance’ (see also Evans 1999; Higgins 2000). I do so because the discursive intervention of Zapatismo represents, in its aims, strategies and composition, a challenge to modern ethical ideals in a manner consistent with what I have argued thus far: ﬁrst, they articulate a form of ethical subjectivity that transcends both cultural difference and borders; and second, they argue for an alternative conception of politics, in which the future is open to construction in the absence of certainty. This ethical discourse is important in part because it has produced effects that resonate far beyond the immediate context of southern Mexico. The Zapatistas are ‘awakening, moving and stimulating the creative imagination of many others, who are already involved in similar concerns and struggles but often found themselves at a dead end’ (Esteva and Prakash 1998: 36). In this sense, I believe that the writings of Marcos and the EZLN are more than simply interventions in a regional struggle over indigenous rights and autonomy. They also both reﬂect and contribute to, through their broader engagement with global civil society, the development of a new conception of social and cultural agency, within which a different form of ethics and politics is at stake (Couch 2001; Stahler-Sholk 2001).

#### Their operation within a black-white paradigm of race relations can never be truly liberatory because it marginalizes bodies that do not fit neatly into either category – from the Tainos and Chinese to the mulattas and mestizos.

Juan F. Perea, 10-31-1997, Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, “The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The Normal Science of American Racial Thought,” http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1605&context=californialawreview

Hacker's omission of non-Black minority groups in his discussion of specific topics similarly suggests that these groups' experiences do not exist. Chapter nine, on segregated schooling, describes only the experience of Black segregation. This chapter makes no reference to the extensive history of segregation in education suffered by Latinos/as.39 Chapter ten asks, "What's Best for Black Children?" with no commensurate concern for other children. Similarly, Chapter eleven, on crime, discusses only perceptions of Black criminality and their interpretation. In discussing police brutality, Hacker describes only White police brutality against Blacks. There is not a single word about the similar police brutality suffered by Latino/a people at the hands of White police officers.' Nor are there any words in these chapters describing the experiences of Native Americans or Asian Americans. The greatest danger in Hacker's vision is its suggestion that non-White groups other than Blacks are not really subject to racism. Hacker seems to adopt the deservedly criticized ethnicity theory," which posits that non-White immigrant ethnics are essentially Whites-in-waiting who will be permitted to assimilate and become White.42 This is illustrated best in Chapter eight, "On Education: Ethnicity and Achievement," which offers the book's only significant discussion of non-White groups other than Blacks. Hacker describes Asians in "model minority" terms, because of high standardized test scores as a group. 3 He portrays Latinos/as as below standard, because of low test scores and graduation rates, and as aspiring immigrants. 4 Describing Asian Americans, Latinos/as and other immigrant groups, Hacker writes: Members of all these "intermediate groups" have been allowed to put a visible distance between themselves and black Americans. Put most simply, none of the presumptions of inferiority associated with Africa and slavery are imposed on these other ethnicities4 While a full rebuttal of this proposition is beyond the scope of this Article, its inaccuracy can be quickly demonstrated. Consider, for instance, the observations of historian David Weber, who described early Anglo perceptions of Mexican people: "American visitors to the Mexican frontier were nearly unanimous in commenting on the dark skin of Mexican mestizos who, it was generally agreed, had inherited the worst qualities of Spaniards and Indians to produce a 'race' still more despicable than that of either parent. '46 Rufus B. Sage expressed the common view of Mexicans in 1846: There are no people on the continent of America, whether civilized or uncivilized, with one or two exceptions, more miserable in condition or despicable in morals than the mongrel race inhabiting New Mexico.... To manage them successfully, they must needs be held in continual restraint, and kept in their place by force, if necessary,-else they will become haughty and insolent. As servants, they are excellent, when properly trained, but are worse than useless if left to themselves.47 More briefly, the common perception of Mexican Americans was that "They are an inferior race, that is all. 48 Incredibly, and without any supporting evidence, Hacker writes that "[m]ost Central and South Americans can claim a strong European heritage, which eases their absorption into the 'white' middle class."'49 Hacker continues, "[w]hile immigrants from Colombia and Cyprus may have to work their way up the social ladder, they are still allowed as valid a claim to being 'white' as persons of Puritan or Pilgrim stock."5 Hacker's comments are simply incredible for their blithe lack of awareness of how racism burdens the lives of Latino/a, Asian American and other racialized immigrant groups. While some Latinos/as may look White and may act Anglo (the phenomenon of passing for White is not limited to Blacks), Hacker's statement is certainly false for millions of Latinos/as. Current anti-immigrant initiatives targeted at Latinos/as and Asians, such as California's Proposition 1875' and similar federal legislation targeting legal and illegal immigrants,52 California's Proposition 209,53 and unprecedented proposals to deny birthright citizenship to the United States-born children of undocumented persons, debunk any notion that the White majority tolerates easily the presence of Latino/a or Asian people.' Ultimately, Hacker seems determined to adhere to the binary paradigm of race and to ignore the complexity introduced by other nonWhite groups, because it is convenient-which, it will be recalled, is a principal danger of paradigms. In the statistical section of the book, Hacker explains some of the problems with statistics he reproduces: Some government publications place persons of Hispanic origin within the black and white racial groupings. Others put them in a separate category, to differentiate them from blacks and whites. Wherever the sources permit, Two Nations has separated out Hispanics, to keep the book's emphasis on race as coherent as possible. Where this has not been possible, readers should bear in mind that the figures for whites may be inflated by the inclusion of considerable numbers of Hispanics.55 Although government publications have confused the ability to count Latinos/as,56 what is startling here is Hacker's vision that coherence in discussion of race requires emphasis on only Black and White. In other words, "real" race is only Black or White. Other groups only render this framework "incoherent." This is why the Black/White paradigm of race must be expanded: it causes writers like Hacker to ignore other non-White Americans, which in turn encourages others to ignore us as well.

#### Wilderson’s totalizing account of blackness is flawed and overly US centric

Dr. Saer Maty Ba, Professor of Film – University of Portsmouth and Co-Editor, 2011, “The US Decentred: From Black Social Death to Cultural Transformation”, Cultural Studies Review, 17(2), September

<http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/csrj/article/viewFile/2304/2474>

A few pages into Red, White and Black, I feared that it would just be a matter of time before Wilderson’s black‐as‐social‐death idea and multiple attacks on issues and scholars he disagrees with run (him) into (theoretical) trouble. This happens in chapter two, ‘The Narcissistic Slave’, where he critiques black film theorists and books. For example, Wilderson declares that Gladstone Yearwood’s Black Film as Signifying Practice (2000) ‘betrays a kind of conceptual anxiety with respect to the historical object of study— ... it clings, anxiously, to the film‐as‐text‐as‐legitimateobject of Black cinema.’ (62) He then quotes from Yearwood’s book to highlight ‘just how vague the aesthetic foundation of Yearwood’s attempt to construct a canon can be’. (63) And yet Wilderson’s highlighting is problematic because it overlooks the ‘Diaspora’ or ‘African Diaspora’, a key component in Yearwood’s thesis that, crucially, neither navel‐gazes (that is, at the US or black America) nor pretends to properly engage with black film. Furthermore, Wilderson separates the different waves of black film theory and approaches them, only, in terms of how a most recent one might challenge its precedent. Again, his approach is problematic because it does not mention or emphasise the inter‐connectivity of/in black film theory. As a case in point, Wilderson does not link Tommy Lott’s mobilisation of Third Cinema for black film theory to Yearwood’s idea of African Diaspora. (64) Additionally, of course, Wilderson seems unaware that Third Cinema itself has been fundamentally questioned since Lott’s 1990s’ theory of black film was formulated. Yet another consequence of ignoring the African Diaspora is that it exposes Wilderson’s corpus of films as unable to carry the weight of the transnational argument he attempts to advance. Here, beyond the US‐centricity or ‘social and political specificity of [his] filmography’, (95) I am talking about Wilderson’s choice of films. For example, Antwone Fisher (dir. Denzel Washington, 2002) is attacked unfairly for failing to acknowledge ‘a grid of captivity across spatial dimensions of the Black “body”, the Black “home”, and the Black “community”’ (111) while films like Alan and Albert Hughes’s Menace II Society (1993), overlooked, do acknowledge the same grid and, additionally, problematise Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act (STEP) policing. The above examples expose the fact of Wilderson’s dubious and questionable conclusions on black film.

## Gender K

### Gender

#### Perm solves – Zapatismo listens and has internal feminist movements

Nicole Blanc, August 2001 (Nicole Blanc runs her organic farm in a small indigenous village in Oaxaca, Mexico, and participates in a number of grassroots organizations, “Zapatismo: a feminine movement”, http://peacenews.info/node/3864/zapatismo-feminine-movement :)

According to the Zapatistas, its army is the heart of its movement, not the movement itself. For them, to follow your heart is to find the path towards dignity. Both notions, of feminine inspiration, contribute to explain why the Zapatistas put their weapons to silence, 12 days after using them; and why they became models of nonviolence, opposed to all forms of militarism and clearly separated from all guerrilla tradition. Beyond symbolism Women have been prominent in all the public events of the Zapatistas. Comandanta Ramona, known since the Dialogue of the Cathedral two months after the uprising, received special notoriety as the only representative of the Zapatistas at the First National Indian Congress, held in Mexico City in 1995. Comandanta Ana Mar&iacute;a pronounced the main speech of the Zapatistas in the First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, held in 1996 in La Realidad, Chiapas. Comandanta Ester was the main speaker of the Zapatista delegation in the Federal Congress in 2001. All of them, and many others, revealed on a number of occasions both their personal talent and the prominent role of women in the Zapatista movement. They also showed how much the movement appreciated the historical and symbolic importance of presenting its main proposals, in critical moments, through the voice of a woman. Beyond symbolism, it is significant that women have had significant participation in all Zapatista delegations, and that its largest delegation, when 5000 Zapatistas travelled all over the country, was made up of couples of men and women. In the Zapatista communities, daily exposed to the pressure of the military siege, women have directly confronted the troops with no other weapon but their dignity, in the best tradition of civil resistance. When the aggressions increased, and the army were killing the men before their eyes and forcing them to escape to the mountains, many women decided to stay in the communities and confront the troops—to protect the community, the children ... and the men. “What else could we do?”, commented Comandanta Margarita, of Morelia. The Revolutionary Law of Women Due to all these entirely visible facts, it is said that Zapatismo could not exist or be understood without the participation of women. That is true but insufficient. The same can be said about almost everything happening in the world. We still need to ask ourselves: To what extent is or is not such participation an additional burden imposed on women? Does Zapatismo really include, in its orientation and practices, the struggle against the oppression of women? Hard facts offer an answer to these questions. The new burden on women was not imposed: they courageously and responsibly assumed it, as part and the expression of their own struggle. And this struggle, the women's struggle, publicly appeared with Zapatismo itself and within it, on 1 January 1994, through its Revolutionary Law of Women. Women's claims were also included in the national and international consultation on the destiny of the movement in 1996. They were also included in all the negotiations with the government, as one of the issues or themes requiring specific treatment. The march of the International Day of Women, in San Crist&oacute;bal, in 1996, was probably the first march of indigenous women in history. Women's claims are not just prominently included in the Zapatistas proposals. They also define a pattern of internal changes in the Zapatista communities. Within them there is increasing participation and influence of women in the decision processes and community affairs. There is a continual correction of the patriarchal bias of rooted customs or the sexist bias of new behaviour; the communities advance every day towards the elimination of all traditional or modern forms of masculine violence. This is not idealisation or romanticism. Women's oppression in indigenous communities, Zapatista or not, is still there. The comandantas celebrate women's advances, but denounce at the same time the problems that persist and the resistance of men to their solution. Before the Federal Congress, Comandanta Ester exposed a lucid account of such oppression. On that occasion, Mar&iacute;a de Jes&uacute;s Patricio, speaking in the name of the National Indian Congress, talked about the subject at great length. She celebrated valued indigenous customs or recent changes, but at the same time identified many customs in relation to women that should be modified, observing that this applies not only to indigenous communities but to the whole of society. A feminine character Communiques, documents and facts associated with the Zapatistas clearly demonstrate their full acknowledgement of the gender question and their decision to approach it in depth. As Comandanta Ramona said, Zapatismo implied “an awakening to a struggle against a present and a past that threaten the women as a probable future”. The Zapatista women have concentrated in one struggle the many facets of their oppression. Azucena Santys, a young Zapatista from Morelia, synthesised it in the following terms: “We were used to having two governments, that of our men and that of the State. We are now organising ourselves to learn more about our rights, educate our men and govern ourselves.” All this has begun to be acknowledged and is awakening increasing interest. But we would like to go a little farther. We believe that women's participation in Zapatismo has not only implied an inclusion of their claims, as women, and a stimulation of profound transformations of gender relations in the communities. It has also given to the movement an original and distinctive character. Some of its peculiarities that attract a lot of attention come from the mark made on it by the women, to the point of giving to it what we describe as a feminine character. Gender is not broken in the indigenous communities. Areas and functions still subsist and are reserved for each gender, and an asymetric and complementary relation between genders that does not necessarily imply oppression of one by the other. This situation gives women a decisive weight in the life of the community, comparatively higher than that of women in the modern society, where they have been reduced, together with the men, to genderless economic individuals, and where women tend to be treated as the second sex. Such conditions may produce the worst of all possible worlds in the communities, when patriarchal oppression is combined with sexist discrimination, but it also has vigorous liberating elements. In the communities, the women struggle for equality as justice, which requires treating the different differently, rather than equality as sameness—which requires treating everyone in the same way. This attitude that women were adopting in their struggle against patriarchal oppression in the communities, was extended to their indigenous condition, within national society. It clearly marked Zapatismo in its defence of indigenous rights, which never fell to the temptation of homogenising egalitarianism. Shaping the movement This situation helps to explain the great importance of the women since the beginning of the movement: without their full acceptance and courageous participation, the movement could not have taken place. This also helps to explain what happened later, when the feminine form of perceiving the world, the basic attitudes of the women, their conceptions of politics and power, got an increasing influence in the shape of the movement. Some of the main principles of Zapatismo, like “commanding by obeying”, “to walk at the pace of the slowest one”, and “to listen as you walk”, are not theoretical statements or abstract values of a new utopia, but concrete shapes and styles of the movement as it is formed and reformed. For us, these are expressions of women's practices, rather than men's. It has been their inspiration and influence that determined this specific character of Zapatismo. It is well known that a small guerrilla group, made up of of indigenous and non- indigenous “ideologised” men, attempted in 1983 to start a revolutionary action in Selva Lacandona in the Latin America guerrilla tradition, following the steps of Che Guevara. This group lost in its confrontation with the communities, as they themselves confessed later. But they learned to listen to the other, and Zapatismo was born after this interaction. We can speculate that the women helped to produce the defeat of the ideologised group and the new spirit that created the movement. And that it was also their influence which determined the movement's lack of interest in “seizing power”, the power up there, the power that in time attempts to impose from the top down, in a very masculine way, the project of society proposed as revolutionary goal. Gender reaffirmation In the indigenous world, there is the trend—and in many cases the real possibility—that women contribute the content of political action, its substance and orientation, while the practical exercise of this action and particularly the mediation with the external world remains in the hands of men. Even today, many indigenous women refuse to accept “political” functions, which until now have been exclusive to men but which they are now willing to share with women. This attitude, considered by some feminists as an expression of the ideological backwardness of women, may be seen instead as a gender reaffirmation, when they protect their own areas and functions in a way that far from marginalising them from political action, put them in its centre. It is our conjecture that the Zapatista women have defined the main content and orientation of the movement. In any case, given the importance of women in Zapatismo, its reduction to the figure of the now famous subcomandante Marcos, whose great qualities we fully recognise, seems to us a racist and macho prejudice. It attributes all the capacities and virtues of the movement to its only white man, as if the indigenous people could not conceive and promote it and the women have no importance in it. This prejudice has been disseminated by the media and the government, not by the Zapatistas. It is time to dissolve it. We can not, in this brief text, elaborate more on our conjecture of the feminine character of Zapatismo or on the more fundamental question of the importance of women in any project of social transformation. In our view, such question should occupy a central place in the debate about the political agenda in the current conditions of the world. To include women in the army or the police does not change the character of militarism. Perhaps we can only leave it behind and pave the way for nonviolence when the organisation of the society become inspired by the feminine ethos.

### AT: Alt

#### Singularity disad – they paper over the ways oppression constitutes itself in different ways than just their singular point of focus – dooms their movement to failure

Simon Tormey, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Sydney, 2006, ‘Not in my Name’: Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation”

Thinking more generally about the socio-political ideology of Zapatismo, what becomes evident is the reluctance to commit themselves to a ‘vision’ or blueprint of how the world should be transformed, or indeed how even the Chiapas should be transformed. This again is a source of irritation for otherwise sympathetic onlookers who would like to see in the Zapatistas the vanguard of an attempt to construct a viable ‘counter- empire’ of the kind influentially discussed by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their controversial work Empire. Surely it is asked, there must be some notion of what the world should look like in order to mobilise people against the world as it is now? Again, the notion that ‘resistance against’ can only make sense when seen as the antonym of a ‘resistance for’, in this case in favour of a distinct political system or space is one that is challenged both implicitly and explicitly by Zapatista practice. As Marcos insists: Zapatismo is not an ideology, it is not bought and paid for by a doctrine. It is … an intuition. Something so open and flexible that it really occurs in all places. Zapatismo poses the question: ‘What is it that excluded me?’‘What is that has isolated me?’ In each place the response is different. Zapatismo simply states the question and stipulates that the response is plural, that the response is inclusive … 29 In attempting to elaborate what Zapatismo is, communiqués articulate the idea of ‘a political force’ that operates in negation to that which is, as opposed to the embodiment of something that has yet to be created. In this sense they directly eschew the idea of a government or system ‘in waiting’ as per the classic ‘putschist’ rhetoric of traditional revolutionary movements. As has often been noted, they have yet to articulate a response to the ‘land question’, which is the very issue that caused the Zapatistas to come into being in the first place. Zapatismo is ‘silent’ on this and all the other matters that have animated left radicals over the past two centuries, that have nurtured them in the ‘hard times’, and helped to maintain their faith that history is on their side. But the ‘silence’ is surely telling in positive ways. As we noted at the outset, this is a political force that prefers not to ‘speak’, but rather to ‘listen’ and provide what Marcos terms an ‘echo’ of what it ‘hears’. As Marcos notes, this would be: An echo that recognises the existence of the other and does not overpower or attempt to silence it. An echo that takes its place and speaks its own voice, yet speaks with the voice of the other. An echo that reproduces its own sound, yet opens itself to the sound of the other. An echo […] transforming itself and renewing itself in other voices. An echo that turns itself into many voices, into a network of voices that, before Power’s deafness, opts to speak to itself, knowing itself to be one and many, acknowledging itself to be equal in its desire to listen and be listened to, to recognising itself as diverse in the tones and levels of voices forming it.30 To Marcos this is a different kind of political practice. It is one that insists that there are no a priori truths that can be handed down to ‘The People’; there is no doctrine that has to be learned or spelled out; there is only ‘lived experience’. Zapatismo is a political force that is concerned with the means by which people can be ‘present’ as opposed to being represented, whether it be by political parties, ideologies, or the other familiar devices and strategies that have prevented voices being heard. To quote Marcos, what they are struggling for is a world in which ‘all worlds are possible’. Similarly In The Second Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle, Marcos declares (on behalf of the Zapatistas) that: ‘we aren’t proposing a new world, but something preceding a new world; an antechamber looking into the new Mexico. In this sense, this revolution will not end in a new class, faction of a class, or group in power. It will end in a free and democratic space for political struggle’.30 Their struggle is one to permit other conceptions of the world to come into being. Of course this is punctuated by a view of what it is that such spaces require: the obliteration of party machines, of the bloated and antique structures of representation that clog Mexico’s political system; but the point is such strictures are regarded as the basis upon which a genuine political process can take place. What is left out is any ‘final’ account of justice, equality or democracy. Contrast Zapatismo in other words, with traditional revolutionary rhetoric and more particularly with the communist struggles of the past with their tightly knit, disciplined hierarchies built on a thorough going utilitarianism that is prepared, as Trotsky once bluntly put it, ‘to break eggs to make an omelette’. In Zapatismo we find on the contrary a sentiment that insists that all the ‘eggs’ are of value. It is ‘dignity’ and ‘respect’ for the singular voice that animates this struggle against representation, not a desire to fulfil the historical or foreordained destiny to which all voices are or will be subject. In this sense as in the other senses discussed here, it seems to me that this is a very Deleuzian kind of struggle, and Deleuze (and Guattari) anticipate on the plane of high theory the kinds of demands being articulated by Marcos and the Zapatistas. This is also to say that the search for a post-representational form of political practice should not be read as necessarily ‘nihilistic’ (as Laclau insists) or as one that inevitably pits the aristocratic ‘one’ against the many. Or if it is, then it is a nihilism that, as per Deleuze’s reading of ‘eternal return’, isa struggle in which being and difference are constantly affirmed. It is an affirmation of difference itself, of the singular voice, and of the possibility of and necessity for ‘spaces’ in which those voices can be heard. In the terms offered by Deleuze and Guattari this would be ‘smooth’ space as opposed to the ‘striated’ space of representational systems. It would be a ‘deterritorialised’ space of combination and recombination in accordance with differentiated, disaggregated desires; not the territorialised space of hierarchy, fixed and known roles that define ‘identity’. In terms of Zapatismo, this is a space in which ‘all worlds are possible’and in which it is the constant combination and recombination of the indigenous peoples that determines what ‘happens’.

#### Empirics prove – singular movements are doomed to failure – only Zapatismo solves

David Solnit, writer and activist organizer who helped take a part in the 1999 WTO Shutdowns, 2003, “Globalize Liberation: How to Uproot the System and Build a Better World,” Text

The new radicalism is a movement of movements, a network of networks, not merely intent on changing the world, but—as the Zapatistas describe—making a new one in which many worlds will fit. It is a patchwork quilt of hope sewn together with countless hands, actions, songs, e-mails, and dreams into a whole that is much greater than the sum of its pieces. These movements, with their new ways of organizing, resistance, communication and new forms of alternative institutions, represent a dramatic departure from the last century’s prevailing strategies of working for change. A common theme within the new radicalism is the practice of letting the means determine the ends. Unless the community or world we want is built into and reflected by the struggle to achieve it, movements will always be disappointed in their efforts. Groups, political parties, or movements that are hierarchically structured themselves cannot change the antidemocratic and hierarchical structures of government, corporations, and corporate capitalism. Many of the twentieth-century’s major efforts – reforming existing institutions or governments in order to make them kinder and gentler, or overthrowing them and then occupying and replicating those same or similar structures of power – were ultimately not successful, and in the worst cases they left a legacy of disaster and betrayal

for those who gave their sweat and blood in the fight for a better world. The term “Left,” has sadly lumped authoritarian groups, parties, governments, and dictators together with genuinely democratic social movements, and the “Left” and “Right” are no longer adequate to describe the complex political spectrum of the twenty-first century. Unless positive new ideas and methods are more clearly articulated and widely explored, people and movements striving for a better world will remain trapped in the failed models of the past. Without a creative break from these patterns we doom ourselves to stagnant movements, another generation of dishearted radicals, and a world unchanged. It is desperately clear that we need to articulate new ways of making change. The new radicalism has been birthed from this desire to popularize and self-organize mass movements form the ground up using these new ways. It’s time to throw out the old mythology that a single organization, ideology, or network can effectively change the world. The era of monolithic movements and international political parties is over. “Correct” political lines, one-ideology-fits-all, rigid blueprints, and cookie-cutter solutions won’t work. Instead, the new radicalism finds its hopeful possibilities in the diverse interconnected movements of movements that has risen up around the planet. These movements are distinct in each culture, community and place, and this diversity is at the heart of the new radicalism’s strength and appeal. This movement of movements represents the evolution of a new model of unity and expanded definitions of solidarity. This is the unity of acting in concert, finding points of convergence, making alliances and building networks, and networks of networks, that articulate a “NO” to the system, louder and more effectively than the sums of all our individual “NO’s.” The new radicalism has emerged organically as the impacted peoples of the world have listened to and connected with each other’s experience. Out of this instinct has come mutual respect and a common understanding of the interlocking systems that keep us all down in different ways. This is the healthy biodiviersity of an ecosystem of resistance.