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## OFF – T

#### Interpretation – the Affirmative must present a delineated enforcement mechanism for the Plan. There is no normal means since terms are negotiated contextually among member states.

WTO No Date "Whose WTO is it anyway?" <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org1_e.htm> //Elmer

**When WTO rules impose disciplines** on countries’ policies, **that is the outcome of negotiations among WTO members.** The rules are **enforced** **by** the **members themselves** **under agreed procedures that they negotiated**, **including the possibility of trade sanctions**. But those sanctions are imposed by member countries, and authorized by the membership as a whole. This is quite different from other agencies whose bureaucracies can, for example, influence a country’s policy by threatening to withhold credit.

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards

#### 1] Shiftiness- They can redefine the 1AC’s enforcement mechanism in the 1AR which allows them to recontextualize their enforcement mechanism to wriggle out of DA’s since all DA links are predicated on type of enforcement i.e. sanctions bad das, domestic politics das off of backlash, information research sharing da if they put monetary punishments, or trade das. SUPERCHARGED BY THE FACT THAT THEY SAY THEY DON’T PASS THE PLAN AND DEFEND THE RES AS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE

#### 2] Real World - Policy makers will always specify how the mandates of the plan should be endorsed. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, states can circumvent the Aff’s policy since there is no delineated way to enforce the affirmative which means there’s no way to actualize any of their solvency arguments.

#### ESpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary- it’s an active part of the WTO is central to any advocacy about international IP law since the only uniqueness of a reduction of IP protections is how effective its enforcement is

Competing interps cuz it leads to a race to the top which is good for debate & reasonability is arbitrary

No rvis cuz ir leads to theory baiting which chills theory and lets abuse happen

Fairness and eudcation are impacts cuz rheyre intrinsic to the debate process

## OFF – K

#### Capitalism necessitates a frame of global modernity structured by racialized accumulation and the dispossession of the slave’s body. The 1ac’s engagement in democracy and ignorance of ontological distinctions strengthens systems of expropriation and hyper-exploitation that generate violent modes of financialized capitalism, justifying policing, the prison industrial complex, and infinite modes of oppression.

Wang ‘18 –PhD candidate in African and African American Studies @ Harvard University [Jackie Wang, February 23, 2018, *Carceral Capitalism*, pages: 115-125] | Saurish

Given the dual character of capitalist accumulation identified by both Rosa Luxemburg and David Harvey, what new understanding of capitalism would be generated by focusing on dispossession and expropriation over work and production? Contemporary political theorists as well as critical ethnic studies, black studies, and Native studies scholars and activists analyze how racial slavery and settler colonialism provide the material and territorial foundation for U.S. and Canadian sovereignty. Rather than casting slavery and Native genocide as temporally circumscribed events that inaugurated the birth of capitalism in the New World (“primitive accumulation”), they show how the racial logics produced by these processes persist to this day: In order to recuperate the frame of political economy, a focus on the dialectic of racial slavery and settler colonialism leads to important revisions of Karl Marx’s theory of primitive accumulation. In particular, Marx designates the transition from feudal to capitalist social relations as a violent process of primitive accumulation whereby “conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, in short, force, play the greatest part.” For Marx, this results in the expropriation of the worker, the proletariat, who becomes the privileged subject of capitalist revolution. If we consider primitive accumulation as a persistent structure rather than event, both Afro-pessimism and settler colonial studies destabilize normative conceptions of capitalism through the conceptual displacements of the proletariat. As Coulthard demonstrates, in considering Indigenous peoples in relation to primitive accumulation, “it appears that the history and experience of dispossession, not proletarianization, has been the dominant background structure shaping the character of the historical relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state.” It is thus dispossession of land through genocidal elimination, relocation, and theft that animates Indigenous resistance and anticapitalism and “less around our emergent status as ‘rightless proletarians.’” If we extend the frame of primitive accumulation to the question of slavery, it is the dispossession of the slave’s body rather than the proletarianization of labor that both precedes and exceeds the frame of settler colonial and global modernity.¹³ As Iyko Day notes, Native dispossession occurs through the expropriation of land, while black dispossession is characterized by enslavement and bodily dispossession. Although **both racial logics buttress white accumulation and** are defined by a “genocidal limit concept” that **constitutes these subjects as disposable**, Day notes that “the racial content of Indigenous peoples is the mirror opposite of blackness. From the beginning, an eliminatory project was driven to reduce Native populations through genocidal wars and later through statistical elimination through blood quantum and assimilationist policies. For slaves, an opposite logic of exclusion was driven to increase, not eliminate, the population of slaves.”¹⁴ A debate has ensued in critical ethnic studies about which axis of dispossession is capitalism’s condition of possibility: the expropriation of Native land or chattel slavery? Was the U.S. made possible primarily by unbridled access to black labor, or through territorial conquest? Is the global racial order defined—as Day writes—primarily by the indigenous-settler binary or the black-nonblack binary? At stake in this debate is the question of which axis of dispossession is the “base” from which the “superstructures” of economy, national sovereignty, or even subjectivity itself emerge. Those who argue that settler colonialism is central have sometimes made the claim that even black Americans participate in settler colonialism and indigenous displacement by continuing to live on stolen land, while those who center slavery and antiblackness have sometimes viewed Native Americans as perpetrators of antiblackness insofar as some tribes have historically owned slaves and seek state recognition by making land-based claims to sovereignty—a claim that relies on a political grammar that black Americans do not have access to, as slaves were rent from their native lands when they were transported to the Americas (see Jared Sexton’s “The Vel of Slavery”). Although weighing in on this debate is beyond the scope of this essay, I generally agree with Day’s assertion that **to treat this set of issues as a zero-sum game obfuscates the complexity of these processes**. With that said, it is important to note that this book deals primarily with the antiblack dimensions of prisons, police, and racial capitalism, though I acknowledge that analyses of settler colonialism are equally vital to understanding the operations of racial capitalism and how race is produced through multiple expropriative logics. Gendered Expropriation Though this book focuses primarily on black racialization in a contemporary context, it is worth noting that expropriation reproduces multiple categories of difference—including the man-woman gender binary. Although categories of difference were not invented by capitalism, **expropriative processes assign particular meanings to categories of difference.** “Woman” is reproduced as inferior through the unwaged theft of her labor, while the esteem of the category of “man” is propped up by the valorization of his labor. Even when women are in the professional workforce, they are still vulnerable to expropriation when they are given or take on work beyond their formal duties—whether it’s washing the dishes at the office, mentoring students, or doing thankless administrative work while male colleagues get the “dysfunctional genius” pass. But above all, **gendered expropriation occurs through the extraction of care labor, emotional labor, as well as domestic and reproductive labor**— all of which is enabled by the enforcement of a rigid gender binary.This system is propped up by gender socialization, which compels women to psychologically internalize a feeling of responsibility for others. Although, at a glance, it might seem that the expropriation of women’s labor happens primarily through housewifization, the marriage contract, and the assignment of child-care duties to women, in the current epoch—characterized by an aging baby boomer population and a shortage of geriatric health-care workers—women are increasingly filling this void by taking care of sick parents, family members, and loved ones. It is hardly surprising that two-thirds of those who care for those with Alzheimer’s disease are women, even as women are the primary victims of this disease. Given that women’s lives are often interrupted by both childcare duties and caring for ailing family members, it’s also hardly surprising that women accumulate many fewer assets and are more likely to retire into poverty than their male counterparts. A recent report found that the European Union gender pension gap was 40 percent, which far exceeds the gender pay gap of 16 percent. Overall, gender is a material relation that, among other things, bilks women of their futures. The aged woman who has toiled by caring for others is left with little by the end of her life. Though gender distinctions are maintained through expropriative processes, they also have consequences beyond the economic and material realm. While it could be said that disposability is the logic that corresponds to racialized expropriation, gendered subjectivation has as its corollary rapeability. It also goes without saying that these expropriative logics are not mutually exclusive, as nonwhite women and gender-nonconforming people may be subject to a different set of expropriative logics than white women. Racialized Expropriation Although I do not claim that expropriation should be defined exclusively as racialization (again, because different expropriative logics reproduce multiple categories of difference), this book deals primarily with the antiblack racial order that is produced by late-capitalist accumulation. Michael C. Dawson and Nancy Fraser are two contemporary political theorists who have defined expropriation as a racializing process in capitalist societies. In “Hidden in Plain Sight,” Dawson takes Fraser to task for not acknowledging racialized expropriation as one of the “background domains” of capitalist society. Understanding the logic of expropriation, in his view, is necessary for understanding which modes of resistance are needed at this historical juncture. His article begins with a meditation on the question: Should activists and movements such as Black Lives Matter focus on racialized state violence (police shootings, mass incarceration, and so forth), or should they focus on racialized inequality caused by expropriation and exploitation? What is the relationship between the first logic—characterized by disposability—and the second logic—characterized by exploitability and expropriability? Rather than describing these logics as distinct forms of antiblack racism, he analyzes them as two dimensions of a dynamic process whereby capitalist expropriation generates the racial order by fracturing the population into superior and inferior humans: Understanding the foundation of capitalism requires a consideration of “the hidden abode of race”: the ontological distinction between superior and inferior humans—codified as race—that was necessary for slavery, colonialism, the theft of lands in the Americas, and genocide. This racial separation is manifested in the division between full humans who possess the right to sell their labor and compete within markets, and those that are disposable, discriminated against, and ultimately either eliminated or superexploited.¹⁵ **Black racialization**, then, **is the mark that renders subjects as suitable for**—on the one hand—**hyperexploitation and expropriation, and**, on the other hand, **annihilation**. Before the neoliberal era, the racial order was propped up by the state, and racial distinctions were enforced through legal codification, Jim Crow segregation, and other formal arrangements. In a contemporary context, though the legal regime undergirding the racial order has been dismantled, **race has maintained** its dual character, which consists of “not only **a probabilistic assignment of** relative **economic value but also an index of** differential **vulnerability** to state violence.”¹⁶ In other words, vulnerability to **hyperexploitation and expropriation in the economic domain and** vulnerability to **premature death in the political and social domains**. My essay on the Ferguson Police Department and the city’s program of **municipal plunder is an attempt** to make visible the hidden backdrop of Mike Brown’s execution: **the widespread racialized expropriation of black residents carried out by the criminal justice arm of the state**. It is not just that Mike Brown’s murder happened alongside the looting of residents at the behest of the police and the city’s financial manager, but that racial legacies that have marked black residents as lootable are intimately tied to police officers’ treatment of black people as killable. The two logics reinforce and are bound up with each other. In her response to Dawson’s analysis of racialization as expropriation, Fraser develops Dawson’s claims by looking at the interplay between economic expropriation and “politically enforced status distinctions.”¹⁷ Not only does accumulation in a capitalist society occur along the two axes of exploitation and expropriation, but one makes the other possible in that the “**racialized subjection of those whom capital expropriates is a condition of possibility for the freedom of those whom it exploits**.”¹⁸ In other words, the “front story” of free workers who are contracted by capitalists to sell their labor-power for a wage is enabled by, and depends on, expropriation that takes place outside this contractual arrangement. Fraser further extends Dawson’s analysis by offering a historical account of the various regimes of racialization. In her analysis of the “proletarianization” of black Americans as they migrated from the South to industrial centers in the North and Midwest during the first half of the twentieth century, she points out that even in the context of industrial “exploitation,” the segmented labor market was organized such that a **“confiscatory premium was placed on black labor.”** Black industrial workers were paid less than their white counterparts. In some sense, the racialized gap in earnings can be thought of as the portion that was expropriated from black workers. It is not as though the black laborers who joined the ranks of the industrial proletariat were newly subjected to exploitation rather than expropriation, but that these two methods of accumulation were operating in tandem. In the “present regime of racialized accumulation”—which she refers to as “financialized capitalism”—Fraser notes that there has been a loosening of the binary that has historically separated who should be subjected to expropriation from who should be subjected to exploitation, and that during the present period, debt is regularly deployed as a method of dispossession: Much large-scale industrial exploitation now occurs outside the historic core, in the BRICS countries of the semi-periphery. And expropriation has become ubiquitous, afflicting not only its traditional subjects but also those who were previously shielded by their status as citizenworkers. In these developments, debt plays a major role, as global financial institutions pressure states to collude with investors in extracting value from defenseless populations.¹⁹ While I agree with Fraser’s claim that the “sharp divide” between “expropriable subjects and exploitable citizen-workers” has been replaced by a “continuum” (albeit a continuum that remains racialized), I would add that the existence of poor whites who have fallen out of the middle class or have been affected by the opiate crisis at the present juncture represents not racial progress for black Americans, but the generalization of expropriability as a condition in the face of an accumulation crisis. In other words, immiseration for all rather than a growing respect for black Americans. Fraser rightly points out that “expropriation becomes tempting in periods of crisis.”²⁰ Sometimes the methods of accumulation that were once reserved exclusively for racialized subjects bleed over and are used on those with privileged status markings. If **expropriation and exploitation now occur on a continuum**, then it has been made possible, in part, by late capitalism’s current modus operandi: the probabilistic ranking of subjects according to risk, sometimes indexed by a person’s credit score. As I will demonstrate in the coming sections, this method is not a race-neutral way of gleaning information about a subject’s personal integrity, credibility, or financial responsibility. It is merely an index of already-existing inequality and a way to distinguish between which people should be expropriated from and which should be merely exploited.

#### The WTO regime is emblematic of the globalization of corporate capitalism and late stage capitalism’s imperialism – the affirmative’s call to take action through the WTO only reproduces imperialism and the world economy

Fukuda 10, Yasuo Fukuda, Professor of Graduate School of Economics at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, and author of Modern Market Economy and Inflation (1992), Commodification of Land and Urban Problems (1993), Distribution of Wealth and Income in Modern Japan (2002) and Corporate Globalization and Local Sovereignty (2010), “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE”, January 2010, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>, accessed by apark 7/5/21

Lenin outlined five pillars by which to define imperialism. The first is monopoly capital gaining control of the major industries of a country. The growth of monopoly capital is a consequence of market concentration caused by competition among firms. Once market concentration reaches a certain point, it becomes possible for a small number of winners to form collusions, such as cartels, which transform the nature of the economy, leading to the dominance of monopoly capital. The second pillar is the formation of business relationships between industrial and financial monopoly capital. Monopoly capital also forms cozy relationships with government through the financing of political campaigns and through revolving doors. In short, monopoly capital wields governing power over national economies through market concentration, collusions among large firms, and direct political influence. The third pillar is foreign investment. Drawing on its political influence, monopoly capital effects the transfer of wealth from workers, farmers, small to medium-sized businesses, and the self-employed to monopoly capital. The resulting distortion of income distribution causes disproportionate growth among industries—especially between manufacturing and farming—and suppresses consumption. This leads to over-accumulation, which forces monopoly capital to export merchandise and invest abroad. The fourth pillar is global divisions among monopoly capital through cartels. These divisions occur in the same way as those which take place at the national level; competition among large firms, and the market concentration which follows, leads to the formation of global cartel agreements. The fifth pillar is colonization of less-developed countries by the Great Powers, operating at the behest of monopoly capital. Such colonization is an outcome of global competition among opposing elements of monopoly capital. Monopoly capital takes advantage of colonization to monopolize control of natural resources and export markets, and as a means to protect capital invested in less-developed countries against appropriation. Figure 1 shows how the five pillars are related. The figure starts with monopoly capital as governing powers, from which follows a causal relationship down to the last outcome, competition for colonization. In other words, colonization is the final outcome of the governing power of monopoly capital. This is why Lenin considered monopoly capital to be the key to imperialism. Looking at contemporary capitalism from the viewpoint of Lenin’s “Imperialism,” it is clear that four of the five pillars (excepting the fifth) are still applicable to capitalism under the WTO regime. First, a small number of multinational corporations typically control more than half the market-share of major industries. For example, in the commercial seed market, the world’s top three corporations (Monsanto, DuPont, and Syngenta of Switzerland) control almost half of the world market. Cargill, along with its top four competitors, handle 85 percent of world grain trade. In the pharmaceutical industry, the top ten corporations hold a combined 54.8 percent share of the world market (ETC Group 2008). In banking, the world’s top 45 banks account for nearly 40 percent of the gross tier 1 capital of the top 1,000, and about 45 percent of the total assets (The Banker, June 24, 2009). It hardly needs saying that these companies enhance their power considerably through close relationships with governments, and through political contributions, lobbying, revolving doors, and the like. Second, industrial and financial monopoly capital establish political action groups as a means to advance common political goals. The negotiation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) represents a typical example of this sort of collusion between major companies of both the industrial and financial spheres. Third, no monopoly capital can survive without strategic foreign investment, including direct as well as portfolio investment. For instance, automobile companies will not survive without gaining access to Chinese and Indian markets. Fourth, in the course of intense competition over dominant market shares, large multinational corporations often collude to form price cartels (Connor 2001; Levenstein and Suslow 2001). The cartel-based character of monopoly capital culminated during GATT Uruguay Round negotiations, as large businesses cooperated to set market-rules specifically tailored to their own ends. There is no colonization occurring under the WTO regime. Modern capitalism lacks the fifth pillar of early 20th century imperialism. However, this does not mean that modern capitalism is without imperialism. Monopoly capital has gained new methods of obtaining the governing power over developing countries in place of colonization. First, major multinational corporations subcontract to firms in developing countries, thereby assimilating these firms into global business networks. For example, big food retailers such as Wal-Mart and Tesco have established global supply chain management networks which subcontract to farmers in developing countries, thereby bringing these farmers under centralized managerial control (South Centre and Traidcraft 2008). Here, prices fetched at farm gates are determined by monopolists at the top of the supply chain. Second, monopoly capital now dictates the rules of trade by directly involving itself in the crafting of trade policy. Big business coalitions took part in drafting the WTO Agreements. In the case of GATS, multinational corporations, including Citigroup, J. P. Morgan Chase, and Barclays Bank, drafted the proposal under the authorization of US and EU governments, and then used lobbying to push the agreement through at the time of negotiations (Balanyá et al. 2003). In the case of the negotiations for the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), it was the US Intellectual Property Committee (USIPC), a US business group, which wrote the initial draft, at the request of the US Trade Representative (Weissman 1996). Those party to the USIPC include Monsanto, Pfizer, DuPont, and IBM. Market and trade rules amount to a form of infrastructure vis-à-vis the markets. The body which decides the rules of trade has a considerable advantage over other stakeholders. Under the current setting, it is large multinationals, especially the agents of US monopoly capital, which control the rules of trade, specifically through cozy relationships with the US government. Therefore, it is the governance of trade rules which most distinguishes modern capitalism from the imperialist systems of the early 20th century. The IMF and the World Bank are monopoly capital’s third source of governing power over developing countries. The IMF and the World Bank are under the control of the G7 (the US, Japan, Germany, France, the UK, Canada, and Italy), which hold nearly 42 percent of the votes in these two organizations. Within the G7 itself, only the US (specifically the US Treasury Department) has the power of veto. Furthermore, US and EU companies routinely establish relationships with the IMF and the World Bank directly. Stanley Fisher, former deputy managing director of the IMF, became vice-chairman of Citibank shortly after finishing his IMF tenure. James Wolfensohn, a former World Bank president, came from a senior executive role at Salomon Brothers and, following his stint at the World Bank, returned to Wall Street as chairman of the International Advisory Board of Citigroup. In 1995, while president of the World Bank, Wolfensohn started a Staff Exchange Program in order to facilitate employee sharing between multinational corporations and the Bank (Cray 2006). It was against this backdrop that the IMF and World Bank, through loan conditionality, forced developing countries to adopt open door policies, resulting in a flood of imports from the developed world (Marsden 2003; Weissman 2000; Weisbrot et al. 2009). Thus, the WTO regime is nothing short of a regime of imperialism, whereby monopoly capital exercises governing power over both national markets and the world economy. Whereas the first four of the five pillars by which Lenin defined imperialism still apply under the WTO regime, in place of the fifth (colonization), monopoly capital has gained new tools of dominance, most specifically the ability to design market rules. In losing the policy space to protect and develop local firms, developing countries are obliged to become incorporated into a global network managed by monopoly capital. In this way, income is steadily transferred from the lower rungs of the global economy to monopoly capital at the top. In short, the WTO regime constitutes a new stage of imperialism, in which monopoly capital holds hegemony over market rules in place of colonization.

#### **Thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that is best able to challenge the anti-Blackness structured through racial capitalism.**

#### The impact is racial capitalism – the 1AC locks in inevitable state sanctioned violence through the sustainability of incarceration regimes, migrant exploitation, slavery, and contemporary racial warfare developed through liberal tactics of disposability and inclusion that devalue blackness.

Melamed ‘15 –assistant professor of English and Africana Studies @ Marquette University [Jodi Melamed, Spring 2015, *Racial Capitalism*, pages: 53-54] | Saurish

Our dominant critical understanding of the term racial capitalism stays close to the usage of its originator, Cedric Robinson, in his seminal Black Marxism: The Making of a Black Radical Tradition.3 Robinson develops the term to correct the developmentalism and racism that led Marx and Engels to believe mistakenly that European bourgeois society would rationalize social relations. Instead, Robinson explains, the obverse occurred: “The development, organization, and expansion of capitalist society pursued essentially racial directions, so too did social ideology. As a material force . . . racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from capitalism. I have used the term ‘racial capitalism’ to refer . . . to the subsequent structure as a historical agency.”4 Thus the term “racial capitalism” requires its users to recognize that **capitalism is racial capitalism**. Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating, and it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of **severe inequality** among human groups—capitalists with the means of production/workers without the means of subsistence, creditors/debtors, conquerors of land made property/the dispossessed and removed. These antinomies of accumulation **require loss, disposability**, and the unequal differentiation of human value, **and racism** enshrines the inequalities that capitalism requires. Most obviously, it does this by displacing the uneven life chances that are inescapably part of capitalist social relations onto fictions of differing human capacities, historically race. We often associate racial capitalism with the central features of white supremacist capitalist development, including slavery, colonialism, genocide, incarceration regimes, migrant exploitation, and contemporary racial warfare. Yet we also increasingly recognize that contemporary **racial capitalism deploys liberal** and multicultural t**erms of inclusion to** value and **devalue forms of humanity differentially to fit** the needs of reigning state- **capital orders**. A thread of emergent critical understanding, proceeding from the recognition that procedures of racialization and capitalism are ultimately never separable from each other, seeks to comprehend the complex recursivity between material and epistemic forms of racialized violence, which are executed in and by core capitalist states with seemingly infinite creativity (beyond phenotype and in assemblages). Importantly, this approach understands the state and concomitant rights and freedoms to be fully saturated by racialized violence. Chandan Reddy, for example, demonstrates how the U.S. state in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has exercised its monopoly on legitimate violence both in response to “race”—the nationstate’s operational code for that irrationality and threat that freedom must exterminate—and as racial cruelty.5 The term “racial cruelty” signifies the extreme or surplus violence alongside and within state practices of supposedly rational violence (military, security, and legal), through which the state establishes itself as at once the protector of freedom and an effective, because excessive, counterviolence to the violence of race. Thus political emancipation is fatally coupled to both ordinary and **excessively cruel racialized state violence**. We can combine Reddy’s insights with David Harvey’s description of a “state-finance nexus” to posit a “state-finance-racial violence nexus.”6 Harvey’s term refers to the “central nervous system of accumulation,” where structures of governance whose relays cannot be separated out as either “political” or “economic” syncopate state management of the circulation of capital and circulate capital in a manner that conditions state functions, which become increasingly monetized, privatized, and commodified.7 **The “state**-finance-racial violence nexus” names the inseparable confluence of political/economic governance with racial violence, which **enables ongoing accumulation through dispossession by calling** forth the specter of **race (as threat) to legitimate state** counter**violence in the interest of financial asset owning** classes that would otherwise appear to violate social rationality, from the police-killing of immigrants and African American youth (in the name of safety for the white and prosperous), to the letting die of the racialized poor, to the social deaths transited through the precedent of Indigenous dispossession for profit.8 Accumulation under capitalism is necessarily expropriation of labor, land, and resources. But it is also something else: we need a more apposite language and a better way to think about capital as a system of expropriating violence on collective life itself.9 To this end, one way to strengthen racial capitalism as an activist hermeneutic is to use it to name and analyze the production of social separateness—the disjoining or deactiving of relations between human beings (and humans and nature)—needed for capitalist expropriation to work. Ruth Wilson Gilmore suggests a similar understanding of racial capitalism as a technology of antirelationality (a technology for reducing collective life to the relations that sustain neoliberal democratic capitalism) in her seminal definition of racism. Following Gilmore, “Racism is the state-sanctioned and/or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death, in distinct yet densely interconnected political geographies.”10 This last part of Gilmore’s definition is seldom quoted, yet crucially it identifies a dialectic in which forms of humanity are separated (made “distinct”) so that they may be “interconnected” in terms that feed capital. Gilmore elsewhere names this process “partition” and identifies it as the base algorithm for capitalism, which only exists and develops according to its capacity “to control who can relate and under what terms.”11

#### The alternative is an affirmation of Dual Power organizing through the Communist Party to provide effective mechanisms to educate communities and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation to fundamentally destroy capitalism.

Escalante 18 – MA in Department of Philosophy @ University of Oregon & a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist [Alyson Escalante, September 21, 2018, *Party Organizing In The 21st Century*, accessed from: <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>] | Saurish

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. **By building institutions which** can **meet people’s needs, we** are able to **concretely demonstrate that communists can offer** the oppressed **relief from** the horrific conditions of **capitalism**. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of **dual power** in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a **public face** as a **communist party**. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean **an organizational strategy** which adopts the **party model**. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods **for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around** democratically determined **goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis**. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is **building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement**. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth.

movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, **to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends**, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing **a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism.** The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

## Case

### Framework

#### Subject formation is value to debate and therefore the framing you will take for this round. If we win that they have an un-ethical orientation to the world that is sufficient to vote them down because if we win that the aff is racist there’s no reason why you should assume their impacts, which subsumes their FW.

Dylan Rodriguez, Professor of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside, November 18, 2016 “The Pitfalls of (White) Liberal Panic,” <https://abolitionjournal.org/the-pitfalls-of-white-liberal-panic/> //bl

There should be no shock at the success of White Nationalist revival. A fog of liberal-progressive panic seeps across the closest quarters, oddly individualizing what some inhabit as a normal and collective disposition of familiarity with emergency under conditions of constant bodily and spiritual duress. In the living room, kitchen, office, school, cafe, park, dorm room, gym, and library there is a steady-sad din: How did this happen, Why such hate, There are so many of them, What will happen to our country, Will I be threatened, My uncle and neighbor lied, What does the world think of us, I do not feel safe, What do we do now, Who will protect those people from them, How could this happen my god my god… Wrapped up in the noise, it is worth reminding that this alleged descent into new chapters of state-induced racial and sexual terror is not reducible to the serial reprehensible (though completely unsurprising) tweets, assaults, and grandstanding of the new President-Elect. There are some who understand, because their wisdom is inherited, that the terror he embodies is both long-standing and carried in the thrust of a Civilization’s futurity. This guy was always here, he is the persona his predecessors possessed but disguised so well (though you never fooled me, you assholes), and many of those in the throes of liberal-white-people-panic know this deep down because their revulsion to him is driven by a hatred of the intimate, the familial, and maybe the same. I must admit: i suspect some of them are incapable of seeing and feeling past themselves, their own bodily integrity, this isolated moment in a long, long history. The way they are spinning into prescriptions of how and why “we must resist” this particular abhorrence not only domesticates the liberal white riot, it threatens an infiltration of imagination in dislocated quarters that are accustomed to their negligence and generally thankful for their absence. The white misery desires multicultural company. Some of the ones panicking in public (online, on mic, on screen) are ready to tell the rest of us what to do, how to feel, and when to move—when in truth, if they felt so motivated, they would realize that their greatest contribution might be to shut the fuck up and get out of the way, because there has been some well thought-out, beautifully imagined, wild shit going on for years now, and some of it entails anticipation of their demise along with—because they are part of—the abhorrence. And those of us doing this kind of work (teaching, singing, organizing, playing, conspiring… i will plead the Fifth) have long realized that the lines we draw (such as the one i am replicating here) are never so clean, that we cross them because they always cross us, and it never feels good until we get back to the other side. Here we are again: there are rapists, there are thugs, unruly women, incorrigible queers, “marauders in the streets” (as the new President’s far more liberal predecessor Barry Goldwater once said) who must be neutralized, humiliated, violated in the bask of national vanity. It is to elevate to the level of assumption that the subjection of Black people to unbreaking proto-genocidal state violence is a generalized template through which other-others are periodically audited. To be undocumented is to be Brown or Black, and if others might fall into this category, it is only by misfortune of official nomenclature. “Grabbing pussy” is no longer a phrase that white women and old white men (or crusty-ass others) can condemn as the repulsive lyrical flourish of “those rappers” (whose names they rarely know), now that it has become the regular orientation of a ruler’s impulse-order. Elsewhere you see the peoples’ fugitive broadcasts of the racist police threat, usually carried out by white cops, but sometimes by Black and Brown ones, even and especially under the Watch of The Black President. (If they could kill this way under him, what will they be capable of doing now?) Can we say that a certain Hope is dead, and there must again be vigilant suspicion of what some mean by Change? Should we admit, now, that the “postracial” moment was a precursor (rather than a provocation) to a white populism that bizarrely insists on its nonraciality while it projects GIFs, memes, and clumsy puns invoking monkeys, taco bowls, and the Prophet Muhammad? It is stranger still that old terms—racism, misogyny, homophobia, sexism—have flooded the national discourse as if this spectacle, this candidate, this President-elect is the catalyst of a doomsday that has in fact been long present in the seemingly limitless reach of white (male) entitlement to degrade, humiliate, and assert dominion over the field of zero consequences. The morbid-cynical joyride of (white… multiculturalist?) liberal panic is neither merited nor, for some of us, fathomable. One could learn lessons from the twentysomethings in my classroom—Black, Brown, a few white, working class and lower middle class, queer and trans\*, one degree (or less) removed from an incarcerated and/or undocumented loved one—who do not lament a damn thing, and are simmering with urgent questions about the necessity of artful, collective rebellion against an order. They are invigorating a truth that some older, wiser heads have generously shared for years: that to live within an everyday understanding—and embrace—of emergency is to thrust liberal panic to the margins of an indulgence. It is to say, without a hint of “i told you so” smugness or exaggerated rage, that such a political-cultural recalibration to the White Supremacist Normal (however absurd this version may be) is always to be anticipated. The question is never “if,” it is “when” and “to what extent.” The problem, every fourth year, is never one of electoral outcome, it is one of political culture and the nuances of repression and fleeting opportunism that may follow. Despite outward appearances, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and Donald Trump are first cousins swaying to rhythms of progress and reaction, united by a commitment to negotiate and relate to the fact of white nationhood. Pres. Obama will be remembered fondly in the liberal-national memory as the glimmering preface to an unexpected descent into the eighth bolgia of an American Hustle. But what is most remarkable about this moment is not the instantaneous implosion of an electoral/governing regime nor the anticipated onslaught of official attacks on basic civil and sexual freedoms. Rather, it is the possibility that every radical accusation against the United States Empire and the complex monolith of “White America” that could once be easily dismissed as paranoid and extremist, hateful and “reverse racist,” or even treasonous and “terrorist” is now reckoning sober consideration as being, at the very least, on to something. Undoubtedly, the audacity of hope, the optimism of change, and the belief in the transformative possibilities of symbolic-charismatic leadership divined from the Executive Branch of the U.S. nation-building machinery should die a lonely death here, and should not be revivified anytime, ever again. Liberal panic amidst proto-fascist ascendancy is the symptom of an insistent belief in the long-debunked narrative of (with apologies to the rest of the Américas) an American possibility that shines with justice and shared joy in the spoils of [White Being](http://trueleappress.wordpress.com/2016/08/30/policing-and-the-violence-of-white-being-an-interview-with-dylan-rodriguez/). Panic never lasts long, and once it dissipates, there is therapeutic (mal)adjustment to yet another new normal. The modalities of sanctioned resistance to the worst of the normal become common, tolerable, negotiable, and finally ignorable. Civil society (that is, this civil society) again reveals the non-negotiable terms of being human (in fact, of “human being”) in a rush to reconvene a spirit of nation, though possibly many more Other humans than at any time in the last half-century will refuse the call, despite the seductions of compulsory corporate diversity and official multiculturalism. It is not worth the time and energy, because the moment forces yet another reckoning with that which cannot be assumed: health, home, rights, respected personhood, and at times the future itself. They don’t understand, will never understand, what it means to carry this stress, and those of us who do must talk about it as incitement on our own, complex terms. It is always killing us, slowly and quickly, but maybe now is their time to suffer. An insurgency imperative accompanies a revival that is White Nationalist in origin, and white supremacist-misogynist in form. It is a different kind of invitation, one that thrills in living against, creating for, refusing impossible, renarrating the “practical,” catalyzing collective genius to shift a historical script. As always, this is nothing new, although it might make sense to inhabit the thing as if everything is still to be done.

#### rest was j analytics