# 1nc vs diego

## OFF – T

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Waiver is temporary.

Green 5/6 [Andrew Green (Devex Contributing Reporter based in Berlin, his coverage focuses primarily on health and human rights and he has previously worked as Voice of America's South Sudan bureau chief and the Center for Public Integrity's web editor). “US backs waiver for intellectual property rights for COVID-19 vaccines”. Devex. 06 May 2021. Accessed 7/31/2021. <https://www.devex.com/news/us-backs-waiver-for-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-vaccines-99847> //Xu]

In a stunning reversal, U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration came out in favor of waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines Wednesday. The move follows months of U.S. opposition that began under former President Donald Trump to a proposal from South Africa and India to temporarily set aside intellectual property rights around products that would protect, contain, and treat COVID-19. Its supporters have argued that the proposal, first tabled at the World Trade Organization in October and now backed by more than 100 countries, is necessary to expand vaccine production and overcome global shortages.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections “during pandemics”, which is an suspension – don’t let them get We Meets since their Plan defends a waiver.

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 4] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents.

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 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.

#### Thus, the only role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best deconstructs capitalistic production, accumulation, and commodification.

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 1AC’s methodology of limited IP waivers affirms the anti-Black Empire of contemporary biomedical industries – the plan results in concentrations of Black bodies identified as “problems”

Krupar & Ehlers ’16 – Krupar: PhD in Geography @ University of California-Berkeley, MA in East Asian Studies @ Stanford University, Geographer and Provost's Distinguished Associate Professor at Georgetown University; Professor @ University of Sydney in Department of Sociology and Social Policy, School of Social and Political Sciences Research Coordinator [Shiloh Krupar & Nadine Ehlers, 15 June 2016, *Biofutures: Race and the governance of health*, accessed from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775816654475, pages: 2-4] | saurish

Contemporary biomedical technologies that target race seem to ameliorate the ‘‘cut’’ of systemic racism—by targeting supposedly race-specific health factors or directing health care toward particular spaces to alleviate health disparities. In what follows, we consider two examples of biomedical targeting technologies and their biopolitical operations. First, we focus on BiDil, a pharmaceutical approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 2005, and subsequently marketed as a race-specific drug for self-identified African Americans suffering from heart failure. Second, we turn to what is known as ‘‘medical hot spotting,’’ a practice that began in Camden, New Jersey in 2007, and that uses GIS technologies and spatial profiling to identify populations that are medically vulnerable (‘‘health care’s costliest 1%’’) in order to provide preemptive care at home and lower hospital admissions and health care costs. These targeting operations are deployed ostensibly to affirm life: They are said to redress past forms of biomedical neglect and enable the tailoring of biomedical intervention into vulnerable communities, and they are advocated as the means through which to foster the health of those populations—through attention, through targeting. Such forms of redress and attention might be understood, then, as the attempt to practice—and actualize—a different racial future, precisely through attending to inequities in the present. However, **targeted health interventions may in effect signal inequitable and endangering forms of biomedical administration**.3 We advance this more cautionary view through three foundational claims. First, regardless of the motivations for biomedical targeting—that is, the will to attend to black health—**the operation of race-specific biomedical targeting of black subjects is structured through an epistemology of anti-blackness**. More than racist actions against blacks, the architecture of racial discrimination, or a paradigm that binds blackness and death together, anti-blackness is a form of knowledge that positions the black subject outside of the category Human.4 This positioning stems from liberal humanist thought and is constitutive of Western modernity (Barrett, 2014). Not only has the epistemology of anti-blackness shaped the racial past in the U.S., but it also curtails the present and future of black life. Such expulsion of black lives from the normative position Human is undeniable, ‘‘[g]iven the histories of slavery, colonialism, segregation, lynching’’ and the ongoing daily imperiling of black lives through police brutality and mass incarceration (Weheliye, 2014: 19). **That biomedical targeting is structured through antiblackness is evident in the way it reinstitutes racial difference and separation and**, as we will show, **stages an additional form of violence by actually expelling blacks from the possibility of optimal health.** Black lives have been consistently imperiled in and through the biomedical encounter, in the form of lack of access to care and health insurance, inequities in caregiving, and the medical abuse of black bodies, from grave robbing for medical experimentation, to the Tuskegee Syphilis Experiments, and the appropriation of the Henrietta Lacks cell line (Duster, 2003a; Institute of Medicine Report, 2002; Nelson, 2011; Roberts, 2012; Van Ryn and Fu, 2003; Washington, 2008). Anti-blackness continues to thwart black life and futurity through biomedical targeting operations that subject African Americans to what Du Bois (1899) named as a ‘‘social atmosphere . . . which differs from that surrounding whites.’’5 Race-based targeting efforts that are aimed at redressing health inequities recursively **secure anti-blackness by refusing to acknowledge its structuring logic**, thus **equating blackness with inevitable vulnerability, risk, threat, and premature death**.6 Second, and related to our first point, these biomedical targeting operations extract the conditions of black health and illness from the broader contexts of structural racism. Biomedical targeting generally fails to recognize the social conditions in which poor health emerges and, in the case of black subjects, how poor health, institutional racism, and the epistemology of anti-blackness are ontologically enmeshed. The targeting of black populations—specifically the two cases we explore here—does not simply direct resources to black subjects. Instead, in such operations, race is objectified as that to be targeted, meaning that race itself is not undone: That is, race as a stratifying mechanism that orders the social—a social order characterized by anti-blackness—is not called into question. Both BiDil and medical hot spotting demarcate populations, with supposedly distinct bodies, and name them as a political problem in need of specific health governance; black bodies and racialized spaces are targeted in order to manage the life of the population. Accordingly, BiDil might be seen to **ontologize blackness as a corporeal truth for market accumulation**, while medical hot spotting can be said to spatially ontologize structural racism in order **to secure cost efficiencies** of

the health care system. BiDil is predicated on financial extraction; medical hot spotting is predicated on threat containment. These biomedical targeting technologies reveal how **health interventions do not necessarily support or achieve a better future for African Americans**. Instead, **they advance** the epistemological violence of **anti-blackness by concentrating the ‘‘problem’’ of black life in the U.S. at** the scales of: (1) **the racialized body (BiDil) and** (2) **space (hot spots), which both become objects of ever more heightened administration, financial exploitation, and securitization**. BiDil positions African Americans as ‘‘problem bodies’’ that must take on responsibility for their own racialized embodied risk through the act of buying and consuming race-based medicine; here, anti-blackness operates through the black responsibilization of risk. Medical hot spotting tracks, maps, and fixes high-cost health care users in ‘‘problem spaces’’ that are positioned outside the populace; hot spotting locates and reifies the structural position of anti-blackness in space for the purposes of surveillance, anticipation of risk, and containment. Third, contemporary biomedical targeting technologies are an endangering form of health administration exacerbated by **the logics of neoliberalism**. Under neoliberal conditions, populations previously excluded from the vital politics of the nation are now ostensibly being addressed. However, the two biomedical targeting technologies that we explore reveal a predatory power to demarcate race for purposes spanning financial extraction to threat containment—even as such ‘‘targeting’’ is advocated as the means for addressing the embodied and spatial effects of racial inequality. In neoliberal times, the color line no longer operates as a clear and obvious modality of exclusion, as Du Bois would have it (Goldberg, 2008). The neoliberal biopolitics of health increasingly emphasizes customizing health, the body, and life itself through biomedical practices (Clarke et al., 2003: 181–182). Our two case studies reveal how customizing health seems to be an operation of inclusion (directly or indirectly by race) within biomedicine: BiDil is a customized drug that attends to black health; it targets racial minorities supposedly to extend life. Medical hot spotting is also a form of customization through care delivery: It delineates ‘‘problem spaces’’—where high utilizers of health care are located—in order to direct resources and generate efficiencies in health provisions. ‘‘Customizing’’ works in the first case through ‘‘color awareness’’ and marketing within biomedicine (i.e. the racialized spectacle of the body), and paradoxically in the second, through invisibilizing race at the level of ‘‘location’’/space according to the socalled colorblind agency of the free market and cost–benefit analysis (O’Boyle, 2007). While both targeting technologies may attempt to alleviate racial health disparities, they simultaneously **augment racial difference and exacerbate racial inequalities**—but they do so in very different ways: thus emphasizing the importance of tracing out the empirically distinct means through which each technology resecures the epistemology of anti-blackness. BiDil highlights the neoliberal refusal to acknowledge the social production of risk, by casting health as an individual—not social—enterprise. Medical hot spotting disavows the historical and spatial processes of racial formation that structure the present and simultaneously shows that certain (racialized) subjects are positioned—in advance—as risk failures within the paradoxically ‘‘race-neutral future’’ of the nation. To begin exploring these ideas, we turn to the case of BiDil, the oft-disputed first pharmaceutical with a race-specific indication.

#### 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.
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