#### [Hart] Subjects are fundamentally unstable because of *evolution* : all subjects fluctuate as they continue to evolve. Babies become toddlers, teenagers become adults, all which prove evolution.

#### Affect is constitutive: it is the capacity to experience and to be experienced. In round, everyone has the capacity to experience each other. There is no way any person or thing can escape affection.

**Hardt 14:** Hardt, Micheal. [Professor at Duke University] “The Power to be Affected” *Springer Science and Business,* 2014. BP – JP

Lauren Berlant’s work is filled with explorations of the passions, the many ways in which we are affected by powers greater than ourselves—in institutional contexts and intimate relations, in sexual encounters and aesthetic experiences, and in political affairs and economic struggles. The object of her journeys through the affects is not simply to register or catalogue—let alone lament—the affective damage caused by living in contemporary society or the ways in which our desires are thwarted. Instead, she regards the pains, pleasures, frustrations, and longing as so many tracks we can follow to understand how people manage in this world to create new intimacies, new bonds, and new forms of life.1 Simply getting by and surviving in a dangerous and threatening world, though, is not enough. Berlant revives classical concepts to name her ultimate goals: **we should strive for the good life and seek human flourishing.** Orienting the analysis and even the affirmation of the affects toward a project for the good life might well seem an odd combination since the classical tradition teaches us—or, at least, this is what we are usually told—that the passions are the ties that bind us in servitude; only following the dictates of sovereign reason can we truly flourish. In Berlant’s work, instead, the only path toward achieving the good life must be constructed with and through the affects. To understand the arc of Berlant’s project, I find it helpful to pose it in relation to that of Baruch Spinoza, to which it has strong correspondences. (Berlant may well be a closet Spinozist—even without knowing it.) For Spinoza being affected by others, by external forces, is not a weakness but a strength, a power. As a first approximation, **think of the power** to be affected **as a gauge of your capacity to be really in the world, to register and feel its diverse powers.** Once we open up and expand our power to be affected, however, then begins the work of selecting among the affects and discovering the means to repeat or prolong those that are beneficial and prevent the detrimental. That is a path, through the affects, with the affects, toward joy and flourishing. The first step of this process is to take stock realistically and recognize that we are not sovereign subjects. Berlant is rightly suspicious of the standard ethical injunctions that assume our individual sovereignty, as well as those that aim at constructing or supporting sovereign political powers. Consider the sovereign individual, in correspondence with Carl Schmitt’s political formula, as the one who decides (2007). Berlant questions both elements of this statement: the one and the decision. Sovereign decision, she claims, resides on an illusion of self-control, “a fantasy misrecognized as an objective state” (2011, p. 97). People are not always engaged in projects of self- extension, she says, and in fact, they seldom have significant control over their decision-making. Spinoza expresses the same idea in quantitative terms. The power of all individual or limited subjects to think and act autonomously corresponds proportionally to the relation between their powers and the power of nature as a whole. “The force by which a man perseveres in existing is limited, and infinitely surpassed by the power of external causes” (1985 Ethics IV P3). Only God (or nature as a whole) is self-caused because it has no outside. The fact that the power of the world outside of us so far surpasses our own power means that we are affected by others much more than we affect the world or even autonomously affect ourselves, and thus, our capacity for sovereign decision-making is minimal too**.** The other half of Schmitt’s dictum is equally unfounded: “the one” never decides or acts or is acted on. The subject is never one. Agency and causality, Berlant suggests, should be understood not in terms of unities but instead “as dispersed environmental mechanisms at the personal as well as the institutional level” (2011, p. 114). Spinoza expresses this too in mathematical and geometrical form. A body or an individual, he explains, is formed when a great number of parts agree with each other and thus communicate in a consistent way (1985 Ethics II P13 definition). Essential to a body is the relation: the body lives as long as that relation is maintained. Instead of thinking in terms of unities, then, we need to think the relation among multiplicitiesand recognize the consistency of dispersed landscapes. To identify the locus of decision or acting or being acted upon, we need to look to not the one but the consistent relation among the many. There is no point in lamenting our relative lack of poweror unity or ability to rule ourselves autonomously. Spinoza, in fact, ridicules those wise men who, maintaining a fantasy of the sovereign subject, chastise us for being ruled by passions. “Philosophers look upon the passions by which we are assailed as vices, into which men fall by their own fault. So it is their custom to deride, bewail, berate them, or, if their purpose is to appear more zealous than others, to execrate them. They believe that they are thus performing a sacred duty, and that they are attaining the summit of wisdom when they have learnt how to shower extravagant praise on a human nature that nowhere exists and the revile that which exists in actuality. The fact is that they conceive men not as they are, but as they would like them to be. As a result, for the most part it is not ethics they have written, but satire; and they have never worked out a political theory that can have practical application” (2002 Political Treatise, Chapter 1, Introduction, 680). A practical political theory instead must begin where people are**,** and really existing people are primarily filled, so to speak, by passions. Berlant poses the terrain of the nonsovereign in terms of the “interruptions” or “intermissions” that break the imagined efforts of self- extension of sovereign subjects. (Be careful, though, not to be misled by these terms because, as Berlant makes clear, they are the norm not the exception: we live in the interruption and the intermission the vast majority of the time.)

#### [Weheliye 1] The state’s conception of identity and inclusion only further exasperates exclusion: by using the WTO as an arbiter to determine whether non - western countries are valued or ignored, these countries are forced to experience violence and compete with one another for rights recognition.

**Weheliye 1**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP/BP

Paradoxically, the particular biological material in question remains the property, at least nominally, of all humanity and is not proper to Moore the individual person: “Lymphokines, unlike a name or a face, have the same molecular structure in every human being and the same, important functions in every human being's immune system. Moreover, the particular genetic material which is responsible for the natural production of lymphokines, and which defendants use to manufacture lymphokines in the laboratory, is also the same in every person; it is no more unique to Moore than the number of vertebrae in the spine or the chemical formula of hemoglobin.”20 **So, while the court grants personhood to human subjects in an individualized fashion that is based on comparatively distinguishing between different humans, when biological material clashes with the interests of capital, the court appeals to the indivisible biological sameness of the Homo sapiens species**. Since the court's ruling does not place this slice of human flesh in the commons for all humans to share, it tacitly grants corporations the capability of legally possessing this material with the express aim of generating monetary profit. Considering that corporations enjoy the benefits of limited personhood and the ability to live forever under U.S. law, corporate entities are entrusted with securing the immortal life of biological matter, while human persons are denied ownership of their supposed essence.21 My interest here lies not in claiming inalienable ownership rights for cells derived from human bodies such as Lacks's and Moore's but to draw attention to how thoroughly the very core of pure biological matter is framed by neoliberal market logics and by liberal ideas of personhood as property. We are in dire need of alternatives to the legal conception of personhood that dominates our world, and, in addition, to not lose sight of what remains outside the law, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magically transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity-based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how the focus on inclusion, recognition, and equality based on a narrow legal framework (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not only hinders the eradication of violence against trans people and other vulnerable populations but actually creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.” If demanding recognition and inclusion remains at the center of minority politics, it will lead only to a delimited notion of personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others, thus allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differences between full humans, not-quite-humans, and nonhumans. This can be gleaned from the “successes” of the mainstream feminist, civil rights, and lesbian-gay rights movements, which facilitate the incorporation of a privileged minority into the ethnoclass of Man at the cost of the still and/or newly criminalized and disposable populations (women of color, the black poor, trans people, the incarcerated, etc.).23 To make claims for inclusion and humanity via the U.S. juridical assemblage removes from view that the law itself has been thoroughly violent in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison-industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on, and that it continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man. Instead of appealing to legal recognition, Julia Oparah suggests counteracting the “racialized (trans)gender entrapment” within the prison-industrial complex and beyond with practices of “maroon abolition” (in reference to the long history of escaped slave contraband settlements in the Americas) to “foreground the ways in which often overlooked African diasporic cultural and political legacies inform and undergird anti-prison work,” while also providing strategies and life worlds not exclusively centered on reforming the law.24 Relatedly, Spade calls for a radical politics articulated from the “ ‘impossible’ worldview of trans political existence,” which redefines “the insistence of government agencies, social service providers, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprofiteers that the existence of trans people is impossible.”25 A relational maroon abolitionism beholden to the practices of black radicalism and that arises from the incompatibility of black trans existence with the world of Man serves as **one example** of how putatively abject modes **of being need no tbe** redeployed **within hegemonic framework but** can be **operationalized as variable liminal territories or** articulated **assemblages in movements to abolish the grounds upon which all forms of subjugation are administered.**

#### [Bashford 06] The aff’s attempts to promote health are rooted in Eurocentric medical intervention that forces non-Western countries to either conform and suffer, or exist in a zone created external to the law.

**Bashford 06:** [Alison Bashford is Laureate Professor in History and Director of the Laureate Centre for History & Population. She also directs the [New Earth Histories Research Program](https://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/our-research/research-centres-institutes/research-networks/new-earth-histories-research-program). Her work connects the history of science, global history, and environmental history into new assessments of the modern world, from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries Bashford, A. (2006). Global biopolitics and the history of world health. *History of the Human Sciences*, *19*(1), 67–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695106062148>] Mgong

The cultural history of medical intervention in the colonial world is quite informative with regard to a profounder comprehension of the meaning and practices of the structures of global health. Tropical medicine as a distinctive discipline in the curricula of medical studies was born with the objective of facilitating the settlement of Britons and other Europeans in threatening environments characterized by pests such as smallpox, malaria or yellow fever.64 But it also held the mission of improving the lives of natives engaged in the colonial businesses, therefore pursuing the “benevolent” task assigned to imperialism. Nevertheless, in his revision of British and Australian literature in the imperial period, Cameron-Smith identifies tropical medicine “as a discourse that constructed the space of the tropics as Other and thus as racially pathological.”65 Building upon perceptions of higher mortality overseas as compared to the metropolis, and of climate-conditioned “native laziness” vis-à-vis the superiority of the Northern European spirit, physicians in the 18th century came to the conclusion that “foreign countries were simply unhealthy.”66 In any case, the economic profits from colonial enterprise outweighed the mortality risk, and so the Empire prolonged its mission of civilization and exploitation. In his article on medicine in Somaliland during the first half of the 20th century, Mohamed shows how colonial rule benefited from health interventions, vaccination namely, as it improved public health. The medical mission was therefore “popularizing the Government, and identifying the administration with the people’s welfare.”67 The integration of tropical medicine’s culture and history when linked to the rise of “medical police” is particularly illustrative of both the character of this early securitization of infectious diseases and the apparatus of biopolitical instrumentalization at the global level. Beyond international and national political institutions, culture, science and medical practice informatively contribute to the historical power regime. Hygienism has been notably instrumental with regard to the implementation of powerful white-supremacist regimes such as the one South African experienced during the Apartheid period.68 According to Youde, the legacy of public health intervention as historically anti-black population transpires from the 2000 conflict between South African government, notably President Thabo Mbeki, and the international AIDS community. Mbeki claimed that the international community’s AIDS discourse was a Western neo-colonialist discourse expressing Africans’ inferiority as a race to tackle their own problems. This episode was particularly dramatic since South Africa was holding, as it still does, the highest rate of HIV infections in the world David Fidler is quite right when affirming that major global health concerns are “revolutionizing” the way International Relations researchers observe them, from an “uninteresting” topic to a relatively prominent one as part of post-Cold War human security paradigm. The general issue of Western securitization of infectious diseases is mostly, and hierarchically, connected to scenarios of biological agents spread for terrorist purposes, outbreaks of diseases transmitted within the food chain, and extensive impact of major diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria in Southern and Eastern African weak states**.** The adoption of a historical-political lens vis-à-vis a juridicalinstitutional one allows us to come to, not only denser, but also, perhaps, surprising conclusions about the intimate function of disease in the whole Western global security project**.** First, the historical-political approach takes governance’s constitution as an assemblage of dispersed, though hierarchized, liberal powers. Second, it permits an appreciation of the power role played by a larger range of actors, namely INGOs, apart from the states and multilateral organizations. As the HIV-security nexus case shows, INGOs played an essential role in the early politicization of the issue of HIV. Third, this approach emphasizes the idea of structure as the major securitization driver. Even though context remains important (e.g. September 11, 2003 SARS outbreaks, etc.), structural governance elements, i.e. surveillance mechanisms of epidemic control, preparedness and response, strongly contributed to Western security. They helped in the expansion and consolidation of the world system of dominance over the colonial world in function of a rising global liberal economy. Post-September 11 ‘new order’ in global health and the security agenda emerging from it unfolds continuities of the colonial legacy. Such continuities appear as tantamount to the post-Cold War reduction of state sovereignty in the international arena, proportionately to the hegemonization of the assemblage of dispersed, multifaceted liberal powers.

#### [Weheliye 2] Collective suffering becomes the metric to determine whether a subject warrants state recognition or not.– leading to endless political and psychological violence.

**Weheliye 2**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP

Suffering, especially when caused by political violence, has long functioned as the hallmark of both humane sentience and of inhuman brutality. **Frequently, suffering becomes the defining feature of those subjects excluded from the law, the national community, humanity, and so on due to the political violence inflicted upon them even as it, paradoxically, grants them access to inclusion and equality.** In western human rights discourse, for instance, the physical and psychic residues of political violence enable victims to be recognized as belonging to the “brotherhood of Man.” **Too often, this tendency not only leaves intact hegemonic ideas of humanity as indistinguishable from western Man but demands comparing different forms of subjugation in order to adjudicate who warrants recognition and belonging.** As W. E. B. Du Bois asked in 1944, if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights did not offer provisions for ending world colonialism or legal segregation in the United States, “Why then call it the Declaration of Human Rights?”2 Wendy Brown maintains, “politicized identity” operates “only by entrenching, restating, dramatizing, and inscribing its pain in politics; it can hold out no future...that triumphs over this pain.”3 Brown suggests replacing the identitarian declaration “I am,” which merely confirms and solidifies what already exists, with the desiring proclamation “I want,” which offers a Nietzschean politics of overcoming pain instead of clinging to suffering as an immutable feature of identity politics. While I recognize Brown's effort to formulate a form of minority politics not beholden to the aura of wounded attachments and fixated almost fetishistically on the state as the site of change, we do well to recall that many of the political agendas based on identity (the suffragette movement, the movement for the equality of same-sex marriages, or the various movements for the full civil rights of racialized minority subjects, for instance) are less concerned with claiming their suffering per se (I am) than they are with using wounding as a stepping stone in the quest (I want) for rights equal to those of full citizens. Liberal governing bodies, whether in the form of nation-states or supranational entities such as the United Nations or the International Criminal Court make particular forms of wounding the precondition for entry into the hallowed halls of full personhood, only acknowledging certain types of physical violence. For instance, while the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees passed a resolution in 2008 that includes rape and other forms of sexual violence in the category of war crimes, there are many forms of sexual violence that do not fall into this purview, and thus bar victims from claiming legal injury and/or personhood.4 Even more generally, the acknowledgment and granting of full personhood of those excluded from its precincts requires the overcoming of physical violence, while epistemic and economic brutalities remain outside the scope of the law. **Congruently, much of the politics constructed around the effects of political violence, especially within the context of international human rights but also with regard to minority politics in the United States, is constructed from the shaky foundation of surmounting or desiring to leave behind physical suffering so as to take on the ghostly semblance of possessing one's personhood. Then and only then will previously minoritized subjects be granted their humanity as a legal status.** Hence, the glitch Brown diagnoses in identity politics is less a product of the minority subject's desire to desperately cling to his or her pain but a consequence of the state's dogged insistence on suffering as the only price of entry to proper personhood, what Samera Esmeir has referred to as a “juridical humanity” that bestows and rescinds humanity as an individualized legal status in the vein of property. **Apportioning personhood in this way maintains the world of Man and its attendant racializing assemblages, which means in essence that the entry fee for legal recognition is the acceptance of categories based on white supremacy and colonialism, as well as normative genders and sexualities.**

#### **[Whitfield] We should reject the aff and embrace Liberated Zones – intentional communities that operate independent of the state – key to Black conceptions of freedom. No perms – this requires MOVING AWAY FROM THE STATE, not increasing state power.**

Whitfield: Whitfield, Ed. [Black social critic, writer, and community activist] “What must we do to be free? On the building of Liberated Zones.” *Prabuddha: Journal of Social Equality*, Vol. 2, 2018. CH

Life in a liberated zone entails: •Sustainably making and/or finding food •Sustainably making and developing people as the carriers and creators of productivity, culture, wisdom and technology •Making meaning: evolving life beyond birth, survival, and death •Collectively and determinedly defending what we have made The Limitations of The So-called Democracy of an Oppressive System There was a time when you could buy a car of any color, as long as it was black. There wasn’t much choice. These days, we are encouraged to vote in elections where we can support candidates from either of the two-capitalist war-mongering parties. Independent candidates who actually support social transformation are described as wasted votes or not allowed to get very far in the political vetting process. It brings to mind an option that might have been offered to the enslaved to vote on which plantation to be enslaved on, or to choose their overseer based on their position on what would be the maximum number of lashes in a beating, or the best way to punish low production or talking back. I’d like to think that I am a descendent from the slave who would have stood on the back row of such a slave voting campaign gathering, constantly looking up into the sky. When asked what they were looking for and why, they would whisper, “Y’all go ahead and vote on one of them or the other, but I’m looking for the north star in the dipping gourd. ‘Cause first chance I get, I’m outta here.” In the USA, we won’t vote ourselves to freedom in spite of the rhetoric of what claims to be the more progressive of the two oppressive exploitative parties. We will have to build freedom. And on leaving the plantation, we may want to burn down the big house. Not because burning it will feed us, but rather because it just seems like the right thing to do. The Devastating Nature of the Present It should be clear to us that we don't all share equitably in the benefits from modern world. We live in a world of the domination of capital. In it the owner class accumulates the surplus created by those who produce value. Those in the owning class then use their control over the socially created value to dominate virtually every aspect of social life for the singular purpose of being able to extract and accumulate even more value. This power that comes as a benefit of the ownership of means of life is used to threaten death by starvation to all who resist obeying the needs of capital expansion. There is no limit to the greed of the capitalist system. The unlimited expansion of capital is the singular logic of this world system. But infinite expansion is not possible on a finite planet, and we see the effect of careless exploitation of natural resources and human activity on the planet’s ability to support human life with its needs for clean water and clean air in addition to controlling the potential for climate disasters that are caused by human activity.

He adds:

There are already existing communities that are very much like the liberated zones I describe here. There are intentional communities that combine collective living arrangements with productive opportunities, often including or even centered around food production. Some of them are arranged as egalitarian communities where everything is shared, and intense democratic processes draw all of the community members into collective decision making on all of the community’s affairs, including how the necessary tasks for the community are shared. There is a long history of such communities and they have likely had little impact on the larger societies outside of them, even though they possess many transformative elements. Some of these communities are insular in nature and mainly represent a way to get away from what is painful, irrational, or at the very least, undesirable in the mainstream communities. Many of these communities are also known for leading a rustic, some might even say primitive existence. That is partly a reflection of the distance between these communities and the consumerism that surrounds them. I would offer that for the type of liberated zones that I think will make more of a difference to be viable, they would have to be able to create an intense loyalty among those who live in them, and a strong base of support for those on the outside, who, for one reason or the other do not. It would never be sufficient to offer that these communities are capable, or even interested in replicating the lifestyles that have been created in the dominant society. There would need to be some conscious breaking away from societal norms. But I contend that it becomes easier as the existing structures prove themselves increasingly incapable of keeping their promises of a comfortable life for the many. But we still have to ask, “Is it enough stuff?” You know we are addicted to bigger and bigger piles of stuff, despite the ecological price that we pay and the fact that for whatever we accumulate there is someone somewhere trying to sell us more. There are still those who will not be satisfied unless they are able to buy the things that are being marketed to them. Many young people will not remember, but once a 19-inch TV was considered a big screen. Nowadays, folks with limited income will buy 52” and 80” screens on time terms, claiming that these are household needs. While I am no one to object to other people’s desires, I don’t think the liberated zones that I envision would be producing large screen TV units in the near term. There would likely be live theatre, and live concerts, and live music, art and poetry shows on the regular. This is what I mean when I talk about the need to make meaning. We are capable of leading good lives without the consumer debt peonage that many of us have become accustomed to as a means of fulfilling the dreams not of our families and communities, but rather the dreams of the marketers who derive their privilege from compensation they get from getting us to buy things that we don’t need, and quite honestly might not have even thought of, had the marketers not told us that we just had to have them. It is sad that we are called upon to measure ourselves, not by what we know, not by what we can do, not by what we are, but rather by what we buy at high prices because of celebrity endorsements. It is sad to hear “I just want to get paid.” As the highest aspiration of some young folks. And when someone points out to them the unfairness of a system that makes many more losers than winners and points out that we deserve a society that is fair and creates opportunities for all, it is so sad to hear, “I'll take my chance. I’d rather take a chance at being rich than to have certainty of a less glamorous existence.” We need to remember that we are addicted. But more and more people are coming to realize that the deck is stacked. You get to cut the cards but the jokers, the aces and kings have all been taken out of the deck. There is very little left to win. This isn’t really gambling, because we have no chance.

#### [Wehelieye 4] Deviant bodies are compared against one another under the state as the color line sets the basis for how subjects should be – women, queer folk, and black people stray from the standard conception of the Western Man, and face oppression as a result. Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to deconstruct the western Man.

**Weheliye 4**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP

Consequently, **racialization figures as a master code within the genre of the human represented by western Man, because its law-like operations are yoked to species-sustaining physiological mechanisms in the form of a global color line—instituted by cultural laws so as to register in human neural networks—that clearly distinguishes the good/life/fully-human from the bad/death/not-quite-human**. This, in turn, authorizes the conflation of racialization with mere biological life, which, on the one hand, enables white subjects to “see” themselves as transcending racialization due to their full embodiment of this particular genre of the human while responding anti-pathetically to nonwhite subjects as bearers of ontological cum biological lack, and, on the other hand, in those subjects on the other side of the color line, it creates sociogenically instituted physiological reactions against their own existence and reality.40 Since the being of nonwhite subjects has been coded by the cultural laws in the world of Man as pure negativity, their subjectivity impresses punishment on the neurochemical reward system of all humans, or in the words of Frantz Fanon: “My body was returned to me spread-eagled, disjointed, redone, draped in mourning on this white winter's day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is wicked, the Negro is ugly.” **Political violence plays a crucial part in the baroque techniques of modern humanity, since it simultaneously serves to create not-quite-humans in specific acts of violence and supplies the symbolic source material for racialization**. For Wynter, the promise of black studies—and the numerous other ruptures precipitated by the 1960s—lies in its liminality, which contains potential exit strategies from the world of Man. **However, we must first devise new objects of knowledge that facilitate “the calling in question of our present culture's purely biological definition of what it is to be, and therefore of what it is like to be, human.”** We must do so because we cannot fully understand the present incarnation of the human from within the “biocentric and bourgeois” epistemic order that authorizes the biological selectedness of Man and, conversely, the creation of “dysgenic humans” (those who are evolutionarily dysselected), “a category comprised in the US of blacks, Latinos, Indians as well as the transracial group of the poor, the jobless, the homeless, the incarcerated,” the disabled, and the transgendered.43 Within our current episteme, these groups are constituted as aberrations from the ethnoclass of Man by being subjected to racializing assemblages that establish “natural” differences between the selected and dysselected. In other words, black, Latino, poor, incarcerated, indigenous, and so forth populations become real objects via the conduit of evolutionarily justified discourses and institutions, which, as a consequence, authorizes Man to view himself as naturally ordained to inhabit the space of full humanity. **Thus, even though racializing assemblages commonly rely on phenotypical differences, their primary function is to create and maintain distinctions between different members of the Homo sapiens species that lend a suprahuman explanatory ground (religious or biological, for example) to these hierarchies**. As Wynter explains, “all our present struggles with respect to race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, struggles over the environment, global warming, severe climate change, the sharply unequal distribution of the earth resources...—these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle.”44 Wynter's oeuvre facilitates the analysis of the relay between different forms of subjugation, because in it the human operates as a relational ontological totality. Therefore, the Man versus Human battle does not dialectically sublate the specificity of the other struggles but articulates them in this open totality so as to abolish Man and liberate all of humanity rather than specific groups.