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#### *Interpretation* – federal economic engagement is *direct aid* and *trade agreements*

Daga 13 (Sergio Daga, director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, Bolivia, visiting senior policy analyst, Heritage Foundation, M.A. Economics, University of Chile, B.A. Economics, Catholic University of Bolivia, also trained at Libertad y Desarrollo, Chile, and the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, United States, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic: U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela,” National Center for Policy Analysis, Debate Backgrounder No. 7, 5-15-2013, http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf)

Economics is the branch of human knowledge concerned with the ¶ satisfaction of human wants through the production of goods and ¶ services, and the exchange of those goods and services between two ¶ or more individuals. Thus, economics encompasses human activities ¶ from simple barter between two individuals to international trade ¶ between firms or governments. Many of these economic activities ¶ are regulated by government, and some are outlawed. Trade and ¶ other economic activities that cross national borders — such as ¶ sales of goods and services, travel, migration or transfers of money ¶ — are regulated by both the government of the originating country ¶ and the government of the destination country. The government ¶ itself could be an economic actor, buying and selling from other ¶ governments or firms in other countries; or the government could ¶ regulate the private economic activities of individuals and firms.¶ Economic engagement between or among countries can take ¶ many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements ¶ designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign ¶ aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic ¶ engagement with private economic engagement through 3) ¶ international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) ¶ remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are ¶ important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate ¶ resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by ¶ the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with ¶ respect to some countries than to others.

#### Prefer it –

#### First, limits – any regulation, product, or private action is justified – infinite unpredictable AFFs

#### Second, ground – means-focus is key to stable disad and counterplan prep – they create a race to shallow, unpredictable single-sector strategies

### 1nc fw

#### A. Interpretation – The affirmative must advocate the resolution through an instrumental defense of action by the United States federal government

#### Violation - the aff is a discussion of maquiladoras and Mexico

#### Our interpretation is best ---

#### A) A limited topic **of discussion that provides for** equitable ground **is key to productive inculcation of** decision-making **and** advocacy skills **in every and all facets of life---even if their position is contestable that’s distinct from being** valuably debatable**---this still provides room for flexibility, creativity, and innovation, but targets the discussion to avoid mere statements of fact**

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp45-

Debate is a **means of settling differences**, so there **must be a** difference of opinion or a **conflict of interest** before there can be a debate. **If everyone is in agreement** on a tact or value or policy, there is **no need for debate**: **the matter can be settled by unanimous consent**. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, **there is no debate**. In addition, debate **cannot produce effective decisions** without **clear identification of a question or questions to be answered**. For example, **general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration**. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is **not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question** and identification of a line **demarcating sides in the controversy**. To be discussed and resolved effectively, **controversies must be stated clearly**. **Vague understanding** results in **unfocused deliberation** and **poor decisions**, frustration, and emotional distress, as **evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007**. Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, **but without a focus for their discussions**, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education **without finding points of clarity or potential solutions.** **A gripe session would follow**. But if a **precise question** is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more **profitable area of discussion** is opened up **simply by placing a focus on the search** for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. To have a **productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making** by directing and **placing limits on the decision** to be made, **the basis for argument should be clearly defined**. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, **the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation**. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose. Although we now have a **general subject**, we have not yet stated a problem. **It is still too broad**, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a **debate proposition** such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. **This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation** of the controversy by advocates, or **that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy**; in fact, **these sorts of debates may be very engaging**. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by **focus on a particular point of difference**, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### B. Ground --- the resolution exists to create fair division of aff and neg ground --- any alternative framework allows the aff to pick a moral high ground that destroys neg offense.

#### C. Switch side debate - arguing about perspectives contrary to what you believe in increases tolerance - also solves their offense because they can talk about their literature on the negative.

#### D. Policymaking Education **– debates about government policy are key to connect theory and practice, regardless of whether we become policymakers**

Esberg & Sagan 12 (Jane Esberg is special assistant to the director at New York University's Center on International Cooperation. Scott Sagan is a professor of political science and director of Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy,” 2/17 The Nonproliferation Review, 19:1, 95-108)

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by **students in educational simulations**. Government participants learn about the **importance of understanding foreign perspectives,** the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to **overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia**,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and **thinking more creatively** about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 The **skills of imagination** and the subsequent ability to **predict foreign interests** and reactions remain **critical for real-world foreign policy makers**. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the **dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences** and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7 By **university age**, **students** often have a **pre-defined view of international affairs**, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises **force students to challenge their assumptions** **about how other governments behave and how their own government works**.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, **educational literature has expounded on their benefits**, from encouraging engagement by **breaking from the typical lecture format**, to improving communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to **link fact and theory**, providing a context for facts while **bringing theory into the realm of practice**.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: **they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.**’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 **Role-playing exercises** certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a **more active style**. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, **students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others**.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students **how to contextualize and act on information.**14

### 1nc 3

#### The focus on ­­­­­­­­­­­­­­native dispossession and civil society as the underpinning of all exploitations becomes an alibi for acquiescence of class struggles – they obscure the logic of capital and ensure repetition of oppression

**Zavarzadeh 94** (Mas'Ud, The Stupidity That Consumption Is Just as Productive as Production": In the Shopping Mall of the Post-al Left," College Literature, Vol. 21, No. 3, The Politics of Teaching Literature 2 (Oct., 1994),pp. 92-114)

Post-al logic is marked above all by its erasure of "production" as the determining force in organizing human societies and their institutions, and its insistence on "consumption" and "distribution" as the driving force of the social.5 The argument of the post-al left (briefly) is that "labor," in advanced industrial "democracies," is superseded by "information," and consequently "knowledge" (not class struggle over the rate of surplus labor) has become the driving force of history. The task of the post-al left is to deconstruct the "metaphysics of labor" and consequently to announce the end of socialism and with it the "outdatedness" of the praxis of abolishing private property (that is, congealed alienated labor) in the post-al moment. Instead of abolishing private property, an enlightened radical democracy which is to supplant socialism (as Laclau, Mouffe, Aronowitz, Butler, and others have advised) should make property holders of each citizen. The post-al left rejects the global objective conditions of production for the local subjective circumstances of consumption, and its master trope is what R-4 [France] so clearly foregrounds: the (shopping) "mall"?the ultimate site of consumption "with all latest high-tech textwares" deployed to pleasure the "body." In fact, the post-al left has "invented" a whole new interdiscipline called "cultural studies" that provides the new alibi for the regime of profit by shifting social analytics from "production" to "consumption." (On the political economy of "invention" in ludic theory, see Transformation 2 on "The Invention of the Queer.") To prove its "progressiveness," the post-al left devotes most of its energies (see the writings of John Fiske, Constance Penley, Michael Berube, Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Andrew Ross, Susan Willis, Stuart Hall, Fredric Jameson), to demonstrate how "consumption" is in fact an act of production and resistance to capitalism and a practice in which a Utopian vision for a society of equality is performed! The shift from "production" to "consumption" manifests itself in post-al left theories through the focus on "superstructural" cultural analysis and the preoccupation not with the "political economy" ("base") but with "representation"? for instance, of race, sexuality, environment, ethnicity, nationality, and identity. This is, for example, one reason for [Hill's] ridiculing the "base" and "superstructure" analytical model of classical Marxism (Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy) with an anecdote (the privileged mode of "argument" for the post-al left) that the base is really not all that "basic." To adhere to the base/superstructure model for [him] is to be thrown into an "epistemological gulag." For the post-al left a good society is, therefore, one in which, as [France] puts it, class antagonism is bracketed and the "surplus value" is distributed more evenly among men and women, whites and persons of color, the lesbian and the straight. It is not a society in which "surplus value"?the exploitative appropriation of the other's labor-is itself eliminated by revolutionary praxis. The post-al left's good society is not one in which private ownership is obsolete and the social division of labor (class) is abolished. Rather it is a society in which the fruit of exploitation of the proletariat (surplus labor) is more evenly distributed and a near-equality of consumption is established. This distributionist/consumptionist theory that underwrites the economic interests of the (upper)middle classes is the foundation for all the texts in this exchange and their pedagogies. A good pedagogy in these texts therefore is one in which power is distributed evenly in the classroom: a pedagogy that constructs a classroom of consensus not antagonism (thus opposition to "politicizing the classroom" in OR-1 [Hogan]) and in which knowledge (concept) is turned through the process that OR-3 [McCormick] calls "translation"?into "consumable" EXPERIENCES. The more "intense" the experience, as the anecdotes of [McCormick] show, the more successful the pedagogy. In short, it is a pedagogy that removes the student from his/her position in the social relations of production and places her/him in the personal relation of consumption: specifically, EXPERIENCE of/as the consumption of pleasure. The post-al logic **obscures** the laws of motion of capital by very specific assumptions and moves-many of which are rehearsed in the texts here. I will discuss some of these, mention others in passing, and hint at several more. (I have provided a full account of all these moves in my "Post-ality" in Transformation 1.) I begin by outlining the post-al assumptions that "democracy" is a never-ending, open "dialogue" and "conversation" among multicultural citizens; that the source of social inequities is "power"; that a post-class hegemonic "coalition," as OR-5 [Williams] calls it-and not class struggle-is the dynamics of social change; that truth (as R-l [Hill] writes) is an "epistemological gulag"? a construct of power and thus any form of "ideology critique" that raises questions of "falsehood" and "truth" ("false consciousness") does so through a violent exclusion of the "other" truths by, in [Williams'] words, "staking sole legitimate claim" to the truth in question. Given the injunction of the post-al logic against binaries (truth/falsehood), the project of "epistemology" is displaced in the ludic academy by "rhetoric." The question, consequently, becomes not so much what is the "truth" of a practice but whether it "works." (Rhetoric has always served as an alibi for pragmatism.) Therefore, [France] is not interested in whether my practices are truthful but in what effects they might have: if College Literature publishes my texts would such an act (regardless of the "truth" of my texts) end up "cutting our funding?" [he] asks. A post-al leftist like [France], in short, "resists" the state only in so far as the state does not cut [his] "funding." Similarly, it is enough for a cynical pragmatist like [Williams] to conclude that my argument "has little prospect of effectual force" in order to disregard its truthfulness. The post-al dismantling of "epistemology" and the erasure of the question of "truth," it must be pointed out, is undertaken to protect the economic interests of the ruling class. If the "truth question" is made to seem outdated and an example of an orthodox binarism ([Hill]), any conclusions about the truth of ruling class practices are excluded from the scene of social contestation as a violent logocentric (positivistic) totalization that disregards the "difference" of the ruling class. This is why a defender of the ruling class such as [Hill] sees an ideology critique aimed at unveiling false consciousness and the production of class consciousness as a form of "epistemological spanking." It is this structure of assumptions that enables [France] to answer my question, "What is wrong with being dogmatic?" not in terms of its truth but by reference to its pragmatics (rhetoric): what is "wrong" with dogmatism, [he] says, is that it is violent rhetoric ("textual Chernobyl") and thus Stalinist. If I ask what is wrong with Stalinism, again (in terms of the logic of [his] text) I will not get a political or philosophical argument but a tropological description.6 The post-al left is a New Age Left: the "new new left" privileged by [Hill] and [Williams]- the laid-back, "sensitive," listening, and dialogic left of coalitions, voluntary work, and neighborhood activism (more on these later). It is, as I will show, anti-intellectual and populist; its theory is "bite size" (mystifying, of course, who determines the "size" of the "bite"), and its model of social change is anti-conceptual "spontaneity": May 68, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and, in [Hill's] text, Chiapas. In the classroom, the New Age post-al pedagogy inhibits any critique of the truth of students' statements and instead offers, as [McCormick] makes clear, a "counseling," through anecdotes, concerning feelings. The rejection of "truth" (as "epistemological gulag"?[Hill]), is accompanied by the rejection of what the post-al left calls "economism." Furthermore, the post-al logic relativizes subjectivities, critiques functionalist explanation, opposes "determinism," and instead of closural readings, offers supplementary ones. It also celebrates eclecticism; puts great emphasis on the social as discourse and on discourse as always inexhaustible by any single interpretation? discourse (the social) always "outruns" and "exceeds" its explanation. Post-al logic is, in fact, opposed to any form of "explanation" and in favor of mimetic description: it regards "explanation" to be the intrusion of a violent outside and "description" to be a respectful, caring attention to the immanent laws of signification (inside). This notion of description which has by now become a new dogma in ludic feminist theory under the concept of "mimesis" (D. Cornell, Beyond Accommodation)?regards politics to be always immanent to practices: thus the banalities about not politicizing the classroom in [Hogan's] "anarchist" response to my text7 and the repeated opposition to binaries in all nine texts. The opposition to binaries is, in fact, an **ideological alibi for erasing class struggle**, as is quite clear in [France's] rejection of the model of a society "divided by two antagonistic classes" (see my Theory and its Other).

**The aff’s approach to knowledge which privileges subjectivity and uncertainty denies the objectivity in class relations and the oppression that is produced from capital accumulation**

**Zavarzadeh 94** (Mas'Ud, The Stupidity That Consumption Is Just as Productive as Production": In the Shopping Mall of the Post-al Left," College Literature, Vol. 21, No. 3, The Politics of Teaching Literature 2 (Oct., 1994), pp. 92-114)

**The unsurpassable objectivity** which is **not open** to rhetorical **interpretation** and constitutes the decided foundation of critique is the "outside" that Marx calls the "Working Day" (Capital 1: 340-416). ([France] willfully misrecognizes my notion of objectivity by confusing my discussion of identity politics and objectivity.) The working day is not what it seems: its reality, like the reality of all capitalist practices, is an alienated reality-there is a contradiction between its appearance and its essence. It "appears" as if the worker, during the working day, receives wages that are equal compensation for his labor. This mystification originates in the fact that the capitalist pays not for "labor" but for "labor power": when labor power is put to use it produces more than it is paid for. The "working day" is the site of the unfolding of this fundamental contradiction: it is a divided day, divided into "necessary labor" the part in which the worker produces value equivalent to his wages and the "other," the part of "surplus labor"?a part in which the worker works for free and produces "surplus value." The second part of the working day is the source of profit and accumulation of capital. "Surplus labor" is the OBJECTIVE FACT of capitalist relations of production: without "surplus labor" there will be no profit, and without profit there will be no accumulation of capital, and without accumulation of capital there will be no capitalism. The goal of bourgeois economics is to conceal this part of the working day, and it should therefore be no surprise that, as a protector of ruling class interests in the academy, [Hill], with a studied casualness, places "surplus value" in the adjacency of "radical bible-studies" and quietly turns it into a rather boring matter of interest perhaps only to the dogmatic. To be more concise: "surplus labor" is that **objective, unsurpassable "outside**" that cannot be made part of the economies of the "inside" without capitalism itself being transformed into socialism. Revolutionary critique is grounded in this truth-objectivity-since all social institutions and practices of capitalism are founded upon the objectivity of surplus labor. The role of a revolutionary pedagogy of critique is to produce class consciousness so as to assist in organizing people into a new vanguard party that aims at abolishing this FACT of the capitalist system and trans-forming capitalism into a communist society. As I have argued in my "Postality" [Transformation 1], (post)structuralist theory, through the concept of "representation," makes all such facts an effect of interpretation and turns them into "undecidable" processes. The boom in ludic theory and Rhetoric Studies in the bourgeois academy is caused by the service it renders the ruling class: it makes the OBJECTIVE reality of the extraction of surplus labor a subjective one-not a decided fact but a matter of "interpretation." In doing so, it "deconstructs" (see the writings of such bourgeois readers as Gayatri Spivak, Cornel West, and Donna Haraway) the labor theory of value, displaces production with consumption, and resituates the citizen from the revolutionary cell to the ludic shopping mall of [France].

**(((MUST PROCESS))) The oppression of women is not the ahistorical products an abstract system of patriarchy – it’s the historical product of the emergence of a classed society founded on the logic of surplus accumulation – The shift from necessity to surplus transformed division of labor into a tool to concentrate wealth and power over women**

**Cloud 3** (Dana, Prof. Comm at UT, “Marxism and Oppression”, Talk for Regional Socialist Conference)

In order to challenge oppression, it is important to know where it comes from. Historians, archaeologists, and anthropologists tell us that in pre-class societies such as hunter-gatherer societies, racism and sexism were unheard of. Because homosexuality was not an identifiable category of such societies, discrimination on that basis did not occur either. In fact, it is clear that racism, sexism, and homophobia have arisen in particular kinds of societies, namely class societies. Women’s oppression originated in the first class societies, while racism came into prominence in the early periods of capitalism when colonialism and slavery drove the economic system. The prohibition against gays and lesbians is a relatively modern phenomenon. But what all forms of oppression have in common is that they did not always exist and are not endemic to human nature. They were created in the interest of ruling classes in society and continue to benefit the people at the top of society, while dividing and conquering the rest of us so as to weaken the common fight against the oppressors. The work of Marx’s collaborator Friederich Engels on The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State in some respects reflects the Victorian times in which in was written. Engels moralizes about women’s sexuality and doesn’t even include gay and lesbian liberation in his discussion of the oppressive family. However, anthropologists like the feminist Rayna Reiter have confirmed his most important and central argument that it was in the first settled agricultural societies that women became an oppressed class. In societies where for the first time people could accumulate a surplus of food and other resources, it was possible for some people to hoard wealth and control its distribution. The first governments or state structures formed to legitimate an emerging ruling class. As settled communities grew in size and became more complex social organizations, and, most importantly, as the surplus grew, the distribution of wealth became unequal—and a small number of men rose above the rest of the population in wealth and power. In the previous hunter-gatherer societies, there had been a sexual division of labor, but one without a hierarchy of value. There was no strict demarcation between the reproductive and productive spheres. All of that changed with the development of private property in more settled communities. The earlier division of labor in which men did the heavier work, hunting, and animal agriculture, became a system of differential control over resource distribution. The new system required more field workers and sought to maximize women’s reproductive potential. Production shifted away from the household over time and women became associated with the reproductive role, losing control over the production and distribution of the necessities of life. It was not a matter of male sexism, but of economic priorities of a developing class system. This is why Engels identifies women’s oppression as the first form of systematic class oppression in the world. Marxists since Engels have not dismissed the oppression of women as secondary to other kinds of oppression and exploitation. To the contrary, women’s oppression has a primary place in Marxist analysis and is a key issue that socialists organize around today. From this history we know that sexism did not always exist, and that men do not have an inherent interest in oppressing women as domestic servants or sexual slaves. Instead, women’s oppression always has served a class hierarchy in society. In our society divided by sexism, ideas about women’s nature as domestic caretakers or irrational sexual beings justify paying women lower wages compared to men, so that employers can pit workers against one another in competition for the same work. Most women have always had to work outside the home to support their families. Today, women around the world are exploited in sweatshops where their status as women allows bosses to pay them very little, driving down the wages of both men and women. At the same time, capitalist society relies on ideas about women to justify not providing very much in the way of social services that would help provide health care, family leave, unemployment insurance, access to primary and higher education, and so forth—all because these things are supposed to happen in the private family, where women are responsible. This lack of social support results in a lower quality of life for many men as well as women. Finally, contemporary ideologies that pit men against women encourage us to fight each other rather than organizing together.

#### Vote negative to endorse a political strategy that withdraws from capitalist relations

#### Universal Rejection is key – it’s the only way to hollow out capitalist structures – the debate should be a question of competing methodologies – The primary question of the ballot should be affirming an ethical orientation that best organizes against capitalist relations

Herod 4 renowned philosopher, author, and social activist

(James, “Getting Free”, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm>, accessed 8/6/09)

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t imply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction. The content of this vision is actually not new at all, but quite old. The long term goal of communists, anarchists, and socialists has always been to restore community. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to get free from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self-managed cooperatives. The long term goals have always been clear: to abolish wage-slavery, to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world.

### 1nc 4

#### Plan: We should critically analyze gender relations implicit in economic engagement anywhere but Mexico.

Engaging with Mexico crowds out Chinese engagement

Brandt et al, 12 – American University School of International Science (Jon Brandt Derek Hottle Nicole Adams Nav Aujla Christina Dinh Kirsten Kaufman Devin Kleinfield-Hayes Wanlin Ren Andrew, “Chinese Engagement in Latin America and the Caribbean: Implications for US Foreign Policy”, December http://www.american.edu/sis/usfp/upload/Chinese-Engagement-in-LAC-AU\_US-Congress-FINAL.pdf)//VP

The PRC’s military interests in LAC are closely aligned with its commercial objectives. Bilateral security ties build political goodwill with regional players, thus reducing the likelihood of actions against Chinese exports and investments.57 China’s economic priorities are seen in its “official system of cataloguing states as cooperative, friendlycooperative or strategic partners—with the implication that this has for the allocation of economic resources.”58 China’s four “strategic partners” in Latin America - Argentina, Mexico, Brazil and Venezuela – serve as important trading partners and commodity suppliers.China’s strategic posture in the Western Hemisphere is consistent with its publically stated national security priorities. The PRC’s 2010 national defense white paper emphasizes a defensive Chinese military strategy, focusing on strengthening international military relations and countering foreign interference in domestic affairs. The paper highlights Chinese concerns about international military competition in the areas of missile defense, cyberspace, outer space, and the polar regions, while simultaneously insisting the PRC does not seek confrontation or global hegemony. While China’s ties with LAC reflect a growing desire to protect economic and security interests**,** the PRC is promoting cooperation which reflects “mutual trust and benefit,” not offensive measures that would directly threaten the United States. A number of high-level defense visits have occurred between China and Latin American **nations.59 While these** interactions have not resulted in groundbreaking bilateral strategic initiatives, they serve as confidence building measures and provide openings for arms transactions.606

influence is zero-sum

Kreps, 13 **–** Assistant Professors of Government at Cornell University **(**Sarah E., “No Strings Attached? Evaluating China’s Trade Relations Abroad,” May 17, http://thediplomat.com/china-power/no-strings-attached-evaluating-chinas-trade-relations-abroad)//VP

To be sure, China may not have a purposeful plan to bring their trade partners into alignment on foreign policy questions. Even if unintentional**,** however,this “gravitational effect” has a sound economic basis. Developing countries in Africa and Latin America are comparatively much more dependent on China than China is on these countries. In a ten year period, for example, Sudan’s trade with China rose from 1 to 10% of its Gross Domestic Product. That pattern is even starker in a country like Angola, for which trade with China represented 25% of its GDP in 2006. While China certainly needs access to the resources in these countries, the individual countries are far less important to China than China is to these countries. The asymmetry in needs gives China a bargaining advantage that translates into foreign policy outcomes even if not by explicit design. Whether by design or not, the convergence with China’s foreign policy goals is important on at least two levels. First, developing countries in Africa and Latin America may be lulled by the prospect of partnering with a country such as China that does not have an explicit political agenda, as did the United States and Soviet Union during the Cold War, but this appears to be an illusion. Whether this reaches the level of “new colonialism” as former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton referred to it remains to be seen, but the economic asymmetries that undergird the relationship make that prospect more likely. A second set of implications deals with the United States. During the same period in which China’s trade with Africa and Latin America and foreign policy convergence have increased, the United States and China have actually diverged in their overall UNGA voting behavior. This suggests something of a zero sum dynamic in which China’s growing trade relations make it easier to attract allies in international forums while US influence is diminishing. Taken together, these trends call for greater engagement on behalf of the United States in the developing world. Since the September 2001 attacks, Washington has dealt with Africa and Latin America through benign neglect and shifted its attention elsewhere. If foreign policy alignment does follow from tighter commercial relations, the US ought to reinvigorate its trade and diplomatic agenda as an important means of projecting influence abroad.

Key to their soft power

Castillo 9 **–**Anthony Castillo is a writer for the Diplomat, (“China in Latin America, June 18, 2009, http://thediplomat.com/2009/06/18/china-in-latin-america/?all=true)//sawyer

China’s aim in Latin America these days differs dramatically from the 1960s, when the Maoist revolution was the main exporting commodity into Latin America. ‘Chinese policy towards Latin America today is highly pragmatic rather than ideologically driven,’ Professor Gonzalo Paz, a China-Latin American expert at George Washington University told The Diplomat. Professor Paz said this is a ‘new development paradigm that seems to be attractive to Latin American countries.’A sign of this new paradigm is the growing and wider range of bilateral agreements China has signed with Latin American countries, from education to tourism; from aviation to natural resources exploitation.The trade between China and Latin America has jumped from US$10 billion in 2000 to US$102.6 billion in 2007, and Beijing has committed to increase its direct investment by around US$50 billion over the next few years. Due to its export boom and favourable terms of trade, Latin America enjoys a healthy surplus.The Chinese diplomatic model – soft power, multipolar and non-interference – is considered as a real alternative to the US political and economic influence in the region.‘South-south cooperation’, ‘strategic partnership of common development’ or ‘common understanding’ is the narrative used by Chinese leaders to frame the Sino-Latin American relationship. This has been the narrative used by the considerable number of high-ranking Chinese officials who have become frequent visitors to the region, including President Hu Jintao, who has visited Latin America three times in less than five years. This says a lot.Dr Adrian Hearn, a China-Latin American Researcher at the University of Sydney and author of the forthcoming book, China and Latin America: The Social Foundations of a Global Alliance, said China’s soft power, technology transfer and integrated development had been the key to this link.‘The soft power exercised by Beijing relies heavily on the Chinese communities that began flourishing in the late 19th and early 20th centuries,’ Hearn said.The first Chinese immigrants in Latin America arrived in Cuba in 1847 and since then have formed well-established Chinatowns in the majority of Latin American countries. Hearn suggests, ‘Chinatowns are key to the soft power exercised by China in the region.’ This is especially the case in Cuba, Mexico, Peru, Costa Rica and Panama, countries with the largest number of Chinese immigrants. ‘Chinatown’s leaders play a central role in making connections and building partnerships.’

Extinction

Nye, 5 - Harvard University Distinguished Service Professor (Joseph S, “The Rise of China’s Soft Power”, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, 12-29-05, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/1499/rise\_of\_chinas\_soft\_power.html)//KG

While recent U.S. Congressional reports have focused on the rise of China's economic and military power, far less attention has been paid to the rise of China's soft power. Yet in a global information age, soft sources of power such as culture, political values, and diplomacy are part of what makes a great power. Success depends not only on whose army wins, but also on whose story wins. China has always had an attractive traditional culture, but now it is entering the realm of global popular culture as well. Chinese novelist Gao Xingjian won China's first Nobel Prize for Literature in 2000, and the Chinese film "Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon" became the highest grossing non-English film. Yao Ming, the Chinese star of the U.S. National Basketball Association's Houston Rockets, is rapidly becoming a household name, and China is set to host the 2008 Summer Olympics. The enrollment of foreign students in China has tripled to 110,000 from 36,000 over the past decade, and the number of foreign tourists has also increased dramatically to 17 million last year. China has created 26 Confucius Institutes around the world to teach its language and culture, and while the Voice of America was cutting its Chinese broadcasts to 14 from 19 hours a day, China Radio International was increasing its broadcasts in English to 24 hours a day. In terms of political values, the era of Maoism (and Mao jackets) is long past. Although China remains authoritarian, the success of its political economy in tripling gross domestic product over the past three decades has made it attractive to many developing countries. In parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the so-called "Beijing consensus" on authoritarian government plus a market economy has become more popular than the previously dominant "Washington consensus" of market economics with democratic government. China has reinforced this attraction by economic aid and access to its growing market. China has also adjusted its diplomacy. A decade ago, it was wary of multilateral arrangements and at cross purposes with many of its neighbors. Since then, it has joined the World Trade Organization, contributed more than 3,000 troops to serve in United Nations peacekeeping operations, become more helpful on nonproliferation issues (including hosting the six-party talks on North Korea), settled territorial disputes with its neighbors, and joined a variety of regional organizations. This new diplomacy, coupled with the slogan of "China's peaceful rise," helps to alleviate fears and reduce the likelihood of other countries allying to balance a rising power.

### 1nc case

#### Feminist issues cannot be resolved within masculinised structures- they don’t provide an alternative

J. Ann Tickner (professor of international relations at USC) 2001, Gendering World Politics. Pp. 119-120.

The tensions and contradictions to which Stienstra has pointed are evident in the successes and failures of women's organizing. While the internationalization of feminism has been very successful in raising issues of discrimination and has made considerable strides in getting gender issues recognized by international organizations, in concrete terms women are doing less well than men in all societies. There was a recognition at the Beijing Conference that, in spite of the attention to these issues over the twenty years since the beginning of the UN Decade for Women women’s global status was not improving significantly. A significant reason for these inequalities, which continue, is that women must operate within "masculinized" organizations and structures.76 Since global organizing is far removed from the realities of many women's lives, there is a sense that although social movements are used to promote solutions that criticize' the state, a return to the state is probably necessary to meet the dislocations and poverty generated by the economic globalization of the late twentieth century."

#### advocacy works through the masculine structure of the state, only further oppressing women, co-opting any hope of solvency

**Sjoberg** Ass’t Prof of Poli Sci at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University 200**9** Laura Security Studies 18.2 informaworld d/a 7/13/10

Feminists have analyzed traditional concepts and theories in Security Studies. In doing so, they have demonstrated the gender bias in security's core concepts, such as the state, violence, war, peace, and even security itself, urging redefinition in light of that bias.78 For example, Jacqui True has pointed out that the state is constructed on the dual gendered dichotomies of inside/outside and public/private.79 Women's lives and gender subordination are trapped in the inside, private dimension of that dichotomy, where abuse is invisible.80 From a feminist perspective, the state can be seen as a misleading construction that purports to protect its citizens but often perpetuates the subordination of women.81 A gender-based analysis, then, questions the unitary nature of state security by arguing that secure states often only achieve security by sacrificing the security of some of their citizens, namely, women.82 In place of the focus on state security, feminists have suggested an approach to security that begins its analysis at the margins of social and political life.83

#### Value to life is inevitable, subjective, and they don’t control the link to it.

**Shermer, 8** –Michael, founder of the Skeptics Society and Editor of Skeptic Magazine, “"The Meaning of Life, the Universe, and Everything"”—Commencement Speech at Whittier College, 5/23/08 http://www.whittier.edu/News/Articles/2008CommencementSpeech.aspx

Purpose is personal, and there are countless activities people engage in to satisfy this deep-seated need.There are, however, a handful of powerful means by which we can bootstrap ourselves toward higher goals that have proven to be especially beneficial to both individuals and society. Science tells us that there are five things you can do to create meaning and purpose in your life. Here they are: 1. Love and family—the bonding and attachment to others increases one's sphere of moral inclusion to care about others as much as, if not more than, oneself. And here I shall take a moment to acknowledge the courage of the California State Supreme Court to increase the possibility of marital happiness to the tens of thousands of gays and lesbians in our state who wish to enjoy the same rights and liberties as everybody else. 2. Meaningful work and career—the sense of purpose derived from discovering one's passion for work drives people to achieve goals so far beyond the needs of themselves that they lift all of us to a higher plane, either directly through the benefits of the work, or indirectly through inspiration. And here let me shift my politics slightly rightward to tell you that not only is it okay to make a lot of money, it is a moral virtue to earn your way to wealth and prosperity, and that market capitalism—conjoined with liberal democracy—is the best hope for humanity's future that we have. 3. Recreation and play—it is vital to take time off from work, get away from the office, hang out with your friends, see new places, veg out, goof off, and explore new activities with no purpose other than their shear enjoyment. (In other words, build into your purpose no purpose at all.) 4. Social and political involvement—as a social primate species endowed by evolution with the moral emotions of guilt and pride, shame and joy, we have a social obligation to our local community and our larger society to participate in the process of determining how best we should live together, and a moral duty to reach out and help those in need. Research shows that those who do so are happier and more fulfilled people. 5. Transcendency and spirituality—a capacity unique to our species, as far as we can tell, that includes aesthetic appreciation, spiritual reflection, and transcendent contemplation through a variety of expressions such as art, music, dance, exercise, meditation, prayer, quiet contemplation, and religious revere, connecting us on the deepest level with that which is outside of ourselves.

#### People can chose life or death – you cant decide, Its subjective

Schwartz, et al 2002 (Lisa, Lecturer in Philosophy of Medicine, Department of General Practice, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK; Paul Preece, Theme Coordinator of Medical Ethics, Dundee Medical School, Ninewells, Dundee, UK; and Rob Hendry, Medical Advisor, Medical & Dental Defense Union of Scotland, Mackintosh House, Glasgow, UK, Medical Ethics: A Case-Based Approach, p. 112, November)

The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life**.** The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violatetheir autonomy andtheir freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past**.** As the deontological position puts itso well**,** to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

#### A focus on the political is key – problem solving capacities determine efficacy and resolves actual issues

Jarvis, 2k [Daryl, Lecturer in Government at the University of Sydney, “International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism”, pages 128-130]

Perhaps more alarming though is the outright violence Ashley recom-mends in response to what at best seem trite, if not imagined, injustices. Inculpating modernity, positivism, technical rationality, or realism with violence, racism, war, and countless other crimes not only smacks of anthropomorphism but, as demonstrated by Ashley's torturous prose and reasoning, requires a dubious logic to maje such connections in the first place. Are we really to believe that ethereal entities like positivism, mod-ernism, or realism emanate a "violence" that marginalizes dissidents? Indeed, where is this violence, repression, and marginalization? As self- professed dissidents supposedly exiled from the discipline, Ashley and Walker appear remarkably well integrated into the academy-vocal, pub-lished, and at the center of the Third Debate and the forefront of theo-retical research. Likewise, is Ashley seriously suggesting that, on the basis of this largely imagined violence, global transformation (perhaps even rev-olutionary violence) is a necessary, let alone desirable, response? Has the rationale for emancipation or the fight for justice been reduced to such vacuous revolutionary slogans as "Down with positivism and rationality"? The point is surely trite. Apart from members of the academy, who has heard of positivism and who for a moment imagines that they need to be emancipated from it, or from modernity, rationality, or realism for that matter? In an era of unprecedented change and turmoil, of new political and military configurations, of war in the Balkans and ethnic cleansing, is Ashley really suggesting that some of the greatest threats facing humankind or some of the great moments of history rest on such innocuous and largely unknown nonrealities like positivism and realism? These are imagined and fictitious enemies, theoretical fabrications that represent arcane, self-serving debates superfluous to the lives of most people and, arguably, to most issues of importance in international relations. More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflects our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating the-ory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our lmowledge.37 But to suppose that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggles as actors in international politics. What does Ashley's project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the emigres of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to suppose that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary-or is in some way bad-is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, "So what?" To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this "debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics" be judged pertinent, relevant, help-ful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholasti-cally excited by abstract and recondite debate.38 Contrary to Ashley's assertions, then, a poststructural approach fails to empower the marginalized and, in fact, abandons them. Rather than ana-lyze the political economy of power, wealth, oppression, production, or international relations and render an intelligible understanding of these processes, Ashley succeeds in ostracizing those he portends to represent by delivering an obscure and highly convoluted discourse. If Ashley wishes to chastise structural realism for its abstractness and detachment, he must be prepared also to face similar criticism, especially when he so adamantly intends his work to address the real life plight of those who struggle at marginal places. If the relevance of Ashley's project is questionable, so too is its logic and cogency. First, we might ask to what extent the postmodern "emphasis on the textual, constructed nature of the world" represents "an unwarranted extension of approaches appropriate for literature to other areas of human practice that are more constrained by an objective reality. "39 All theory is socially constructed and realities like the nation-state, domestic and international politics, regimes, or transnational agencies are obviously social fabrications. But to what extent is this observation of any real use? Just because we acknowledge that the state is a socially fabricated entity, or that the division between domestic and international society is arbitrar-ily inscribed does not make the reality of the state disappear or render invisible international politics. Whether socially constructed or objectively given, the argument over the ontological status of the state is of no particular moment. Does this change our experience of the state or somehow diminish the political-economic-juridical-military functions of the state? To recognize that states are not naturally inscribed but dynamic entities continually in the process of being made and reimposed and are therefore culturally dissimilar, economically different, and politically atypical, while perspicacious to our historical and theoretical understanding of the state, in no way detracts from its reality, practices, and consequences. Similarly, few would object to Ashley's hermeneutic interpretivist understanding of the international sphere as an artificially inscribed demarcation. But, to paraphrase Holsti again, so what? This does not malce its effects any less real, diminish its importance in our lives, or excuse us from paying serious attention to it. That international politics and states would not exist with-out subjectivities is a banal tautology. The point, surely, is to move beyond this and study these processes. Thus, while intellectually interesting, con-structivist theory is not an end point as Ashley seems to think, where we all throw up our hands and announce there are no foundations and all real-ity is an arbitrary social construction. Rather, it should be a means of rec-ognizing the structurated nature of our being and the reciprocity between subjects and structures through history. Ashley, however, seems not to want to do this, but only to deconstruct the state, international politics, and international theory on the basis that none of these is objectively given but fictitious entities that arise out of modernist practices of representation. While an interesting theoretical enterprise, it is of no great conse- quence to the study of international politics. Indeed, structuration theory has long talcen care of these ontological dilemmas that otherwise seem to preoccupy Ashley.40

**Liberal institutions prevent endless warfare and genocide**

O’Kane 97 – (“Modernity, the Holocaust, and politics”, Economy and Society, February, Ebsco)

Chosen policies cannot be relegated to the position of immediate condition (Nazis in power) in the explanation of the Holocaust. Modern bureaucracy is not 'intrinsically capable of genocidal action' (Bauman 1989:106). Centralized state coercion has no natural move to terror. In the explanation of modern genocides it is chosen policies which play the greatest part, whether in effecting bureaucratic secrecy, organizing forced labour, implementing a system of terror, harnessing science and technology or introducing extermination policies, as means and as ends. As Nazi Germany and Stalin's USSR have shown, furthermore, those chosen policies of genocidal government turned away from and not towards modernity7. The choosing of policies, however, is not independent of circumstances. An analysis ofthe history of each case plays an important part in explaining where and how genocidal governments come to power and analysis of political institutions and structures also helps towards an understanding ofthe factors which act as obstacles to modem genocide. But it is not just political factors which standin the way of another Holocaust in modern society. Modern societies have not only pluralist democratic political systems but also economic pluralism where workers are free to change jobs and bargain wages and where independent firms, each with their own independent bureaucracies, exist in competition with State-controlled enterprises. In modem societies this economic pluralism both promotes and is served by the open scientific method. By ignoring competition and the capacity for people to move between organizations whether economic, political, scientific or social, Bauman overlooks crucial but also very 'ordinary and common1 attributes of truly modem societies. It is these very ordinary and common attributes of modernity' which stand in the way of modern genocides.

#### No impact

**Goldstein 1**—Professor of International Relations at American University, 2001 (Joshua S., War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, pp.411-412)

I began this book hoping to contribute in some way to a deeper understanding of war – an understanding that would improve the chances of someday achieving real peace, by deleting war from our human repertoire. In following the thread of gender running through war, I found the deeper understanding I had hoped for – a multidisciplinary and multilevel engagement with the subject. Yet I became somewhat more pessimistic about how quickly or easily war may end. The war system emerges, from the evidence in this book, as relatively ubiquitous and robust. Efforts to change this system must overcome several dilemmas mentioned in this book. First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices. So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

#### Violence and domination are inevitable

**Thayer 4** – Thayer has been a Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and has taught at Dartmouth College and the University of Minnesota [*Darwin and International Relations: On the Evolutionary Origins of War and Ethnic Conflict*, University of Kentucky Press, 2004, pg. 75-76 //adi]

The central issue here is what causes states to behave as offensive realists predict. Mearsheimer advances a powerful argument that anarchy is the fundamental cause of such behavior. The fact that **there is no world government** compels the leaders of states to take steps to ensure their security, such as striving to have a powerful military, **aggressing when forced to** do so, and forging and maintaining alliances. This is what neorealists call **a self-help system**: leaders of states arc forced to take these steps because nothing else can guarantee their security in the anarchic world of international relations. I argue that evolutionary theory also offers a fundamental cause for offensive realist behavior. Evolutionary theory explains why individuals are motivated to act as offensive realism expects, whether an individual is a captain of industry or a conquistador. My argument is that anarchy is even more important than most scholars of international relations recognize. The human environment of evolutionary adaptation was **anarchic**; our ancestors lived in a state of nature in which resources were poor and dangers from other humans and the environment were great—so great that it is truly remarkable that a mammal standing three feet high—without claws or strong teeth, not particularly strong or swift—survived and evolved to become what we consider human. Humans endured because natural selection gave them the right behaviors to last in those conditions. This environment produced the behaviors examined here: egoism, domination, and the in-group/out-group distinction. These specific traits arc sufficient to explain why leaders will behave, in the proper circumstances, as offensive realists expect them to behave. That is, **even if they must hurt other humans** or risk injury to themselves, they will strive to **maximize their power**, defined as either control over others (for example, through wealth or leadership) or control over ecological circumstances (such as meeting their own and their family's or tribes need for food, shelter, or other resources).

#### Patriarchy is inevitable—hormones prove

**Goldberg 99** (Steven, Chairman of the Department of Sociology, City College, City University of New York, “The Inevitability of Patriarchy” http://lilt.ilstu.edu/gmklass/foi/readings/patriarchygoldberg.htm, EB)

The thesis put forth here is that the hormonal **renders the social inevitable**.  Because of hormonal differences between males and females, it is inevitable that males will be socialized to aspire to the roles that have highest status in a society.  Our biology makes the social arrangement known as patriarchy --the rule of males --inevitable. It is true (as the feminists never tire of pointing out) that what are considered masculine roles in one society may be considered feminine roles in another society.  Of far greater importance, however, is the fact that in **every known society** the masculine roles are rewarded with higher status than the feminine roles.  The role of healer might be a masculine role in a society such as ours, and a feminine role in some other culture; but in any society that accords this role high status, the expectation will be that it will be filled principally be men. The reason for this is simply that men are by nature more aggressive than women, and social arrangements have been designed to accommodate this fact.

#### The alternative alone gets coopted and is based on flawed scholarship

**Caprioli, 04** (“Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis” Mary Caprioli, Dept. of Political Science, University of Tennessee. International Studies Review. Volume 42 Issue 1 Page 193-197, March 2004. http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/0020-8833.00076.) AK

Conventional feminist IR scholars misrepresent the field of international relations in arguing that IR scholarship as popularly accepted excludes alternative explanations of state behavior, including feminist inquiry, that go beyond structural, state-focused models. Feminist IR theorists, among others, critique the IR field for its state-centric approach and argue that "a world of states situated in an anarchical international system leaves little room for analyses of social relations, including gender relations" (Tickner 2001:146). As a result, they appear to set up a straw man by refusing to recognize the variety within "conventional" IR research. Indeed, as Jack Levy (2000) has observed, a significant shift to societal-level variables has occurred, partly in response to the decline in the systemic imperatives of the bipolar era. Certainly the democratic peace literature, particularly its normative explanation (Maoz and Russett 1993; Dixon 1994), among other lines of inquiry, recognizes the role of social relations in explaining state behavior. The normative explanation for the democratic peace thesis emphasizes the societal level values of human rights, support for the rule of law, and peaceful conflict resolution in explaining the likelihood of interstate conflict. Furthermore, dyadic tests of the democratic peace thesis rely "on an emerging theoretical framework that may prove capable of incorporating the strengths of the currently predominant realist or neorealist research program, and moving beyond it" (Ray 2000:311). In addition, theorizing and research in the field of ethnonationalism has highlighted connections that domestic ethnic discrimination and violence have with state behavior at the international level (Gurr and Harff 1994; Van Evera 1997; Caprioli and Trumbore 2003a, 2003b). Contrary to the argument that conventional IR theory excludes feminist inquiry, space exists within the field of international relations **for feminist inquiry** even allowing for a state-centric focus, just as room exists for scholars interested in exploring the democratic peace and ethnonationalism. International relations feminists make the same mistake that they accuse IR scholars of making: narrowing the space for various worldviews, thereby creating competition and a sense of exclusion among the so-called others. If the role of "feminist theory is to explain women's subordination, or the unjustified asymmetry between women's and men's social and economic positions, and to seek prescriptions for ending it" (Tickner 2001:11), then feminist IR scholarship ought to allow for an explanation of how women's subordination or inequality has an impact on state behavior, assuming a state- centric focus, while at the same time challenging the predetermination of a structural analysis. If domestic inequality does affect state behavior, or even perpetuates the existence of states, then policy prescriptions should be sought.
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#### The alternative is the only way out– capitalism will inevitably collapse – only a transition now prevents extinction.

**Monbiot, 04** (George Monbiot, Professor of Philosophy at Bristol and Professor of Politics at Keele. Author, columnist, and political activist. “Manifesto for a New World Order.” p. 238)

None of the measures proposed in this book are sufficient, however, to address a far bigger question, that of the curtailment of the world-eating and mathematically impossible system we call capitalism, and its replacement with a benign and viable means of economic exchange. But I hope that, if implemented, they might begin to establish some of the preconditions in which a global debate about the world's economic and ecological destiny could begin. Because capitalism is built upon the lending of money at interest, capitalist economies are driven by the need to repay debt, which is why survival within this system is contingent upon endless growth. Endless growth is physically impossible. As Heinrich Haussmann has shown, a single pfennig (about half a US cent) invested at five per cent compound interest in the year AD 0 would have yielded, by 1990, a volume of gold 134 billion times the weight of the planet Interest repayments, in other words, are feasible only in the short term. As debt can be paid only by generating value, capitalism seems destined to destroy the planet.

#### Regardless of our alternative’s solvency, we have an ethical obligation to reject capitalism – our utopian thinking is key to resistance.

**Marsh 95** (james l, critique, action, and liberation p. 334-335)

Denial of utopia mutilates freedom and reason. We can appreciate this point more deeply by focusing phenomenologically on my experience of myself as an incarnate subject in the world. First of all, questioning is essential to the life of reason, and any questioning points beyond the data to a future answer arrived at in a future insight and judgment. A scientist hit on the head by an apple asks questions that point toward a future answer. Any question negates the given set of facts and anticipates a new future.7> Next, on the level of insight and conceptualization we arrive at a universal that is not exhausted by any particular manifestation or instance. ''Triangle'' is not exhausted by this particular triangular thing, "justice" by this particular example of justice, "beauty" by this particular painting. Moreover, no particular, sensible incarnation matches the perfection of the ideal. These instances of "triangle," "justice," "beauty," respectively, are not perfect; they have cracks, blemishes, and impurities.8 Further, on a reflective, ethical level I constitute through reflection and choice myself as an end in a community of ends. This ethical norm has the same inexhaustibility and perfection as any universal, but in addition is the ethical obligation to realize the ideal. If, therefore, I am essentially and eidetically an experiencing, understanding, judging, and choosing subject and the current social situation is irrational and unjust in not respecting that reality, I have three choices. I can capitulate to the situation and in so doing reduce or renounce my humanity, or I can live a double life in thinking utopian thoughts and pursuing a nonutopian life, or I can pursue the utopia of a full economic, social, and political democracy that is worthy of such a rational, free subject and incarnates in its institutions full respect for such a subject. Only the last option is fully consistent with the life of incarnate reason and freedom Finally, we may affirm a threefold exteriority to the irrational, exploitative capitalist system: exteriority as past, present, and future. Exteriority as past is the laborer initially confronting capital as deprived of means of production, land, and means of consumption; as present exteriority is labor confronting capital as nothing, poor, more and more deprived of skill, surplus value, and even of employment; and as future exteriority is the utopia of liberation that is suggested by, demanded by, and called for by the alienated present. Such utopia as norm and goal calls into question our alienated bourgeois present. "Exteriority" or "the other" in this book has at least five moments or stages of articulation: as phenomenologically described, as ethically evaluated, as hermeneutically interpreted, as critically judged, and as anticipated in an utopian manner. Our affirmation of "utopia" as essential and implied by ''rationality" in the full sense just completes and fills out our affirmation of exteriority as linked to rationality. A rationality and freedom and ethics and hermeneutics and critique and praxis not open to exteriority are incomplete, truncated, mutilated. Exteriority is the positive ground enabling us to go fully beyond a merely negative dialectic. We affirm, then, the ethical necessity of pursuing ethical community and democratic socialism as the rational embodiment of that vision. Here it is important to be clear about the difference between acquisitive, empirical reason and constitutive, ethical reason. Ethical community as utopia is not primarily something I stand back and predict objectively and scientifically; it is something to which I commit myself ethically and politically. An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed, it may seem unlikely, given this particular person's past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over our capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations. I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but I remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. … To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their own proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental. Indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial. What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet's "To be or not to be" speech? What does an empirical study of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx's Capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso's Guernica ?11To the extent, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason but the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factual, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted, topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

#### the affirmatives focus on identity as a solution creates a world of discourse- detracting from material solutoins and preventing the overthrow of capitalism

Rene **Poitevin 2001** [Rene Francisco Poitevin, originally from Puerto Rico, is a member of the SR editorial collective. His political background and work experience include low-income-housing organizing, prison reform advocacy, and media activism. He is currently in the doctoral program in sociology at the University of California] “The end of anti-capitalism as we knew it: Reflections on postmodern Marxism” (Socialist Review) http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3952/is\_200101/ai\_n8932891/pg\_11/?tag=content;col1>

I felt then, and I still do, that in order to expose and denounce and supersede a regime that was profoundly unjust, Marxism had to be part of the solution. I ended the 1990s, however, profoundly dissatisfied with both the theory and the practice of what constitutes "the Left" in this country. When I look around and see what passes for radical politics today, I see a Left so acquiescent and timid in its demands that one has to wonder what is left of the Left. And the theory and action that claims recognition as critical, or oppositional, is not only more dogmatically anti-Marxist than ever, it is also masquerading itself as socialist discourse. What I see is **a U.S. Left political practice** - vehement in rhetoric and tone -- **more invested in pursuing a reformist intra-middle class liberal agenda**, all in the name of "going beyond Marx," **than with the well-being of the majority of people in this country.** This is a Left that insists on downplaying institutional and structural inequality, the asymmetric distribution of social and economic power, in favor of issues concerning language, cultural representation, procedural democracy, access to elite employment, and environmental degradation as a quality-of-life issue. So my critique of actually existing U.S. Lefts comes out of my own need for intellectual and political self-clarification, but more importantly, it is a way to look forward to what must be done. This approach, however, requires by way of introduction a preliminary inventory and assessment of what I mean by "actually existing U.S. Lefts." While I acknowledge that "the Left" is by no means monolithic, it is possible to provide a critique of radical politics by looking at the academic Left in the university. This paper is first a critique of what constitutes the Left in academia - the poverty of politics and theory in the ivory tower relates directly to the crisis of the broader Left. Within this academic context, "radical democracy"' has been the Left's dominant theoretical orientation for the last two decades. And within the radical democracy tradition itself, the "Amherst School" of postmodern Marxism, which I will explain in more detail shortly, has been the most vocal trend in academic circles since the mid 1990s (as anybody who went to their Marxism 2000 Conference or who has looked at their journal Rethinking Marxism can testify.) As the title of this paper suggests, a close reading of the Amherst School of postmodern Marxism as standard bearer for an academic Left will allow me to engage with the broader current political crisis in Left politics -- and radical democracy. I begin with the postmodern (mis)appropriation of Althusser's notion of "overdetermination," namely the intuition that reality is so complex that it is better understood as a multicausal process rather than as a "structural" or systemic mechanism, as in the traditional Marxist explanation of capitalism. Then, through a close reading of J.K. Gibson-Graham's (which is the professional name of scholars Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson), The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It),2 I show that despite its intuitive analytical appeal and theoretical sophistication, their book espouses an unconvincing and ultimately reactionary postmodern/post-Marxist politics - one that is ultimately predicated around how to make capitalism more user friendly. I will show that **to** **practice or "perform" postmodern Marxist politics in our present situation is** not to engage in what the Amherst School of postmodern Marxism describes as a "politics of opportunity and attainment,"3 but **to practice the politics of surrender instead**. I will make clear that **what ultimately gives internal consistency to many of the critiques of postmodern and post-Marxist theorists is a profound distortion and co-optation of the most critical, unique, and politically mobilizing features of Marxist theory, on one hand, combined with a renaturalization of a capitalism predicated on liberal notions of social and economic reform, on the other.** The Amherst School of postmodern Marxism, which is predicated on a rethinking of Marxist theory from a post-structuralist standpoint,5 came together as a recognizable cluster during the late 1980s, first through the writings of scholars like Richard Wolff, Stephen Resnick, and David Ruccio, and later through the publication of the journal Rethinking Marxism and conferences sponsored by the Association for Economic and Social Analysis (AESA), and a newer generation of scholars that can be traced to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (they either teach, worked, or graduated from there.)6 Operating within the broader tradition of radical democracy triggered by Laclau and Mouffe's Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,7 the Amherst School spent the 1990s ferociously debating and advocating their vision of politics predicated on the "overdetermination" of the social world, namely, the claim that causal explanations of social phenomena, and macroanalyses of economic systems, are really nothing more than myths and fictions that cannot stand the cross-examination of discursive analysis and the analytical power of post-structuralist tools. Because of the close overlap between the critiques of Marxism espoused by radical democracy, a la Laclau and Mouffe, and postmodern Marxism, a la J.K. Gibson-Graham, I use the term "postmodern/post-Marxism" to refer to the epistemological and political goals they share in common. By "postmodern/post-Marxism" I refer to the shared set of positions through which radical democracy and the Amherst School reduce Marxism to a "teleological, totalizing, and essentializing" tradition. Moreover, within the radical democracy/ post-- modern Marxism school, classical Marxism is also understood to be an inherently economistic and class-reductionist paradigm. Both traditions share a commitment to postmodern politics that refuses to privilege class oppressions over other forms of domination. And they refuse to theorize capitalism as a macro-level social structure that is inherently exploitative. Thus it makes sense to combine them both for analytical purposes under the rubric of "postmodern/post-Marxists." The main difference between radical democrats and postmodern Marxists is that the former absolutely refuse to use the label "Marxist" to describe themselves, while the latter accept the label. Radical democracy is definitely a "post-Marxist" tradition, with Laclau and Mouffe its best-known members. (Most) postmodern Marxists, on the other hand, still claim the label "Marxists" to construct themselves, even if, at times, they might be conflicted about it. In so doing, it is not at all clear what in the Marxist tradition the post-Marxists are actively drawing on. The need that J.K. Gibson-Graham exhibit in one of their essays to clarify their self-identification as Marxists - however thinly - is a perfect example of the uses of "Marxism" to describe the Amherst School: "The chapter reads as a Marxist speaking to an audience of Marxists" because the paper was first presented at a Marxist conference. Overdetermination and Its Discontents In an intellectual custody battle resembling a lot of the drama of the Elian Gonzalez case, structuralists and postmoderns continue to fight over the legacy of Louis Althusser.9 From the same guy who brought us the most rigid construction of subjectivity in all of Western Marxism, now comes the notion of "overdetermination," the claim that no social reality can be explained in terms of causal hierarchies and/or specific mechanisms. This legacy of Althusser is divided into two distinct, mutually exclusive camps. On the one hand, the structuralist Althusser brings us the (oversimplified) notion of capitalism constructed as a fixed "box" with allocated and predetermined "slots" in which people lack any agency and are simply reduced to enacting already programmed scripts. On the other hand, the overdeterminist Althusser tells us that not only is the "capitalist structure" gone, but no social phenomenon (be it a person, identity, social movement, or institution) can ever be explained in terms of causal hierarchies or specific mechanisms. Whereas the earlier, structuralist Althusser used to bring us the "truth" about the capitalist system in dear and unambiguous terms, now the overdeterminist Althusser, as presented by the Amherst School, denies the very possibility of theorizing macro social and economic processes in terms of causal mechanisms. Instead of "structure" we are left with what postmodern Marxists call "discursive fixings," namely the claim that any and all interpretation of reality is inherently unstable because "reality" is constituted by "discourse" and discourse changes through time and place." So in the overdetermined Althusserian reality, the best we can do is to try to "hold" or temporarily "fix" particular social realities, with the explicit understanding that whatever categories or situations we can come up with, are bound to change and are inherently unstable, due to the ever-changing nature of meaning in discourse and language. So tells the story. At first I could not figure out the obsession of the Amherst School, which goes back all the way to Laclau and Mouffe, with wanting to become the "official" executors of the Althusserian estate. Am I the only one who thinks that Althusser is overrated at best and just plain wrong more often than not? The answer to this apparent contradiction lies in the rhetorical power that Althusser grants in making legitimate claims to the Western Marxist tradition - whoever controls the "franchise" to his name gets instant credibility. From this perspective then, it does not really matter what Althusser said or did, as long as Althusser's credentials as a "real" Marxist remain convincing. And the fact is that Althusser might have been wrong or crazy - he could have been a lousy theorist or even a murderer, we can debate that either way - but his Marxist credentials remain unchallenged. So, reclaiming and retaining the Althusserian "legacy" is a very rewarding endeavor that is nothing short of a carpool lane into Marxist theory. And it is Marxist legitimacy that the postmodern Marxists lack and desperately seek. The Amherst School's strategy has been to lock on to Althusser's "overdetermination" and claim it as their own as a way to argue for the legitimacy of postmodern epistemologies as an acceptable part of the Marxist canon. In this way postmodern Marxists get to have their cake and eat it too. They get to reject and condemn notions of capitalism as a macro-system that is inherently exploitative -- while remaining Marxists at the same time. Thus, statements like "overdetermination enables us to read the causality that is capitalism as coexisting with an infinity of other determinants, none of which can be said to be less or more significant"11 together with sentences like "We are not arguing for the abandonment of such terms as 'working class,' but for an approach to their use that does not know in advance what they mean" get to pass for legitimate Marxist positions.12 How claims such as these, where we can neither explain capitalism nor tell what we mean by "working class," can pass for Marxist theory today, all in the name of Althusser, is beyond my comprehension. The Amherst School's sleight of hand is made possible in part because Althusser actually never fully developed his concept of overdetermination beyond some rather cryptic comments.13 But fortunately for the Amherst School, this is where post-structuralist theory can come to the rescue, making it possible for Althusserian thought to become more clear. Take for example J.K. Gibson-Graham's approach, when they say that "Althusser's overdetermination can be understood as signaling the irreducible specificity of every determination... the openness and incompleteness of every identity; the ultimate unfixity of every identity ...."14 People familiar with Derrida's work will recognize immediately that what Gibson-Graham have done is attribute to Althusser what is in fact Derrida's definition of the "sign," which for him is one of the fundamental building blocks of language. What this seemingly innocent trick by the Amherst School does is to effectively transform Althusser's "overdetermination" into a problem of language and discourse - and therefore into a post-structuralist agenda.15 This kind of post-structuralist-wolves-dressed-up-in-Marxist-clothes trick, so entrenched within the postmodern Marxist tradition, needs to be rejected and denounced. To substitute Derrida for Althusser might be a clever trick that allows postmodern Marxism to sound legitimate, but it is certainly not Althusserian Marxism. The End of Capitalism (As We Know It) The first thing that jumps out after reading The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy is the way in which there are at least two ways of smashing the capitalist state: we can have the Leninist revolution or we can change the definition of capitalism and make it disappear. J.K. Gibson-Graham succeeds in doing the latter: in a kind of theoretical abracadabra, capitalism is definitely gone by the end of their book. But despite the theoretical sophistication of their work - a no-holds barred embracing of post-structuralist theory - once the epistemological fireworks dissipate, the argument of the book is actually rather simple. If what is wrong with Left politics "is the way capitalism has been 'thought' that has made it so difficult for people to imagine its supersession,"16 then it logically follows that what is to be done is to change its definition so that it can be "thought" differently - and therefore be made easier to get rid of. And if the problem of why U.S. radical politics has been so ineffective for the last two decades is the stubborn Marxist insistence upon "the image of two classes locked in struggle," a situation that "has in our view become an obstacle to, rather than a positive force for, anticapitalist endeavors,"17 then how about getting rid of this whole class struggle thing and "reimagine" labor and capital as allies rather than enemies?18 Would not that make the whole task of social transformation much easier? Perhaps, but as we will see shortly, getting rid of capitalism is easier said than done. The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) begs another question: Who are they going after? Is it capitalism or is it Marx? Their book spends so much time on what is supposedly wrong with Marxism that at times it reads more like The End of Marxism As We Knew It. This approach is typical of a pattern that, to quote Wendy Brown, "responds less to the antidemocratic forces of our time than to a ghostly philosophical standoff between historically abstracted formulations of Marxism and liberalism. In other words, this effort seeks to resolve a problem in a (certain) history of ideas rather than a problem in history."19 Simply put, **postmodern Marxist politics has more to do with the micropolitics of the ivory tower than with the plight of the workers who clean their campuses**. However, once it becomes clear that a necessary condition for the primacy of postmodern theory and politics is that Marxism has to go (otherwise you do not have to become a postmodern to address their concerns), J.K. Gibson-Graham's anti-Marxist hostility, while actively embracing the Marxist label in order to render it useless, makes a lot of sense. And once again, all this is done with impeccable logic: Given that Marxism is still the only doctrine that calls for the systematic overthrow of capitalism, getting rid of Marx(ism) is also to get rid of the need for revolution with a big "R."20 One of the problems with trying to make the case for postmodern Marxism is that in order to get rid of Marxism and declare its tradition obsolete, you have to distort its legacy by constructing a straw man. This straw man-reading of Marx is predicated upon the double maneuver of collapsing Marxist history into Stalinism, on the one hand, and reducing Marxist theory to "essentialism," "totality," and "teleology," on the other. As J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves acknowledge, without any regrets, "Indeed, as many of our critics sometimes charge, we have constructed a 'straw man.'"21 What is left out of their quasi-humorous dismissal of Marxism is the complicity of such a straw man in the long history of red-baiting and anti-Marxist repression in this country and around the world. Also left out is the rich Marxist scholarship that was addressing their concerns long before there was a postmodern Marxist school. The fact is that postmodern Marxist's "contributions" are not as original nor as profound as they might have us believe. For example, what about the bulk of the Western Marxist tradition since the Frankfurt School? Has it not been predicated on a rejection of the economic reductionism embedded in the passage from the Preface to the Introduction to A Critique of Political Economy in which the (in)famous base/superstructure metaphor of society gets set in stone as the "official" definition of historical materialism? Or what about Horkheimer and Adorno's relentless critique of instrumental rationality? Marxism, in spite of what the postmodern Marxists want us to believe, has long been making the case for the centrality of culture and its irreducibility to economic laws, as anybody who has read Walter Benjamin or Antonio Gramsci can certify. Furthermore, postcolonial Marxism and critical theory have also been theorizing at more concrete levels of analyses the irreducibility of subjectivity to class.22 And despite the postmodern Marxist excitement when talking about class as a relational process, in fact it is impossible to tell that they are not the first ones to talk about class as a relational process, lots of Marxists before the Amherst School have been theorizing and clarifying the relational mechanisms embedded in class politics. Postmodern Marxism also ignores Lefebvre's urban Marxist contribution: his emphasis on the importance of experience and the everyday in accounting for social processes.24 And Marxist feminist contributions on the intersection of agency and gender with race, class, and sexuality are conveniently erased from J.K. Gibson-Graham's reduction of Marxism to a straw man.25 The fact is that when one looks at Marxism not as a distorted "straw man" but on its own terms, taking into account its richness and complexity, Marxist theory starts to appear all of a sudden less "totalizing," "essentializing," and "reductionist" and instead as more rich in possibilities and more enabling. Excursion Filosofica A third feature of J.K. Gibson-Graham's work, in particular, and of the whole radical democracy tradition, in general, is its post-structuralist extremism.26 For postmodern Marxists it is not enough to point out that, as both Foucault and Habermas argue, we inhabit an intellectual regime characterized by a paradigm shift from the "philosophy of consciousness" to the "philosophy of language."27 Nor is it good enough for postmodern/post-Marxists to recognize the pitfalls embedded in Hegelian epistemology and argue instead, as Spivak does, for strategic-- uses-of-essentialism as a corrective to the excesses of teleological thinking and fixed notions of class.28 No way. As far as postmodern Marxism is concerned, the only way to compensate for constructions of capitalism that are too totalizing is through the unconditional surrender of the Marxist project. As J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves make clear, "to even conceive of 'capitalism' as 'capitalisms' is still taking 'capitalism' for granted."29 And to try to redistribute the heavy theoretical and political burden placed upon the proletariat by reconfiguring political agency through "race-class-gender," as opposed to just class, is still a futile endeavor: essentialism is still essentialism whether one essentializes around one or three categories. This strand of post-structuralism, one that once again, can be directly traced back to Laclau and Mouffe's Hegemony and

Socialist Strategy,30 is predicated on the faulty epistemological premise that what really matters is "discourse." As Laclau and Mouffe clarify, "our analysis rejects the distinction between discursive and nondiscursive practices. It offirms that every object is constituted as an object of discourse."31 The problem with this approach is that **once we enter this world of epistemological foundationalism predicated on the claim that there is "nothing but discourse," we enter a world of relativism in which all we can do is "create discursive fixings**," as J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves prescribe, that will guarantee that "any particular analysis will never find the ultimate cause of events."32 It is this ideological postmodern insistence on reducing all of social reality to discourse that ultimately overloads its theoretical apparatus and causes it to buckle beneath them. **The Amherst School's "provisional ontology" is incapable of escaping the performative trap of trying to get rid of essentialism by essentializing all of reality as "discursive."** **The postmodern Marxist approach to ontology boils down to substituting in political practice every occurrence of "continuity" with "discontinuity" as a way to get rid of essentialism and macro-narratives.** Even Foucault, the great master of discontinuity, distances himself from such mirror-reversal solutions when theorizing the limits of discourse and accounting for the "divergence, the distances, the oppositions, the differences" that constitute the episteme of a period. In a (rarely cited) interview titled "Power and the Study of Discourse," **Foucault goes to great length to emphasize the importance of the nondiscursive** (which he defines as "a whole play of economic, political and social changes"34) **as a necessary condition for the successful application of "discourse" to Left politics**." When explicitly asked whether "a mode of thought which introduces discontinuity and the constraints of system" does "not remove all basis for a progressive political intervention"36 (in other words, is post-structuralist politics friend or foe of Left politics), Foucault does three things before he can answer in the affirmative. First, he defends the need for "discourse" and "discontinuity" in unmasking the hidden teleologies embedded in metanarratives of universal history and so forth, in other words, in unmasking the myth of "the sovereignty of the pure subject." Next, and this is crucial in understanding the role of discourse in post-structuralist analysis, Foucault proceeds to triangulate "discourse" as an interplay between three separate levels of analysis: intradiscursive, interdiscursive, and extradiscursive transformations. Taken together, these three levels of analysis constitute the basic "schemes of dependence" that define the conditions that regulate discursive historical transformations and social change. An example of the intradiscursive, for Foucault, is the relationship between the objects, operations, and concepts that constitute a single discipline, let's say math. How "math" constitutes itself with all its many subfields, rules, and definitions is an example of intradiscursive. Interdiscursive, on the other hand, deals with the relationship between one discipline (Foucault uses the example of medical discourse) and other disciplines, in this example other disciplines outside of medicine, such as economics or natural history. And the extradiscursive level of analysis, the one relevant for us in our assessment of postmodern Marxism, deals between the discursive and those "transformations outside of discourse."37 Foucault talks about the connections between "medical discourse and a whole play of economic, political, and social changes" as an example of extradiscursive processes. Notice how careful and unequivocal Foucault's analysis is in emphasizing and making sure that we do not reduce all of reality to some simple notion of "discourse." **The irreducibility of the nondiscursive cannot be summarily dismissed as irrelevant, as postmodern/post-Marxists do**. The key point in assessing the postmodern/post-Marxist epistemological and ontological viability is this: **None of Foucault's subtleties in theorizing the "nondiscursive" are present in the postmodern/post-- Marxist model. Not only is Foucault's notion of "discourse" more complex and nuanced than the one presented in postmodern/post-Marxism, the "nondiscursive" is defined as constituted by "institutions, social relations, economic and political conjuncture" - and as explicitly nonreducible to discourse.3**8 This is why **the postmodern/post-Marxist's incapability and/or refusal to account for the irreducibility of the nondiscursive aspects of institutions and the economy ultimately disqualifies them from articulating a viable Left project. To retort by saying that it is OK to not deal with the centrality of the nondiscursive (e.g., the institutional) because "every object is constituted as an object of discourse"39 misses the point that the moment of the nondiscursive and extradiscursive is both irreducible and essential.** How many more Ptolemaic circles of "discursive fixings" is it going to take before it becomes clear that postmodern Marxism's bankrupt epistemology/ontology cannot articulate a viable project for radical politics? The Postmodern Intellectual as Revolutionary Subject, Or Capitalocentrism Strikes Back Let us bracket for a moment the limitations of postmodern/post-Marxist epistemologies, together with their "provisional ontology," and focus instead on the merits of their "performative" politics. What is it exactly that has been/can be accomplished politically in this new paradigm? I will point out two results from the postmodern/post-Marxist approach. First, in the postmodern/post-Marxist world, it is the (white, middleclass) postmodern intellectual who gets constituted as the new "revolutionary subject."40 In a political universe controlled by postmodern Marxist physics, where there are no longer objective mechanisms of oppression, but what matters is "rather how... we wish to think of the complex interaction between these [sic] complexities,"" the postmodern intellectual becomes the de facto new vanguard. **In a political** practice that denies the possibility of objective criteria in deciding what constitutes social phenomena, postmodern intellectuals are the agency in charge of allocating legitimacy to political claims. It is no longer the material conditions or the historical conjuncture of a particular situation that determine what is to be done, but as JK. Gibson-Graham claim, it is "rather how we wish to think" about social problems that constitutes the defining criteria for validity and politics - in a context where the "we" is constituted by a postmodern intelligentsia. Simply put**, it is no longer up to the working class, or queer people of color, or women, or the party intellectual, or any other subjectivity to decide which project is legitimate enough to merit recognition - and commitment. In the postmodern Marxist world, the hypereducated postmodern scholar is the one in charge of leading and defining which struggles count and how they will be fought.** Simply put, the postmodern intellectual is the new revolutionary subject. One of the most immediate and important tasks in the postmodern/post-Marxist "revolution" is theory production. To paraphrase Lenin, there can be no revolutionary practice without postmodern theory. The reason that postmodern theory is so important is because, as they themselves put it, postmodern Marxism constructs political agency by offering a "range of subject positions that individuals may inhabit, constituting themselves as class subjects with particular political energies and possibilities."42 This, of course, is no small task given that "the production of new knowledges is a world-changing activity, one that repositions other knowledges and empowers new subjects, practices and institutions."43 This privileging of postmodern-theory production, coupled with the unique role conferred on the postmodern intellectual in a political process that privileges discourse at the expense of institutional analysis constitutes (in an ironic twist of fate for people who are so explicitly anti-Leninist) nothing short of a new vanguardism on post-structuralist steroids. But by far the most anticlimactic and disappointing outcome of the postmodern Marxist approach is that **in its desire to get rid of "capitalocentrism,"44 they end up actually reconfiguring the very beast they seek to eliminate by disguising liberal reform as "noncapitalism."** Nowhere is this more obvious than in J.K. Gibson-Graham's celebratory reading of The Full Monty, a film about a group of British steelworkers who lose their jobs due to deindustrialization, and end up refashioning themselves as strippers as a way to reclaim their economic agency.45 The movie shows how the tragic loss of the town's steel mill creates a cascade effect that ends up reconfiguring the social fabric of that community. By the end of the movie, the ex-steelworkers are forced to rethink and renegotiate many types of relationships and identities, from constructions of masculinity and gender roles to economic identities even their wives have to get service jobs to make ends meet. Of particular interest for J.K. Gibson-Graham are the ways in which the movie overlaps with some of the themes of The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It), especially with the ways in which The Full Monty "hinted at different narratives of class transformation, new awareness of class politics and an expanded range of class emotions."46 They also welcomed the way in which the unemployed men "are unable to draw sustenance from old models of resistance-style politics" (i.e., they cannot use the "old" labor/capital class struggle thing) and the way in which the characters in the film pursue what J.K. Gibson-Graham call "non-- capitalist economic relations." Never mind that old predictable "feeling of regret that the climactic one-night-stand striptease is so economically inconsequential" to the well-being of the ex-steelworker strippers, their families, and the community. Even though the ex-steelworkers are still poor at the end of the movie, what matters, according to J.K. Gibson-Graham, is that there was a process of "becoming" that allowed the community to come together, not as ex-workers and ex-managers, or as husbands and wives, but as a "communal economic identity based upon self-value and identification across difference."47 This is important because it is the "communal economic identity" of the successful striptease venture that constitutes the precondition for imagining and engaging in "noncapitalist commodity production," such as worker collectives or self-employed workers. A key part of the ex-steelworkers' success, and an important strategy in postmodern Marxist politics, is that the ex-steelworkers do not pursue the "orthodox" line of worker's challenging capitalist control of industrial property, nor do they seem to care about circuits of capital or structural needs of accumulation. The problem with J.K. Gibson-Graham's celebratory reading of The Full Monty is that regardless of how sound the process of "becoming" might be for that community, and regardless of how well they might manage to get along afterwards, calling their striptease enterprise a "noncapitalist commodity production" that is "full of potential and possibilities" is wishful thinking at best and totally ludicrous at worst. Am I the only one who realizes that what JK. Gibson-Graham refer to as "noncapitalist commodity production" is actually sex work? Would JK. Gibson-Graham still embrace as "noncapitalist economic relations" ex-maquila workers along the U.S.-Mexican border deciding to do sex work a la The Full Monty as long as it brings the community together? Is prostitution OK as long as the prostitute's surplus is not being appropriated by someone else? My main point here is that throughout The Full Monty - and in J.K. Gibson-Graham's review of the film as well - **property relations are never questioned or challenged. In the postmodern/post-Marxist "noncapitalist" world, corporations get to keep ownership of the means of production and their profits, while working class communities continue to lap dance their way through "identification across difference" rather than doing union organizing**. That this kind of argument can be presented not only as "noncapitalist" but also as Marxist thinking should be enough to demonstrate the political bankruptcy of this paradigm. It is also interesting that JK Gibson-Graham maintain that challenging their analysis of The Full Monty, or not endorsing the politics of the film, "is inherently conservative and capitalocentric."48 I disagree strongly. The politics advocated by J.K. Gibson-Graham through their reading of The Full Monty is nothing but liberal politics with post-structuralist delusions of grandeur. **It is one thing to say that we are at a political conjuncture in which the thing to do is to work hard for reform, not "revolution." But it is another thing to argue that revolutionary practice cannot happen on epistemological grounds, and that all we can do is make capitalism as user friendly as possible while obscuring and co-opting the Marxist tradition.** J.K. Gibson-Graham's reading of The Full Monty is both liberal and reactionary. What the postmodern Marxist's reading of The Full Monty demonstrates is that **in their desire to get rid of "capitalocentrism" - the alleged obsession of Marxists with seeing "capitalism" everywhere - they end up reconfiguring and consolidating capitalism back in. In their unreflective romanticizing of reform, and in their haughty contempt for revolutionary thinking and politics,** J.K-.Gibson-Graham's style of **postmodern/post-Marxism delivers what boils down to good old-fashioned liberalism: a mild, state-administered "economic justice" platform centered around individual private liberties, neatly packaged in postmodern gift wrapping**. The bottom line is this: When one looks closely at what postmodern/post-Marxist theory actually offers, and after it is done "representing capitalism through the lens of overdetermination,"49 all one can strategize about is how to make capitalism more "user friendly." **Gone is the project of getting rid of it**. Strangely enough, postmodern/ post-Marxists do not regard these positions as a surrender of the Marxist project at all, but rather, as the exact fulfillment of that commitment.50 From Radical Democracy to Revolutionary Democracy Let me finish by addressing the "vision thing" in Marxist theory, and by putting forward some minimal suggestions for how to proceed. **The problem with the Left** in this country **is not Marx's theorizing of capital, it is the Left's profound poverty of vision**. Simply put, **we cannot think "Revolution" anymore because we cannot think "Capitalism" anymore. What passes for "radical democracy" nowadays is so timid and so willing to declare and settle for quick victories that one has to wonder sometimes where exactly it is that the radicalism in radical democracy lies.** And to make matters worse, **we are living in a period in which the Left itself is the one in charge of convincing us that the "Revolution" is not only politically unfeasible, but also epistemologically impossible**. To paraphrase Marx's famous eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, **postmodern Marxists have interpreted the world for too long - the point is to change it.** Do we need reform? Of course we do, but to construct reform as a "sufficient" condition for social change is to engage not in the politics of empowerment but in the practice of a politics of surrender with delusions of grandeur. Furthermore, **in a post-structuralist epistemological framework in which structural and systemic explanations are forbidden, all we are left with is a blurred capacity to prioritize what is to be done**. In short, in the postmodern Marxist world, it is impossible to structurally explain how the top 1 percent of the world population has more wealth than the bottom 92 percent. To do that would require the admission that there is something called capitalism with a logic to it. Recall that in the postmodern Marxist world, the political importance of "any relationship... [is determined by] how we wish to think of the complex interaction"; it is not based on institutional or systemic mechanisms of how inequality gets generated and reproduced.51 And given the postmodern Marxists' insistence on defining capitalism from the get-go as having "no essential or coherent identity,"52 it is no surprise that such academics are totally irrelevant to real people's struggles against globalization, the IMF, the WTO, and NAFTA. It's the case of the chicken coming home to roost**. It is time to stop the politics of surrender and denial. It is time to stop pretending that if we repeat things over and over again for long enough** (this is called "performative" in postmodern parlance), **things will eventually change. The fact is that the Left has been getting crushed for quite some time now. The fact is that it is going to take more than a cadre of postmodern intellectuals and a new definition of capitalism to establish a just economic and political system. And attempts to co-opt and hijack Marxism for some reformist agenda is not going to do it either.**

#### Appealing to the system for an end to exploitation is wrong – rules will be circumvented and used to maintain the legitimacy of the system

**Moody, 01** Director of a monthly magazine (Kim, “Closing the Door on U.S. Imperialism & Capitalist Globalization” New Politics, Winter 2001 Vol. VIII, Iss. 2; pg. 96 Proquest SW)

It is self-defeating to address the problem of super-exploited labor abroad by calling on the U.S. government or the multilateral institutions it dominates to protect global labor as the AFL-CIO does. Whether it is through trade sanctions, side-bars tacked on to trade agreements, or even through trade agreements that include labor rights in the text, as does the new agreement with Jordan, this is a matter of the fox guarding the hen house. In any case, while we support labor and human rights everywhere, opposition to the kinds of trade agreements that characterize contemporary "open door" imperialism should hardly be abandoned for the promise of paper rights by powers who show no respect for them at home or abroad. Regardless of intentions, such an approach also underwrites the U.S. role as final arbiter in world affairs, i.e., as chief justice of the imperial court. While we would support broad multilateral agreements banning sweatshop practices, child labor, etc., unconnected to trade or investment, as the ILO conventions already do, we should also realize that such agreements and codes generally lack enforcement and that proposing enforcement by the world's greatest violators (certainly in other people's countries) is shaky ground for improvement. As one U.S. worker told Human Rights Watch about U.S. labor law, "I know the law gives us rights on paper, but where's the reality?" Enforcement of agreements that include labor rights clauses, like the enforcement of many domestic laws, ultimately comes down to the actions of the workers and their organizations and allies. Therefore, we should be emphasizing direct solidarity with social and labor movements abroad whenever possible. There are plenty of examples that show it can make a difference.

#### Single-issue movements will be co-opted by capitalism—only complete structural challenges have any hope.

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 39-40)

To aggravate the situation, everything is further complicated by the fact that it is not feasible to find partial solutions to the problems that must be faced. Thus, no ‘single issue’ can be realistically considered a ‘single issue.’ If nothing else, this circumstance has been forcefully highlighted by the disconcerting marginalization of the Green movement on the success of which so much hope has been placed in recent times, even among former socialists. In the past up to a few decades ago it was possible to squeeze out of capital what appeared to be significant concessions—such as relative gains for the socialist movement (which later turned out to be reversible both as legislative measures for working class action and as gradually improving standard of living), obtained through the defensive organizations of labour: its trades unions and parliamentary parties. These gains could be conceded by capital so long as they could be assimilated and integrated by the system as a whole and turned to its productive advantage in the course of its self-expansion. Today, by contrast, confronting even partial issues with any hope of success implies the necessity of challenging the capital system as such. For in our own historical epoch, when productive self-expansion is no longer a readily available way out of the accumulating difficulties and contradictions (hence the purely wishful thinking of getting rid of the black hope of indebtedness by ‘growing out of it’), the global capital system of necessity frustrates all attempts at interfering even to a minimal extent with its structural parameters. In this respect the obstacles to be overcome are actually shared by labour—that is, labour as the radical alternative to capital’s social metabolic order—and the ‘single issue’ movements. For the historic failure of social democracy clearly underlined that only integrable demands can gain legitimacy under the rule of capital. Environmentalism by its very nature—just like the great historic cause of women’s liberation—is non-integrable. Consequently no such cause will for the capital system conveniently fade way, irrespective of how many setbacks and defeats the politically organized forms of ‘single issue’ movements might have to suffer in the foreseeable future. However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naïve. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable issue, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but—precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital—can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

#### impact- Capitalist territorialization maintains global violence and causes the death of the biosphere and nuclear conflicts over resource optimization – that’s extinction

**Massumi 92, (Brian, pHD in Philosophy @ Yale, A user’s guide to capitalism and schizophrenia 1992. P 137-8)** "Postmodernity" is not nothing; it constitutes a limited becoming- supermolecular that can increase some bodies' degrees of freedom beyond anything seen before. The fact that society has reached the point that it can forego both interiority and belief and embrace creation is not to be lamented. A real cause for concern is that it has done so in a framework that restricts mutation. The forced movement of liberal "democracy" (parodic verisimilitude) has re-become real movement (simulation), but within limits: a body's transformational potential is indexed to its buying power. This means that the privilege of self-invention will never extend to every body. Not only do most bodies not have infinite degress of freedom, alarming and increasing numbers are starving and malnourished. Mere survival is a privilege in the brave new neoconservative world. Capitalism's endocolonial expansion has made th e law o f unequal exchange that is written into its axiomatic as inescapable and lethal fact of life. I**ts outward surge of expansion has nearly exhausted the earth, threatening to destroy the environment on which all life depends. Capitalism has not ushered in an age of universal wealth and well-being and never will**. All it can do is displace it own limits. The limits of capitalism used to be external boundaries falling between its formations and non- or precapitalist ones: between molarity and rnolecularity, the capitalist class and the proletariat, the "First World" and the "Third World", resource depletion and technological progress. These boundaries were overtaken by capitalism as it grew to saturate its field of exteriority: Molarity/molecularity has been counteractualized as a distinction between commercialized codes and equally commercialized subcodes (the identification of the "Other" replaced by trafficking in affects for use in becoming-other). Some proletarians have been integrated as corporatist workers who are both commodities on the "job market" and consumers (Fordism), while **growing numbers have been relegated to a "permanent underclass" locked out of steady employment and thus restricted to participating in the economy as consumers**- of the inadequate social services still available after the gutting of the welfare state. The inclusion of all nations in the international debt economy and the creation of "peripheral" areas of underdevelopment in the very heart of the Western world's largest capitals have blurred the boundaries between "First" and "Third" Worlds. The first three limits have been internalized by capitalism, in the sense of being subsumed by its axiomatic. **The last limit, between resource depletion and technological "progress," not only remains but has become absolute- the death of the planet. This limit cannot be internalized by capital** (**although the nuclear arms race of the Cold War** period that transformed the "advanced" nations into permanent war economies based on postponed conflagration **was a delirious attempt to do just that). It can,** however, **be crossed. It is capitalism's destiny to cross it**. For although capitalism has turned quantum in its mode of operation, it has done so in the service of quantity: **consumption and accumulation are**, have been, **and will always be its reason for being. Capitalism's strength, and its fatal weakness, is to have elevated consumption and accumulation to the level of a principle marshaling superhuman forces of invention- and destruction. The abstract machine of consumption-accumulation has risen, Trump-like in all its inhuman glory. Its fall will be a great deal harder**. What the [mal deterministic constraint that is the capitalist relation ultimately determines is global death. The virtual pole of capitalism turns out to be no less suicidal than fascism-paranoia, though in a very different way- by virtue of its success, not because of an irresolvable contradiction endemic to its dynamic. Capitalism is not defined by its contradictions. It is the social tendency to overcome contradiction. The four fundamental dense points of its axiomatic grid constitute a creative tension, a real differential, the unmediated operation of a mode of transpersonal desire. Fascism-paranoia is a desire for unity that is applied to a body of interceding agency whose operation consists in carrying a body outside of itself in order to find its identity. It is also a transpersonal desire, or abstract machine, but one that is mediated by a detour through molarity. The logical contradictions haunting fascist-paranoid formations are indirect expressions of a forcibly personalized desire to transcend matter. Capitalism's limits are a direct result of its more successful desire to make itself immanent to matter (in the process of which, as a side effect, it frees some bodies to transcend forced personification).

#### Capitalism turns workers into slaves, their very conscious is corrupted and they lose sight of their own lives

**Marsh 95**, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, PhD from Northwestern University

(James, Critique Action and Liberation, p 277)

Ideally, nature, workers' own bodies, and the world around them, should be the vehicle of their conscious self-expression. In estranging human beings from object and process, capitalism estranges them from their own consciousness. It turns consciousness into a means of individual life or mere physical existence. Rather than living to work the worker works in order to live, to keep body and soul together. That which should be a means becomes an end, and that which should be the end becomes a means. Rather than nature being the environment in which human beings freely, consciously express themselves and realize themselves, nature is turned against them. Consciousness ceases to be an end and becomes a means to the realization of profit. Use value, the capacity of products for fulfilling real human needs, in capitalism becomes subordinate to the product's exchange value, the abstract labor time as measured in money. The consciousness of everyone, even the capitalist, is alienated in the pursuit of profit. Money becomes an all-consuming god devouring everything in its path. In this institutionalized reification in which things become more important than consciousness, what Marx calls the fetishism of commodities arises. Human beings forget that they are the source of value in their wealth and think that it is the source of their value.

#### Western feminism enables capitalist domination because 1) they ignore the role of class in gender oppression and 2) hard won economic freedom turns into exploitation.

**Gordon 96**

(April A. Gordon, Transforming Capitalism and Patriarchy: Gender and Development in Africa. Publisher: Lynne Rienner. Place of Publication: Boulder, CO. Publication Year: 1996.http://www.questia.com/read/96895144# Page Number: pg 80)

One reason liberal feminism in the West fails to address such oppressions as imperialism, classism, and racism is that this would require feminists to acknowledge that their own privileges are tied to the oppression of poor, nonwhite, and Third World women ( A. Russo 1991:299-307). Indeed, liberal feminism is compatible with liberal capitalism and what some view as the paternalistic, women in development (WID) economic strategy in the Third World, which will be discussed in Chapter 4. Liberal feminism's emphasis on legal reforms and equal rights is not only the most acceptable version of feminism to the First World, it has also gained the most support among Third World feminist politicians, jurists, and academics.It was liberal feminism that inspired the UN Decade for Women, which won support from male-dominated governments all over the world. The reasons for this support are obvious. Liberal feminism's reformism is more politically acceptable because it leaves unchallenged the underlying structural causes of gender inequality and its relationship to other systems of oppression such as the inequitable world economic order and internal systems of social and political inequality (see Stamp 1989; Cagatay et al. 1986; Barrow 1985; Steady 1985). Apfel-Marglin and Simon ( 1994: 35 - 36 ) criticize the entire ideological underpinnings of the development of women feminist project, which, they claim, descends from Victorian colonial feminism. WID posits the white Western independent woman integrated into a commodified world as the norm. Rather than questioning the development process, WID identifies the barriers (i.e., tradition and social constraints) to women's access to the market. WID sees women as oppressed victims of societies in need of transformation to liberate women. If Third World women's self-perception is not one of an autonomous, independent self, but one embedded in kinship and other social bonds, such perceptions are invalidated. "Cognitive authority" belongs to the experts who know what women need to be "developed." Not surprisingly, the modern, developed individual/self with rights (to its own labor with the rights to sell it), equality, and autonomy is a reality created by and functional for industrial capitalism.

#### Intellectual resistance to capitalism creates a critical pedagogy that is a necessary precondition for real world change.

Giroux 6/19 [Henry, Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism” June 6, 2012 <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>]

While **a change in consciousness does not guarantee a change in either one's politics or society, it is a crucial precondition for connecting what it means to think otherwise to conditions that make it possible to act otherwise.** The education deficit must be seen as intertwined with a political deficit, serving to make many oppressed individuals complicit with oppressive ideologies. As the late Cornelius Castoriadis made clear**, democracy requires "critical thinkers capable of putting existing institutions into question.... while simultaneously creating the conditions for individual and social autonomy**."[(41)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a41) **Nothing will change politically or economically until** new and emerging **social movements take seriously the need to develop a language of radical reform and create new public spheres that support the knowledge, skills and critical thought that are necessary features of a democratic formative culture. Getting beyond the big lie as a precondition for critical thought, civic engagement and a more realized democracy** will mean more than correcting distortions, misrepresentations and falsehoods produced by politicians, media talking heads and anti-public intellectuals**. It will** also **require addressing how new sites of pedagogy have become central to any viable notion of agency, politics and democracy itself**. **This is not a matter of elevating cultural politics over material relations of power as much as it is a rethinking of how power deploys culture and how culture as a mode of education positions power**. James Baldwin, the legendary African-American writer and civil rights activist, argued that the big lie points to a crisis of American identity and politics and is symptomatic of "a backward society" that has descended into madness, "especially when one is forced to lie about one's aspect of anybody's history, [because you then] must lie about it all."[(42)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a42) He goes on to argue "that one of the paradoxes of education [is] that precisely at the point when you begin to develop a conscience, you must find yourself at war with your society. It is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person."[(43)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a43) What Baldwin recognizes is that learning has the possibility to trigger a critical engagement with oneself, others and the larger society - education becomes in this instance more than a method or tool for domination but a politics, a fulcrum for democratic social change. Tragically, in our current climate "learning" merely contributes to a vast reserve of manipulation and self-inflicted ignorance. **Our education deficit** is neither reducible to the failure of particular types of teaching nor the decent into madness by the spokespersons for the new authoritarianism. Rather, it **is about how matters of knowledge, values and ideology can be struggled over as issues of power and politics**. **Surviving the current education deficit will depend on progressives using history,** memory and knowledge not only to reconnect intellectuals to the everyday needs of ordinary people, but also **to jumpstart social movements by making education central to organized politics and the quest for a radical democracy.**

#### And, Confining discourse to only policy debates constructs a regime of truth that masks the constructed nature of their harms and solvency; this undermines their entire explanation of the world.

**Smith, 97** (Steve, professor of political science at the University of Wales,Review of International Studies, Cambridge journals online)

B**y focusing on the policy debate, we restrict ourselves to the** issues of the day, to the **tip of the political iceberg**. What politics seems to me to be crucially about is how and why some issues are made intelligible as political problems and how others are hidden below the surface (being defined as ‘economic’ or ‘cultural’ or ‘private’). In my own work I have become much more interested in this aspect of politics in the last few years. I spent a lot of time dealing with policy questions and can attest to the ‘buzz’ that this gave me both professionally and personally. But I became increasingly aware that the realm of the political that I was dealing with was in fact a very small part of what I would now see as political. I therefore spent many years working on epistemology, and in fact consider that my most political work. I am sure that William Wallace will regard this comment as proof of his central claim that I have become scholastic rather than scholarly, but I mean it absolutely. My current work enquires into how it is that we can make claims to knowledge, how it is that we ‘know’ things about the international political world. My main claim is that International Relations relies overwhelmingly on one answer to this question, namely, an empiricist epistemology allied to a positivistic methodology. This gives the academic analyst the great benefit of having a foundation for claims about what the world is like. It makes policy advice more saleable, especially when positivism’s commitment to naturalism means that the world can be presented as having certain furniture rather than other furniture. The problem is that in my view ; indeed it is in fact a very *political* view of knowledge, born of the Enlightenment with an explicit political purpose. So much follows politically from being able to present the world in this way; crucially the normative assumptions of this move are hidden in a false and seductive mask of objectivity and by the very difference between statements of fact and statements of value that is implied in the call to ‘speak truth to power’. For these reasons, I think that the political is a far wider arena than does Wallace. This means that I think I am being very political when I lecture or write on epistemology. Maybe that does not seem political to those who define politics as the public arena of policy debate; but I believe that my work helps uncover the regimes of truth within which that more restricted definition of politics operates. In short, I think that Wallace’s view of politics ignores its most political aspect, namely, the production of discourses of truth which are the very processes that create the space for the narrower version of politics within which he works. My work enquires into how the current ‘politics’ get defined and what (political) interests benefit from that disarming division between the political and the non-political. In essence, how we know things determines what we see, and the public realm of politics is itself the result of a prior series of (political) epistemological moves which result in the political being seen as either natural or a matter of common sense.
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### T/FW

#### intent to define

Lederach 12 – John Paul Lederach, Professor of International Peacebuilding at the University of Notre Dame and Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Colorado, “From Isolation to Engagement: Strategies for Countering Violent Extremism”, Peace Policy, 1-25, http://peacepolicy.nd.edu/2012/01/25/from-isolation-to-engagement-strategies-for-countering-violent-extremism/

The U.S. government’s list of “Foreign Terrorist Organizations” is a central part of a counter-terrorism strategy based on the isolation of individuals and groups who espouse violence defined as terrorism. This strategy makes it illegal to provide material support to those individuals and groups, which increasingly is interpreted to prohibit any contact or consultation with groups on the list.

Peacebuilding, on the other hand, proposes a strategy of *engagement*. Engagement requires contact and deliberative dialogue, inclusive of all views. It develops processes that focus on accurately understanding the sources of violence and addressing them through a range of nonviolent change strategies.

#### Resolved requires a policy

**Louisiana House** 3-8-2005, <http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm>

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

#### United States federal government is only three branches

**Black’s Law 90** (Dictionary, p. 695)

“[*Government*] In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.”

#### Prefer specificity – pragmatic discussion of US-Mexico policies is essential to forming coalitions and addressing political challenges

**Acosta et al. 12** (Mariaclaire Acosta, “Policy Recommendations for U.S.-Mexico Relations” Annenberg Retreat with the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, <http://sunnylands.org/files/posts/159/stronger_f.pdf>, 4/1/12, rm)

The U.S.-Mexico relationship is among the most important and complex bilateral relationships in the world. The plethora of issues, actors, and stakeholders add political challenges to what at times appear to be common sense, win-win solutions. Such complexity should not lead to fatalism, but rather creative and intensive joint problem solving. Within the broad array of voices that take interest in the relationship, there exists the potential for alliances and coalitions powerful enough to overcome opposition and to achieve significant advances. Right now, during the recovery from joint economic crises, cooperation to create jobs and strengthen the competitiveness of regional manufacturers offers a tremendous opportunity and should be at the center of the bilateral agenda. Prioritizing measures to enhance trade and reactivating the alliance between the private sectors of the United States and Mexico could change the tone and politics of the relationship. The security challenges faced by each country are real and unavoidable. They should be prioritized, yet balanced with an agenda based on economic opportunity and shared prosperity. The definition and implementation of new, more focused security strategies designed to reduce violence and strengthen the rule of law, within a framework of shared responsibility, may bring new energy and popular support to a difficult ongoing issue. Political spaces may be opening for each nation to tackle what are in political terms primarily domestic issues, despite their significant regional implications. The major decline in illegal immigration and corresponding improvement in border security in the United States presents a new starting point for discussions of comprehensive immigration reform. Along similar lines, a burgeoning pragmatism toward the development of petroleum resources in Mexico could change the parameters of the debate on energy reform. Progress in either Mexico or the United States on these seemingly intractable issues could breathe new energy into the bilateral relationship, and each side should seek to capitalize on any potential developments. Partisan politics generally loom large in election years, and 2012 is no different for the United States or Mexico. The truth is that there will be real political limitations on what the winner of each election can do, but if there is a lesson from the history of U.S.-Mexico relations, it is that an inclusive process of strategic planning can generate sound ideas and strengthen the political will to seek real advances. This is precisely why the Wilson Center and The Annenberg Retreat at Sunnylands came together: to stimulate this process. The ideas presented in this document are based on the observation that Mexico, the United States, and the global context have all undergone major transformations since the last time the two countries had simultaneous election years in 2000.

#### Pragmatic discussions of economic policy are uniquely important

**Kolodko, 13** (Grzegorz Kolodko, Professor Grzegorz W. Kolodko is an intellectualist and politician, a key architect of Polish reforms, and renowned expert on economic policy, “The New Pragmatism and the Future of World Economy”, 1/25/23, <http://www.economonitor.com/blog/2013/01/the-new-pragmatism-and-the-future-of-world-economy/>, rm)

The confrontation of two views of modern capitalism – neoliberal capitalism and state capitalism - will determine the social market economy that forms the New Pragmatism in the future. Even the International Monetary Fund, for many years the hub of economic orthodoxy, admits that policy should be focused on increasing tax revenue, rather than on cutting budget expenditure (at cost of socioeconomic inequality). How to reconcile the practical approach with an approach which is fundamentally principled? Is it possible to practice economic pragmatism and remain a man of principle? Is it worth it? It is, indeed, both possible and worthwhile. If we want to live in a world of peace and harmonious development – and we certainly do – new values must be introduced to the process of economic reproduction, however without disregarding the requirements of pragmatism, which is a fundamental and indispensable feature of rational economic management. We need to adopt a more pragmatic approach, favoring multiculturalism and one emanating from a system of values that promote participatory globalization, social cohesion and sustainable development. There is no contradiction, as the core values underlying the social management process and its economic purposes are concordant to a large extent. The most important aspect of the two approaches is a balanced, long-term socio-economic development. Its equilibrium should be three-fold: (1) sustainable economic growth, or growth associated with goods and capital markets, as well as investment, finance and labor; (2) socially sustainable growth, or growth associated with a fair, socially acceptable distribution of income and an appropriate participation of the main population groups in basic public services; (3) environmentally sustainable growth, or growth associated with maintaining adequate relations between our economic activity and nature. Therefore, we do not have to sacrifice basic principles on the altar of short-term economic matters or tactical issues but, instead, adapt practical strategic activities to these principles. This imperative charts the evolutionary path for the political economy of the future.