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#### Resisting capitalism’s reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility – the current social order guarantees social exclusion on a global scale

Zizek and Daly 2k4 (Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety.   
For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears).

This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place.

Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle.

Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### Global capitalism threatens survival

Zizek**,** Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana 1999Slavoj, The Ticklish Subject, page 350-351

Thisalreadybrings us to the second aspect of our critical distance towards risk society theory: the way it approaches the reality of capitalism. Is it not that, on closer examination, its notion of 'risk' indicates a narrow and precisely defined domain in which risks are generated: the domain of the uncontrolled use of science and technology in the conditions of capitalism? The paradigmatic case of 'risk', which is not simply one among many out risk 'as such', is that of a new scientific-technological invention put to use by a private corporation without proper public democratic debate and control, then generating the spectre of unforeseen cata­strophic long-term consequences. However,is not this kind of risk rooted in the fact that the logic of market and profitability is driving privately owned corporations to pursue their course and use scientific and techno­logical innovations(or simply expand their production)without actually taking account of the long-term effects of such activity on the environ­ment, as well as the health of humankind itself?

Thus - despite all the talk about a 'second modernity' which compels us to leave the old ideological dilemmas of Left and Right, of capitalism versus socialism, and so on,behind - is not the conclusion to be drawn that in the present global situation, in which private corporations outside public political control are making decisions which can affect us all, even up to our chances of survival, the only solution lies in a kind of direct socialization of the productive process - in moving towards a society in which global decisions about the fundamental orientation of how to develop and use productive capacities at the disposal of society would somehow be made by the entire collective of the people affected by such decisions? Theorists of the risk society often evoke the need to counteract reign of the 'depoliticized' global market with a move towards radical repoliticization, which will take crucial decisions away from state planners and experts and put them into the hands of the individuals and groups concerned themselves (through the revitalization of active citizenship, broad public debate, and so on) - however, theystop short of putting in question the very basics of the anonymous logic of market relations and global capitalism, which imposes itself today more and more as the 'neutral' Real accepted by all parties and, as such, more and more depoliticized. 34

#### The Affirmative’s demand for urgency is a product of hypocritical outrage meant to extend the privilege of global capitalism – our alternative is to do nothing in the face of the affirmative

Zizek 2008 Slavoj Violence p 6-8  
Let’s think about the fake sense of urgency that pervades the left-liberal humanitarian discourse on violence: in it, abstraction and graphic (pseudo)concreteness coexist in the staging of the scene of violence—against women, blacks, the homeless, gays. . . “A woman is raped every six seconds in this country” and “In the time it takes you to read this paragraph, ten children will die of hunger” are just two examples. Underlying all this is a hypocritical sentiment of moral outrage. Just this kind of pseudo-urgency was exploited by Starbucks a couple of years ago when, at store entrances, posters greeting customers pointed out that a portion of the chain’s profits went into health-care for the children of Guatemala, the source of their coffee, the inference being that with every cup you drink, you save a child’s life.   
There is a fundamental anti-theoretical edge to these urgent injunctions. There is no time to reflect: we have to act now. Through this fake sense of urgency, the post-industrial rich, living in their secluded virtual world, not only do not deny or ignore the harsh reality outside their area—they actively refer to it all the time. As Bill Gates recently put it: “What do computers matter when millions are still unnecessarily dying of dysentery?”   
Against this fake urgency, we might want to place Marx’s wonderful letter to Engels of 1870, when, for a brief moment, it seemed that a European revolution was again at the gates. Marx’s letter conveys his sheer panic: can’t the revolutionaries wait for a couple of years? He hasn’t yet finished his Capital*.*A critical analysis of the present global constellation—one which offers no clear solution, no “practical” advice on what to do, and provides no light at the end of the tunnel, since one is well aware that this light might belong to a train crashing towards us—usually meets with reproach: “Do you mean we should do nothing? Just sit and wait?” One should gather the courage to answer: “YES, precisely that!” There are situations when the only truly “practical” thing to do is to resist the temptation to engage immediately and to “wait and see” by means of a patient, critical analysis. Engagement seems to exert its pressure on us from all directions. In a well-known passage from his Existentialism and Humanism, Sartre deployed the dilemma of a young man in France in 1942, torn between the duty to help his lone, ill mother and the duty to enter the Resistance and fight the Germans; Sartre’s point is, of course, that there is no a priori answer to this dilemma. The young man needs to make a decision grounded only in his own abyssal freedom and assume full responsibility for it.6 An obscene third way out of the dilemma would have been to advise the young man to tell his mother that he will join the Resistance, and to tell his Resistance friends that he will take care of his mother, while, in reality, withdrawing to a secluded place and studying… .   
There is more than cheap cynicism in this advice. It brings to mind a well-known Soviet joke about Lenin. Under socialism, Lenin’s advice to young people, his answer to what they should do, was “Learn, learn, and learn.” This was evoked at all times and displayed on all school walls. The joke goes: Marx, Engels, and Lenin are asked whether they would prefer to have a wife or a mistress. As expected, Marx, rather conservative in private matters, answers, “A wife!” while Engels, more of a bon vivant, opts for a mistress. To everyone’s surprise, Lenin says, “I’d like to have both!” Why? Is there a hidden stripe of decadent jouisseur behind his austere revolutionary image? No—he explains: “So that I can tell my wife that I am going to my mistress, and my mistress that I have to be with my wife. . .“ “And then, what do you do?” “I go to a solitary place to learn, learn, and learn!”   
Is this not exactly what Lenin did after the catastrophe of 1914? He withdrew to a lonely place in Switzerland, where he “learned, learned, and learned,” reading Hegel’s logic. And this is what we should do today when we find ourselves bombarded with mediatic images of violence. We need to “learn, learn, and learn” what causes this violence.

#### The affirmative is nothing but a nostalgic longing for the glory days of US domination of Venezuela and Latin America, a neoliberal fantasy that would devastate Venezuelan popular classes.

Petras, professor of sociology at Binghamton University, 2010 [James, “U.S. Venezuelan Relations: Imperialism and Revolution”, http://lahaine.org/petras/b2-img/petras\_usven.pdf]

Under US hegemony Venezuela was a major player in the US effort to isolate and undermine the Cuban revolutionary government. Venezuelan client regimes played a major role in support of the successful US led effort to expel Cuba from the OAS; in 1961 and brokering a deal in the early 1990’s to disarm the guerillas in El Salvador and Guatemala without regime or structural changes in exchange for legal status of the excombatants. In short, Venezuelan regimes played a strategic role in policing the Central American-Caribbean region, a supplier of oil and as an important regional market for US exports. For Venezuela the benefits of its relations with the US were highly skewed to the upper and the affluent middle classes. They were able to import luxury goods with low tariffs and invest in real estate, especially in south Florida. The business and banking elite were able to “associate” in joint ventures with US MNC especially in the lucrative oil, gas, aluminum and refinery sectors. US military training missions and joint military exercises provided a seemingly reliable force to defend ruling class interests and repress popular protests and revolts. The benefits for the popular classes, mainly US consumer imports, were far outweighed by the losses incurred through the outflow of income in the form of royalties, interest, profits and rents. Even more prejudicial were the US promoted neo-liberal policies which undermined the social safety net, increased economic vulnerability to market volatility and led to a two decade long crises culminating in a double digit decline in living standards (1979 – 1999). Toward Conceptualizing US-Venezuelan Relations Several key concepts are central to the understanding of US-Venezuelan relations in the past and present Chavez era. These include the notion of ‘hegemony’ in which the ideas and interests of Washington are accepted and internalized by the Venezuelan ruling and governing class. Hegemony was never effective throughout Venezuelan class and civil society. “Counterhegemonic” ideologies and definitions of socio-economic interests existed with varying degree of intensity and organization throughout the post 1958 revolutionary period. In the 1960’s mass movements, guerilla organizations and sectors of the trade unions formed part of a nationalist and socialist counter-hegemonic bloc. Venezuelan-US relations were not uniform despite substantial continuities over time. Despite close relations and economic dependence especially during the 1960’s counter-insurgency period, Venezuela was one of the original promoters of OPEC, nationalized the oil industry (1976), opposed the US backed Somoza regime and White House plans to intervene to block a Sandinista victory (in 1979). The regression from nationalist capitalism to US sponsored neo-liberalism in the late 1980’s and 1990’s reflected a period of maximum US hegemony, a phenomena that took place throughout Latin America in the 1990’s. The election and re-election of President Chavez beginning in 1998 through the first decade of the new century marked a decline of US hegemony in the governing and popular classes but not among the business elite, trade union officials (CTV) and sectors of the military and public sector elite especially in the state oil company (PDVSA). The decline in US hegemony was influenced by the change in the power configuration governing Venezuela, the severe economic crises in 2000 – 2002, the demise and overthrow of client regimes in key Latin American countries and the rise of radical social movements and left center regimes. Accelerating the ‘loss of presence of the US’ and ‘policing’ of Latin America, were the wars in the Middle East, Iraq, South Asia (Afghanistan, Pakistan) and the expanding economic role and trading relations between Latin America and Asia (mainly China). The commodity boom between 2003 – 2008 further eroded US leverage via the IMF and WB and enhanced the counterhegemonic policies of the center-left regimes especially inVenezuela. A key concept toward understanding the decline of US hegemony over Venezuela are “pivotal events”. This concept refers to major political conflicts which trigger a realignment of inter-state relations and changes the correlation of domestic socio-political forces. In our study President’s Bush’s launch of the “War on Terror” following 9/11/01 involving the invasion of Afghanistan and claims to extra territorial rights to pursue and assassinate adversaries dubbed “terrorists” was rejected by President Chavez (“you can’t fight terror with terror”). These events triggered far reaching consequences in USVenezuelan relations. Related to the above, our conceptualization of US-Venezuelan relations emphasizes the high degree of inter-action between global policies and regional conflicts. In operational terms the attempt by Washington to impose universal/global conformity to its war on terrorism led to a US backed coup, which in turn fueled Chavez’ policy of extra hemispheric alignments with adversaries of the White House. Historical shifts in global economic power and profound changes in the internal make-up of the US economy have necessitated a reconceptualization of the principal levers of the US empire. In the past dollar diplomacy, meaning the dominant role of US industry and banks, played a major role in imposing US hegemony in Latin America, supplemented via military interventions and military coups especially in the Caribbean and Central America. In recent years financial capital “services” have displaced US manufacturing as the driving force and military wars and intervention have overshadowed economic instruments, especially with the surge of Asian trade agreements with Latin America. We reconceptualize US-Venezuelan relations in light of a declining US economic and rising military empire, as a compensatory mechanism for sustaining hegemony especially as a tool for restoring client domestic elites to power. The relation between past imperial successes in securing harmonious hegemonic collaborating rulers in the 1990’s and the profound political changes resulting from the crises of and breakdown of neo-liberalism, led Washington to totally misread the new realities. The resulting policy failures (for example Latin America’s rejection of the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas) and isolation and defeat of US policy toward Venezuela, Cuba and Honduras reflects what we conceptualize as “romantic reaction”, a failure of political realism: nostalgia for the imperial “golden age” of hegemony and pillage of the1990’s. The repeated failure by both the Bush and Obama regime to recognize regime changes, ideological shifts and the new development models and trade patterns has lead to mindless threats and diplomatic incapacity to develop any new bridges to the centrist regimes in the key countries of South America, especially toward Mercosur (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay).

### Drug Wars

#### The affirmative’s so called solution to the “war on drugs” is actually an excuse for the U.S. to militarize Latin America to benefit big corporations at the expensive of the greater population

Paley, Vancouver Media Co-op cofounder, 12 — [Dawn Paley, co-founder of the Vancouver Media Co-op, has a Masters in Journalism from UBC and a degree in Women's Studies from SFU, 2012 (“Drug War Capitalism: Militarization & Economic Transformation in Colombia & Mexico,” Analysis, June/August 2012, Available Online at <http://www.solidarity-us.org/pdfs/Dawn.pdf>, accessed on July 4th, 2013)][SP]

Barely two months later, Calderón launched the war on drugs in Mexico. The following year, the U.S. and Mexican governments announced the Mérida Initiative, described as “a package of U.S. counterdrug and anticrime assistance for Mexico and Central America.”(27) By the time it was signed by George W. Bush in 2008, Garza’s prodding about cracking down on narcos in order to boost business was forgotten. Instead, the primary justification for lawmakers endorsing the bill was to stem the flow of drugs to the United States.(28)¶ Both the U.S. government and critics agree that the Mérida Initiative in Mexico and Central America is a refined iteration of Plan Colombia. “We know from the work that the United States has supported in Colombia and now in Mexico that good leadership, proactive investments, and committed partnerships can turn the tide,” Hillary Clinton lectured delegates to the Central America Security Conference in Guatemala City last summer.(29)¶ Total U.S. funding for the Mérida Initiative between 2008 and 2010 was $1.3 billion for Mexico, whose government matched the funds 13 to 1.(30) Mérida/Central America Regional Security Initiative funds flowing to Central America during the same period stood at $248 million, while the Merida/Caribbean Basin Security Initiative funds of $42 million went to Haiti and the Dominician Republic.(31)¶ Merida’s “comprehensive strategy” includes funds for training police and soldiers to protect critical infrastructure, militarizing police and outfitting local security forces with U.S. equipment, transforming the Mexican judicial system to a U.S.-style oral trials system, modernizing the U.S.-Mexico border and promoting institutional building and economic reform.¶ One of USAID’s program goals is that the “Government of Mexico becomes more effective in curbing monopolies and eliminating anticompetitive practices.”(32) They focus on legislation related to telecommunications, banking and energy regulation. Another important objective is to advocate a new regulatory regime and additional privatization, deregulation, and foreign direct investment in the transportation, financial, energy and telecommunications sectors.(33)¶ Pemex — along with the Federal Electricity Commission — is the crown jewel of the privatization effort. Many prominent Mexicans, including Enrique Peña Nieto, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) candidate and frontrunner in the 2012 presidential elections, have advocated its privatization. Some, like the head of the Mexican Stock Exchange, have proposed using as their model Colombia’s oil sector reform.(34)¶ In a March 2012 presentation, a Bank of Mexico representative talked about the pending reform agenda for the country’s central bank. This includes improving the ease with which companies can do business in Mexico, removing “legal obstacles,” preventing labor flexibility, “strengthening the rule of law,” and consolidating macroeconomic policies.(35)¶ In 2008, before the financial crisis spread to Mexico, FDI reached $23.2 billion but fell the following year to $11.4 billion.(36) However FDI has rebounded and by 2011 stood at $19.43 billion, primarily in the manufacturing sector (44.1%) followed by financial services (18%) and mining (8%).(37) Recent announcements indicate that there will be a surge of new investment in auto and aerospace manufacturing in central Mexico.¶ Mexico’s Finance Minister Bruno Ferrari told Bloomberg in an English interview in August 2011 that “Nowadays what we are seeing is that we are having a big fight against crime so that, as I said, [it] guarantees the future investments and the investments we are having right now because what we are seeing is that Mexico is fighting to prevail against crime.”(38)¶ Ferrari’s statement is backed up by the experiences of the transnational business elite. According to a 2009 Business Week cover story,(39) attacks on foreign staff and factories have been rare in Juárez and other border towns along drug-trafficking routes, including Reynosa, Nuevo Laredo, and Tijuana.¶ Police are already deployed with special instructions to care for transnational corporations. Following the kidnapping of a corporate executive, the police suggested managers alter their work routines, leave Juárez by sundown, and stick to two key roads. Patrols were beefed up along these roads, “creating relatively safe corridors between the border and the industrial parks.”(40)¶ Even more important is another kind of security transnational corporations need. As the director of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean underscored, “What is important for an investor in regards to security has to do with legal security and country risk.”(41)¶ This notion of “security” calls up the Colombia model: paramilitarization in the service of capital. This model includes the formation of paramilitary death squads, the displacement of civilian populations, and an increase in violence. In the commercial sector, it is workers, small businesses and a sector of the local elite who are hit hardest by drug war policies.¶ Though these non-official aspects of the war on drugs are sometimes presented as damaging or threatening foreign direct investment, in fact it is violence that controls workers and displaces land-based communities from territories of interest to transnational corporate expansion.¶ For generations, Indigenous and peasant communities in Colombia had defended their collective title to their lands, yet paramilitary groups effectively forced them to flee. This phenomenon is concisely described by David Maher and Andrew Thompson:¶ "…paramilitary forces continue to advance a process of capital accumulation through the forced displacement of communities in areas of economic importance. Large sections of Colombia’s citizenry continue to abandon their lands as they are forcibly displaced from their homes, satisfying the voracious appetite of foreign (mainly U.S.) multinational corporations (MNCs) for Colombian territory as the neo-liberal economic programme is further entrenched in Colombian society."[(42)](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/3652" \l "N42)¶ In 2001, paramilitaries were responsible for half of all forced displacements in Colombia. Guerrilla groups caused 20% of the cases, with paramilitaries and guerrillas together for another 22%.[(43)](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/3652" \l "N43) “Paramilitary groups not only bear the bulk of the responsibility, they are also more effective in instigating displacement.”[(44)](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/3652" \l "N44)¶ In Colombia, paramilitarization is also beneficial to transnational corporations wishing to dissuade labor organizing:¶ "As part of the protracted U.S.-supported counterinsurgency campaign, paramilitary–state violence continues to systematically target civil groups, such as trade union organisations, which are considered a threat to the political and economic 'stability' conducive to the neo-liberal development of Colombia. This has made Colombia very attractive to foreign investment as poor working conditions and low wages keep pro?t margins high."[(45)](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/3652" \l "N45)¶ Well-documented cases of Chiquita Brands, Drummond mining corporation, and BP, the oil giant, have traced the links between paramilitary groups and U.S. and transnational corporations.[(46)](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/3652" \l "N46) In March of 2007, representatives of Chiquita Brands pled guilty in a Washington, D.C. court to making payments to the Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia (AUC) paramilitaries.[(47)](http://www.solidarity-us.org/node/3652" \l "N47)¶ “Chiquita made over 100 payments to the AUC amounting to over $1.7 million,” according to the U.S. Department of Justice. “Chiquita Brands paid blood money to terrorists like Carlos Castaño to protect its financial interests,” according to the law firm representing the victims.

#### Neo-liberalism insures Drug Wars continue

MERCILLE 2011-Third World Quarterly lecturer in the School of Geography, Planning and Environmental Policy at UCD (Julien, “Violent Narco-Cartels or US Hegemony?” Third World Quarterly October 1, 2011 <http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer>? sid=02b8d665-1f56-4927-b613-b62aef76c915%40sessionmgr11&vid=17&hid=18)//IB

This article presents an alternative interpretation that focuses on US hegemony over Mexico and in particular the neoliberal reforms like NAFTA that it has promoted since the early 1980s. Although the article’s emphasis is on drug issues, it is framed within a critical political economic analysis of US foreign policy and neoliberalism. In outline, and as will be illustrated throughout, it is maintained that post-World War II US foreign policy has been shaped by the following key factors. First and foremost is the corporate sector’s need to maintain a favourable investment climate and markets in Latin America and elsewhere. Second is geopolitics and military strategy, which in Latin America has meant trying to keep the region as a US‘backyard’ free of European, and later Chinese, inﬂuences, in addition to supporting allied military and militaristic regimes in power to prevent internal opposition from steering the region on a path independent of US hegemony. Ideology also plays a role in co-opting and making acceptable US policies to elites and segments of the population in Latin America.13 The article ﬁrst shows that neoliberal policies have increased the size of the drugs industry, for example by forcing millions of peasants into the drugs trade in search of work. Second, it demonstrates how US hegemonic projects like NAFTA have been protected and policed partly under the pretext of the war on drugs, which is used discursively to promote closer bilateral relations between the US and Mexican militaries. This allows the latter to contain popular opposition to neoliberal policies in general, but also to use drugs control directly as a pretext to arrest individuals and groups who resist such projects. Washington’s support for institutions and oﬃcials corrupted by the Mexican narcotics industry and associated with human rights abuses—the Mexican government, military and security forces, and perhaps even some cartel leaders—will be highlighted. Third, drugs money laundering by US banks will be discussed with reference to Mexican cases to show that the ﬁnancial sector’s involvement in narcotics has never been tightly regulated because it provides signiﬁcant liquidity to a powerful segment of US society. The article concludes by pointing to the large US drug consumption that fuels traﬃcking and to Washington’s failure to invest more in treatment of addicts and prevention, the two solutions proven by research to be the most eﬀective in reducing consumption, as opposed to the relatively ineﬀective arrests of drug kingpins and seizures of narcotics shipments.14The US failure to stop the smuggling of ﬁrearms south of the border will also be brieﬂy discussed. Overall, and contrary to the mainstream interpretation, the article emphasises the signiﬁcant responsibility of the US in Mexico’s drug traﬃc and its discursive manipulation of the war on drugs, none of which, however, negates the responsibility of Mexican drug cartels as generators of violence. The next section provides historical background showing the continuities between the past and more recent situation.