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#### Conceptualizing a capitalist monolith prevents coalition building—undermines reforms because we’re too scared to fight the system

J.K. Gibson-Graham, the pen name of Katherine Gibson, Senior Fellow of Human Geography at Australian National University, and Julie Graham, professor of Geography at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1996, The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It), p. viii-x

In a very different discursive setting, I had recently encountered Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s description of what she calls the “Christmas effect.” To Sedgwick’s mind what is so depressing about Christmas is the way all the institutions of society come together and speak “with one voice (1993: 5): the Christian churches, of course, but also the state (which establishes school and national holidays), commerce, advertising, the media (revving up the Christmas frenzy and barking out the Christmas countdown), social events and domestic activities, “they all . . . line up with each other so neatly once a year, and the monolith so created is a thing one can come to view with unhappy eyes” (p. 6). Sedgwick points to a similar monolithic formation in the realm of expectations about sexuality, where gender, object choice, sexual prac­tices (including the privileging of certain organs and orifices), and “life­styles” or life choices are expected to come together in predictable associations. This set of expectations, which counters and yet constrains the sexual experience of so many, is not just the occasion of seasonal distress. It is a source of lifelong oppression, a matter of survival, and a painful constrictor of sexual possibility, if not desire. In my comments as a discussant I seemed to be chafing against a similarly constraining “Christmas effect” in the realm of social theory. The researchers had set out to produce a rich and differentiated set of stories about industrial and community change, but they ended up showing how households and communities accommodated to changes in the industrial sector. In their papers things not only lined up with but revolved around industry, producing a unified social representation centered on a capitalist economy (the sort of thing that’s called a “capitalist society” in both everyday and academic discussion). But Sedgwick’s questions about Christmas, the family, and sexuality suggested the possibility of other kinds of social representations: “What if. . . there were a practice of valuing the ways in which meanings and institutions can be at loose ends with each other? What if the richest junctures weren’t the ones where everything means the same thing?” (1993: 6). For this research project following Sedgwick’s suggestions might mean that unstable gender identities, inabilities to adapt to the new shiftwork schedule, and noncapitalist economic activities should be emphasized rather than swept under the rug. The vision of households, subjects, and capitalist industry operating in harmony (and in fact coming together in a new phase of capitalist hegemony) might be replaced by alternative social representations in which noncapitalist economic practices proliferated, gender identities were renegotiated, and political subjects actively resisted industrial restructuring, thereby influencing its course. More generally, Sedgwick’s vision suggests the possibility of represent­ing societies and economies as non-hegemonic formations. What if we were to depict social existence at loose ends with itself, in Sedgwick’s terms, rather than producing social representations in which everything is part of the same complex and therefore ultimately “means the same thing” (e.g., capitalist hegemony)? What might be the advantages of representing a rich and prolific disarray? I was particularly attuned to these problems and possibilities because I had myself been a producer, in my earlier work as a political economist, of representations of capitalist hegemony. As a member of a large and loosely connected group of political economic theorists who were interested in what had happened to capitalist economies following on the economic crisis of the 1970s, I had engaged in theorizing the ways in which industrial production, enterprises, forms of consumption, state regulation, business culture, and the realm of ideas and politics all seemed to undergo a change in the 1970s and 80s from one hegemonic configuration to another. It didn’t matter that I was very interested in the differences between industries or that I did not see industrial change —even widespread change — as emanating from or reflecting a macrologic of “the economy.” I was still representing a world in which economy, polity, culture, and subjectivity reinforced each other and wore a capitalist face. Chasing the illusion that I was understanding the world in order to change it, I was running in a well-worn track, and had only to cast a glance over my shoulder to see, as the product of my analysis, “capitalist society” even more substantial and definitive than when I began. In those exciting early days I had yet to take seriously the “perform­ativity” of social representations — in other words, the ways in which they are implicated in the worlds they ostensibly represent. I was still trying to capture “what was happening out there,” like the researchers on the panel. I wasn’t thinking about the social representation I was creating as constitutive of the world in which I would have to live. Yet the image of global capitalism that I was producing was actively participating in consolidating a new phase of capitalist hegemony.1 Over a period of years this became increasingly clear to me and increasingly distressing. My situation resembled that of the many other social theorists for whom the “object of critique” has become a perennial and consequential theoretical issue. When theorists depict patriarchy, or racism, or compul­sory heterosexuality, or capitalist hegemony they are not only delineating a formation they hope to see destabilized or replaced. They are also generating a representation of the social world and endowing it with performative force. To the extent that this representation becomes influ­ential it may contribute to the hegemony of a “hegemonic formation”; and it will undoubtedly influence people’s ideas about the possibilities of difference and change, including the potential for successful political interventions.2

#### Perm, do the plan and reject the capitalist method of development

Oliver J. Michael, Professor at University of Greenwich, 19’99, [CAPITALISM, DISABILITY AND IDEOLOGY:

A MATERIALIST CRITIQUE OF THE NORMALIZATION PRINCIPLE, <http://www.independentliving.org/docs3/oliver99.pdf>] VN

A materialist approach to this would suggest, as does the French philosopher Foucault (1973) , that the way we talk about the world and the way we experience it are inextricably linked -the names we give to things shapes our experience of them and our experience of things in the world influences the names we give to them. Hence our practices of normalizing people and normalizing services both constructs and maintains the normal/abnormal dichotomy. It is becoming clear that the social structures of late capitalist societies cannot be discussed in a discourse of normality/abnormality, because what characterizes them is difference; differences based on gender, ethnic backgrounds, sexual orientation, abilities, religious beliefs, wealth, age, access or non-access to work and so on. And in societies founded on oppression, these differences cross cut and intersect each other in ways they we haven't even begun to properly understand, let alone try to resolve (Zarb and Oliver 1993). The concept of simultaneous oppression (Stuart 1993) may offer a more adequate way of understanding differences within the generic category of disability. Certainly people are beginning to talk about their experience in this way.Oliver, Michael J. 1999. 7 (16"As a black disabled women, I cannot compartmentalise or separate aspects of my identity in this way. The collective experience of my race, disability and gender are what shape and inform my life". (Hill 1994.7) Kirsten Hearn provides a poignant account of how disabled lesbians and gay men are excluded from all their potential communities. Firstly, "The severely able-bodied community and straightdisabled community virtually ignored our campaign". (Hearn 1991.30) and, "Issues of equality are not fashionable for the majorityof the severely able-bodied, white, middle-class lesbian and gay communities. (Hearn 1991.33) The point that I am making is that the discourse of normalization (whatever the intent of its major proponents and however badly they feel it has been misused by its disciples} can never adequately describe or explain societies characterised by difference because of its reductionist views of both humanity and society. Individual and group differences cannot be described solely in terms of the normality/abnormality dichotomy and inegalitarian social structures cannot be explained by reference only to valued and devalued social roles. Normalization can also never serve to transform peoples lives; a point to which I shall return.

#### Breaking down Ableism internal-link turns Capitalism—It provides the MASTER TROPE unlocking multiple forms of oppression.

 Siebers 2010 [“Disability Aesthetics” Tom Siebers 2010]

Oppression is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves "groups," and not "individuals," means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority-what some call "in-built" or "biological" inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics-not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed.  Two additional thoughts must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. "Racism" disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. "Sexism" disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. "Classism" disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. "Ableism" disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature.  Second, it is crucial to remember the lessons of intersectional theory. This theory rightly focuses on how oppressive systems affect the identity of the oppressed individual, explaining that because individuality is complex, containing many overlapping identities, the individual is vulnerable to oppressive systems that would reduce the individual to one or two identities for the purpose of maintaining power and control (Collins 2O8). Intersectional theorists restore a complex view of the individual and fight against creating hierarchies between different identities. For example, the debate whether it is worse to be black or female is viewed as divisive and unproductive. My tactic here is similar. I want to look at identity not from the point of view of the oppressed individual but from the point of view-limited as it may seem and significant because limited-of oppressive systems.Disability is the master trope of human disqualification, not because disability theory is superior to race, class, or sex/gender theory, but because all oppressive systems function by reducing human variation to deviancy and inferiority defined on the mental and physical plane.  Intersectional analysis shows that disability identity provides a foundation for disqualification in cases where other minority identities fail because they are known to be socially constructed for the purposes of domination. It is not clear why disability has proven so useful a trope for maintaining oppression, but one reason may be that it has been extraordinarily difficult to separate disability from the naturalist fallacy that conceives of it as a biological defect more or less resistant to social or cultural intervention. In the modern era, of course, eugenics embodies this fallacy. Eugenics has been of signal importance to oppression because eugenics weds medical science to a disgust with mental and physical variation, but eugenics is not a new trend, only an exacerbation of old trends that invoke disease, inferiority, impairment, and deformity to disqualify one group in the service of another's rise to power. As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority-and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.

#### Reclaiming public space as universal challenges the neoliberal control of the status quo

[David T. Mitchell](http://muse.jhu.edu/results?section1=author&search1=David%20T.%20Mitchell)  [Associate Professor in the Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education Department in the College of Education at Temple University](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.2.mitchell.html#back) and [Sharon L. Snyder](http://muse.jhu.edu/results?section1=author&search1=Sharon%20L.%20Snyder) [independent](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.2.mitchell.html#back) scholar, 2010[“Disability as Multitude:Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power” [Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/)  [Volume 4, Number 2,](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/toc/jlc.4.2.html) <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.2.mitchell.html>]MW

We want to begin thinking about new horizons of disability in a multicultural, transnational, and post-imperialist world. To apply the prefix post- to these [End Page 180] historical movements is not to suggest their "end." Each continues a dynamic legacy of exploitation, travesty, and domination that reverberates in the aftermath of a lengthy period of military and cultural subjugation. However, like other dynamos (the term Henry Adams used to represent the churning engine of industrial capitalism at the end of the nineteenth century) they must come to rest of their own inertia or metamorphose into a new hegemonic amalgam: one made of the scraps of the old imperial machine and alternative formations of resistance now co-opted; a newly minted, prostheticized, even if ultimately compromised social organization. As Hardt and Negri argue, rather than feeling doomed about the saturation of imperial power through networks of capitalism we might also see room for potential: "The immediately social dimension of the exploitation of living labor immerses labor in all the relational elements that develop the potential of insubordination and revolt through the entire set of laboring practices" (Empire, 29). International movements of disabled persons have managed to cultivate forms of insubordination within global capitalism by leveraging pressure for social equality and accessible public commons with reference to other movements demanding similar objectives. In 2000 a group of disabled women in South Korea protested a dangerous lift by setting up tents in an underground subway; a Bosnia-Herzegovina disabled student-led campaign made pedestrians aware of curb cuts for wheelchair users by painting them bright yellow; and a Russian disability group blocked entrance to the Moscow underground rail system to hinder others from entering as they were excluded due to a lack of alternative forms of ingress. In each of these examples, people with disabilities staged their protests by seeking to produce parallel experiences of exclusion in others who took their own ease of entry in public spaces for granted. Global disability movements have waged their campaigns around concepts of universal access to collective areas while also calling attention to the dwindling existence of the commons under neoliberal privatization schemes. The creativity of these civil disobedience tactics turns exclusions on their head. In Marxist terms, disability protest makes people who are not identified as disabled see the world as if through a camera obscura. They use the production of temporary inaccessibility for non-disabled users in order to point out the daily impediments faced by people with disabilities. Even in the midst of protesting structural barriers disabled activists are narrated as "fragile" and as taking unnecessary chances with their already too fragile health. However, as Mike Davis points out inPlanet of Slums ([2006](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.2.mitchell.html" \l "b3)), a proper systemic analysis needs to invert the terms of this recognition by placing the blame for vulnerability in its appropriate place: "'Fragility' is simply a synonym for systematic [End Page 181] government neglect of environmental safety" (125). Additionally, within disability collectives we find alternative discourses to consumption, standardization, and belonging that offer important possibilities for collective political action on a global scale.

#### The alternative is a lie, revolution empirically leads to worse conditions

Martin Peretz, Lecturer in Social Studies, Harvard; February 3, 2003 New Republic

What is the grand "progressive" vision for which the French left fights, which the Zionists and Jews are insidiously holding back? In the grand conflicts of the last century, there was always a left-wing structure of Manichaeanism. On the one side: imperialism and capitalism. On the other: a compelling and revolutionary dream. The dreams turned out to be nightmares. But they were dreams, nonetheless. Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Castro, Che, the Viet Cong, the Sandinistas, always a man and a movement saying they aimed to build a better world, which they actually tried to describe. In the end, of course, the better world did not arrive: In its place were death camps, mass deportations, forced famines, massacres, reeducation programs, prisons of the body, and greater prisons of the soul.