### Cap K

#### The 1ac's interrogation of identity erases the metaphysical positioning of the proletariat that makes true revolution possible.

**Power 10** (Nina Power, Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at Roehampton University. Theory and Event Volume 13, Issue 1, 2010)

But this generic universality, the experience of the species in production, is not enough to break with the generalities of metaphysics: the collective practice of work does not do enough to separate out man from the beasts, it merely places him in another natural category. But Gattung shouldn't be understood merely naturally; Virno's historically specific claim about the point at which we can identify the major features of human nature and our troubled interaction with the environment is a claim about our generic being, but it is also a material and a historical claim about the situation we find ourselves in now. We should remember, too, that the original reception of the idea of Gattungswesen by the Young Hegelians sought to reconcile the alienated individual with the universal in the social, in light of the fact that the universality promised by the Hegelian system appeared nowhere in reality. This absence is the reason why the young Marx could write of the proletariat that it "can lay claim to no particular right because the wrong it suffers is not a particular wrong but wrong in general."[39](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.1.power.html" \l "f39) But Agamben equates the living being with its political, linguistic and natural capture by the state so completely that there seems to be no room for any kind of historically anomalous or collectively unprecedented subject, the proletariat or anything else, one that would break with history or disrupt everyday order. For Agamben, Marx moves too quickly to conceive of man as a natural being, neglecting the role of art, in particular. The real break in history as Agamben sees it is not recent transformations in the nature of work (from Fordism to post-Fordism, for instance), but the advent of nihilism. The historical event that a rethinking of praxis, poiesis and work must encounter is thus a cultural-metaphysical break, and not an economic one. The importance of nihilism for Agamben explains to some extent his continued emphasis on the State (for example, in terms of the commonalities he discerns between Nazism and modern democracies), and the West's biopolitical mode of governance. If class has gone, if what we are left with is a "single planetary petty bourgeoisie" as the form in which "humanity has survived nihilism,"[40](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.1.power.html" \l "f40) it is because, for Agamben, we exist still under the "sign" of Nazism. But does it make sense to speak of the camp, and of homo sacer as the primary images of contemporary politics? Certainly we cannot ignore the fact that illegal detention centers exist, that immigrants are simultaneously social scapegoats and exploited workers, but Agamben runs the risk of totalizing these images into seemingly insurmountable conditions of contemporary life. There is something exceedingly ominous about the following two statements, made in Means Without End, the first with reference to Tiananmen: "the tanks will appear again"[41](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.1.power.html" \l "f41) and the second more general claim that "[t]he camp ... is the new biopolitical nomos of the planet."[42](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.1.power.html" \l "f42)

#### Capitalism has become Deleuzian in form, style and content – Deleuze has lost any potential it once may have had – now easily predicted, captured and incorporated by that same system itself for its own ends of reification.

**Vandenberghe 2008** (Frédéric Vandenberghe, Deleuzian capitalism, *Philosophy Social Criticism* 2008; 34; 877, vol 34 no 8 • pp. 877–903, Sage Publications)

The basic principle of rhizomatic sociology is that society is always *en fuite*, always leaking and fleeing, and may be understood in terms of the manner in which it deals with its *lignes de fuite*, or lines of flight. There is always something that flees and escapes the system, something that is not controllable, or at least not yet controlled. With their machinic analysis of becoming, Deleuze and Guattari want to encourage leakages and ‘cause a run off – *faire fuire* – as when you drill a hole in the pipe or open up the abscess’ (Guattari, 1977: 120; Deleuze and Guattari, 1980: 249; Deleuze, 1990: 32). The intention is obviously anti-systemic– draining the system, digging holes, continuing the work of the old mole. Yet, today, the capitalistic system itself thrives on anti-systematicity, ‘artificial negativity’ (Adorno), or ‘repetition and difference’ (Deleuze). It feeds, as it were, on its own problems and in the process it changes itself and mutates. The ‘repetition of the same’ eventually leads to ‘difference’, which is tantamount to saying that the survival of capitalism means ‘continuity with difference’. Capitalism explores and anticipates the de-territorializing lines of flight to capture them from without, enter into symbiosis with them, and redirect them from within, like a parasite, towards its own ends. Capitalism is inventive; its creativity knows no limits – ‘it is of the viral type’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980: 580). Deleuze and Guattari put their anti-capitalist hopes in the guerrilla tactics of the schizoid minority that refuses to play the game (Marcuse’s *nicht mitmachen*) of the self-content majority. Although they know that the squirms of the dispersed minority accompany the war machine of the entrepreneurial companies like their ‘supplement’, although they realize that capitalism advances like a war machine that feeds on the lines of flight and indicated that capitalism knows no internal limits, they nevertheless believed that capitalism would find its logical conclusion in the schizophrenic production of a free flow of desire: ‘Schizophrenia is the external limit of capitalism itself’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972: 292). What they apparently meant by that mad statement is that the final crisis of capitalism would eventually be generated not by the regulation or domestication of capitalism but by the complete commodification of the desiring machines that we are. Only by accelerating the decadence of the present system, only through some kind of self-commodification in a consumerist potlatch, would the capitalist system be beaten by its own game: Which is the revolutionary path, if there’s one? To withdraw from the world market . . . in a curious renewal of the ‘economic solution’ of the fascists? Or might it go in the opposite direction? To go still further in the movement of the market, of decoding and territorialisation? . . . Not withdraw from the process, but going further, ‘accelerating the process’, as Nietzsche said. As a matter of fact, we ain’t seen nothing yet. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972: 285)1 A quarter of a century later, the process of accumulation has accelerated to the point that capitalism itself has become Deleuzian in form, in style and in content. This junction is not accidental. As usual, an ironic and profoundly perverse relationship exists between the romantic ethic and the spirit of capitalism (Campbell, 1987: 202–27). Needless to say that I am not claiming that Deleuze’s libertarian critique of capitalism was anti-critical or phoney from the start and that Deleuze is somehow the Giddens of the 1970s: a neo-liberal disguised as a libertarian, or Thatcher on LSD. What I am claiming is, rather, that capitalism has progressively integrated the critique of capitalism into its mode of functioning, with the result that capitalism appears stronger than ever, whereas the critique of capitalism seems rather disarmed.In their magisterial analysis of the new spirit of capitalism, Boltanski and Chiapello (1999: 241–90) have convincingly demonstrated that capitalism has coopted the postmodernizing critique of the 1960s and 1970s and used it as a way to reorganize itself and expand infinitely. The industrially organized capitalism of the ‘golden thirties’ (1945–73) was essentially Fordist. Bureaucratic, hierarchical, pyramidal and centrally controlled, planned and taylorized, oriented to the mass production of standardized goods, it was elephantine, rigid and alienating. The neocorporatist arrangement between the state, the employers and the unions guaranteed job security, an indexed income, a steady career track and a pension, but this security hardly compensated for the employees’ lack of autonomy. Attacking the dehumanizing and disciplining, massifying and standardizing nature of the ‘capitalist-bureaucratic-technical-totalitarian society of planned exploitation and directed consumption’ (Lefebvre) in the name of spontaneity, creativity and authenticity, the libertarian left took over the ‘artistic critique’ of capitalism of the bohemians and translated their grievances in a language that was inspired by surrealism and the ‘masters of suspicion’ (Marx, Freud and

#### You have one concrete identity - proletariat. Capitalism requires a subject that continues to reinvent itself.

Zizek 4

Slavoj, Zizek, senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology, [University of Ljubljana](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Ljubljana), [Slovenia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slovenia), and a professor at the [European Graduate School](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Graduate_School). July 2004. <http://www.believermag.com/issues/200407/?read=interview\_zizek>

Now with the antiglobalism movement, they are still, in a limited way, reemerging. But the idea is that the fundamental conflicting areas are no longer those of vertical up-vs.-down social struggle, but more horizontal differences between me and you, between different social groups: the problem of tolerance; the problem of tolerance of other races, religious minorities, and so on. So then the basic problem becomes that of tolerating differences. I am not saying this is bad, of course we should fight for this, but I don’t think that this horizon—within which the ultimate ethical value is then that of tolerating difference—is the fundamental place for question. My problem with liberalism is in principle. This move of the new Left, or new radicals, towards a problem of identity politics (minority politics, gay rights, etc.) lacks a certain more radical insight into the basically antagonistic character of society. This radical questioning has simply disappeared.¶ For example, take my friend Judith Butler. Of course from time to time, she pays lip service to some kind of anticapitalism, but it’s totally abstract, what it’s basically saying is just how lesbians and other oppressed sexual minorities should perceive their situation not as the assertion of some kind of substantial sexual identity, but as constructing an identity which is contingent, which means that also the so-called straight normal sexuality is contingent, and everybody is constructed in a contingent way, and so on, and in this way, nobody should be excluded. There is no big line between normality identity and multiple roles. The problem I see here is that there is nothing inherently anticapitalist in this logic. But even worse is that what this kind of politically correct struggling for tolerance and so on advocates is basically not only not in conflict with the modern tendencies of global capitalism, but it fits perfectly. What I think is that today’s capitalism thrives on differences. I mean even naïve positivist psychologists propose to describe today’s subjectivity in terms like multiple subject, fixed-identity subject, a subject who constantly reinvents itself, and so on. So my big problem with this is the painting of the enemy as some kind of self-identified stable substantial patriarch to which these multiple identities and constant reinventing should be opposed. I think that this is a false problem; I am not impressed by this problem. I think that this is a certain logic, totally within the framework of today’s capitalism, where again, capitalism, in order to reproduce itself, to function in today’s condition of consumption society, the crazy dynamics of the market, no longer needs or can function with the traditional fixed patriarchal subject. It needs a subject constantly reinventing himself.

#### Hegemonic projects work - the past century proves. Their focus on micropolitics takes out all the 1ac's solvency, and their refusal to get their hands dirty with a little fascism leaves us enslaved to capitalism.

Sanbonmatsu 4

(John Sanbonmatsu, Asst Professor of Philosophy and Religion at the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 2004 [The Postmodern Prince p. 154-155]

  Alas, the events of subsequent decades dashed any realistic hope that this "new" approach, based on dispersion and "difference," would alone prove sufficient to dismantle existing structures of power. By the 1990s, the "amazing efficacy of discontinuous, particular and local criticism," as Foucault called it, no longer seemed as amazing as it had twenty years before. It was the political and religious right, not the left, which was to succeed in mobilizing a transformative hegemonic political project with truly global reach.   That the right and not the left has made such headway is in part due to the left's own rejection of a hegemonic, which is to say, strategic, conception of praxis. Missing is an effective leadership willing and able to organize the scattered and isolated movements of the powerless into a coherent whole. "The absence of political leadership on the left is striking," an American activist observed in the early 199os. "We have few national figures, few leaders who transcend narrow sectoral issues. The left must ask why this is so .... In a society as large and complex as ours, with its enormous backlog of problems, we will need intellectual, moral, and political figures to inspire cohesive political action." So long as many on the left continue to refuse leadership and to neglect a strategic orientation, i.e., a sense of a meaningful alternative to the present order, and of the concrete objectives necessary to get there, social movements will continue to lurch from crisis to crisis.   The erosion of the use value of theory has meanwhile led some critics to turn Machiavelli and Gramsci on their heads, e.g., inverting the relationship between virtu and fortuna to suggest that agency is impossible and the social whole is no longer subject to meaningful description. Foucaultian cultural studies critic Kirstie McClure, for example~ demands that intellectuals give up their obsolete interest in trying to reveal something about "the truth of the world." We must thus resist looking for a "comprehensive causal theory," a theory of "'truth,'" a theory that might serve as "a guarantor of practical imperatives, a find of justifications for instrumental action, and an authoritative foundation." Thus do postmodernists continue to suppress or abolish the "directive" or active element from our politics. In so doing they exert a subtle but unmistakable pressure on chi sa-those with at least some knowledge of the actual origins of social crises--not to educate chi non sa--those who do not. The effect of this only apparent populism is to confine the critical intelligentsia to a narrow, cosmopolitan, sectarian sphere, while at same time maintaining the people themselves in perpetual ignorance both of the mechanisms of power and of the tried (if, certainly, contested) historical methods for challenging that power. But should we take the postmodernists' advice, we would resemble that prince who, during calm weather, neglects to take the opportunity to reinforce the and build levies, and prepare the people by bringing them to higher ground. We would thus give our will completely over to the play of chance fortune, and so leave the future of the earth in the hands precisely those most lacking in scruples, and in humanity.

#### Capitalism results in incalculable atrocities - this structural violence outweighs.

Herod 7 (James, Columbia U graduate and political activist, “Getting Free” Pg. 22-23 JF)

We must never forget that we are at war, however, and that we have been for five hundred years. We are involved in class warfare. This defines our situation historically and sets limits to what we can do. It would be nice to think of peace, for example, but this is out of the question. It is excluded as an option by historical conditions. Peace can be achieved only by destroying capitalism. The casualties from this war, on our side, long ago reached astronomical sums. It is estimated that thirty million people perished during the first century of the capitalist invasion of the Americas, including millions of Africans who were worked to death as slaves. Thousands of peasants died in the great revolts in France and Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During the enclosures movement in England and the first wave of industrialization, hundreds of thousands of people died needlessly. African slaves died by the millions (an estimated fifteen million) during the Atlantic crossing. Hundreds of poor people were hanged in London in the early nineteenth century to enforce the new property laws. During the Paris uprising of 1871, thirty thousand communards were slaughtered. Twenty million were lost in Joseph Stalin’s gulag, and millions more perished during the 1930s when the Soviet state expropriated the land and forced the collectivization of agriculture an event historically comparable to the enclosures in England (and thus the Bolsheviks destroyed one of the greatest peasant revolutions of all time). Thousands of militants were murdered by the German police during the near revolution in Germany and Austria in 1919. Thousands of workers and peasants were killed during the Spanish Civil War. Adolf Hitler killed ten million people in concentration camps (including six million Jews in the gas chambers**).** An estimated two hundred thousand labor leaders, activists, and citizens have been murdered in Guatemala since the coup engineered by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1954. Thousands were lost in the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Half a million communists were massacred in Indonesia in 1975. Millions of Vietnamese were killed by French and U.S. capitalists during decades of colonialism and war. And how many were killed during British capital’s subjugation of India, and during capitalist Europe’s colonization of Asia and Africa? A major weapon of capitalists has always been to simply murder those who are threatening their rule. Thousands were killed by the contras and death squads in Nicaragua and El Salvador. Thousands were murdered in Chile by Augusto Pinochet during his counterrevolution, after the assassination of Salvador Allende. Speaking of assassinations, there is a long list: Patrice Lumumba, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci (died in prison), Ricardo Flores Magon (died in prison), Che Guevara, Gustav Landauer, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King Jr., Fred Hampton, George Jackson, the Haymarket anarchists, Amilcar Cabral, Steve Biko, Karl Liebnicht, Nat Turner, and thousands more. Thousands are being murdered every year now in Colombia. Thousands die every year in the workplace in the United States alone. Eighty thousand die needlessly in hospitals annually in the United States due to malpractice and negligence. Fifty thousand die each year in automobile accidents in the United States, deaths directly due to intentional capitalist decisions to scuttle mass transit in favor of an economy based on oil, roads, and cars (and unsafe cars to boot). Thousands have died in mines since capitalism began. Millions of people are dying right now, every year, from famines directly attributable to capitalists and from diseases easily prevented but for capitalists. Nearly all poverty-related deaths are because of capitalists. We cannot begin to estimate the stunted, wasted, and shortened lives caused by capitalists, not to mention the millions who have died fighting their stupid little world wars and equally stupid colonial wars. (This enumeration is very far from complete.) Capitalists (generically speaking) are not merely thieves; they are murderers. Their theft and murder is on a scale never seen before in history a scale so vast it boggles the mind. Capitalists make Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Genghis Khan, and Attila the Hun look like boy scouts. This is a terrible enemy we face.

#### One must understand the existing social totality before one can act on it—grounding the sites of political contestation or knowledge outside of labor and surplus value merely serve to humanize capital and prevent a transition to a society beyond oppression

**Tumino**(Prof. English @ Pitt) **01**

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique]

Any **effective political theory will have to** do at least two things: it will have to **offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such**an interrelated **knowledge, offer**a guideline for **praxis**. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, **only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity**.But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that**to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality**. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This**systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions**and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All **modes** of Marxism **now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so**—and this is my main argument—**legitimate capitalism**. Why? **Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society**, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, **has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois** left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . .**For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable**, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). **Such an understanding** of social inequality **is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not** human **labor.** That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. **Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth.** In this paper I argue that **any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition** of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value **and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory**.

#### Our alternative is to return the priority of political contestation to class. The aim of our alternative makes the production of social relations, capitalism and class, the starting point for resistance and criticism.

McLaren & D'Anniable 4 - (Peter, Valerie Scatamburlo, Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 36, No. 2, 2004, © 2004 Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia April 2004, Class Dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of ‘difference)

The real problem is the internal or dialectical relation that exists between capital and labor within the capitalist production process itself—a social relation in which capitalism is intransigently rooted. This social relation—essential to the production of abstract labor—deals with how already existing value is preserved and new value (surplus value) is created (Allman, 2001). If, for example, the process of actual exploitation and the accumulation of surplus value is to be seen as a state of constant manipulation and as a realization process of concrete labor in actual labor time—within a given cost-production system and a labor market—we cannot underestimate the ways in which ‘difference’ (racial as well as gender difference) is encapsulated in the production/reproduction dialectic of capital. It is this relationship that is mainly responsible for the inequitable and unjust distribution of resources. A deepened understanding of this phenomenon is essential for understanding the emergence of an acutely polarized labor market and the fact that disproportionately high percentages of ‘people of color’ are trapped in the lower rungs of domestic and global labor markets (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 1999). ‘Difference’ in the era of global capitalism is crucial to the workings, movements and proﬁt levels of multinational corporations but those types of complex relations cannot be mapped out by using truncated post-Marxist, culturalist conceptualizations of ‘difference.’ To sever issues of ‘difference’ from class conveniently draws attention away from the crucially important ways in which ‘people of color’ (and, more speciﬁcally, ‘women of color’) provide capital with its superexploited labor pools—a phenomenon that is on the rise all over the world. Most social relations constitutive of racialized differences are considerably shaped by the relations of production and there is undoubtedly a racialized and gendered division of labor whose severity and function vary depending on where one is situated in the capitalist global economy (Meyerson, 2000).6 In stating this, we need to include an important caveat that differentiates our approach from those invoking the well-worn race/class/gender triplet which can sound, to the uninitiated, both radical and vaguely Marxian. It is not. Race, class and gender, while they invariably intersect and interact, are not co-primary. This ‘triplet’ approximates what the ‘philosophers might call a category mistake.’ On the surface the triplet may be convincing—some people are oppressed because of their race, others as a result of their gender, yet others because of their class—but this ‘is grossly misleading’ for it is not that ‘some individuals manifest certain characteristics known as “class” which then results in their oppression; on the contrary, to be a member of a social class just is to be oppressed’ and in this regard class is ‘a wholly social category’ (Eagleton, 1998, p. 289). Furthermore, even though ‘class’ is usually invoked as part of the aforementioned and much vaunted triptych, it is usually gutted of its practical, social dimension or treated solely as a cultural phenomenon—as just another form of ‘difference.’ In these instances, class is transformed from an economic and, indeed, social category to an exclusively cultural or discursive one or one in which class merely signiﬁes a ‘subject position.’ Class is therefore cut off from the political economy of capitalism and class power severed from exploitation and a power structure ‘in which those who control collectively produced resources only do so because of the value generated by those who do not’ (Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997, p. 2). Such theorizing has had the effect of replacing an historical materialist class analysis with a cultural analysis of class. As a result, many post-Marxists have also stripped the idea of class of precisely that element which, for Marx, made it radical—namely its status as a universal form of exploitation whose abolition required (and was also central to) the abolition of all manifestations of oppression (Marx, 1978, p. 60). With regard to this issue, Kovel (2002) is particularly insightful, for he explicitly addresses an issue which continues to vex the Left—namely the priority given to different categories of what he calls ‘dominative splitting’—those categories of ‘gender, class, race, ethnic and national exclusion,’ etc. Kovel argues that we need to ask the question of priority with respect to what? He notes that if we mean priority with respect to time, then the category of gender would have priority since there are traces of gender oppression in all other forms of oppression. If we were to prioritize in terms of existential signiﬁcance, Kovel suggests that we would have to depend upon the immediate historical forces that bear down on distinct groups of people—he offers examples of Jews in 1930s Germany who suffered from brutal forms of anti-Semitism and Palestinians today who experience anti-Arab racism under Israeli domination. The question of what has political priority, however, would depend upon which transformation of relations of oppression are practically more urgent and, while this would certainly depend upon the preceding categories, it would also depend upon the fashion in which all the forces acting in a concrete situation are deployed. As to the question of which split sets into motion all of the others, the priority would have to be given to class since class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforcement and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of ‘classism’ to go along with ‘sexism’ and ‘racism,’ and ‘species-ism’). This is, ﬁrst of all, because class is an essentially (hu)man-made category, without root in even a mystiﬁed biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender distinctions—although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable—indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species’ time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because ‘class’ signiﬁes one side of a larger ﬁgure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state. Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of women’s labor. (Kovel, 2002, pp. 123–124) Contrary to what many have claimed, Marxist theory does not relegate categories of ‘difference’ to the conceptual mausoleum; rather, it has sought to reanimate these categories by interrogating how they are refracted through material relations of power and privilege and linked to relations of production. Moreover, it has emphasized and insisted that the wider political and economic system in which they are embedded needs to be thoroughly understood in all its complexity. Indeed, Marx made clear how constructions of race and ethnicity ‘are implicated in the circulation process of variable capital.’ To the extent that ‘gender, race, and ethnicity are all understood as social constructions rather than as essentialist categories’ the effect of exploring their insertion into the ‘circulation of variable capital (including positioning within the internal heterogeneity of collective labor and hence, within the division of labor and the class system)’ must be interpreted as a ‘powerful force reconstructing them in distinctly capitalist ways’ (Harvey, 2000, p. 106). Unlike contemporary narratives which tend to focus on one or another form of oppression, the irrefragable power of historical materialism resides in its ability to reveal (1) how forms of oppression based on categories of difference do not possess relative autonomy from class relations but rather constitute the ways in which oppression is lived/experienced within a class-based system; and (2) how all forms of social oppression function within an overarching capitalist system. This framework must be further distinguished from those that invoke the terms ‘classism’ and/or ‘class elitism’ to (ostensibly) foreground the idea that ‘class matters’ (cf. hooks, 2000) since we agree with Gimenez (2001, p. 24) that ‘class is not simply another ideology legitimating oppression.’ Rather, class denotes ‘exploitative relations between people mediated by their relations to the means of production.’ To marginalize such a conceptualization of class is to conﬂate an individual’s objective location in the intersection of structures of inequality with people’s subjective understandings of who they really are based on their ‘experiences.’ Another caveat. In making such a claim, we are not renouncing the concept of experience. On the contrary, we believe it is imperative to retain the category of lived experience as a reference point in light of misguided post-Marxist critiques which imply that all forms of Marxian class analysis are dismissive of subjectivity. We are not, however, advocating the uncritical fetishization of ‘experience’ that tends to assume that experience somehow guarantees the authenticity of knowledge and which often treats experience as self-explanatory, transparent, and solely individual. Rather, we advance a framework that seeks to make connections between seemingly isolated situations and/or particular experiences by exploring how they are constituted in, and circumscribed by, broader historical and social circumstances. Experiential understandings, in and of themselves, are suspect because, dialectically, they constitute a unity of opposites—they are at once unique, speciﬁc, and personal, but also thoroughly partial, social, and the products of historical forces about which individuals may know little or nothing (Gimenez, 2001). In this sense, a rich description of immediate experience in terms of consciousness of a particular form of oppression (racial or otherwise) can be an appropriate and indispensable point of departure. Such an understanding, however, can easily become an isolated ‘difference’ prison unless it transcends the immediate perceived point of oppression, confronts the social system in which it is rooted, and expands into a complex and multifaceted analysis (of forms of social mediation) that is capable of mapping out the general organization of social relations. That, however, requires a broad class-based approach. Having a concept of class helps us to see the network of social relations constituting an overall social organization which both implicates and cuts through racialization/ethnicization and gender … [a] radical political economy [class] perspective emphasizing exploitation, dispossession and survival takes the issues of … diversity [and difference] beyond questions of conscious identity such as culture and ideology, or of a paradigm of homogeneity and heterogeneity … or of ethical imperatives with respect to the ‘other’. (Bannerji, 2000, pp. 7, 19) A radical political economy framework is crucial since various ‘culturalist’ perspectives seem to diminish the role of political economy and class forces in shaping the ediﬁce of ‘the social’—including the shifting constellations and meanings of ‘difference.’ Furthermore, none of the ‘differences’ valorized in culturalist narratives alone, and certainly not ‘race’ by itself can explain the massive transformation of the structure of capitalism in recent years. We agree with Meyerson (2000) that ‘race’ is not an adequate explanatory category on its own and that the use of ‘race’ as a descriptive or analytical category has serious consequences for the way in which social life is presumed to be constituted and organized. The category of ‘race’—the conceptual framework that the oppressed often employ to interpret their experiences of inequality ‘often clouds the concrete reality of class, and blurs the actual structure of power and privilege.’ In this regard, ‘race’ is all too often a ‘barrier to understanding the central role of class in shaping personal and collective outcomes within a capitalist society’ (Marable, 1995, pp. 8, 226). In many ways, the use of ‘race’ has become an analytical trap precisely when it has been employed in antiseptic isolation from the messy terrain of historical and material relations. This, of course, does not imply that we ignore racism and racial oppression; rather, an analytical shift from ‘race’ to a plural conceptualization of ‘racisms’ and their historical articulations is necessary (cf. McLaren & Torres, 1999). However, it is important to note that ‘race’ doesn’t explain racism and forms of racial oppression. Those relations are best understood within the context of class rule, as Bannerji, Kovel, Marable and Meyerson imply—but that compels us to forge a conceptual shift in theorizing, which entails (among other things) moving beyond the ideology of ‘difference’ and ‘race’ as the dominant prisms for understanding exploitation and oppression. We are aware of some potential implications for white Marxist criticalists to unwittingly support racist practices in their criticisms of ‘race-ﬁrst’ positions articulated in the social sciences. In those instances, white criticalists wrongly go on ‘high alert’ in placing theorists of color under special surveillance for downplaying an analysis of capitalism and class. These activities on the part of white criticalists must be condemned, as must be efforts to stress class analysis primarily as a means of creating a white vanguard position in the struggle against capitalism. Our position is one that attempts to link practices of racial oppression to the central, totalizing dynamics of capitalist society in order to resist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy more fully.7

### Off

#### Nathan and I offer our counter advocacy that we should investigate the area of indefinite detention through assemblages to critique the intersection of identities that detain the terrorist.

#### Solves their aff better - the 1ac has made a case that homonationalism pervades society, it is entrenched through practices like patriotism. Yet their remedy to this is to examine the WAR POWERS AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT. Their directly bites into their 5th piece of evidence, the Shomura card, which criticizes any strategy which begins from the perspective of changing the government.

#### Language like 'President of the united states' always already implies a legalistic framework - this dooms their solvency.

Schlag ‘90 (Pierre, professor of law at the University of Colorado, Stanford Law Review, lexis, AM)

In fact, normative legal thought is so much in a hurry that it will tell you what to do even though there is not the slightest chance that you might actually be in a position to do it. For instance, when was the last time you were in a position to put the difference principle n31 into effect, or to restructure [\*179] the doctrinal corpus of the first amendment? "In the future, we should. . . ." When was the last time you were in a position to rule whether judges should become pragmatists, efficiency purveyors, civic republicans, or Hercules surrogates? Normative legal thought doesn't seem overly concerned with such worldly questions about the character and the effectiveness of its own discourse. It just goes along and proposes, recommends, prescribes, solves, and resolves. Yet despite its obvious desire to have worldly effects, worldly consequences, normative legal thought remains seemingly unconcerned that for all practical purposes, its only consumers are legal academics and perhaps a few law students -- persons who are virtually never in a position to put any of its wonderful normative advice into effect.

#### They bear whiteness to violence, but they assume that homonationalism is found in the executive - we must own up to our own tendencies for violence.

Kappeler 95 (Susanne, The Will to Violence: The politics of personal behavior, Pg. 10-11)

Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgment, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls 'organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally, and also individually organized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major power mongers, For we tend to think that we cannot 'do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of 'what would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defense?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as 'virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN - finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like 'I want to stop this war', 'I want military intervention', 'I want to stop this backlash', or 'I want a moral revolution. 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in co-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our non-comprehension': our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we 'are' the war in our 'unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the 'fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't'- our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the 'others.' We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape 'our feelings, our relationships, our values' according: to the structures and the values of war and violence.

#### Turns us into bodies to be mobilized for destruction.

Salter 85. M.G. Salter, lecturer in criminal law at the University of Birmingham, “The Rule of Power in the Language of Law,” The Liverpool Law Review Vol.VII(1) [1985] pg. 45

Through this linguistic patterning of administered time, the student is kept under the continual assessment of normalising judgments that examine, compare and contrast in order to accumulate a knowledge. Even the measurers are themselves externally measured, graded and assessed. Between staff, considerations of tactics determine aspects of discourse. Rarely is complete openness and honesty strategic.¶ Power also operates through legal discourse to assemble specific relations between people through individualising and collectivising them into pre-given categories. We can see this within the landlord tenant relationship. Even in their legal battles and formal agreements the relations between landlords and tenants are pre-determined through such notions as property, ownership and possessory rights. These shape the formation of intentions and the consequences of action. Legal battles for "student rights", "tenants rights" or those for blacks, consumers and women, take place upon a language already worked by power and for which the determination of what "tenancy'~ "rights" etc.~ means has already happened.¶ It is therefore inadequate to see these effects of power as mere rituals without penetrating deeper into the rules of operation that make possible and govern such elements of discourse. These rules set up an order of succession between different speakers' contributions, they determine who has the right to follow whom~ to interrupt, overrule~ qualify remarks~ re-interpret in "the light of broader policy considerations" and which positions may be taken upon what has been said by previous speakers and the status of statements made. Power also determines the effect of these modifications upon the subsequent authority of the overruled speaker.¶ Not only is the "who" prescribed in advance, but the "how" of these overrulings, qualifications, re-interpretations etc. If a statement by the Attorney-General over the use of the Emergency Powers legislation during violent strikes and unlawful picketing is subsequently to be qualified, this cannot be done in just any fashion. Power thus enforces what it has already established as the "proper" manner of any qualification. This has already pre-defined what specific element can~ in that particular qualifying discourse~ be related to what other~ if it is to count as a successful use of a particular ritualised tactic. Breach of these rules established under certain laws of co,possibility leads not to a successful "qualification" of the Attorney-General's earlier statement~ but to something else -perhaps an unintended public humiliation of a senior member of government. ¶ In our academic discourse the power of the legal professions to impose a particular form and content for "their" qualification has already structured the occasion of any possible discourse. Both inside and outside academia power has already declared which qualified person, occupying which certified occupation for how many years can give an authoritative rendition of any particular law. (8) Also it pre-determines from what place this must be offered and according to which rituals of circumstance - accompanying gestures, style and body positions - to maintain the authority of the speaker. (9)¶ A law of compossibility has then laid down rules whose historical interplay determine why the appearance and disappearance of a particular discourse could not have occurred otherwise. The effects of their operation is to assemble and hold together not only a particular legal theme, but also a group of subjects whose status empowers them to speak and command an audience upon this theme. For example, the legality of bail conditions imposed upon pickets is not a theme for anyone at any time or place. Whether student, lecturer, defence lawyer, trade union leader or picket, mastery of these rules by the subject they create within the field they open up is a pre-condition for successful practical action within it. This is certainly true when the sites are the adversarial, and therefore highly tactical, atmospheres of court rooms, television debates or picket lines.¶ Such mastery and command does not make a person master of the rules themselves. It is still power that is heard when language speaks; they are no-onets personal possession or plaything. They are outcomes of chosen practices they themselves have made possible. It does not then appear to be a question of a "ruling class" which owns and therefore has certain power at its free disposal consciously to secure its rule over a dominated class. If anything the relationship is that power rules through establishing the meaning of particular social relationships. One has power like one has a cold, i.e. we are had by it and must make the best of it, develop resistance, fight the symptoms that aggravate us, discover, understand and use its effects to our advantage. No-one is exempt. The unfinished rituals power establishes generate our legal and ethical codes as well as the social relationships of their field of application. These relationships themselves create potentially violent tensions whose threat and reality support the widely felt need for such codes and law.¶ Power operates as much through the understanding as the speaking of legal discourse. Thus even the individual's understanding of law is made to "run on time" according to preset and administered rhythms. The intelligibility of laws governing, say, official secrets and labour relations, are constantly established through what is written and said in and about them. This constituted intelligibility is not in itself dependent upon administrative and labour practices. Instead, the dependency of its theme is articulated through language which makes constant but selective use of these relations. It does so in order to lay down a way in which these relations can be authoritatively addressed through it. As a lawyer I should be able to understand these laws better than those to whom they directly apply. Of course, it is a different matter to consider what this established intelligibility then means for administrators and trade unionists.¶ Power therefore delimits and holds together a select audience for particular legal discourses. The authoritative legal version which I may attempt to render is cornered by a particular profession and expressed upon non-legal and external practices such as journalism~ trade unionism, policing, law courts and prisons. From such constituted/constituting sources legal discourse has inscribed upon it~ and inserted within it~ an implicit philosophy of life, system of ethics and criteria for "sound judgement". These are not essentially or exclusively legal in character, but are bound up with the evolution of modernist societies and their struggles with unaccountable feudal and royal power. For example, the struggle for the rule of law has always been a power-struggle between competing potential law makers, for access to and control over law making machinery and then for the gaining of universal social recognition of the laws that have been made. There can also be a struggle within academia between and among students and lecturers over the weight given to purely academic matters, research, professional training etc., that occur against external government financial and relevancy criteria.

#### Change must begin with the self - their political strategy of critique on the other 'out there' will fail, we must begin our critique with our selves in here.

Chandler 13 – prof of IR @ Westminster

(The World of Attachment? The Post-humanist Challenge to Freedom and Necessity, Millenium: Journal of International Studies, 41(3), 516– 534)

The world of becoming thereby is an ontologically flat world without the traditional hierarchies of existence and a more shared conception of agency. For Bennett, therefore, ‘to begin to experience the relationship between persons and other materialities more horizontally, is to take a step toward a more ecological sensibility’.78 Here there is room for human agency but this agency involves a deeper understanding of and receptivity to the world of objects and object relations. Rather than the hubristic focus on transforming the external world, the ethico-political tasks are those of work on the self to erase hubristic liberal traces of subject-centric understandings, understood to merely create the dangers of existential resentment. Work on the self is the only route to changing the world. As Connolly states: ‘To embrace without deep resentment a world of becoming is to work to “become who you are”, so that the word “become” now modifies “are” more than the other way around.’ Becoming who you are involves the ‘microtactics of the self’, and work on the self can then extend into ‘micropolitics’ of more conscious and reflective choices and decisions and lifestyle choices leading to potentially higher levels of ethical self-reflectivity and responsibility. Bennett argues that against the ‘narcissism’ of anthropomorphic understandings of domination of the external world, we need ‘some tactics for cultivating the experience of our selves as vibrant matter’. Rather than hubristically imagining that we can shape the world we live in, Bennett argues that: ‘Perhaps the ethical responsibility of an individual human now resides in one’s response to the assemblages in which one finds oneself participating. Such ethical tactics include reflecting more on our relationship to what we eat and considering the agentic powers of what we consume and enter into an assemblage with. In doing so, if ‘an image of inert matter helps animate our current practice of aggressively wasteful and planet-endangering consumption, then a materiality experienced as a lively force with agentic capacity could animate a more ecologically sustainable public’. For new materialists, the object to be changed or transformed is the human – the human mindset. By changing the way we think about the world and the way we relate to it by including broader, more non-human or inorganic matter in our considerations, we will have overcome our modernist ‘attachment disorders’ and have more ethically aware approaches to our planet. In cultivating these new ethical sensibilities, the human can be remade with a new self and a ‘new self-interest’.

### Case

#### a.) How progressive of you, right on! the 1AC is apt in describing the ethical injustice of indefinite detention, but leaves out how it is pertinent FOR THEM - this destroys their solvency and the potential for coalitions.

Halberstam 13 - Professor of English and Director of The Center for Feminist Research at University of Southern California. (Jack, http://www.minorcompositions.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/undercommons-web.pdf, The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study) -modified

These kinds of examples get to the heart of Moten and Harney’s world of the undercommons – the undercommons is not a realm where we rebel and we create critique; it is not a place where we “take arms against a sea of troubles/and by opposing end them.” The undercommons is a space and time which is always here. Our goal – and the “we” is always the right mode of address here – is not to end the troubles but to end the world that created those particular troubles as the ones that must be opposed. Moten and Harney refuse the logic that stages refusal as inactivity, as the absence of a plan and as a mode of stalling real politics. Moten and Harney tell us to listen to the noise we make and to refuse the offers we receive to shape that noise into “music.” In the essay that many people already know best from this volume, “The University and the Undercommons,” Moten and Harney come closest to explaining their mission. Refusing to be for or against the university and in fact marking the critical academic as the player who holds the “for and against” logic in place, Moten and Harney lead us to the “Undercommons of the Enlightenment” where subversive intellectuals engage both the university and fugitivity: “where the work gets done, where the work gets subverted, where the revolution is still black, still strong.” The subversive intellectual, we learn, is unprofessional, uncollegial, passionate and disloyal. The subversive intellectual is neither trying to extend the university nor change the university, the subversive intellectual is not toiling in misery and from this place of misery articulating a “general antagonism.” In fact, the subversive intellectual enjoys the ride and wants it to be faster and wilder; she does not want a room of his or her own, she wants to be in the world, in the world with others and making the world anew. Moten insists: “Like Deleuze. I believe in the world and want to be in it. I want to be in it all the way to the end of it because I believe in another world in the world and I want to be in that. And I plan to stay a believer, like Curtis Mayfield. But that’s beyond me, and even beyond me and Stefano, and out into the world, the other thing, the other world, the joyful noise of the scattered, scatted eschaton, the undercommon refusal of the academy of misery.” The mission then for the denizens of the undercommons is to recognize that when you seek to make things better, you are not just doing it for the Other, you must also be doing it for yourself. While men may think they are being “sensitive” by turning to feminism, while white people may think they are being right on by opposing racism, no one will really be able to embrace the mission of tearing “this shit down” until they realize that the structures they oppose are not only bad for some of us, they are bad for all of us. Gender hierarchies are bad for men as well as women and they are really bad for the rest of us. Racial hierarchies are not rational and ordered, they are chaotic and nonsensical and must be opposed by precisely all those who benefit in any way from them. Or, as Moten puts it: “The coalition emerges out of your recognition that it’s [messed] up for you, in the same way that we’ve already recognized that it’s fucked up for us. I don’t need your help. I just need you to recognize that this shit is killing you, too, however much more softly, you stupid motherfucker, you know?” coalition unites us in the recognition that we must change things or die. All of us. We must all change the things that are fucked up and change cannot come in the form that we think of as “revolutionary” – not as a masculinist surge or an armed confrontation. Revolution will come in a form we cannot yet imagine. Moten and Harney propose that we prepare now for what will come by entering into study. Study, a mode of thinking with others separate from the thinking that the institution requires of you, prepares us to be embedded in what Harney calls “the with and for” and allows you to spend less time antagonized and antagonizing. Like all world-making and all world-shattering encounters, when you enter this book and learn how to be with and for, in coalition, and on the way to the place we are already making, you will also feel fear, trepidation, concern, and disorientation. The disorientation, Moten and Harney will tell you is not just unfortunate, it is necessary because you will no longer be in one location moving forward to another, instead you will already be part of “the “movement of things” and on the way to this “outlawed social life of nothing.” The movement of things can be felt and touched and exists in language and in fantasy, it is flight, it is motion, it is fugitivity itself. Fugitivity is not only escape, “exit” as Paolo Virno might put it, or “exodus” in the terms offered by Hardt and Negri, fugitivity is being separate from settling. It is a being in motion that has learned that “organizations are obstacles to organising ourselves” (The Invisible Committee in The Coming Insurrection) and that there are spaces and modalities that exist separate from the logical, logistical, the housed and the positioned. Moten and Harney call this mode a “being together in homelessness” which does not idealize homelessness nor merely metaphorize it. Homelessness is the state of dispossession that we seek and that we embrace: “Can this being together in homelessness, this interplay of the refusal of what has been refused, this undercommon appositionality, be a place from which emerges neither self-consciousness nor knowledge of the other but an improvisation that proceeds from somewhere on the other side of an unasked question?” I think this is what Jay-Z and Kanye West (another collaborative unit of study) call “no church in the wild.”

#### b.) Absent this discussion, the affirmative occupies the position of the Maoist - the impact is imperialism and a reproduction of the harms of the 1ac.

Rey Chow, Comparative Literature—Brown University, 1993

Writing Diaspora, p. 15-16

The Orientalist has a special sibling whom I will, in order to highlight her significance as a kind of representational agency, call the Maoist. Arif Dirlik, who has written extensively on the history of political movements in twentieth-century China, sums up the interpretation of Mao Zedong commonly found in Western Marxist analyses in terms of a "Third Worldist fantasy"—"a fantasy of Mao as a Chinese reincarnation of Marx who fulfilled the Marxist promise that had been betrayed in the West."'6 The Maoist was the phoenix which arose from the ashes of the great disillusionment with Western culture in the 1960s and which found hope in the Chinese Communist Revolution.17 In the 1970s, when it became possible for Westerners to visit China as guided and pampered guests of the Beijing establishment, Maoists came back with reports of Chinese society's absolute, positive difference from Western society and of the Cultural Revolution as "the most important and innovative example of Mao's concern with the pursuit of egalitarian, populist, and communitarian ideals in the course of economic modernization" (Harding, p. 939). At that time, even poverty in China was regarded as "spiritually ennobling, since it meant that [the] Chinese were not possessed by the wasteful and acquisitive consumerism of the United States" (Harding, p. 941). Although the excessive admiration of the 1970s has since been replaced by an oftentimes equally excessive denigration of China, the Maoist is very much alive among us, and her significance goes far beyond the China and East Asian fields. Typically, the Maoist is a cultural critic who lives in a capitalist society but who is fed up with capitalism—a cultural critic, in other words, who wants a social order opposed to the one that is supporting her own undertaking. The Maoist is thus a supreme example of the way desire works: What she wants is always located in the other, resulting in an iden-tification with and valorization of that which she is not/does not have. Since what is valorized is often the other's deprivation—"having" poverty or "having" nothing—the Maoist's strategy becomes in the main a rhetorical renunciation of the material power that enables her rhetoric. In terms of intellectual lineage, one of the Maoist's most important ancestors is Charlotte Bronte's Jane Eyre. Like Jane, the Maoist's means to moral power is a specific representational position—the position of powerlessness. In their reading of Jane Eyre, Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse argue that the novel exemplifies the paradigm of violence that expresses its dominance through a representation of the self as powerless: Until the very end of the novel, Jane is always excluded from every available form of social power. Her survival seems to depend on renouncing what power might come to her as teacher, mistress, cousin, heiress, or missionary's wife. She repeatedly flees from such forms of inclusion in the field of power, as if her status as an exemplary subject, like her authority as narrator, depends entirely on her claim to a kind of truth which can only be made from a position of powerlessness. By creating such an unlovely heroine and subjecting her to one form of harassment after another, Bronte demonstrates the power of words alone. This reading of Jane Eyre highlights her not simply as the female underdog who is often identified by feminist and Marxist critics, but as the intellectual who acquires power through a moral rectitude that was to become the flip side of Western imperialism's ruthlessness. Lying at the core of Anglo-American liberalism, this moral rectitude would accompany many territorial and economic conquests overseas with a firm sense of social mission. When Jane Eyre went to the colonies in the nineteenth century, she turned into the Christian missionary. It is this understanding—that Bronte's depic-tion of a socially marginalized English woman is, in terms of ideological production, fully complicit with England's empire-building ambition rather than opposed to it—that prompted Gayatri Spivak to read Jane Eyre as a text in the service of imperialism. Referring to Bronte's treatment of the "madwoman" Bertha Mason, the white Jamaican Creole character, Spivak charges Jane Eyre for, precisely, its humanism, in which the "native subject" is not created as an animal but as "the object of what might be termed the terrorism of the categorical imperative." This kind of creation is imperialism's use/travesty of the Kantian metaphysical demand to "make the heathen into a human so that he can be treated as an end in himself."19 In the twentieth century, as Europe's former colonies became independent, Jane Eyre became the Maoist. Michel de Certeau describes the affinity between her two major reincarnations, one religious and the other political, this way: The place that was formerly occupied by the Church or Churches vis-4-vis the established powers remains recognizable, over the past two centuries, in the functioning of the opposition known as leftist. [T]here is vis-A-vis the established order, a relationship between the Churches that defended an other world and the parties of the left which, since the nineteenth century, have promoted a different future. In both cases, similar functional characteristics can be discerned. . . The Maoist retains many of Jane's awesome features, chief of which are a protestant passion to turn powerlessness into "truth" and an idealist intolerance of those who may think differently from her. Whereas the great Orientalist blames the living "third world" natives for the loss of the ancient non-Western civilization, his loved object, the Maoist applauds the same natives for personifying and fulfilling her ideals. For the Maoist in the 1970s, the mainland Chinese were, in spite of their "backwardness," a puritanical alternative to the West in human form—a dream come true.

#### Aff obscures ongoing hunger strikes - true radical politics is to let the Other die - their radical move to condemn detention is a ploy at maintaing Empire's power by disempowering the detainee.

Schor & Martina 13 - \*PhD candidate at Utrecht University. She holds an MA from the International Institute of Social Studies, part of the Erasmus University, \*\* co-founder of Mediacate, a media literacy organization, cultural critic with an interest in representations of race and gender in media. (Patricia, Egbert Alejandro, http://criticallegalthinking.com/2013/10/14/alien-body-contemporary-netherlands-incarceration-force-feeding-asylum-seekers/, The Alien Body in Contemporary Netherlands: Incarceration and Force-​feeding of Asylum Seekers, October 14th 2013)

. Asylum seekers on hunger strike are protesting against their physical and metaphorical exclusion from the Dutch public sphere. Their deaths would catapult them into this very anaemic space, however briefly, and disturb the carefully constructed and policed human face of the Dutch nation. Hunger strikes ‘call for’ the application of exceptional rules, for they qualify as acts of resistance to the power of the state. The tension, on the one hand, between an ethics of care that doesn’t decry death, as is the case with euthanasia in the Netherlands and, on the other, ‘death as protest’ indicates that for asylum-​seekers another ethics (or lack thereof) applies. While voluntary death as a means to end suffering is allowed, death as a form of protest is not. Disciplinary power and biopower shape a certain kind of subject and a specific embodied response to power. In the zone of the non-​being one’s body is the last, if not only, means to protest oppression, whereby a ‘slow death’ stands for the body’s radicalisation. The Dutch state does not recognise hunger strike as a valid and deliberate political act, as a refusal to live under intolerable conditions, or as a form of revolutionary suicide that ‘strategically blurs the difference between risking one’s life in order to confront oppressive forces and resolutely taking one’s life in order to end unbearable suffering.’ (Ryan 2000, 391) Under these circumstances (the Dutch state forces asylum seekers to subsist in a ‘space of death’), force-​feeding represents a prolonging of suffering (or a staying of death). Force-​feeding suggests a desire for their continued existence — however, outside of the Netherlands.

#### Their strategy of assemblages maintains status quo power dynamics and classifications of otherness.

Protevi 10 (John Protevi is Professor of French Studies at Louisiana State University, “Rhythm and Cadence, Frenzy and March: Music and the Geo-Bio-Techno-Affective Assemblages of Ancient Warfare”, Theory and Event)

*Ontology of Affect*—For Deleuze and Guattari (hereafter “DG”) “affect” comprises the active capacities of a body to act and the passive capacities of a body to be affected or to be acted upon. In other words, affect is what a body can do and what it can undergo. The use of this term derives from Deleuze’s reading of Spinoza, in which Deleuze carefully distinguishes “affect” (affectus), as the experience of an increase or decrease in the body’s power to act, from “affection” (affectio), as the composition or mixture of bodies, or more precisely the change produced in the affected body by the action of the affecting body in an encounter. Affectus or what we could call “experiential affect” is not representational, Deleuze remarks, “since it is experienced in a living duration that involves the difference between two states.” As such an experience of difference, *affectus* is “purely transitive.”[4](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.3.protevi.html#f4) In the main discussion of affect in ATP,[5](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.3.protevi.html#f5) DG do not maintain the Spinozist term “affection,” but they do distinguish the relations of the extensive parts of a body (including the “modification” of those relations resulting from an encounter), which they call “longitude,” from the intensities or bodily states that augment or diminish the body’s “power to act [*puissance d’agir*],” which they call “latitude.” In other words, the “latitude” of a body comprises the affects or the capacities to act and to be acted upon of which a body is capable at any one time in an assemblage. What are these “acts” of which a body is capable? Using one of the key terms of ATP, DG define affects as “becomings” or capacities to produce emergent effects in entering assemblages.[6](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.3.protevi.html#f6) These emergent effects will either mesh productively with the affects of the body, or clash with them. Meshing emergent effects will augment the power of that body to form other connections within or across assemblages, resulting in joyous affects, while clashing emergent effects will diminish the power to act of the body, producing sad affects. For DG, knowledge of the affects of a body is all-important: “We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do [*ce qu’il peut*], in other words, what its affects are.”[7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.3.protevi.html#f7) Affect is part of DG’s dynamic interactional ontology, so that defining bodies in terms of affects or power to act and to undergo is different from reading them in terms of properties of substantive bodies by which they are arranged in species and genera. At this point in their text, DG illustrate the way affect is part of the process of assembling by reference to the relation between Little Hans and the horse in Freud’s eponymous case study. While we will not do a thematic study of the horse in ATP, we should recall the prevalence of horses (alongside wolves and rats) in the discussions of affect in ATP: besides the Little Hans case, we also find the becoming-horse of the masochist being submitted to dressage,[8](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.3.protevi.html#f8) and of course the repeated analyses of man-horse assemblages in the Nomadology chapter (the stirrup, the chariot, etc.). We will return to the question of horse-man assemblages in ancient warfare, in particular to a recent thesis whereby the defeat of the light chariot forces by berserker “runners” is the crucial factor in the defeat of Bronze Age kingdoms that mark the 1200 BCE collapse, leading to the eventual emergence of the polis/phalanx assemblage.[9](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v013/13.3.protevi.html#f9)

#### Affect has been coopted by the military to mobilize warfare through ontological war. Relying solely on experience and perception cements the trend towards total war - their politics of assemblage is exactly what the status quo wants.

Evans and Guillaume, 2010 (Brad Evans is lecturer in the School of Politics and International Studies at the University of Leeds, Laura Guillaume has a PhD in International Politics from Aberystwyth University; “Deleuze and War: Introduction”, Theory and Event)

Brian Massumi addresses the tendencies of contemporary war, which were intensified though not caused by September 11th 2001. On the one hand, the post-September 11th security response was undertaken in the name of the spectre of the absent towers: one remembers what one does not see. On the other, military action becomes increasingly conceived under the banner of ‘pre-emption’, where one acts to prevent something which has not occurred, which has not been experienced. In this sense, a schism grows between (military) action and perception— we can no longer trust our senses. For Massumi, this has revealing consequences for how we are to think contemporary war in relation to the politics of everyday life. Rather than thinking in terms of what we experience or perceive, Massumi suggests that we ought to explore what takes place in this space before perception, in which we are primed for attention, ready to perceive, on ‘red alert.’ This space before action, before decision, is increasingly the subject of a military ‘occupation.’ Rather than being a discreet activity which takes place in a defined location against a pre-determined set of people, war becomes generalised, ubiquitised, prior to politics. Massumi cites Arquilla and Ronfeldt, who define ‘soft power’ as ‘epistemological warfare’, because it is concerned with what people know, or what they think they know. Massumi suggests that soft power is now ubiquitous. No longer merely the companion to exceptional ‘hard power’ operations, ‘epistemological warfare’ has become the condition of ‘normal’ political life. However, this is not quite right. For the current ‘everyday war’ is concerned not so much with what we know (or think we know) as what we are (or are becoming). This is not so much epistemological as ontological war, concerned with the ongoing emergence of subjects of certain kinds primed to react and respond in certain ways to emergent dangers which are themselves in a permanent condition of emergence. This future-facing war is always in the process of conditioning corporeal emergence and determining future reactions. Like capitalism itself, this process is non-linear and seemingly compatible with the Liberal predicates of freedom and individualism: predicates which are incapable of interrogating the pre-individual domain of affect, and which are thereby entirely compatible with this generalised state of war (as a mode of governance) and unable to provide the platform for an effective critique (as a politics of resistance). Consequently, Massumi says that ‘[i]t is not enough to stop one war or even many. It is not enough to vote out one government bent on war, nor many.’ Rather the task is to reclaim the space of emergence—of the virtual—which is in danger of being given over to a military logic of pre-emption.