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#### The affirmative’s performance trades off with political struggles against neoliberalism – their blanket criticism of a falsely universal liberalism weakens the anti-neoliberal movement

Joseph M. Schwartz, 8-9-13 (Professor of Political Science at Temple University. Schwartz's teaching and published work focuses on the complex interaction among morality, ideology, and political and institutional development., “A Peculiar Blind Spot: Why did Radical Political Theory Ignore the Rampant Rise in Inequality Over the Past Thirty Years?”, Volume 35, Issue 3, 2013, Special Issue: Studying Politics Today: Critical Approaches to Political Science)

This article explores why self-defined radical and “subversive” political theory has, by and large, failed to examine the rampant increase in inequality under thirty years of neoliberal capitalism as a major threat to democracy.1 During this period, the most highly cited work in radical political thought focused on predominantly ontological and epistemological issues of “difference” and “the fiction of the coherent self.”2 But just as post-structuralist and difference theorists attacked the rational chooser of Rawlsian liberalism as a falsely universal subject and interrogated equality as a homogenizing category, political elites of both the right and the moderate left achieved an ideological consensus in favor of a new, neoliberal universal subject—the entrepreneurial, self-sufficient, competitive marketplace individual. Thus, it is rather ironic that during the “Great Compression” of the 1960s, when income and wealth inequality moderately decreased—in part due to the power of the labor and social democratic movements in advanced democracies—the revival of political theory focused on the challenge to democracy posed by economic inequality and the absence of voice for employees in the workplace; think of the early work of Carole Pateman, C.B. Macpherson, Michael Walzer, and Sheldon Wolin.3 Yet in the past several decades of rapidly growing inequality most radical theorists have focused on the challenge difference poses to democratic societies or how liberal democratic institutions of “governance” engage in the repressive norming of the self. This is not to deny the role that difference plays within a democratic pluralist society, or the intellectual validity of interrogating how dominant institutional norms can constrict individual identity. But the problem that vexed Rousseau, Mill, Marx, and the founders of contemporary democratic theory remains more relevant than ever: how do inequalities in wealth, income, power, and life-opportunity contradict the formal commitment of liberal democracy to the equal moral worth of persons?¶ Given the accentuated role that corporate power and wealth plays in American politics today, why also do few political theorists examine the tension between corporate power and democracy? Not since Charles Lindblom's and Robert Dahl's work in the late 1970s and early 1980s have students of politics focused on the anomalous role of corporations in a democratic society. As Dahl and Lindblom argued, in a democratic society binding decisions should only be granted legitimacy if they are made democratically. Yet corporate management regularly issues edicts that have binding, coercive effects on their employees and society at large.4 Nor have theorists focused on how the weakening of democratic institutions of countervailing power, such as unions and grass-roots social movements, has engendered a formal democracy that is de facto an oligarchy. 5 Recently, mainstream—even behavioral—American politics scholars have investigated the corrosive effects that the fungible nature of wealth into political power has upon democracy, as well as the resulting dominance in decision-making of the political preferences of elites. But recent political theory has been relatively silent on these issues.6¶ By the late 1980s theorists of difference, such as Iris Marion Young and Carol Gilligan, shifted the focus of radical theory from economic democracy to a critique of how one-size-fits-all social policies failed to meet the differential needs of members of particular groups.7 The turn to difference offered important insights for both theorists and activists, as democratic public policies must account for the differential needs of particular individuals and groups. But what the focus on difference sometimes obscured is that the argument that each individual should receive the resources necessary to satisfy their particular human needs still relies upon a universal democratic commitment to the equal standing of all members of society.¶ In contrast to theories of difference, the post-structuralist turn in political theory in part arose as a reaction to fears that identity and difference politics essentialized and homogenized the status of the self within groups.8 Post-structuralism rejected both Rawlsian liberalism's belief in a coherent, rational chooser and identity politics' granting of primacy to the group as the shaper of individual identity. Instead, post-structuralist analysis emphasized the labile, incoherent, shifting nature of a self constituted by, in Judith Butler's terms, the “performative discursive iteration” of social norms.9 Post-structuralist theorists emphasized the agonal nature of politics and the ever-present possibility that the discursive self could “performatively resist” hegemonic norms.10 That is, by refusing to perform according to the social norms that allegedly inscribe the self, individuals could engage in “transgressive” resistance. Ironically, just as allegedly radical theorists discerned the “radical Nietzschean” possibilities of individual resistance, the social and political options of working class individuals and many people of color in the United States were being further constrained by increased social, economic, and political inequality. This focus on individual resistance may have come about—as the literary theorist Terry Eagleton argues—because the forward progress of the left had been reversed by the triumph of Thatcher and Reagan and, thus, theorists lost faith in the possibility of democratic majoritarian political change.11

#### Discursive critiques alone fail to combat neoliberalism – only a state-oriented approach allows debate pedagogy to transcend racist ideologies and practices

Giroux Global TV Network Chair in Communication @ McMaster University 6-4-10 (Henry, “Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy Under the Reign of Neoliberalism,” Communication Education (52), Issue 3-4, pgs. 191-211 Mike)

Any attempt to address the politics of the new racism in the United States must begin by reclaiming the language of the social and affirming the project of an inclusive and just democracy. This suggests addressing how the politics of the new racism are made invisible under the mantle of neoliberal ideology, that is, raising questions about how neoliberalism works to hide the effects of power, politics, and racial injustice. What is troubling and must increasingly be made problematic is that neoliberalism wraps itself in what appears to be an unassailable appeal to common sense. As Jean and John Comaroff (2000) observe: there is a strong argument to be made that neoliberal capitalism in its millennial moment portends the death of politics by hiding its own ideological underpinnings in the dictates of economic efficiency: in the fetishism of the free market, in the inexorable, expanding needs of business, in the imperatives of science and technology. Or, if it does not conduce to the death of politics, it tends to reduce them to the pursuit of pure interest, individual or collective. (p. 322) Defined as the paragon of all social relations, neoliberalism attempts to eliminate an engaged critique about its most basic principles and social consequences by embracing the market as the arbiter of social destiny (Rule, 1998, p. 31). More is lost here than neoliberalism’s willingness to make its own assumptions problematic. Also lost is the very viability of politics itself. Not only does neoliberalism in this instance empty the public treasury, hollow out public services, and limit the vocabulary and imagery available to recognize antidemocratic forms of power and narrow models of individual agency, but it also undermines the socially discursive translating functions of any viable democracy by undercutting the ability of individuals to engage in the continuous translation between public considerations and the private interests by collapsing the public into the realm of the private (Bauman, 2001). Divested of its political possibilities and social underpinnings, freedom finds few opportunities for rearticulating private worries into public concerns or individual discontent into collective struggle (Bauman, 2001). Hence, the “first task in engaging neoliberalism is revealing its claim to a bogus universalism and making clear how it functions as a historical and social construction. Neoliberalism hides the traces of its own ideology, politics, and history either by rhetorically asserting its triumphalism as part of the end of history or by proclaiming that capitalism and democracy are synonymous. What must be challenged is neoliberalism’s future tense narrative of inevitability, demonstrating that the drama of world history remains wide open (Medovoi, 2002, p. 66). But the history of the changing economic and ideological conditions that gave rise to neoliberalism must be understood in relation to the corresponding history of race relations in the United States and abroad. Most importantly, as the history of race is either left out or misrepresented by the official channels of power in the United States, it is crucial that the history of slavery, civil rights, racial politics, and ongoing modes of struggle at the level of everyday life be remembered and used pedagogically to challenge the historical amnesia that feeds neoliberalism’s ahistorical claim to power and the continuity of its claims to common sense. The struggle against racial injustice cannot be separated from larger questions about what kind of culture and society are emerging under the imperatives of neoliberalism, what kind of history it ignores, and what alternatives might point to a substantive democratic future. Second, under neoliberalism all levels of government have been hollowed out and largely reduced either to their policing functions or to maintaining the privileges of the rich and the interests of corporate power, both of which are largely White. In this discourse, not only is the state absolved of its traditional social contract of upholding the public good and providing crucial social provisions and minimal guarantees for those who are in need of such services, but it also embraces a notion of color-blind racelessness. State racelessness is built on the right-wing logic of rational racists such as Dinesh DSouza (1995), who argue that What we need is a separation of race and state (p. 545). As David Theo Goldberg (2002) points out, this means that the state is now held to a standard of justice protective of individual rights and not group results from. This in turn makes possible the devaluation of any individuals considered not white, or white-like, the trashing or trampling of their rights and possibilities, for the sake of preserving the right to private rational discrimination of whites. [Thus] racist discrimination becomes privatized, and in terms of liberal legality state protected in its privacy. (p. 229) Defined through the ideology of racelessness, the state removes itself from either addressing or correcting the effects of racial discrimination, reducing matters of racism to individual concerns to be largely solved through private negotiations between individuals, and adopting an entirely uncritical role in the way in which the racial state shapes racial policies and their effects throughout the economic, social, and cultural landscape. Lost here is any critical engagement with state power and how it imposes immigration policies, decides who gets resources and access to a quality education, defines what constitutes a crime, how people are punished, how and whether social problems are criminalized, who is worthy of citizenship, and who is responsible for addressing racial injustices. As the late Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Grass, 2002) argues, there is a political and pedagogical need not only to protect the social gains, embodied in state policies, that have been the outcome of important collective struggles, but also to invent another kind of state (p. 71). This means challenging the political irresponsibility and moral indifference which are the organizing principles at the heart of the neoliberal vision. As Bourdieu suggests, this points to the need to restore a sense of utopian possibility rooted in a struggle for a democratic state. The racial state and its neoliberal ideology need to be challenged as part of any viable antiracist pedagogy and politics. Antiracist pedagogy also needs to move beyond the conundrums of a limited identity politics and begin to include in its analysis what it would mean to imagine the state as a vehicle for democratic values and a strong proponent for social and racial justice. In part, reclaiming the democratic and public responsibility of the state would mean: arguing for a state in which tax cuts for the rich, rather than social spending, are seen as the problem; using the state to protect the public good rather than waging a war on all things public; engaging and resisting the use of state power to both protect and define the public sphere as utterly White; redefining the power and role of the state so as to minimize its policing functions and strengthen its accountability to the public interests of all citizens, rather than to the wealthy and corporations. Removing the state from its subordination to market values means reclaiming the importance of social needs over commercial interests, democratic politics over corporate power, and addressing a host of urgent social problems that include but are not limited to: the escalating costs of health care, housing, the schooling crisis, the growing gap between the rich and poor, the environmental crisis, the rebuilding of the nation’s cities and impoverished rural areas, the economic crisis facing most of the states, and the increasing assault on people of color. The struggle over the state must be linked to a struggle for a racially just, inclusive democracy. Crucial to any viable politics of antiracism is the role the state will play as a guardian of the public interest and as a force in creating a multiracial democracy. Third, it is crucial for any antiracist pedagogy and politics to recognize that power does not just inhabit the realm of economics or state power, but is also intellectual, residing in the educational force of the culture and its enormous powers of persuasion. This means that any viable antiracist pedagogy must make the political more pedagogical by recognizing how public pedagogy works to determine and secure how racial identity, issues, and relations are produced in a wide variety of sites including schools, cable and television networks, newspapers and magazines, the Internet, advertising, churches, trade unions, and a host of other public spheres in which ideas are produced and distributed. This means becoming mindful of how racial meanings and practices are created, mediated, reproduced, and challenged through a wide variety of discourses, institutions, audiences, markets, and constituencies which help determine the forms and meaning of publicness in American society (Brenkman, 1995, p. 8). The crucial role that pedagogy plays in shaping racial issues reaffirms the centrality of a cultural politics that recognizes the relationship between issues of representation and the operations of power, the important role that intellectuals might play as engaged, public intellectuals, and the importance of critical knowledge in challenging neoliberalism’s illusion of unanimity. But an antiracist cultural pedagogy also suggests the need to develop a language of critique and possibility, and to wage individual and collective struggles in a wide variety of dominant public spheres and alternative counterpublics. Public pedagogy as a tool of antiracist struggles understands racial politics not only as a signifying activity through which subject positions are produced, identities inhabited, and desires mobilized but also as the mobilization of material relations of power as a way of securing, enforcing, and challenging racial injustices. While cultural politics offers an opportunity to understand how race matters and racist practices take hold in everyday life, such a pedagogical and cultural politics must avoid collapsing into a romanticization of the symbolic, popular, or discursive. Culture matters as a rhetorical tool and mode of persuasion, especially in the realm of visual culture, which has to be taken seriously as a pedagogical force, but changing consciousness is only a precondition to changing society and should not be confused with what it means to actually transform institutional relations of power. In part, this means contesting the control of the media by a handful of transnational corporations (on this subject, see McChesney & Nichols, 2002). The social gravity of racism as it works through the modalities of everyday language, relations, and cultural expressions has to be taken seriously in any antiracist politics, but such a concern and mode of theorizing must also be accompanied by an equally serious interest in the rise of corporate power and the role of state institutions and agencies in shaping contemporary forms of racial subjugation and inequality (Goldberg & Solomos, 2002, p. 231). Racist ideologies, practices, state formations, and institutional relations can be exposed pedagogically and linguistically, but they cannot be resolved merely in the realm of the discursive. Hence, any viable antiracist pedagogy needs to draw attention between critique and social transformation, critical modes of analysis and the responsibility of acting individually and collectively on one’s beliefs. Another important issue that has to be included in any notion of antiracist pedagogy and politics is the issue of connecting matters of racial justice to broader and more comprehensive political, cultural, and social agendas. Neoliberalism exerts a powerful force in American life because its influence and power are spread across a diverse range of political, economic, social and cultural spheres. Its ubiquity is matched by its aggressive pedagogical attempts to reshape the totality of social life in the image of the market, reaching into and connecting a wide range of seemingly disparate issues that bear down on everyday life in the United States. Neoliberalism is persuasive because its language of commercialism, consumerism, privatization, freedom, and self-interest resonates with, and saturates, so many aspects of public life. Differences in this discourse are removed from matters of equity and power and reduced to market niches. Agency is privatized, and social values are reduced to market-based interests. And, of course, a democracy of citizens is replaced by a democracy of consumers. Progressives, citizens, and other groups who are concerned about matters of race and difference need to maintain their concerns with particular forms of oppression and subordination, but the limits of various approaches to identity politics must be recognized so as not to allow them to become either fixed or incapable of making alliances with other social movements as part of a broader struggle over particular freedoms and the more generalized freedoms associated with an inclusive and radical democracy. I have not attempted to be exhaustive in suggesting what it might mean to recognize and challenge the new racism that now reproduces more subtle forms of racial subordination, oppression, and exclusion, though I have tried to point to some pedagogical and political concerns that connect racism and neoliberal politics. The color line in America is neither fixed nor static. Racism as an expression of power and exclusion takes many meanings and forms under different historical conditions. The emphasis on its socially and historically constructed nature offers hope because it suggests that what can be produced by dominant relations of power can also be challenged and transformed by those who imagine a more utopian and just world. The challenge of the color line is still with us today and needs to be recognized not only as a shameful example of racial injustice but also as a reprehensible attack on the very nature of democracy itself.

#### Neoliberalism results in an indiscriminate death drive for production – this is the same logic that produced Stalinism and Nazism

Santos ‘3 (Boaventura de Sousa, director of the Center for Social Studies at the University of Coimbra, EUROZINE, COLLECTIVE SUICIDE OR GLOBALIZATION FROM BELOW, http://www.eurozine.com/article/2003-03-26-santos-en.html)

Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is **manifested in** the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day **reality and that the problems** and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment**, hunger and death in the Third World,** this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied**. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists.** This **political** logic **is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it** is ultra-conservative **in that** it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo**.** Inherent to it is the **notion of the** end of history**. During the last hundred years,** the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and**, therefore**, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. **At all these moments,** a death drive, **a catastrophic heroism,** predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other**. Paradoxically,** the broader the definition of the other **and the efficacy of its destruction,** the more likely collective suicide **becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version,** neoliberalism **is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism.** Its death drive takes **a number of** forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war against Iraq and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, - and much more if the costs of reconstruction are added - enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years.

#### The Alternative is to use this academic space to oppose neoliberalism.

#### The Role of the Ballot is to affirm the team who best confronts hegemonic structures of oppression.

#### We have the best starting point for anti-racial critique – neoliberalism frames racial discourses and praxis

Giroux Global TV Network Chair in Communication @ McMaster University 6-4-10 (Henry, “Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy Under the Reign of Neoliberalism,” *Communication Education (52)*, Issue 3-4, pgs. 191-211 Mike)

The public morality of American life and social policy regarding matters of racial justice are increasingly subject to a politics of denial. Denial in this case is not merely about the failure of public memory or the refusal to know, but an active ongoing attempt on the part of many conservatives, liberals, and politicians to rewrite the discourse of race so as to deny its valence as a force for discrimination and exclusion either by translating it as a threat to American culture or by relegating it to the language of the private sphere. The idea of race and the conditions of racism have real political effects, and eliding them only makes those effects harder to recognize. And yet, the urgency to recognize how language is used to name, organize, order, and categorize matters of race not only has academic value but also provides a location from which to engage difference and the relationship between the self and the other and between the public and private. In addition, the language of race is important because it strongly affects political and policy agendas as well. One only has to think about the effects of Charles Murray’s (1984) book, Losing Ground, on American welfare policies in the 1980s. But language is more than a mode of communication or a symbolic practice that produces real effects: It is also a site of contestation and struggle. Since the mid-1970s, race relations have undergone a significant shift and acquired a new character as the forces of neoliberalism have begun to shape how Americans understand the notion of agency, identity, freedom, and politics itself (for an excellent analysis of this shift in race relations, see Ansell, 1997; Bonilla-Silva, 2001). Part of this shift has to be understood within the emerging forces of transnational capitalism and a global restructuring in which the economy is separated from politics, and corporate power is largely removed from the control of nation states. Within the neoliberal register, globalization represents the triumph of the economy over politics and culture and the hegemony of capital over all other domains of life (Kellner, 2000, p. 307). Under neoliberal globalization, capital removes itself from any viable form of state regulation, power is uncoupled from matters of ethics and social responsibility, and market freedoms replace long-standing social contracts that once provided a safety net for the poor, the elderly, workers, and the middle class. The result is that public issues and social concerns increasingly give way to a growing culture of insecurity and fear regarding the most basic issues of individual livelihood, safety, and basic survival. Increasingly, uncertainty replaces a concern with either the past or the future, and traditional human bonds rooted in compassion, justice, and a respect for others are now replaced by a revitalized social Darwinism, played out nightly in the celebration of reality-based television, in which a rabid self-interest becomes the organizing principle for a winner-take-all society. As insecurity and fear grip public consciousness, society is no longer identified through its allegiance to democratic values, but is identified through a troubling freedom rooted in a disturbing emphasis on individualism and competitiveness as the only normative measures to distinguish between what is a right or wrong, just or unjust, proper or improper action. Zygmunt Bauman (2001) captures this deracinated notion of freedom and the insecurity it promotes in his observation that: Society no longer guarantees, or even promises, a collective remedy for individual misfortunes. Individuals have been offered (or, rather, have been cast into) freedom of unprecedented proportions but at the price of similarly unprecedented insecurity. And when there is insecurity, little time is left for caring for values that hover above the level of daily concerns or, for that matter, for whatever lasts longer than the fleeting moment. (p. 159) Within this emerging neoliberal ethic, success is attributed to thriftiness and entrepreneurial genius, while those who do not succeed are viewed as either failures or utterly expendable. Neoliberalism’s attachment to individualism, markets, and antistatism ranks human needs as less important than property rights and subordinates the art of politics to the science of economics (Lapham, 2001, p. 8). Racial justice in the age of market-based freedoms and financially driven values loses its ethical imperative to a neoliberalism that embraces commercial rather than civic values, private rather than pubic interests, and financial incentives rather than ethical concerns. Neoliberalism negates racism as an ethical issue and democratic values as a basis for citizen-based action. Of course, neoliberalism takes many forms as it moves across the globe. In the United States, it has achieved a surprising degree of success but is increasingly being resisted by labor unions, students, and environmentalists. Major protests against economic policies promoted by the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization have taken place in Seattle, Prague, New York, Montreal, Genoa, and other cities around the world. In the United States, a rising generation of students is protesting against trade agreements like GATT and NAFTA as well as sweatshop labor practices at home and abroad and the corporatization of public and higher education. Unfortunately, antiracist theorists have not said enough about either the link between the new racism and neoliberalism, on the one hand, or the rise of a race-based carceral state on the other. Neither the rise of the new racism nor any viable politics of an antiracist movement can be understood outside of the power and grip of neoliberalism in the United States. Hence, at the risk of oversimplification, I want to be a bit more specific about neoliberalism’s central assumptions and how it frames some of the more prominent emerging racial discourses and practices.

#### Neolib re-appropriates anti-racist discourse to serve profit motives – prevents their in-round discourse from having any spill-over effect

Giroux Global TV Network Chair in Communication @ McMaster University 6-4-10 (Henry, “Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy Under the Reign of Neoliberalism,” *Communication Education (52)*, Issue 3-4, pgs. 191-211 Mike)

Under the reign of neoliberalism in the United States, society is largely defined through the privileging of market relations, deregulation, privatization, and consumerism. Central to neoliberalism is the assumption that profit making be construed as the essence of democracy, thus providing a rationale for a handful of private interests to control as much of social life as possible to maximize their financial investments. Strictly aligning freedom with a narrow notion of individual interest, neoliberalism works hard to privatize all aspects of the public good and simultaneously narrow the role of the state as both a gatekeeper for capital and a policing force for maintaining social order and racial control. Unrestricted by social legislation or government regulation, market relations as they define the economy are viewed as a paradigm for democracy itself. Central to neoliberal philosophy is the claim that the development of all aspects of society should be left to the wisdom of the market. Similarly, neoliberal warriors argue that democratic values be subordinated to economic considerations, social issues be translated as private dilemmas, part-time labor replace full-time work, trade unions be weakened, and everybody be treated as a customer. Within this market-driven perspective, the exchange of capital takes precedence over social justice, the making of socially responsible citizens, and the building of democratic communities. There is no language here for recognizing antidemocratic forms of power, developing nonmarket values, or fighting against substantive injustices in a society founded on deep inequalities, particularly those based on race and class. Hence, it is not surprising that under neoliberalism, language is often stripped of its critical and social possibilities as it becomes increasingly difficult to imagine a social order in which all problems are not personal, social issues provide the conditions for understanding private considerations, critical reflection becomes the essence of politics, and matters of equity and justice become crucial to developing a democratic society. It is under the reign of neoliberalism that the changing vocabulary about race and racial justice has to be understood and engaged. As freedom is increasingly abstracted from the power of individuals and groups to participate actively in shaping society, it is reduced to the right of the individual to be free from social constraints. In this view, freedom is no longer linked to a collective effort on the part of individuals to create a democratic society. Instead, freedom becomes an exercise in self-development rather than social responsibility, reducing politics to either the celebration of consumerism or a privileging of a market-based notion of agency and choice that appear quite indifferent to how power, equity, and justice offer the enabling conditions for real individual and collective choices to be both made and acted upon. Under such circumstances, neoliberalism undermines those public spaces where noncommercial values and crucial social issues can be discussed, debated, and engaged. As public space is privatized, power is disconnected from social obligations, and it becomes more difficult for isolated individuals living in consumption-oriented spaces to construct an ethically engaged and power-sensitive language capable of accommodating the principles of ethics and racial justice as a common good rather than as a private affair. According to Bauman (1998), the elimination of public space and the subordination of democratic values to commercial interests narrow the discursive possibilities for supporting notions of the public good and create the conditions for the suspicion against others, the intolerance of difference, the resentment of strangers, and the demands to separate and banish them, as well as the hysterical, paranoiac concern with law and order (p. 47). Positioned within the emergence of neoliberalism as the dominant economic and political philosophy of our times, neoracism can be understood as part of a broader attack against not only difference but also the value of public memory, public goods, and democracy itself. The new racism both represents a shift in how race is defined and is symptomatic of the breakdown of a political culture in which individual freedom and solidarity maintain an uneasy equilibrium in the service of racial, social, and economic justice. Individual freedom is now disconnected from any sense of civic responsibility or justice, focusing instead on investor profits, consumer confidence, the downsizing of governments to police precincts, and a deregulated social order in which the winner takes all. Freedom is no longer about either making the powerful responsible for their actions or providing the essential political, economic, and social conditions for everyday people to intervene in and shape their future. Under the reign of neoliberalism, freedom is less about the act of intervention than it is about the process of withdrawing from the social and enacting one’s sense of agency as an almost exclusively private endeavor. Freedom now cancels out civic courage and social responsibility while it simultaneously translates public issues and collective problems into tales of failed character, bad luck, or simply indifference. As Amy Elizabeth Ansell (1997) points out: The disproportionate failure of people of color to achieve social mobility speaks nothing of the justice of present social arrangements, according to the New Right worldview, but rather reflects the lack of merit or ability of people of color themselves. In this way, attention is detracted away from the reality of institutional racism and towards, for example, the culture of poverty, the drug culture, or the lack of black self-development. (p. 111) Appeals to freedom, operating under the sway of market forces, offer no signposts theoretically or politically for engaging racism, an ethical and political issue that undermines the very basis of a substantive democracy. Freedom in this discourse collapses into self-interest and as such is more inclined to organize any sense of community around shared fears, insecurities, and an intolerance of those others who are marginalized by class and color. But freedom reduced to the ethos of self-preservation and brutal self-interests makes it difficult for individuals to recognize the forms that racism often take when draped in either the language of denial, freedom or individual rights. In what follows, I want to explore two prominent forms of the new racism, color blindness and neoliberal racism and their connection to the New Right, corporate power, and neoliberal ideologies.

#### Our position against neoliberalism is necessary to reinvigorate movements *against the state* – the alternative recovers the possibility of performative resistance against dominant structures through its political praxis of solidarity

Joseph M. Schwartz, 8-9-13 (Professor of Political Science at Temple University. Schwartz's teaching and published work focuses on the complex interaction among morality, ideology, and political and institutional development., “A Peculiar Blind Spot: Why did Radical Political Theory Ignore the Rampant Rise in Inequality Over the Past Thirty Years?”, Volume 35, Issue 3, 2013, Special Issue: Studying Politics Today: Critical Approaches to Political Science)

Given how divided the United States is, not only politically, but also geographically and socially on lines of race, class, and citizenship status, democratic theorists perhaps should refocus their energies on defining the role solidarity and equality of standing must play in the construction of a just society. For example, the political conflict likely to define America's political future is how expeditiously undocumented workers and their dependents become full citizens. Unlike some who long for a return to a class-based politics of social solidarity, I am well aware that forms of racial, national, and gender exclusion helped construct past forms of political solidarity.12 Moreover, the working class has never been a truly homogeneous and “universal class”; its identity and consciousness are constructed in complex ways that reflect the intersectionality of race, class, gender, and sexuality and the role that ideology and culture play in social life.¶ Yet, absent a revival of a pluralist, majoritarian left it is hard to imagine how difference can be institutionalized in an egalitarian manner. Theorists of difference are, in some ways, blind to the reality that difference (or “diversity”) can be—and is being—institutionalized on a radically inegalitarian social terrain, in which some social groups have much more power and opportunity than others. This blind spot mimics the weaknesses of the liberal pluralist theory that dominated political science in the 1950s and 1960s. Then, radical theorists pointed out that liberal pluralist society failed to be fully democratic because some groups had inordinate economic and political power as compared to their small numbers within the demos.13 Today, the same critique of difference can be made.¶ Post-structuralist theorists' focus on the performative resistance of decentered, mutable selves also fails to recognize that the performative options of working-class individuals, persons of color, women, and gays and lesbians are constrained by the structural distribution of racial, economic, and gendered forms of power. Thus, if the performative options of the vast majority are to be enhanced, left theorists have to recover a politics and practice of solidarity and democratic equality; concepts which neither a pure politics of difference nor an agonal politics of post-structuralist radical democracy can adequately ground.

## Off-2

#### The 1AC should have came with a trigger warning- Vote Neg

Louise McCudden, 3- ’12 (“Trigger warnings are nothing to do with censorship. They give people more choice, not less.”, The F word Blog)

It's a small but important win in terms of awareness for the causes of both feminism and mental health that "trigger warnings" are now reasonably common online. Yet they're not used by the majority of bloggers, and show no real signs of moving beyond the blogosphere. Not only that, but they are often met with curious levels of resistance, even derision, from entirely sensible, compassionate people. It matters a great deal, and we should say so, because trigger warnings are invaluable. They allow a little bit of control over what you choose to look at; enough to make all the difference between participating in communities, discussions, blogs, and other life-changing support networks, or avoiding them. Support networks are lost to victims, and important voices of experience are lost to the support networks.¶ "Triggering", of course, usually happens as a symptom of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Anyone suffering from PTSD - whether they've been officially diagnosed with it or not - will understand what "triggering" is immediately, but the more painful the trigger, the worse it is to explain, so we're often left with a vague argument about "offensive topics" versus "freedom of speech" which is, although interesting, almost entirely irrelevant to trigger warnings.¶ A call for trigger warnings is not indicative of moral outrage, humour failure, or a plea for censorship. Triggering is more like a chemical reaction, or a phobia, than personal distaste. It's not moral, or emotional. It's medical.¶ Sometimes it's explained like this. If there's a trauma you've had trouble processing, vivid depictions of similar traumas can remind you of it. Well, yes, they can. But this, while horrible, isn't quite what triggering is. When something triggers repressed memories, they stream into your consciousness without your consent. It doesn't just remind of you what happened; it actually makes you re-live it. You feel like you're experiencing the incident again, in real life - until it stops.¶ It's nothing to do with being offended, or having hurt feelings. If you suffer from PTSD, you probably handle being extraordinarily "upset" most days without so much as a sneeze. But the impact of being hit with an unexpected trigger is much worse than being "upset." You might feel sick. You might get a migraine. You might shut down emotionally, you not be able to stay in control of your temper, or your tears. You might black out momentarily, or even forget who, or where, you are. When that happens in a controlled environment or in a safe place with people you trust it's bad enough but if it's happening in the middle of the street, or in a meeting, or when you're standing on the tube with strangers in your personal space, or on a date, or in a job interview, or when you're babysitting, or when you're driving, or...?¶ Identifying something as a potential likely trigger is not the same as passing a moral judgment, and nor is it a call for the item to be censored. Writers who handle an issue like rape sympathetically and intelligently still often choose to carry trigger warnings, because they know that acknowledging a potential trigger is not a value judgment on the content. You can absolutely love something, but still find it triggers for you.¶ And content warnings aren't a radical concept. Films, video games, even music albums carry advisory labels; news readers tell you if the report coming up might distress you, so it's not like we don't already understand and accept the idea anyway. ¶ All trigger warnings do is acknowledge that there are different sorts of horror, and they're not all measurable by things like age. If a record label is going to warn me that Eminem will use a swear word, why not warn me that he's going to depict a rape scene? If Facebook is going to protect people from breastfeeding images in case we find those offensive, surely they could warn us if we're about to click on a page with vivid rape stories, in case that makes us unwell? ¶ So trigger warnings are nothing to do with censorship. If anything, they're the opposite of censorship. If you're interested in free choice and free speech, then trigger warnings are a way to protect those principles. Giving people a trigger warning is simply giving them information. Not giving one because you didn't think of it or didn't know about them is different - I've done that myself. But knowing about them, and choosing not to use them, because you have an idea in your head about censorship and freedom? That's just deliberately denying people information that might help them make an important choice. And there are loads of reasons why people might do that, of course. But none of them have anything to do with freedom.

## Case

#### The 1AC’s calls for inclusion and accessibility are nothing more than the production and assimilation of otherness. This creates a violent form of identification whereby the other becomes an object of manipulation, another commodity in the economy of symbolic change.

**Baudrillard 93** (Jean, “Otherness Surgery”, found on page 51 in “Screened Out”,)[rkezios]

With modernity, we enter the age of the production of the Other. The aim is no longer to kill the Other, devour it, seduce it, vie with it, love it or hate it, but, in the first instance, to produce it. The Other is no longer an object of passion, but an object of production. Perhaps, in its radical otherness or its irreducible singularity, the Other has become dangerous or unbearable, and its seductive power has to be exorcized?

Or perhaps, quite simply, otherness and the dual relation progressively disappear with the rise of individual values and the destruction of symbolic ones? The fact remains that otherness does come to be in short supply and, if we are not to live otherness as destiny, the other has to be produced imperatively as difference. This goes for the world as much as for the body, sex and social relations. It is to escape the world as destiny, the body as destiny, sex (and the opposite sex) as destiny, that the production of the other as difference will be invented. For example, sexual differ- ence: each sex with its anatomical and psychological characteristics, with its own desire and all the irresolvable consequences that ensue, including the ideology of sex and the Utopia of a difference based both in right and in nature. None of this has any meaning in seduction, where it is a question not of desire but of a game with desire, and where it is a question not of the equality of the sexes or the alienation of the one by the other, since game-playing involves a perfect reciprocity of part- ners (not difference and alienation, but otherness and complicity). Seduction is as far from hysteria as can be. Neither of the sexes projects its sexuality on to the other; the distances are given; otherness is intact - it is the very condition of that higher illusion that is play with desire. However, with the coming of the nineteenth century and Romanticism, a mas- culine hysteria comes into play and with it a change in the sexual paradigm, which we must once again situate within the more general, universal framework of the change in the paradigm of otherness. In this hysterical phase, it was, so to speak, the femininity of man which pro- jected itself on to woman and shaped her as an ideal figure in his image. In Romantic love, the aim was not now to conquer the woman, to seduce her, but to create her from the inside, to invent her, in some cases as achieved Utopian vision, as idealized woman, in others as jemme jatale, as star - another hysterical, supernat- ural metaphor. The Romantic Eros can be credited with having invented this ideal of harmony, of loving fusion, this ideal of an almost incestuous form of twin beings — the woman as projective resurrection of the same, w h o assumes her super- natural form only as ideal of the same, an artefact doomed henceforth to Vamour ox, in other words, to a pathos of the ideal resemblance of beings and sexes - a pathetic confusion which substitutes for the dual otherness of seduction. T h e whole mechanics of the erotic changes meaning, for the erotic attraction which previously arose out of otherness, out of the strangeness of the Other, now finds its stimulus in sameness - in similarity and resemblance. Auto-eroticism, incest? No. Rather a hypostasis of the Same. Of the same eyeing up the other, investing itself in the other, alienating itself in the other - but the other is only ever the ephemeral form of a difference which brings me closer to me. This indeed is why, with Romantic love and all its current spin-offs, sexuality becomes connected with death: it is because it becomes connected with incest and its destiny - even in banalized form (for we are no longer speaking of mythic, tragic incest here; with modern eroticism we are dealing with a secondary incestuous form - of the protection of the same in the image of the other - which amounts to a confusion and corruption of all images). We have here then, in the end, the invention of a femininity which renders woman superfluous. The invention of a difference which is merely a roundabout copulation with its double. And which, at bottom, renders any encounter with otherness impossible (it would be interesting to know whether there was not any hysterical quid pro quo from the feminine in the construction of a virile, phallic mythology; feminism being one such example of the hystericization of the mas- culine in woman, of the hysterical projection of her masculinity in the exact image of the hysterical projection by man of his femininity into a mythical image of woman). However, there still remains a dissymmetry in this enforced assignment to dif- ference. This is why I have contended, paradoxically, that man is more different from woman than woman is from man. I mean that, within the framework of sexual dif- ference, man is merely different, whereas in woman there remains something of the radical otherness which precedes the debased status of difference. In short, in this process of extrapolation of the Same into the production of the Other, of hysterical invention of the sexual other as twin sister or brother (if the twin theme is so prominent today, that is because it reflects this mode of libidinal cloning), the sexes become progressively assimilated to each other. This develops from difference to lesser difference through to the point of role-reversal and the vir- tual non-differentiation of the sexes. And it ends up making sexuality a useless function. In cloning, for example, pointlessly sexed beings are going to be repro- duced, since sexuality is no longer needed for their reproduction. If the real woman seems to disappear in this hysterical invention of the feminine (though she has other means of resisting this), in this invention of sexual difference, in which the masculine occupies the privileged pole from the outset, and in which all the feminist struggles will merely reassert that insoluble privilege or difference, we must recognize too that masculine desire also becomes entirely problematical since it is able only to project itself into another in its image and, in this way, render itself purely speculative. So all the nonsense about the phallus and male sexual priv- ilege, etc. needs revising. There is a kind of transcendent justice which means that, in this process of sexual differentiation which culminates inexorably in non- differentiation, the two sexes each lose as much of their singularity and their otherness. This is the era of the Transsexual, in which all the conflicts connected with this sexual difference carry on long after any real sexuality, any real alterity of the sexes, has disappeared. Each individual repeats on his or her own body this (successful?) takeover of the feminine by masculine projection hysteria. The body is identified and appropriated as a self-projection, and no longer as otherness and destiny. In the facial features, in sex, in sickness and death, identity is constantly being altered. You can do nothing about that. It is destiny. But this is precisely what has to be warded off at all costs in the identification of the body, the individual appropriation of the body, of your desire, your appearance, your image: plastic surgery on all fronts. For if the body is no longer a site of otherness, of a dual relation, if it is a site of identification, then you have urgently to reconcile yourself with it, to repair it, perfect it, turn it into an ideal object. Everyone treats his/her body as man treats woman in the projective identification we have described: he invests it as a fetish in a desperate attempt at self-identification. The body becomes an object of autistic worship, of an almost incestuous manipulation. And it is the body's resemblance to its model which becomes a source of eroticism and unconsummated self-seduction, insofar as it vir- tually excludes the Other and is the best means of excluding any seduction from elsewhere. Many other things relate also to this production of the Other - a hysterical, spec- ulative production. Racism is one example, in its development throughout the modern era and its current recrudescence. Logically, it ought to have declined with progress and the spread of Enlightenment. But the more we learn how unfounded the genetic theory of race is, the more racism intensifies. This is because we are dealing with an artificial construction of the Other, on the basis of an erosion of the singularity of cultures (of their otherness one to another) and entry into the fetish- istic system of difference. So long as there is otherness, alienness and a (possibly violent) dual relation, there is no racism properly so called. That is to say, roughly, up to the eighteenth century, as anthropological accounts attest. Once this 'natural' relation is lost, we enter upon an exponential relation with an artificial Other. And there is nothing in our culture with which we can stamp out racism, since the entire movement of that culture is towards a fanatical differential construction of the Other, and a perpetual extrapolation of the Same through the Other. Autistic cul- ture posing as altruism. We talk of alienation. But the worst alienation is not being dispossessed by the other, but being dispossessed of the other: it is having to produce the other in the absence of the other, and so continually to be thrown back on oneself and one's own image. If, today, we are condemned to our image (to cultivate our bodies, our 'looks', our identities, our desires), this is not because of alienation, but because of the end of alienation and the virtual disappearance of the other, which is a much worse fate. In fact, the definition of alienation is to take oneself as one's focus, as one's object of care, desire, suffering and communication. This definitive short-circuiting of the other ushers in the era of transparency. Plastic surgery becomes universal. And the surgery performed on the face and the body is merely the symptom of a more rad- ical surgery: that performed on otherness and destiny. What is the solution? There is no solution to this erotic trend within an entire culture; to this fascination, this whirl of denial of otherness, of all that is alien and negative; to this foreclosing of evil and this reconciliation around the Same and its multiple figures: incest, autism, twinship, cloning. All we can do is remind ourselves that seduction lies in non-reconciliation with the other, in preserving the alien status of the Other. One must not be reconciled with oneself or with one's body. One must not be reconciled with the other, one must not be reconciled with nature, one must not be reconciled with the feminine (that goes for women too). Therein lies the secret of a strange attraction.

## 2nc

### Neolib

#### Neoliberalism prevents radical critique in the university setting

Feigenbaum Professor of Media and Politics at Bournemouth University ‘7 (Anna, “The Teachable Moment: Feminist Pedagogy and the Neoliberal Classroom,” *Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies (29) 4*, 337-349, Mike)

Canadian scholar Elizabeth Brule ́ argues in her 2004 essay, ‘‘Going to the Market,’’ that the corporatization of the university has led to the construction of students as rational, economic decision makers. As Brule ́ argues, ‘‘The only choices considered rational, however, are those that increase one’s employment opportunities within the strict confines of the labour market.’’ 1 Brule ́ further cites this construction as the cause for students’ disengagement with critical pedagogy. The corporatization of the university, she suggests, makes it increasingly difficult for educators to foster feminist and anti-racist perspectives. 2 Competition, self-sufficiency and strident individualism — which are both the symptoms and disease of neoliberalism — appear entirely at odds with the overthrow of power relations. Trapped within a neoliberal agenda, students come to disavow any connection with radical critique. 3

#### Conversely - The alternative ruptures neoliberalism in the university setting

Feigenbaum Professor of Media and Politics at Bournemouth University ‘7 (Anna, “The Teachable Moment: Feminist Pedagogy and the Neoliberal Classroom,” *Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies (29) 4*, 337-349, Mike)

This question of ‘‘conditions’’ is precisely what is at stake in the scenes I have discussed. At the junctures of risk and vulnerability, at the sites of pain and anxiety, what we are able to exchange in spite of — and with spite toward — neoliberalism, is not only a nomadic or temporary escape. Rather, the exchanges of the teachable moment flow back into and again outside of the classroom, imagining and creating conditions for ethical relations and critical consciousness. It is this transitional movement of knowledge that ruptures the logic of the increasingly corporatized classroom, challenging neoliberal ideologies which seek to dictate fictions of fleshless and touch-free, economically rational relations between student and teacher. Thus, by simultaneously confronting the corporatization of our classrooms and engaging the creative risk of encounter, we are sometimes able to move — in writing and also in flesh — the effects of these teachable moments.

#### Star this evidence on your flow – the alternative solves the case – neoliberalism is what prevents single black mothers from receiving any type of welfare AND it’s the ultimate risk to their children – even if we cannot capture their performance we solve the impact of the 1AC

Bezusko 10-4-13 (A., “Constructing the Monstrous Black Mother: How the War on Welfare was Won,” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Studies Association Annual Meeting, Puerto Rico Convention Center and the Caribe Hilton., San Juan, Puerto Rico, Mike)

The War on Welfare (1980-1996) understood poverty through culture, but with the rise of neoliberal economic policies pathology re-emerges to explain why people chose poverty over economic freedom. Conservatives began to use the discourse of freedom to their advantage, and linked freedom to the free market—only those who work and consume are truly “free.” Welfare was no longer about meeting the basic needs of the poor, but, rather, about dependence (un-freedom) on the state for care. One could not be “free” economically or psychologically without entering the wage labor system. As David Harvey notes, the free market was idealized as “liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills [through] strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. ” As such, the War on Welfare narrowed our ideological constructions of freedom to market freedom, the freedom to work, and the freedom to own and control private property. The War on Welfare solidified the turn of national discourses on poverty as “cultural,” a code word for race in policy studies, and feminized. The end of welfare as we know it, the slogan of the War on Welfare, was about ending Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) (specifically un-married black mothers) while Social Security, unemployment insurance, workman’s compensation or veteran’s benefits were reframed as (male) entitlements. The female-headed family was understood through what it needed—a male figurehead that would provide economic security. This need, a mark of un-freedom, would be constructed for popular consumption through the monstrous welfare mother. These neoliberal discourses of freedom appear in popular novels, also made into films, such as Sapphire’s Push where the ultimate danger for children is having mothers who are not neo-liberally “free.” For the purposes of this presentation I will first discuss the emergence of the Welfare Queen in political and social scientific discourse during the War on Welfare as both domestic and international policy during the Reagan era. I will argue that Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s assertion that “A country that does not take care of its domestic problems is not going to have an effective position abroad” is crucial in understanding the emergence and the contours of the Welfare Queen. Indeed, according to hegemonic political and social science discourses those who did not succeed given the benefits of the free market did so by choice or individual pathology, and because of the strong link between the free market and American identity the racial makeup of the Welfare Queen was an instrumental facet in constructing the image of the un-American woman, and the un-American family. I will then turn to how and why the stereotypical Welfare Queen re-emerges in the “post-racial,” Obama era to serve as an ideological reminder of the infinite possibilities for social uplift that reifies the free market as guarantor of individual freedom.

### A2: Perm

#### And, this makes all of their impacts inevitable – performative resistance is coopted by socioeconomic authority – our material stance against neoliberalism is key

Joseph M. Schwartz, 8-9-13 (Professor of Political Science at Temple University. Schwartz's teaching and published work focuses on the complex interaction among morality, ideology, and political and institutional development., “A Peculiar Blind Spot: Why did Radical Political Theory Ignore the Rampant Rise in Inequality Over the Past Thirty Years?”, Volume 35, Issue 3, 2013, Special Issue: Studying Politics Today: Critical Approaches to Political Science)

Many commentators note that neither Brown nor Butler analyze how social and group dynamics contribute to the constitution of the self. 26 Butler holds that resistance can only come through an “ironic” and subversive choice to “perform” outside the iteratively performed social norms that enable and constitute the subject.27 Such a conception not only raises the now traditional question of whether she can define who is “the doer behind the deed” of resistance; it also conjures up an ironic parallel between the methodological (“anti”) individualist nature of Butler's world of discursively constructed subjects and Rawls's methodological individualist rational chooser. Communitarians and deliberative democrats frequently criticize Rawls for deducing rules of justice from the representative thinking of one deracinated and de-sexed ideal chooser operating in the original position and behind the veil of ignorance. In a similar manner, Butler's performative resister appears to be a representative (yet incoherent) subject whose repertoire of ironic, performative resistance seems to draw upon disembodied discourse. Thus, it seems as if one incoherent self can represent all incoherent selves. The alleged freedom of the transgressive self also strikingly mirrors the neoliberal conception of the free chooser in the marketplace, whose freedom is allegedly unconstrained by any structural barriers such as class domination.¶ But, in reality, discursive performance is not the sole manner by which individuals negotiate the material, cultural, and structural realities that both empower and constrain individuals. For example, individuals cannot readily discursively perform themselves out of their socio-economic or class position. There is a certain materiality to poverty or to being subject to the authority and discipline of a boss that cannot simply be ironically and performatively resisted. Class and other forms of gender and racial power relations are structural, as well as discursive. Even the “parodic” possibilities of gender reversal are constrained by the communities in which one resides. Is the reversal of drag a viable public possibility in a violently homophobic community?

#### Confronting neolib is a pre-requisite to forming anti-racial coalitions – the perm gets coopted by ruling elites

Pink ’10 (“’Neoliberal Anti-Racism’ is an Oxymoron,” October 1, <http://pink-scare.blogspot.com/2010/10/neoliberal-anti-racism.html>, Mike)

A purportedly "anti-racist" neoliberal politics is nothing of the sort. The two projects, anti-racism on the one hand, and neoliberalism on the other, are worlds apart. Properly understood, there can be no reconciliation between them. Are there people who will nonetheless claim that they are for abolishing racism, though they are neoliberals? Sure. But what does that prove? It proves only one thing: that there are people out there who have false beliefs about what the relationship between racism and neoliberalism is. Since we're talking about racism here, let's focus the discussion. Let's stick with the experience of Black people in the US. At every point in US history, anti-racist struggle has been multifaceted, diverse in terms of tactics and aims, and mixed in its level of militancy. Some currents have offered flawed analyses, some offered a mixed bag of effective resistance but facile conclusions about what liberation would consist in. This is true of the history of every movement against oppression, by the way. To be sure, there have been many false starts and wrong turns in the movement for Black liberation in this country. There are the Thomas Sowells and Booker T. Washingtons peppered throughout history. But it hardly follows that any one person who merely purports to struggle against racism has had the last word on what Black liberation requires. That should be something for which one has to argue. And my sense is that, once we get the arguments straight here, the situation in the contemporary United States is such that racism and capitalism are deeply intertwined, with the consequence that one cannot be overturned without the destruction of the other. There are many reasons for this. First, racism is exacerbated and consolidated by neoliberalism. Because the bare-knuckles capitalism of neoliberalism is anti-democratic, hostile to social spending of any kind, devoted to eviscerating the public sector, etc. it is impossible to redress the deep structural and institutional basis of historical disparities within neoliberalism. That means that redressing the deep racial disparities in the US is foreclosed as a possibility as long as we have no means to meet people's needs by way of redistribution, increased social expenditure, etc. In our society, peoples needs are subordinated to the demands of capital accumulation for the rich. That is no recipe for abolishing the deep inequalities that persist between white and black people on average. Second, racism functions to stabilize and legitimize capitalist social relations. That is, the ruling class has often stoked racism in order to divide and conquer. Moreover, the exploitation of oppressed populations has often proved to better maximize the profits of Capital. Capital thrives by seizing upon and exploiting social misery all over the globe; this is what the iron law of profit demands. Furthermore, it is clear that it simply will not be possible to build the kind of broad movement all working people need to fight against Capital if racism continues to divide us and subjugate some to the power of others. This isn't a zero-sum game. It's not as though fighting racism means further impoverishing poor whites. To think that is to buy the racist kool-aid pedalled by the proto-fascists in the Tea Bagger movement. The opposite is in fact true: a stronger, more confident movement to abolish racial hierarchies would necessary require redistribution, resistance to the logic of profit, etc.... in short, things that are to the benefit to all workers. Third, if one is serious about Black people fighting against racist oppression, then one cannot simply think it's sufficient to have a couple of token Black persons sitting in high positions. If one is serious about Black liberation itself, then one is serious about liberating all Black people, i.e. emancipating the masses of Black people in this country from oppression. That is a necessarily egalitarian political goal, which is ipso facto anti-capitalist. Capitalism is sustained by isolating individuals from one another, convincing them that they are merely consumers who vote with their dollars, etc. When someone starts talking about organizing large swaths of people for a project of collective liberation from oppression... one has departed from path blazed by the individualism of capitalism and neoliberalism in particular. Fourth, the ruling capitalist mythologies about "pulling oneself up by their bootstraps" help to solidify and further entrench racism. As long as structural and historical oppression and exploitation is widely blamed on the victim due to their "lack of character", "work ethic", or "culture of poverty", then we will not be in a position to fight capitalism or racism. As long as the historical and social dimensions of human life are blotted out in favor of capitalist fantasies about "personal responsibility", we will not be in a position to achieve justice of any robust sort.

#### Anti-race criticisms legitimize neoliberal economics – star this evidence – it proves the neg method is mutually exclusive with the affirmative

Sunkara and Michaels Professor of English at University of Illinois Jan. ’11 (Bhaskar and Walter, “Let Them Eat Diversity,” <http://jacobinmag.com/2011/01/let-them-eat-diversity/>, Mike)

Though he might not appreciate the cliché, Walter Benn Michaels is no stranger to controversy. In the early 1980s he wrote a series of articles with Steven Knapp entitled “Against Theory,” in which it was argued that literary works meant only what their authors intended them to mean. He created a stir beyond the Ivory Tower with a 2006 book, The Trouble with Diversity, premised around the idea that a focus on cultural diversity at the expense of economic equality has stunted resistance to neoliberalism. Bhaskar Sunkara: Neoliberalism is often presented as a unified, homogenous ideology, but you differentiate between “left” and “right” neoliberalisms — what’s the difference and which one dominates American politics today? Walter Benn Michaels: The differentiation between left and right neoliberalism doesn’t really undermine the way it which it is deeply unified in its commitment to competitive markets and to the state’s role in maintaining competitive markets. For me the distinction is that “left neoliberals” are people who don’t understand themselves as neoliberals. They think that their commitments to anti-racism, to anti-sexism, to anti-homophobia constitute a critique of neoliberalism. But if you look at the history of the idea of neoliberalism you can see fairly quickly that neoliberalism arises as a kind of commitment precisely to those things. One of the first major works of neoliberal economics by an American is Becker’s [The] Economics of Discrimination, which is designed precisely to show that in competitive economies you can’t afford to discriminate. Foucault sort of marks the beginning of neoliberalism in Europe with the horror at what the Nazi state did and the recognition that you can legitimize the state in a much more satisfactory manner by making it the guardian of competitive markets rather than the guardian of the German volk. And today’s orthodoxy is the idea that social justice consists above all in defense of property and the attack of discrimination. This is at the heart of neoliberalism and right-wing neoliberals understand this and left-wing neoliberals don’t. BKS: What’s at the heart of your work is that equal-opportunity exploitation is what we’re moving towards, or at the very least it’s an ideological goal of the ruling class. So, what explains the shift in the way capital has historically acted — using racial and ethnic divisions to better exploit the working class? WBM: Well, I think there’s absolutely no question that is true. Capitalism throughout the 19th century and through much of the 20th was classically imperialist, which is basically impossible without racism, without a massive commitment to what amounted to European-American White supremacy. But one of the things that’s become obvious — leaving the racism question aside, leaving the discrimination question more generally aside, — is that the condition of capital changed fairly radically in the 20th century. Of course, people have different accounts of why that is. Even those on the Left who agree that the falling rate of profit is central don’t agree on whether it’s a structural necessity or a contingent development. But almost everyone agrees that neoliberalism involved internationalization in a way that cannot be reduced to what imperialism was before and that it involved, above all, a kind of powerful necessity for mobility not of only of capital, but of labor. Stalin famously won the argument but lost the war over whether there could be socialism in one country, but no one has ever been under the impression for more than a millisecond that there could be neoliberalism in only one country. An easy way to look at this would be to say that the conditions of mobility of labor and mobility of capital have since World War II required an extraordinary upsurge in immigration. The foreign born population in the U.S today is something like 38 million people, which is roughly equivalent to the entire population of Poland. This is a function of matching the mobility of capital with the mobility of labor, and when you begin to produce these massive multi-racial or multi-national or as we would call them today multi-cultural workforces, you obviously need technologies to manage these work forces. In the U.S. this all began in a kind of powerful way with the Immigration Act of 1965, which in effect repudiated the explicit racism of the Immigration Act of the 1924 and replaced it with largely neoliberal criteria. Before, whether you could come to the U.S. was based almost entirely on racial or, to use the then-preferred term, “national” criteria. I believe that, for example, the quota on Indian immigration to the U.S. in 1925 was 100. I don’t know the figure on Indian immigration to the U.S. since 1965 off-hand, but 100 is probably about an hour and a half of that in a given year. The anti-racism that involves is obviously a good thing, but it was enacted above all to admit people who benefited the economy of the U.S. They are often sort of high-end labor, doctors, lawyers, and businessmen of various kinds. The Asian immigration of the 70s and 80s involved a high proportion of people who had upper and upper-middle class status in their countries of origin and who quickly resumed that middle and upper middle class status in the U.S. While at the same time we’ve had this increased immigration from Mexico, people from the lower-end of the economy, filling jobs that otherwise cannot be filled—or at least not filled at the price capital would prefer to pay. So there is a certain sense in which the internationalism intrinsic to the neoliberal process requires a form of anti-racism and indeed neoliberalism has made very good use of the particular form we’ve evolved, multiculturalism, in two ways. First, there isn’t a single US corporation that doesn’t have an HR office committed to respecting the differences between cultures, to making sure that your culture is respected whether or not your standard of living is. And, second, multiculturalism and diversity more generally are even more effective as a legitimizing tool, because they suggest that the ultimate goal of social justice in a neoliberal economy is not that there should be less difference between the rich and the poor—indeed the rule in neoliberal economies is that the difference between the rich and the poor gets wider rather than shrinks—but that no culture should be treated invidiously and that it’s basically OK if economic differences widen as long as the increasingly successful elites come to look like the increasingly unsuccessful non-elites. So the model of social justice is not that the rich don’t make as much and the poor make more, the model of social justice is that the rich make whatever they make, but an appropriate percentage of them are minorities or women. That’s a long answer to your question, but it is a serious question and the essence of the answer is precisely that internationalization, the new mobility of both capital and labor, has produced a contemporary anti-racism that functions as a legitimization of capital rather than as resistance or even critique.

#### Neoliberalism commoditizes academic discussions about race – this results in a silencing and terminal exclusion of the aff

Giroux Global TV Network Chair in Communication @ McMaster University 7-22-13 (Henry, “The Violence of Organized Forgetting,” *Communication Education (52)*, Issue 3-4, pgs. 191-211, Mike)

America has become amnesiac - a country in which forms of historical, political, and moral forgetting are not only willfully practiced but celebrated. The United States has degenerated into a social order that is awash in public stupidity and views critical thought as both a liability and a threat. Not only is this obvious in the presence of a celebrity culture that embraces the banal and idiotic, but also in the prevailing discourses and policies of a range of politicians and anti-public intellectuals who believe that the legacy of the Enlightenment needs to be reversed. Politicians such as Michelle Bachmann, Rick Santorum and Newt Gingrich along with talking heads such as Bill O'Reilly, Glenn Beck and Anne Coulter are not the problem, they are symptomatic of a much more disturbing assault on critical thought, if not rational thinking itself. Under a neoliberal regime, the language of authority, power and command is divorced from ethics, social responsibility, critical analysis and social costs. These anti-public intellectuals are part of a disimagination machine that solidifies the power of the rich and the structures of the military-industrial-surveillance-academic complex by presenting the ideologies, institutions and relations of the powerful as commonsense.[1] For instance, the historical legacies of resistance to racism, militarism, privatization and panoptical surveillance have long been forgotten and made invisible in the current assumption that Americans now live in a democratic, post-racial society. The cheerleaders for neoliberalism work hard to normalize dominant institutions and relations of power through a vocabulary and public pedagogy that create market-driven subjects, modes of consciousness, and ways of understanding the world that promote accommodation, quietism and passivity. Social solidarities are torn apart, furthering the retreat into orbits of the private that undermine those spaces that nurture non-commodified knowledge, values, critical exchange and civic literacy. The pedagogy of authoritarianism is alive and well in the United States, and its repression of public memory takes place not only through the screen culture and institutional apparatuses of conformity, but is also reproduced through a culture of fear and a carceral state that imprisons more people than any other country in the world.[2] What many commentators have missed in the ongoing attack on Edward Snowden is not that he uncovered information that made clear how corrupt and intrusive the American government has become - how willing it is to engage in vast crimes against the American public. His real "crime" is that he demonstrated how knowledge can be used to empower people, to get them to think as critically engaged citizens rather than assume that knowledge and education are merely about the learning of skills - a reductive concept that substitutes training for education and reinforces the flight from reason and the goose-stepping reflexes of an authoritarian mindset.[3] Since the late1970s, there has been an intensification in the United States, Canada and Europe of neoliberal modes of governance, ideology and policies - a historical period in which the foundations for democratic public spheres have been dismantled. Schools, public radio, the media and other critical cultural apparatuses have been under siege, viewed as dangerous to a market-driven society that considers critical thought, dialogue, and civic engagement a threat to its basic values, ideologies, and structures of power. This was the beginning of an historical era in which the discourse of democracy, public values, and the common good came crashing to the ground. Margaret Thatcher in Britain and soon after Ronald Reagan in the United States - both hard-line advocates of market fundamentalism - announced that there was no such thing as society and that government was the problem not the solution. Democracy and the political process were all but sacrificed to the power of corporations and the emerging financial service industries, just as hope was appropriated as an advertisement for a whitewashed world in which the capacity of culture to critique oppressive social practices was greatly diminished. Large social movements fragmented into isolated pockets of resistance mostly organized around a form of identity politics that largely ignored a much-needed conversation about the attack on the social and the broader issues affecting society such as the growing inequality in wealth, power and income. What is particularly new is the way in which young people have been increasingly denied a significant place in an already weakened social contract and the degree to which they are absent from how many countries now define the future. Youth are no longer the place where society reveals its dreams. Instead, youth are becoming the site of society's nightmares. Within neoliberal narratives, youth are mostly defined as a consumer market, a drain on the economy, or stand for trouble.[4] Young people increasingly have become subject to an oppressive disciplinary machine that teaches them to define citizenship through the exchange practices of the market and to follow orders and toe the line in the face of oppressive forms of authority. They are caught in a society in which almost every aspect of their lives is shaped by the dual forces of the market and a growing police state. The message is clear: Buy/ sell/ or be punished. Mostly out of step, young people, especially poor minorities and low-income whites, are increasingly inscribed within a machinery of dead knowledge, social relations and values in which there is an attempt to render them voiceless and invisible. How young people are represented betrays a great deal about what is increasingly new about the economic, social, cultural and political constitution of American society and its growing disinvestment in young people, the social state and democracy itself.[5] The structures of neoliberal violence have put the vocabulary of democracy on life support, and one consequence is that subjectivity and education are no longer the lifelines of critical forms of individual and social agency. The promises of modernity regarding progress, freedom and hope have not been eliminated; they have been reconfigured, stripped of their emancipatory potential and relegated to the logic of a savage market instrumentality. Modernity has reneged on its promise to young people to provide social mobility, stability and collective security. Long-term planning and the institutional structures that support them are now relegated to the imperatives of privatization, deregulation, flexibility and short-term profits. Social bonds have given way under the collapse of social protections and the attack on the welfare state. Moreover, all solutions to socially produced problems are now relegated to the mantra of individual solutions.[6] Public problems collapse into the limited and depoliticized register of private issues. Individual interests now trump any consideration of the good of society just as all problems are ultimately laid at the door of the solitary individual, whose fate is shaped by forces far beyond his or her capacity for personal responsibility. Under neoliberalism everyone has to negotiate their fate alone, bearing full responsibility for problems that are often not of their own doing. The implications politically, economically and socially for young people are disastrous and are contributing to the emergence of a generation of young people who will occupy a space of social abandonment and terminal exclusion. Job insecurity, debt servitude, poverty, incarceration and a growing network of real and symbolic violence have entrapped too many young people in a future that portends zero opportunities and zero hopes. This is a generation that has become the new register for disposability, redundancy, and new levels of surveillance and control. The severity and consequences of this shift in modernity under neoliberalism among youth is evident in the fact that this is the first generation in which the "plight of the outcast may stretch to embrace a whole generation."[7] Zygmunt Bauman argues that today's youth have been "cast in a condition of liminal drift, with no way of knowing whether it is transitory or permanent."[8] That is, the generation of youth in the early 21st century has no way of grasping if they will ever "be free from the gnawing sense of the transience, indefiniteness, and provisional nature of any settlement."[9] Neoliberal violence produced in part through a massive shift in wealth to the upper 1%, growing inequality, the reign of the financial service industries, the closing down of educational opportunities, and the stripping of social protections from those marginalized by race and class has produced a generation without jobs, an independent life and even the most minimal social benefits. Youth no longer inhabit the privileged space, however compromised, that was offered to previous generations. They now occupy a neoliberal notion of temporality of dead time, zones of abandonment and terminal exclusion marked by a loss of faith in progress and a belief in those apocalyptic narratives in which the future appears indeterminate, bleak and insecure. Progressive visions pale and are smashed next to the normalization of market-driven government policies that wipe out pensions, eliminate quality health care, punish unions, demonize public servants, raise college tuition, and produce a harsh world of joblessness - all the while giving billions and "huge bonuses, instead of prison sentences . . . to those bankers and investment brokers who were responsible for the 2008 meltdown of the economy and the loss of homes for millions of Americans."[10] Students, in particular, now find themselves in a world in which heightened expectations have been replaced by dashed hopes. The promises of higher education and previously enviable credentials have turned into the swindle of fulfillment as, "For the first time in living memory, the whole class of graduates faces a future of crushing debt, and a high probability, almost the certainty, of ad hoc, temporary, insecure and part-time work and unpaid 'trainee' pseudo-jobs deceitfully rebranded as 'practices' - all considerably below the skills they have acquired and eons below the level of their expectations." [11] What has changed about an entire generation of young people includes not only neoliberal society's disinvestment in youth and the lasting fate of downward mobility, but also the fact that youth live in a commercially carpet-bombed and commodified environment that is unlike anything experienced by those of previous generations. Nothing has prepared this generation for the inhospitable and savage new world of commodification, privatization, joblessness, frustrated hopes and stillborn projects. [12] Commercials provide the primary content for their dreams, relations to others, identities and sense of agency. There appears to be no space outside the panoptican of commercial barbarism and casino capitalism. The present generation has been born into a throwaway society of consumers in which both goods and young people are increasingly objectified and disposable. Young people now reside in a world in which there are few public spheres or social spaces autonomous from the reach of the market, warfare state, debtfare, and sprawling tentacles of what is ominously called the Department of Homeland Security. The structures of neoliberal modernity do more than disinvest in young people and commodify them, they also transform the protected space of childhood into a zone of disciplinary exclusion and cruelty, especially for those young people further marginalized by race and class who now inhabit a social landscape in which they are increasingly disparaged as flawed consumers or pathologized others. With no adequate role to play as consumers, many youth are now considered disposable, forced to inhabit "zones of social abandonment" extending from homeless shelters and bad schools to bulging detention centers and prisons.[13] In the midst of the rise of the punishing state, the circuits of state repression, surveillance, and disposability increasingly "link the fate of blacks, Latinos, Native Americans, poor whites, and Asian Americans" who are now caught in a governing-through-crime-youth complex, which increasingly serves as a default solution to major social problems.[14] As Michael Hart and Antonio Negri point out, young people live in a society in which every institution becomes an "inspection regime" - recording, watching, gathering information and storing data.[15] Complementing these regimes is the shadow of the prison, which is no longer separated from society as an institution of total surveillance. Instead, "total surveillance is increasingly the general condition of society as a whole. 'The prison,' " Michel Foucault notes, "begins well before its doors. It begins as soon as you leave your house - and even before."[16]

## 1NR

### Trigger Warning

#### Here’s a good analogy

Evalilth, No Date (http://fuckyeahtriggerwarnings.tumblr.com)

I’m sure this has been said somewhere on the internet before, but I don’t see it here, and I find it to be a really helpful analogy

Being triggered is like having an allergic reaction.¶ A good description of an allergic reaction (speaking as someone who has a food sensitivity) is an involuntary reaction to a substance which can vary from severe discomfort to serious debilitation and endangerment. Change ‘a substance’ to ‘content’ and that’s pretty much a description of being triggered. The reaction is psychological rather than physical (although it can, of course, have physical symptoms), but it is just as serious and just as involuntary.¶ This is why trigger warnings are needed. Do you tell someone with a food allergy to ‘just deal’ with an exposure to the allergen? Do you say they’re overreacting when they want food to be labeled so they can avoid what they’re allergic to? Do you say that they should just avoid all public food if they’re going to complain about being allergic to some of it?¶ No. You label food and put on warnings so they can see that there is an ingredient in it that they are allergic to. It is still their responsibility to avoid that content, but they need to know it’s there in order to do that, and they need to know it before they react to it.¶ And for the people who say you just need to face up to your problem via exposure? Yes, it’s true that gradual exposure in a safe environment is one way to treat phobias and some times of PTSD. However, that is something that should be addressed with a qualified professional.

#### The public processes you use to combat violence can be re-traumatizing.

Eisenberg ‘11(Stephanie, San Francisco State University, “Speaking from the Margins: Negotiating Barriers to Women’s Participation and Success in Policy Debate,”)

While I initially planned to explore barriers primarily related to style and content of argumentation in debate rounds, the topic of sexual violence came up in a few of the interviews. Dowell (2008) states, “In general, violence against women in the United States is by far the most ignored form of violence” (p. 221). Two of the women I spoke with shared that they were assaulted by someone in the debate community in the past year while several other women recounted stories of female friends in the community who experienced dating violence. Both women expressed how extremely difficult it was to essentially be forced to interact with their attacker. One woman who was punched in the face and held down by a man who wanted to “hook up,” as she explains, was later required to debate her attacker at a tournament, an experience she identifies as extremely traumatic. She explains that there is little to no recourse other than to simply drop out or refuse to have that particular debate and accept a loss, as “debate expects you to put your shit away in favor of having the debate itself.” The only direct recourse for women to address these types of violent attacks is to file a sexual harassment claim, yet this process can be equally traumatic. Another woman notes that it is a lengthy and public process where the attacked woman has the burden of proof. The accompanying investigations that are required offer up a woman’s sexual history as evidence to establish the “truth” to her accusation. Alexandre (2006) uses the Kobe Bryant case as one example for why women may be wary to go through the process of filing rape or sexual assault claims. Women’s sexual behavior not only become a factor in determining their credibility as victims but also becomes part of the public record. In addition to the real sexual violence that some women have experienced, many agreed that women’s bodies are talked and joked about in a way that simply does not happen to men. For example, Judy observes that when female debaters get emotional or angry, they are frequently described as “being on their period,” whereas when male debaters get angry their concerns are usually taken more seriously. Several women also described the fact that women’s sexual business is aired more frequently than men’s. Judy recognizes that this type of rhetoric, including commentary not only on sexual experience but also on women’s appearance and outfits, is reflected in the academy and other professional arenas. Catherine explains that her team thinks an acceptable topic for conversation is who is constrained from judging her due to a sexual encounter. Lucille also notices this discrepancy and notes that no matter how competitivea debater a female might be, the first thing many people will talk about is who they slept with, an experience she does not feel most male debaters share. While hooks (1984) believes that it is easy for women to address some of issues related to sexuality, it is much harder for women to “change the norms of sexuality,” which she believes “can only emerge in an environment where sexual well-being is valued” (p. 149). Due to the fact that these norms are so deeply embedded in the culture of the activity, the academy and Western society, women essentially become faceless in conversations about sexuality.

#### They make debate not a safe space

Stavvers, 1-29-13 (“The value of trigger warnings”, <http://stavvers.wordpress.com/2013/01/29/the-value-of-trigger-warnings/>)

Oh dear, Vagenda. This week, one of the authors has come out against trigger warnings. Her reasoning? She had PTSD, and doesn’t like them because she prefers to confront her problems, and also the internet isn’t a safe space.¶ For the first point, good for her. Seriously, good for Rhiannon, and I’m glad that she’s fairly on top of her mental health problems and has found a way to live with them and deal with them. She’s one of the fortunate ones: many others are not in this position. There are many who would rather avoid seeing things which remind them of trauma, many who would like to be able to close the tab and get on with their day, instead of inadvertently reliving horrors.¶ And it’s these people who I’m thinking about when I put trigger warnings at the top of things I have written. If I’ve helped even one person avoid pain, then I am glad. It’s a little thing for me to do, which can make the all the difference for some people.¶ Trigger warnings are not for yourself; they’re for others. And if Rhiannon from Vagenda prefers not to avoid things, she can use the trigger warnings to seek out content to expose herself to as part of her own personal healing.¶ Rhiannon uses the metaphor of epilepsy to illustrate her point that the internet isn’t a safe space: that, for all the warnings about strobe lights, epilepsy can be triggered by light flickering through the trees. It’s worth noting here only a very small fraction of people with epilepsy are triggered by strobing effects. I’m not, and I’ve had several hours of being hooked up to gooey electrodes staring into a flashing light to prove it. When I was younger and newly-diagnosed, I used to hate that they would put the “epilepsy warning” up before films and plays and so forth, because I had epilepsy and didn’t have a problem with flashing lights. It annoyed the fuck out of me. Then I started thinking of other people, and I realised these warnings weren’t for me, but were hugely valuable for others. The same is true of trigger warnings.¶ And yes, they’re imperfect. Everything is, at the moment. I’ve sat in meetings riddled with manarchists complaining about the need for safer spaces policies, because there’s no such thing as a safe space.¶ No. There isn’t. But that doesn’t mean we should use that as an excuse to stop trying and stop using these interim measures which do help.¶ If you read the comments on the Vagenda piece, you will see people who find trigger warnings a vastly helpful resource in mitigating effects of mental health problems and being able to make decisions. These are the people I am thinking about when I defend trigger warnings, even as my own personal abuse triggers are never covered in trigger warnings.¶ The Vagenda piece begins with a dog-whistle complaint about people being mean to Julie Bindel and Suzanne Moore, who joked about trigger warnings after both of them exhibited startling levels of transphobia. In the last paragraph is another point:¶ Often, it is coupled with a sense of passive aggressive glee (“um. You should have put a trigger warning on that”).¶ This, perhaps, betrays more of the backlash from the privileged over being called out, and I do wonder how much of it was the motivating factor behind the commissioning, writing and existence of the piece. Trigger warnings are hardly complicated. Think of common scenarios that might fuck someone up, and if you write about it, stick a line at the top that you’ll be talking about this. If you’ve missed something which is triggering and someone says so, you lose nothing by doing popping in that simple little line.¶ It astounds me that people are kicking and screaming against something so simple which can make the difference between suffering and being all right. It astounds me that some are being flippant about it, laughing and joking over something which is easy, yet so important.¶ Yes, trigger warnings aren’t the magic bullet. But they’re an interim demand which can help make many feel ever so slightly safer in a fundamentally unsafe world.