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**THEIR TOTALIZING DEPICTION OF CAPITALISM MAKES SPACE FOR RESISTANCE TO CAPITALISM AS IMPOSSIBLE. EITHER THE PERMUTATION SOLVES OR THE ALTERNATIVE WILL HAVE NO EFFECTIVENESS.**

J.K. Gibson-Graham, 1996. Julie Gibson is Professor of feminist economic Geography at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. Katherine Graham is professor and dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs at Carleton. “The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy,” Blackwell Publishers, p.263-4]

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear — and find it easy to believe — that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often resented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could begin to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see or to theorize as consequential in so-called capitalist social formations. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism is large, other things appear small and inconsequential. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conditions under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes a “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian future goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change. In the absence of Capitalism, I might suggest a different object of socialist politics. Perhaps we might be able to focus some of our transformative energies on the exploitation and surplus distribution that go on around us in so many forms and in which we participate in various ways. In the household, in the so-called workplace, in the community, surplus labor is produced, appropriated, and distributed every day by ourselves and by others. Marx made these processes visible but they have been obscured by the discourse of Capitalism, with its vision of two great classes locked in millennial struggle. Compelling and powerful though it might be, this discourse does not allow for a variety of forms of exploitation and distribution or for the diversity of class positions and consciousnesses that such processes might participate in creating. If we can divorce our ideas of class from systemic social conceptions, and simultaneously divorce our ideas of class transformation from projects of systemic transformation, we may be able to envision local and proximate socialisms. Defining socialism as the communal production, appropriation and distribution of surplus labor, we could encounter and construct it at home, at work, at large. These “thinly defined” socialisms wouldn’t remake our societies overnight in some total and millennial fashion (Cullenberg 1992) but they could participate in constituting and reconstituting them on a daily basis. They wouldn’t be a panacea for all the ills that we love to heap on the doorstep of Capitalism, but they could be visible and replicable now.23 To step outside the discourse of Capitalism, to abjure its powers and transcend the limits it has placed on socialist activity, is not to step outside Marxism as I understand it. Rather it is to divorce Marxism from one of its many and problematic marriages — the marriage to “the economy” in its holistic and self-sustaining form. This marriage has spawned a healthy lineage within the Marxist tradition and has contributed to a wide range of political movements and successes. Now I am suggesting that the marriage is no longer fruitful or, more precisely, that its recent offspring are monstrous and frail. Without delineating the innumerable grounds for bringing the marriage to an end, I would like to mark its passing,24 and to ask myself and others not to confuse its passing with the passing of Marxism itself. For Marxism directs us to consider exploitation, and that is something that has not passed away.

Neolib = cap

Li and Zhu 05 (Minqi, Andong, Department of Political Science York University, Marxism Research Institute, “Neoliberalism, Global Imbalances, and Stages of Capitalist Development”, August, online)

Further, we place the current world economic conjuncture within a longer historical perspective. **Neoliberalism can be understood as one particular stage of capitalism with a set of historically specific institutions.** It represents a historical response to the crisis of the last stage of capitalist development. It has developed and consolidated over the past quarter of a century. However, **it has become increasingly ineffective in managing the growing global imbalances. It is possible that the coming world economic upheavals would mark the end of neoliberalism and pave the way for a new set of economic, political, and social institutions.**

And neoliberalism is a particular form of capitalism

Kotz 03 (David, Department of Economics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, “Socialism and Global Neoliberal Capitalism”, online, 2003)

Capitalism today has **predominantly assumed the form of global neoliberalism. This form of capitalism differs in various ways from the regulated, welfarestate capitalism of the postWorld War II decades**.3 The main features of the global neoliberal order include the following: 1**) a high degree of global economic integration including in trade, production, and finance; 2) deregulation and privatization of large transnational corporations and banks; 3) strengthened enforcement of the “rights” of large transnational corporations and banks, such as in the area of socalled “intellectual property rights”; 4) reductions in, or elimination of, state social programs that benefit the working class and other popular groups.**

**By Prioritizing Locally Driven Politics, We are Able to Align Ourselves With a Global Rejection of Hegemonic Structures – Only Through This Reorientation of Politics Can We Dismantle Transnational Systems of Power**

Gustavo Esteva and Madhu Suri Prakash 1998 Grassroots Postmodernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures
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**Global Samaritans may fail to see that when their local actions are informed, shaped and determined by a “global frame of mind,” they become as uprooted as those of the globalists they explicitly criticize**. To relearn how to “think little,” Berry recommends starting with the “basics” of life: food, for example. He suggests discovering ways to eat which take us beyond “global thinking and action” towards “local thinking and action.” **Global thinkers and think tanks**, like the World Bank, **disregard this wisdom at the level of both thought and action. Declaring that current food problems, among others, are global in their nature, they seek to impose global solutions.** Aware of the threats perpetrated by such “solutions,” the proponents of “Think globally, act locally” take recourse to the tradition of Kohr et al. only at the level of action, as a sensible strategy to struggle against the “global forces.” **By refusing to “think little,” given their engagement with global campaigns, the Worldwatch Institute and other “alternative” globalists of their ilk inadvertently function on their enemies’ turf.** How do we defeat the five Goliath companies now controlling 85 percent of the world trade of grains and a round half of its world production? Or the four controlling the American consumption of chicken? Or those few that have cornered the beverage market? **The needed changes will wait for ever if they require forging equally gigantic transnational consumers’ coalitions, or a global consciousness** about the right way to eat. **In accepting the illusory nature of the efforts to struggle against “global forces” in their own territory, on a global scale, we are not suggesting the abandonment of effective coalitions for specific purpose**s, like the Pesticides Action Network, trying to exert political pressure to ban specific threats. Even less are we suggesting that people give up their struggles to put a halt to the dangerous advances of those “global forces.” Quite the opposite. **In putting our eggs in the local basket, we are simply emphasizing the merits of the politics of “No for dealing with global Goliaths: affirming a rich diversity of attitudes and ideals, while sharing a common rejection of the same evils. Such a common “No” does not need a “global consciousness.” It expresses the opposite” a pluriverse of thought, action and reflection.** **All global institutions**, including the World Bank or Coca Cola, **have to locate their transnational operations in actions that are always necessarily local, they cannot exist otherwise. Since “global forces” can only achieve concrete existence at some local level, it is only there – at the local grassroots – that they can most effectively and wisely be opposed.** People at the grassroots are realized that **there is no need to “Think Big”** in order to begin releasing themselves from the clutches of the monopolistic food economy; that they can, in fact, free themselves in the same voluntary ways as they entered it. They are learning to simply say “No” to Coke and other industrial junk, while looking for local alternatives that are healthy, ecologically sound, as well as decentralized in terms of social control. Among the more promising reactions in the industrial world is the movement towards Community Supported Agriculter (CSAs), inspired by both local thinking and action. This growing grassroots movement is teaching urban people how to support small local farmers who farm with wisdom, caring for local soils, waters and intestines. In doing so, local communities simultaneously ensure that unknown farmers from faraway places like Costa Rica or Brail are not exploited with inhuman wages and left sick with cancer or infertility.

#### Disengaging from particularism will fail and invite more oppressive dangers- subversion and radicalization from within current structures is better than waiting for universalism

Daly '99 (Glyn, Lecturer in Politics and International Studies - U of Northampton, THEORY, CULTURE & SOCIETY, vl6, n4, p. 89-90)

More important, however, is Zizek's conceptualization of liberal democracy. And here we see an opposite problem to that which we find in Rorty.20 Whereas Rorty feels obliged to defend, in toto, all the 'institutions and practices of the rich North Atlantic democracies' (1983: 584), Zizek is concerned to negate/displace the liberal-democratac-capitalist totality with a genuine and inclusive universalism (e.g. the ecological movement). Both positions are unsatisfactory. The point is rather to see how the different elements – liberal, democratic, capitalism - have been put together, in an undecidable manner, as an eminently political construction (and not a Sphiozist totality).21 In this way it becomes possible to radicalize and extend the democratic element — as it is possible to deepen the universalist dimension of democracy that is present in a nationalist particularism - beyond its existing configuration and to establish an alternative hegemonic formation. Indeed the dangers of not fighting, and of simply disengaging from the political terrain in the hope of inventing a genuine counter-model of universality, are all too apparent in the way m which socialist internationalist failed to politically engage with the fascism of interwar Germany. Thus it cannot be a question of counterposing the 'bad’ and ‘false' universalism of liberal democracy with the 'good' and 'true' universalism of the ecological movement (as if there were intrinsic connections here). On the contrary, it is a question of critiquing the myth of a naturalistic unity on which both are based and, thereby, to develop a more interventionist and radical politics of subversion and hegemonic recomposition rather than universalist displacement.
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#### Resolved is to reduce through mental analysis

#### Random House Unabridged Dictionary 06

(http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

Resolve: 1.To come to a definite or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full. 2.to separate into constituent or elementary parts; break up; cause or disintegrate (usually fol. by into). 3.to reduce or convert by, or as by, breaking up or disintegration (usually fol. by to or into). 4.to convert or transform by any process (often used reflexively). 5.to reduce by mental analysis (often fol. by into).

#### USFG = the people

Howard 05 (Adam, “Jeffersonian Democracy: Of the People, By the People, For the People,” http://www.byzantinecommunications.com/adamhoward/homework/highschool/jeffersonian.html, 5/27)

Ideally, then, under Jeffersonian Democracy, the government is the people, and people is the government. Therefore, if a particular government ceases to work for the good of the people, the people may and ought to change that government or replace it. Governments are established to protect the people's rights using the power they get from the people.

**The Aff’s discussion reorients scholarship by reorienting politics towards individual agency- all of their policy debate good arguments exist in a falsified world of knowledge production that must be rejected**

Rebecca S. **Bjork 95**, Prof of Communications @ University of Utah, 1995 [inWarranting Assent, “Public Policy Argumentation and Colonialist Ideology in the Post-Cold War Era,” p. 232]

The assumption, all too often taken for granted in academic circles, that scholarship takes place in an “ivory tower” that has no relationship to the real world, is problematic in light of Said’s thorough critique of the discursive practice of Orientalism and his advocacy of “worldly” criticism. As I have attempted to demonstrate in this essay, all scholars and public policy arguers, myself included, cannot escape the cultural embeddedness of their positions, authority and work. If it is the case that human beings are constantly shaped by their surroundings, and form attitudes, beliefs, and values in response to their circumstances, then it seems clear that attempts to “objectively” discover and communicate knowledge are doomed to fail. It is my belief that formalist argumentation theory, with its goals of accurately describing arguments and applying “rational” tests to determine whether they warrant assent, clings to the goal of objectivity. Furthermore, presuming that “rational” argument takes place between equally empowered voices in an “ideal” civic and democratic society, obscures the role of power relations as they are culturally and historically coded in society. Once it is granted that academic discourse circulates throughout culture and becomes part of the taken-for-granted assumption that drive society, then it is imperative that scholars who produce such discourse are vigilant and aware of the power and implications of their work. In this essay, I have attempted to illustrate the ways in which public policy argumentation (scholarly and otherwise) concerning the threats posed by nuclear proliferation, and the potential deployment of ballistic missile defense as a way of alleviating those threats, depict “other” nations in ways that are racist and sexist, and which serve to perpetuate global inequalities. Some might argue that it is easy to point fingers, lay blame, and complain about the current state of international relations without offering any concrete solutions to the dangers that face our world each day. Adopting a critical stance to the evaluation of arguments, however, represents a first step toward constructive change, in that awareness of the ideological power of argumentation opens up possibilities for reconceptualizing the role of scholarship. Listening to the voices of “others,” with sensitivity to the particular situations from which such voices emerge, seems to be logically prior to suggesting alternatives.

#### The Debate space should be used to compare political activism strategies. This is best:

#### A - Provides Mutual feedback between debate and activism, reinforcing one another

#### B - Best allows coalition building

#### C - Localism is a good starting point/coalitions good/and there is a visibility disad to excluding our discussion/ you should be an intellectual

#### Moyers and Giroux, 11-22-13 (Doctorate from Carnegie-Mellon in 1977. He then became professor of education at Boston University from 1977 to 1983. In 1983 he became professor of education and renowned scholar in residence at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he also served as Director at the Center for Education and Cultural Studies. He moved to Penn State Univeristy where he took up the Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University from 1992 to May 2004. He also served as the Director of the Waterbury Forum in Education and Cultural Studies. “We Live in an Era of Zombie Politics: Bill Moyers Interviews Henry Giroux”, <http://www.alternet.org/economy/do-we-live-era-zombie-politics?page=0%2C4&paging=off&current_page=1#bookmark>)

HENRY GIROUX: I mean, yeah, I think intellectuals are— there are two ways we can describe intellectuals. In the most general sense, we can say, "Intellectuals are people who take pride in ideas. They work with ideas." I mean, they believe that ideas matter. They believe that there's no such thing as common sense, good sense or bad sense, but reflective sense.¶ That ideas offer the framework for gives us agency, what allows us to read the world critically, what allows us to be literate. What allows us to be civic literacy may be in some ways the high point of what it means to be an intellectual—¶ BILL MOYERS: Because?¶ HENRY GIROUX: Because it suggests that how we learn what we learn and what we do with the knowledge that we have is not just for ourselves. It's for the way in which we can expand and deepen the very processes of democracy in general, and address those problems and anti-democratic forces that work against it. Now some people make a living as a result of being intellectuals. But there are people who are intellectuals who don't function in that capacity. They're truck drivers. They're workers.¶ I grew up in a working-class neighborhood. The smartest people I have ever met were in that neighborhood. We read books. We went to the library together. We drank on Friday nights. We talked about [Antonio] Gramsci. We drove to Boston—¶ BILL MOYERS: Gramsci being the Italian philosopher.¶ HENRY GIROUX: The Italian philosopher. I mean—¶ BILL MOYERS: The pessimism of the—¶ HENRY GIROUX: Of the intellect, and optimism of the will.¶ BILL MOYERS: Right.¶ HENRY GIROUX: Right? I mean, we—¶ BILL MOYERS: You see the world as it is, but then you act as if you can change the world.¶ HENRY GIROUX: Exactly. I mean, we tried to find ways to both enliven the neighborhoods we lived in. But at the same time, we knew that that wasn't enough. That one— that there was a world beyond our neighborhood, and that world had all kinds of things for us to learn. And we were excited about that. I mean, we drank, danced and talked. That's what we did.¶ BILL MOYERS: And I assume there were some other more private activities.¶ HENRY GIROUX: And there was more private activity.¶ BILL MOYERS: You know, you are a buoyant man. And yet you describe what you call a shift away from the hope that accompanies the living, to a politics of cynicism and despair.¶ HENRY GIROUX: Yeah.¶ BILL MOYERS: What leads you to this?¶ HENRY GIROUX: What leads me to this is something that we mentioned earlier, and that is when you see policies being enacted today that are so cruel and so savage, wiping out a generation of young people, trying to eliminate public schools, eliminating health care, putting endless percentage of black and brown people in jail, destroying the environment and there's no public outrage.¶ There aren't people in the streets. You know, you have to ask yourself, "Has this market mentality, is it so powerful and that it's become so normalized, so taken for granted that the imagination, the collective imagination has been so stunted that it becomes difficult to challenge it anymore?" And I think that leads me to despair somewhat. But I've always felt that in the face of the worst tyrannies, people resist.¶ They're resisting now all over the world. And it seems to me history is open. I believe history is open. I don't believe that we have reached the finality of a system that is so destructive that all we have to do is look at the clock and say, "One minute left." I don't believe in those kinds of metaphors.¶ We have to acknowledge the realities that bear down on us, but it seems to me that if we really want to live in a world and be alive with compassion and justice, then we need educated hope. We need a hope that recognizes the problems and doesn't romanticize them, and also recognizes the need for vision, for social organizations, for strategies. We need institutions that provide the formative culture that give voice to those visions and those ideas.¶ BILL MOYERS: You've talked elsewhere or written elsewhere about the need for a militant, far-reaching, social movement to challenge the false claims that equate democracy and capitalism. Now, what do you mean "militant and far-reaching social movement"?¶ HENRY GIROUX: I mean, what we do know, we know this. We know that there are people working in local communities all over the United States around particular kinds of issues, whether it be gay rights, whether it be the environment, whether it be, you know the Occupy movement, helping people with Hurricane Sandy. We have a lot of fragmented movements.¶ And I think we probably have a lot more than we realize, because the press gives them no visibility, as you know. So, we don't really have a sense of the degree to which these— how pronounced these really are. I think the real issue here is, you know, what would it mean to begin to do at least two things?¶ To say the very least, one is to develop cultural apparatuses that can offer a new vocabulary for people, where questions of freedom and justice and the problems that we're facing can be analyzed in ways that reach mass audiences in accessible language. We have to build a formative culture. We have to do that. Secondly, we've got to overcome the fractured nature of these movements. I mean the thing that plagues me about progressives in the left and liberals is they are all sort of ensconced in these fragmented movements that seem to suggest those movements constitute the totality of the system of oppression that we are facing. And they don’t.¶ Look, we have technologies in place now in which students all over the world are beginning to communicate with each other because they're realizing that the punishing logic of austerity has a certain kind of semblance that a certain normality that, in common ground, that is affecting students in Greece, students in Spain, students in France.¶ BILL MOYERS: And in this country?¶ HENRY GIROUX: And in this country. And it seems to me that while I may be too old to in any way begin to participate in this, I really believe that young people have recognized that they've been written out of the discourse of democracy. That they're in the grip of something so oppressive it will take away their future, their hopes, their possibilities and their sense of the future will be one that is less than what their parents had imagined.¶ And there's no going back. I mean, this has to be addressed. And it'll take time. They'll build the organizations. They'll get— they'll work with the new technologies. And hopefully they'll have our generation to be able to assist in that, but it's not going to happen tomorrow. And it's not going to happen in a year. It's going to as you have to plant seeds. You have to believe that seeds matter.¶ But you need a different vocabulary and a different understanding of politics. Look, the right has one thing going for it that nobody wants to talk about. Power is global. And politics is local. They float. They have no allegiance to anyone. They don't care about the social contract, because if workers in the United States don't want to compromise, they'll get them in Mexico. So the notion of political concessions has died for this class. They don't care about it anymore. There are no political concessions.¶ BILL MOYERS: The financial class.¶ HENRY GIROUX: The financial class.¶ BILL MOYERS: The one percent.¶ HENRY GIROUX: The one percent. That's why they're so savage. They're so savage because there's nothing to give up. They don't have to compromise. The power is so arrogant, so over the top, so unlike anything we have seen in terms of its anti-democratic practices, policies, modes of governance and ideology.¶ That at some point, you know they feel they don't have to legitimate this anymore. I mean, it's because the contradictions are becoming so great, that I think all of a sudden a lot of young people are recognizing this language, this whole language, doesn't work. The language of liberalism doesn't work anymore.¶ No, let's just reform the system. Let's work within it. Let's just run people for office. My argument would be, you have one foot in and you have one foot out. I'm not willing to give up the school board. I'm not willing to give up all forms of electoral politics. But it seems to me at the local level we can do some of that thing, that people can get elected. They can make moderate changes.¶ But the real changes are not going to come there. The real changes are going to come in creating movements that are longstanding, that are organized,

that basically take questions of governance and policy seriously and begin to spread out and become international. That is going to have to happen.¶