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#### The emphasis on individual freedoms is a neoliberal cooptation of social justice advocacy---the aff’s notion of choice abstracts individuals from their social context, precluding structural transformation

Corey Lee Wrenn 13, adjunct professor of Sociology with Dabney S. Lancaster Community College and an adjunct professor of Social Psychology with the Rocky Mountain College of Art and Design, The Neoliberalism Behind Sexy Veganism: Individuals, Structures, and “Choice”, veganfeministnetwork.com/tag/individualism/

I’m going to make a radical claim, well, actually it’s pretty widely accepted in the social sciences: There is no “choice.” This isn’t about the individual. This is about systems of oppression and social structures that shape our behavior and limit what choices are available to us based on our social identity. If you are a young, thin, white woman advocating for Nonhuman Animals in a pornified, hyper-sexualized society, one choice stands out loud and clear: Get naked. It’s supposed to be empowering, and we think maybe it helps animals. First, I’m not really sure why one has to feel sexually empowered when one is advocating against the torture and death of Nonhuman Animals. Why our movement is keen on making violence a turn on is a little disturbing. It probably speaks something to our tendency to juxtapose women with violence. The sexualization of violence against women and other feminized social groups like Nonhuman Animals is evidence to the rape culture we inhabit. Aside that, however, “choice” is often thrown around as a means of deflecting critical thought at systems of oppression. If it’s all about your individual choice, only you are responsible, only you are to blame. Anyone who has a problem with that must be judging you as a person. So often our advocacy is framed as personal choice, an individual expression. If you aren’t vegan, that’s your “choice.” If you want to have sex with vegetables and have it filmed by PETA, that’s your “choice.” This is a co-optation of anti-oppression social activism in a neo-liberal structure of exploitation. Neoliberalism is all about “freedom”: Freedom from government, freedom from regulation, freedom to buy, freedom to sell, freedom to reach your full potential, etc. It’s about individuals out for themselves. This is how capitalism thrives: many are free to do whatever they want in the name of open markets, but ultimately, that freedom comes at a cost to those who will inevitably be exploited to pay for that “freedom.” The ideology of neoliberalism and individualism works to benefit the privileged when individuals can attribute their success to their own individual hard work (when in reality they had extensive help from their race, gender, class, physical ability, etc.). It also works to blame those less fortunate for their failure. We call them lazy, stupid, leeches (when in reality they had extensive barriers placed upon them according to their race, gender, class, physical ability, etc.). This myth of freedom and meritocracy is actually pretty toxic for social movements. If we fail to recognize how structural barriers impede some, while structural privileges benefit others, we will find it difficult to come together as a political collective. When we soak in this neoliberal poison and start to view social movements–inherently collective endeavors designed to challenge unequal power structures–as something done by the individual, for the individual, we’ve lost the fight right off the bat. This isn’t about personal “choice;” there is no personal choice. Choice is socially constructed. Who you are and where you come from will influence exactly what “choices” are or are not available to you. Why the hell are so many young women (mostly white, as women of color aren’t allowed to be sexual under our white supremacy) “choosing” to masturbate vegetables to promote veganism and “choosing” to dance on mobile stripper poles on parade floats to promote kitten adoption? Why choose sex and stripping instead of some other “choice,” like leading a protest, writing a song, writing a book, etc.? Because sex and stripping are the “choices” forced on women, while leadership and innovation (social movement activities that respect the personhood of activists instead of objectifying them) is reserved for men. Making it all about the “individual” also means prioritizing one’s privilege to engage certain behaviors at the expense of other less fortunate groups who suffer as a result. Middle-class white women represent our movement with their thin, sexy forms, but where are the women of color? Where are the larger sized women? That’s right, they don’t get to be sexy. What about their “choice?” Not everyone is granted the “choice” to participate in the so-called “sexual revolution.” Furthermore, the sexual objectification of women and pornography are both linked to increased violence and rape against women. And guess which women have the highest rates of experiences with violence and rape? White women? Nope, guess again. Women of color, poor women, lesbian women, trans women, disabled women, etc. Young white women of privilege can enter public spaces and flaunt their sexuality and find it “liberating,” but it’s the masses of poor and disadvantaged women who bear the brunt of that “liberation” through rapes, sexual harassment, and beatings. Listen up, ladies: It’s a trick. The “individualization” of social advocacy divides. It masks privilege, otherizes, and excludes disadvantaged groups. Neoliberalism is what created the problem in the first place (the oppression of Nonhuman Animals), why would we think using more neoliberalism would fix it? Neoliberalizing our movement means we lose our collective power. And when we play by the rules of this patriarchy, with the bizarre assumption that we can only get people to drop that hamburger if they get a hard on, we simply reinforce oppression. Neoliberalism has co-opted our movement. We surrendered our power; we repackaged our social justice claimsmaking for pornified Playboy-speak. Instead of loudspeakers, pens, and protests, it’s thongs, butts, and boobies. This isn’t a social movement anymore, it’s quelled resistance. Not only are we disempowered, but we’re even further exploited because we become another site of sexual objectification. The bad guys not only get you to shut it up, but they get you to take it off, too. Take, for example, this Playboy image. Porn? Or Liberation? White woman in high heels twisting around to expose her buttocks and breasts. She is completely naked except a swirling robe. She holds a wine glass and smiles at the viewer. Reads, "Male Supremacy is alright--but I favor a different position." The caption reads, “Male supremacy is fine–but I favor a different position.” Ha! The feminist position or a sexual position? Porn? Or Liberation? Having trouble deciding? You should, because there is no difference. Feminism is being repackaged in a way that absolutely eliminates any female threat to male power, it is being repackaged in a way that benefits men. Women are stripping and performing for patriarchy, and they’re doing it willingly. They’re doing it under the mistaken assumption that they’re liberated, as though they are acting of their own free will and individual choice. Don’t for one second think that this hasn’t been happening in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement. PETA regularly hires Playboy “bunnies” to perform their pornographic demonstrations. There’s even a vegan pinup website and a vegan strip club. It’s liberating! Look at the following PETA/Playboy pinup. “Lettuce entertain you.” Ha! Get it! Veganism or sexy time? Which is it? Serious social movement, or more penis-focused noise in the crowded pornography landscape of Western culture?¶ DISCLAIMER Individuals vs. Systems Most of the content of this site is concerned with dismantling systems of oppression. We are cautious of personal "agency" and "choice" in human behavior and "individualism" in collective action. We seek to challenge the institutionalized forms of violence against humans and nonhumans. We urge our readers to refrain from misconstruing the content of this site as personal attacks on individuals.

#### The desire for autonomy is a neoliberal notion of having the illusion of choice. Their need for autonomy rein trenches demands for freedom within an existing system while abandoning of the totalizing goal of transforming capitalism.

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, "Putting Materialism back into Race Theory", http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm) 2006

Gilroy endorses the new social movements precisely because "the new movements are not primarily oriented towards instrumental objectives, such as the conquest of political power or state apparatuses" (226). Instead, the new social movements desire autonomy within the existing system (226) and therefore foreground the "sphere of autonomous self-realization" (233). In other words, they do not want to change an exploitative system, they merely want a little more (discursive) freedom within it, and this (reformist) project signals agency for Gilroy. For Gilroy, the new social movements represent agency, and in this regard, they replace the proletariat—the historic vehicle for social transformation—but their agency, to repeat, is directed toward reforming specific local sites, such as race or gender, within the existing system. In short, they have abandoned the goal of transforming existing capitalism—a totalizing system which connects seemingly disparate elements of the social through the logic of exploitation—for a new goal: creating more humane spaces for new movements within capitalism. So, then, what is so new in the new social movements? It is certainly very "old" in the way it rehabilitates liberal notions of the autonomous subject. Its newness is a sign of the contemporary crisis-ridden conjuncture in capitalist social relations. This crisis of capital and the ensuing rupture in its ideological narrative provides the historical condition for articulating resistance along the axes of race, class, gender, ecology, etc. Even though resistance may take place in very specific domains, such as race, gender, ecological, or sexuality, among others, this does not mean that the crisis is local. It simply indexes how capitalist exploitation brings every social sphere under its totalizing logic. However, rather then point up the systematicity of the crisis, the theorists of the new social movements turn to the local, as if it is unrelated to questions of globality. With Gilroy and the new social movements, we are returned, once again, to the local and the experiential sets the limits of understanding. Gilroy asserts that people "unable to control the social relations in which they find themselves…have shrunk the world to the size of their communities and begun to act politically on that basis" (245). If this is true, then Gilroy, at the level of theory, mirrors this as he "shrinks" his theory to the dictates of crude empiricism. Rather than opening the possibility of collective control over social relations, which points in an emancipatory direction, Gilroy brackets the question of "social relation" and consequently, he limits politics to the cultural (re)negotiations of identity.

#### The aff’s obsession with adolescent individual rights reinforces capitalist notions of private ownership and individualism.

Jacober 5 (Amy Jacober, Seattle School of Theology and Psychology, “Does Adolescence lead to Capitalism or does Capitalism lead to Adolescence?”, April 4 2005)//Miro

Any discussion of teenagers and capitalism needs to begin with these two major themes – individualism and personal rights. Today’s teenagers express this by their very existence. They are self-focused. This is a normal developmental stage. It is also a normal stage in the lifecycle where personal consumption now trumps investment and deferred consumption.[4] In addition to the normal development, we now teach children from birth that they are important, so important in fact that each one has been nurtured and celebrated, not as they connect with their families, their community or larger society but for who they are individually. There are of course exceptions to every rule, but with emerging adulthood now commonly accepted as a developmental stage, the communal scene has shifted.[5] Individual rights are a precursor to private ownership. Initially, property was owned by individuals or individual families. This established wealth, status and power.[6] Today wealth, status and power are still being displayed. Teenagers may not own a house but they certainly spend money to establish their image through ownership of goods. What you own establishes your status regardless of how much debt you accumulate to create your image. Status carries with it an implication of wealth, whether it is true or not. The legacy of capitalism passed to adolescents today is a sense of entitlement and a preoccupation with image. I would say for anyone, but for teenagers in particular, capitalism is more about a lifestyle than economics. This plays out every day in millions of choices made by a group of people wielding over $155 billion in disposable discretionary spending each year since 2000 with no slowing in sight.[7] In fact regardless of overall economic trends, teen spending (ages 12-19) has continued to grow by 5% for the past 7 years. By 2006 the estimation is for adolescent spending to top $190 billion.[8] Children and adolescents working is not new, the amount and where they spend their money is. The end of sanctioned widespread child labor in the US is a great accomplishment. We no longer offer public approval for sending children into mines or accept the non-existence of classrooms in favor of the abundance of factories. (By no means is this to say that child labor has been eliminated, neither here in the US nor in many locations around the world. It would be an entirely different article to look at the disparity of what we publicly state and what occurs in reality…for now, I will stay with the pervasive implications of what we publicly state.) Children and teenagers once took on backbreaking works for long hours to aide their families in paying rent and buying dinner. Today, it is more common to have children mowing lawns or babysitting and adolescents working at the mall or a local shop to buy iPods, lattes, and a new pair of kicks. When asked to contribute toward a camp, school trip or other extra-curricular items, let alone clothing, books or household necessities, it is not uncommon to hear the refrain, “Why do I have to pay for that? I worked hard for my money!” Before being so hard on teenagers as to assume they are greedy and narcissistic, remember that they are a product not only of the home in which they were raised but of the culture that has developed over the centuries. They really believe others are as interested in them as they are in themselves.[9] They are a reflection, distorted as it may be, of individual entitlement before being tempered by the constraints of adulthood in an affluent capitalist society. I have rarely if ever had a conversation with a teenager where the acquisition of money was a goal. At least not a goal in and of itself. Money in a bank account offers nothing to show, it does not express their image. Image is an expression of who they are individually (everything for which they have been trained) and carries with it status. I wish I were the only one to know this. Unfortunately, not only am I not the only to know this but I am among the least to capitalize (excuse the pun) on this information. For a quick 101 on just how pervasive our adult world is into understanding (or is it exploiting?) adolescents, take a peek at The Merchants of Cool, a PBS Frontline special explaining an industry that has taken notice of the billions of discretionary spending done by adolescents.[10] This has become something of a tutorial for understanding adolescents, research focus groups and how capitalism reigns supreme seeking the accumulation of profit through the ownership…of knowledge. It is not a tangible product to be consumed but it is highly valued. By obtaining, by owning knowledge, image may be marketed through products for maximum profit. Perhaps one of the best known marketers of this knowledge is Teenage Research Unlimited (TRU), www.teenresearch.com. TRU is a force in the arena of teenage research. Their own proclamation states “We’re at the forefront of developing new and better methods for researching teens and sharing those learnings with clients. Founded in 1982 as the first marketing-research firm to specialize exclusively in teenagers, TRU’s initial vision remains true today: to develop an unparalleled expertise in the teenage market, and to offer our clients virtually unlimited methods for researching teens.” [11] And share they do…they have an impressive list of clients numbering over 240. These clients fall in the following categories: retail apparel and footwear, advertising and marketing agencies, food and beverage, media, entertainment and leisure, social marketing, electronics and technology, financial, health and beauty and other. Interestingly, in addition to Abercrombie and Fitch, Coca Cola, Time Warner and Verizon, Lifeway Christian Services is included. Several anti-tobacco agencies, American Cancer Society and the Partnership for a Drug Free America are also included. Their research is qualitative and quantitative, extensive and respected. Like rain, it falls on the just and the unjust. TRU is neutral, they gather the information better than anyone else and seek to make the greatest profit from selling their goods. It has become increasingly difficult to differentiate between an innocent victim and savvy participant in marketing. The Persuaders, another PBS Frontline special offered another perspective on this same subject.[12] Correspondent Douglas Rushkoff says America is an Enlightenment society. We were founded on the notion that individual freedoms are of paramount importance. This philosophy has dovetailed quite well with the market’s need to treat us as individuals. It’s easier to market to isolated individuals than to cohesive groups or collectives. The loneliest people can more easily be convinced to buy stuff to fill the void. Marketers tell us we matter – that we’re worth it. We deserve everything. They won’t tell us about sacrifice, participation, or sharing. People who share things, don’t need to buy as much stuff. So advertising exploits the American belief in individualism by recasting it as some sort of consumer right. We are led to think of our consumer choices as some version of true agency – when the choice between Coke and Pepsi really isn’t a choice, at all. On the same show, Douglas Atkin said I don’t believe that Americans are more or less susceptible than anyone else. In fact I don’t like the word `susceptible’ at all…it implies that people are passive receivers of manipulative messages. In general we are highly discriminating. We have to be. We’ve been forced to edit the thousands of messages that assault us and select the few that may have some relevance. We’ve become very marketing literate. Some brands do generate very strong commitment, even devotion from their customers. But this is not the result of any inherent sensitivity or vulnerability to the clever machinations of marketing professionals. The devotees that I interviewed reported that their brands provided a rallying point for people who shared the same values. As one Apple user told me: “literally it’s [the Apple community] based around a machine. But actually it’s based on a common way of thinking. Adolescents (as well as many Americans) are consumed with the idea of expressing their individualism… just like everyone else! See a bunch of friends in their sophomore year of high school and they will talk alike as well as own a small range of music and shop at the same stores. Image is everything and this comes not in the common products (we all wear clothes) but in the brands chosen. These brands come to express something much more, something much greater than a simple logo. They offer a lifestyle based around the product. The irony is that we all purchase a common lifestyle while insisting on individuality. Teenagers at least are honest enough to own this.[14] And own they do! Industrialization allowed for individualism among the masses. Capitalism opened the door for the veneration of youth and all that comes within this developmental arena. Michael Novak14 argues that capitalism may be interpreted to accept human sinfulness. So much so that it opens the possibility, that “rubs sinner against sinner, making even dry wood yield a spark of grace.”[15] He views the foundational concept of “enlightened self-interest” as proof that capitalism does not deny sinfulness, but embraces it! He believes that capitalism embraces our proclivity toward individualism while a system like socialism would be dangerous because it depends on human goodness rather than religion to improve society. There are some rejoinders to this argument. First, proponents of Adam Smith used the term “enlightened self-interest” to describe the primary motive for supplying goods and services. The adjective “enlightened” suggests that these capitalists did not believe they were describing our sinful nature. Secondly, socialism recognizes that some public goods such as healthcare and law enforcement, which everyone in society needs, will not be provided if they are left to the market mechanism. So it could be argued that socialism may be more realistic about human sinfulness. Nevertheless, an essential mechanism of both capitalism and mixed market socialism reflects the brokenness of the world

#### The medical-industrial complex is fundamentally irredeemable, seeking to make change within the system only perpetuates an institution that is driven by an insatiable desire for profit.

Peace 9 (William Peace, PhD 1992 in anthropology Columbia University, Interested in disability rights and bioethics, “The Medical Industrial Complex: Normalcy Rules!”, 2009)//Miro

I wish I could write that I have the solution to our health care woes. However, no single individual is that smart; not even Peter Singer, the media darling who has an insidinary impact on the health care debate. To me, the problem with our health care system is directly related to the human penchant to fit into the mainstream, to be normal, that is healthy. This thought came to me after reading Stephen Kuusisto's post "What Disability Knows: Part One and Part Two" (see Planet of the Blind). Kuusisto points out that all those with a visible disability can never be perceived as normal. Disability is thus mistakenly married to normativity. Divorce is not possible. I, and many others who study disability, agree. The stigma attached to the calamity known as disability is as unfortunate as it is unnecessary. We humans are a diverse bunch and this diversity is the essence of our strength. Yet we fear difference and particularly disability. In disability I see only potential, adaptation, and the best that humanity has to offer. I do not see illness, infirmity, or limits. In Kuusisto's estimation the idea of normal or mainstream is destructive and he recently "told a group of artists and advocates for people with disabilities at the Kennedy Center for the Arts in Washington, DC that the mainstream is one of the great, tragic ideas of our time. There is no mainstream. No one is physically solid, reliable, capable as a solo act, protected against catastrophe; there is only the stream in which each one of us must work to find solace in meaning". This is not only eloquent writing but brilliant thinking in terms of health care: who decides what is "normal" or "mainstream"? The answer is as simple as it is dangerous: the medical industrial complex. The medical industrial complex is much like the military industrial complex I study in my historical work about anthropology. For a military industrial complex to exist, war or the fear of war must be present. Since 1941, the attack on Pearl Harbor and the more recent events of September 11, 2001 we have had an abundance of fear mongering and war. In the medical industrial complex fear is required as well. What do we humans fear? Ill-health, disease, the absence of normalcy and disability. Ill-health is why the medical industrial complex exists. The sick, infirm, and disabled are the primary consumers. The big bucks and profit is in abnormality, exactly what we fear. Healthy people, the mainstream, need not apply. Healthy people are the worst customers. What I want to know is how do we determine what is normal? Who is normal and why are they normal? As one who has not been perceived to be "normal" in thirty years I ask this question because I know power rests among the normate to use Rose Marie Garland-Thompson's awkward term. The normates define and control what it means to be different. These people, normates, dictate not only what is healthy but how ill health is treated. Certain illnesses carry great stigma, AIDS for instance, while others are deemed so rare they are not worth researching (think ALS or Lou Gehrig's Disease). This is why disability studies has much to offer the debate about our health care system--our bodies, disabled bodies, have been medicalized. Disability studies is the one field that is devoted to this subject in the form of why. Why is the disabled body so objectionable? What are the practical and theoretical implications of the rejection of the disabled body? Policy makers, if they were smart, would listen carefully to what disability studies scholars have to say. We people with a disability are the best customers of the medical industrial complex. The problem is that we people with a disability and by extension disability studies scholars are outsiders. The debate over health care is dictated by people like Peter Signer and others who want to get the most bang for their buck and know nothing about disability. I am not dismissing the great cost involved in disability. I am intimately familiar with this. Rather, I want to point out what many know but do not acknowledge: the greatest economic savings do not rest among those that are ill or disabled. If we want to save money and lives the greatest economic and human savings are to found keeping people healthy. Healthy people, normates, are cheap and powerful. The normate, those that control the medical industrial complex, profit from illness. The largest profits are made diagnosing and treating the sick who get well. Just ask anyone that has undergone basic diagnostic testing, medical treatment and been deemed healthy afterwards. The money, capitalistic profit and core of our medical industrial complex, is dependent upon abnormality. Money is made when the medical industrial complex finds perceived pathology. Our perception of what is normal has become increasingly narrow. The reason is simple--profits. The more abnormal one becomes the greater the profit margin. We crippled people have become too costly and will be the direct targets of cost saving measures. Worse, our costly asses are not valued and it is all too easy to moan and groan about the costs of disability and old age. Why treat an elderly person who will die in the near future? Why should an insurance company pay for a $5,000 wheelchair when a wheelchair for $500 will suffice? These sorts of decisions are short sighted savings and laden with value judgments that keep me up at night. If we want to save money this is what I propose: make basic health care affordable. Lower the price of medications for conditions such as high blood pressure so that even the poorest Americans can afford it. If we did this, perhaps what is known as the stroke belt among black Americans in the Southeast would not exist. Force people to live a healthy life style via gut wrenching taxes. If you want to smoke make it cost prohibitive. Raise the price of cigarettes by $10 a pack every year for the next five years and few people will smoke. If we don't want kids to drink soda and eat unhealthy foods ban them from schools. Tax soda and junk foods so severely they are unaffordable. I am not naive. I know we lack the resolve to follow through on my outlandish suggestions. I also know if we did it would have a profound and unsettling impact on our economy; in other words corporations would suffer. Our government will never let this happen and this is part of the problem I am trying to emphasize with my extreme examples. Disability has been eliminated from the discourse on health care reform or perhaps more accurately it is framed only as it pertains to "savings". That is disability is abnormality, costly, and must be reduced. To me, this is akin to targeting and eliminating what makes us so special and diverse. The advances in our medical industrial complex have created more diversity--I see people at adaptive sports programs that are amazingly unique. I marvel at the human spirit and adaptive ability we all possess. I am equally sad to know that physical and cognitive disability is stigmatized and there are times this knowledge makes me ashamed to be human. Let me make one final point in this long and rambling post. I am not opposed to rationing health care. I can live with rationing health care but I can only do so if all are treated equally. Based on what I read and sense, we people with a disability are in for a very rough experience. Disability scholars may not have all the answers or even some of the answers but they must be part of the debate. The elderly, chronically ill, long term cancer survivors, people with a disability all have experience with our flawed health system and yet they are not sitting down to talk with President Obama or his advisors. This has me worried. People with first hand experience need to play a central role in any discussion about the medical industrial complex. I do not see this taking place and cannot help but conclude the so called health care reform in retrospect may seem like the biggest corporate grab for wealth our nation will ever witness. And who will get hurt the most? Why of course those that are the most vulnerable.

#### Neolib drives *all* existential scenarios—best empirical evidence

Deutsch 9 (Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” Peace Magazine, <http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm>)//Miro

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that mass extinction "can happen here." A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."¶ BESIDES PROLIFERATION¶ The use of nuclear weapons in wars would appear to be increasingly acceptable. "We have created a situation in the world where we have a very small number of people in control of nuclear arsenals - people whose competence is not necessarily proven, whose rationality is not necessarily at a high level, and whose ethical standards may or may not be acceptable. These people are in charge of making decisions about the use of weapons that could destroy civilization and most life on earth" (p. 245). In their recent collection of papers on nuclear weapons, Falk and Krieger further suggest that the grand military strategy is "largely to project power in order to reap the benefits of profitability for the few. To take control of resources, and to place our military bases strategically around the world in order to have greater degrees of control, sounds like a strategy to benefit corporate interests." They state that the power elite has cleverly manipulated the public by focusing almost exclusive attention on the issue of proliferation, "with corresponding inattention to possession, continuing weapons development, and thinly disguised reliance on threatened use."

#### *Turns case*—the medical-industrial complex uses “choice” framing to undermine informed consent and push dangerous drugs.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

Another example is the difficulty pro-choice groups have in maintaining a critical perspective on dangerous or potentially dangerous contraceptives, arguing that women should have the "choice" of contraceptives. Many scholars and activists have documented the dubious safety record of Norplant and Depo-Provera, two long-acting hormonal contraceptives (Krust and Assetoyer 1993; Masterson and Guthrie 1986; Roberts 1997; Smith 2001). In fact, lawsuits against Norplant have forced an end to its distribution (although Norplant that remains on the shelves can be sold to women). In 1978, the FDA denied approval for Depo-Provera on the grounds that: (1) dog studies confirmed an elevated rate of breast cancer; (2) there appeared to be an increased risk of birth defects in human fetuses exposed to the drug; and (3) there was no pressing need shown for use of the drug as a contraceptive (Masterson and Guthrie). In 1987, the FDA changed its regulations and began to require cancer testing in rats and mice instead of dogs and monkeys; Depo-Provera did not cause cancer in these animals, but major concerns regarding its safety persist (Feminist Women's Health Centers 1997). Also problematic is the manner in which these contraceptives are frequently promoted in communities of color and often without informed consent (Krust and Assetoyer 1993; Masterson and Guthrie 1986; Smith 2001).7 Yet none of the mainstream pro-choice organizations have ever seriously taken a position on the issue of informed consent as part of their agenda.8 Indeed, Gloria Feldt, president of Planned Parenthood, equates opposition to Norplant and Depo-Provera as opposition to "choice" in her book The War on Choice (Feldt 2004, 34, 37). Planned Parenthood and NARAL opposed restrictions against sterilization abuse, despite the thousands of women of color who were being sterilized without their consent, because they saw such policies as interfering with a woman's "right to choose" (Nelson 2003, 144; Patchesky 1990, 8). Particularly disturbing has been some of the support given by these organizations to the Center for Research on Population and Security, headed by Stephen Mumford and Elton Kessel, which distributes globally a form of sterilization, Quinacrine. Quinacrine is a drug that is used to treat malaria. It is inserted into the uterus where it dissolves, causing the fallopian tubes to scar, rendering the woman irreversibly sterile. Family Health International conducted four in vitro studies and found [End Page 130] Quinacrine to be mutagenic in three of them (Controversy Over Sterilization Pellet 1994; Norsigian 1996). It, as well as the World Health Organization, recommended against further trials for female sterilization, and no regulatory body supports Quinacrine. However, the North Carolina-based Center for Research on Population and Security has circumvented these bodies through private funding from such organizations as the Turner Foundation and Leland Fykes organization (which incidentally funds pro-choice and anti-immigrant groups). The Center for Research on Population and Security has been distributing Quinacrine for free to researchers and government health agencies. There are field trials in eleven countries, with more than 70,000 women sterilized. In Vietnam, a hundred female rubber plant workers were given routine pelvic exams during which the doctor inserted the Quinacrine without their consent. Thus far, the side effects linked to Quinacrine include ectopic pregnancy, puncturing of the uterus during insertion, pelvic inflammatory disease, and severe abdominal pains. Other possible concerns include heart and liver damage and exacerbation of pre-existing viral conditions. In one of the trials in Vietnam, a large number of cases that had serious side effects were excluded from the data (Controversy Over Sterilization Pellet 1994; Norsigian 1996). Despite the threat to reproductive justice that this group represents, Feminist Majority Foundation featured the Center for Research on Population and Security at its 1996 Feminist Expo because, I was informed by the organizers, they promoted choice for women. Then in 1999, Planned Parenthood almost agreed to sponsor a Quinacrine trial in the United States until outside pressure forced it to change its position (Committee on Women, Population and the Environment 1999). A prevalent ideology within the mainstream pro-choice movement is that women should have the choice to use whatever contraception they want. This position does not consider: (1) that a choice among dangerous contraceptives is not much of a choice; (2) the millions of dollars pharmaceutical companies and the medical industry have to promote certain contraceptives, compared to the few resources women's advocacy groups have to provide alternative information on these same contraceptives; and (3) the social, political, and economic conditions in which women may find themselves are such that using dangerous contraceptives may be the best of even worse options.

#### Resisting neoliberal ideology is our ultimate ethical obligation. Status quo modes of thought only serve to legitimize the system.

Zizek and Daly 4(Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Conversations with Zizek, 2004 page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront** the constitutive violence of today’s global **capitalism and its obscene** naturalization / **anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it** throughout the world. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as** if they were simply **a matter of** chance and **sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.

#### The alternative is to *lay siege*- this strategy allows us to resist the defining stories of injustice as *naturally occurring* in favor of an investigation of the way the drive for profit fuels it.

Nix-Stevenson 13 (Dara Nilajah Nix-Stevenson, PhD in philosophy @ UNC Greensboro, A QUERY INTO THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF (UN)NATURAL DISASTERS: TEACHING (ABOUT) THE BIOPOLITICS OF DISPOSABILITY, 2013)//Miro

These realities underscore the predominant vision that guides disaster relief and reconstruction, a vision that is “familiar” and rooted in Empire. Such a vision utilizes disasters as tools to accelerate preexisting economic, social, and political inequities that ensure suffering of the most vulnerable ultimately fueling the biopolitics of disposability. In this way, disasters become what Arundhati Roy characterizes as avatars of Empire suggesting that “what Empire does is to further entrench and exacerbate already existing inequalities” (Roy, 2004, 28). With this understanding that disaster exacerbates pre-existing inequality, it is clear that Empire affects both the production of disaster and the experience of recovery. Particularly as it relates to Hurricane Katrina and Haiti, languages of Empire are rooted in the global paradigm of colonialism, a macro discourse, that illuminates some of the micro dimensions of the post-hurricane recovery. In the North American context, colonialism refers to several transhistorical processes: the original and repeated European colonization of the indigenous land that would become the United States, the establishment of colonies abroad, and the ongoing internal colonization of people of African descent on American soil (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967) that have normalized the existence of Empire. In order to change Empire’s outcome, the defining stories which breed a ‘politics of complicity’ must also change such that counter narratives of mass resistance movements come to frame public policy outcomes. These stories then become the determinant of who benefits in post-disaster or crisis recovery environments. According to Mohanty (2006, p. 8), “one way to address the politics of complicity is to analyze the languages of imperialism and Empire deployed explicitly by the US State”. Seizing this opportunity to address the languages of imperialism is a way to utilize disaster or crisis as a lens for addressing social vulnerability and recovery as it relates to the ways in which recovery is stratified in both its delivery, and in how it is received according to the ascribed and achieved identity of the recipient. As Haiti and Katrina exemplify, institutions of Empire cannot be solely relied upon to lead the way towards disaster relief, recovery, and reconstruction. Instead they must be replaced with “mass resistance movements, individual activists, journalists, artists, and film makers [who’ve] come together to strip Empire of its sheen” (Roy, 2004, p. 29). Though a new critique, David Korten and Vandana Shiva ground mass resistance movements in what they respectively refer to as partnership cultures and Earth Community as a counter-pedagogical strategy to Empire Partnership cultures and Earth Communities employ pedagogical strategies that elevate subaltern voices deemed biopolitically disposable by privileging them in public policy decision making governing post-disaster resource allocation and “recovery” (Trujillo-Pagan, 2010, p. 35). This is a counter-neoliberal strategy that realigns who or what should assign rationality, efficiency, and success in an age of Empire while simultaneously disrupting existing racialized patriarchies and inequities of gender, class, and nation which can be considered the normal routine functioning of neoliberal capitalist economies embedded in Empire. As conceptualized by Arundhati Roy, Our strategy should be not only to confront Empire, but to lay siege to it. To deprive it of oxygen. To shame it. To mock it. With our art, our music, our literature, our stubbornness, our joy, our brilliance, our sheer relentlessness – and our ability to tell our own stories. Stories that are different from the ones we’re being brainwashed to believe. The corporate revolution will collapse if we refuse to buy what they are selling – their ideas, their version of history, their ways, their weapons, their notion of inevitability. Remember this: We be many and they be few. They need us more than we need them. Another world is not only possible, she is on her way. On a quiet day, I can hear her breathing (Roy, 2003, p. 112). From this vantage point, art, music, literature, stubbornness, joy, brilliance, and relentlessness embedded in the counterstory of the subaltern becomes the tool of mass resistance.

#### I’ll contextualize this to the Aff—instead of simply focusing on bringing “choice” to the medical sphere, we must question the structures of capitalism that remove this choice in the first place. Simply tacking on class struggle as an addendum is not sufficient.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

To develop an independent position, it is necessary to reject the pro-life versus pro-choice model for understanding reproductive justice. Many reproductive advocates have attempted to expand the definitions of either pro-life or pro-choice depending on which side of this divide they may [End Page 133] rest. Unfortunately, they are trying to expand concepts that are inherently designed to exclude the experiences of most women, especially poor women, women of color, indigenous women, and women with disabilities. If we critically assess the assumptions behind both positions, it is clear that these camps are more similar than they are different. As I have argued, they both assume a criminal justice regime for adjudicating reproductive issues (although they may differ as to which women should be subjected to this regime). Neither position endows women with inherent rights to their body—the pro-life position pits fetal rights against women's rights whereas the pro-choice position argues that women should have freedom to make choices rather than possess inherent rights to their bodies regardless of their class standing. They both support positions that reinforce racial and gender hierarchies that marginalize women of color. The pro-life position supports a criminalization approach that depends on a racist political system that will necessarily impact poor women and women of color who are less likely to have alternative strategies for addressing unwanted pregnancies. Meanwhile, the pro-choice position often supports population control policies and the development of dangerous contraceptives that are generally targeted toward communities of color. And both positions do not question the capitalist system—they focus solely on the decision of whether or not a woman should have an abortion without addressing the economic, political, and social conditions that put women in this position in the first place. Consequently, it is critical that reproductive advocates develop a framework that does not rest on the pro-choice versus pro-life framework. Such a strategy would enable us to fight for reproductive justice as a part of a larger social justice strategy. It would also free us to think more creatively about who we could work in coalition with while simultaneously allowing us to hold those who claim to be our allies more accountable for the positions they take. To be successful in this venture, however, it is not sufficient to simply articulate a women of color reproductive justice agenda—we must focus on developing a nationally coordinated women of color movement. While there are many women of color reproductive organizations, relatively few actually focus on bringing new women of color into the movement and training them to organize on their own behalf. And to the extent that these groups do exist, they are not generally coordinated as national mobilization efforts. Rather, national work is generally done on an advocacy level with heads of women of color organizations advocating for policy changes, but often working without a solid base to back their demands (Silliman et al. 2005/in press). Consequently, women of color organizations are not always in a strong position to negotiate with power brokers and mainstream pro-choice organizations or to hold them accountable. As an example, many women [End Page 134] of color groups mobilized to attend the 2004 March for Women's Lives in Washington, D.C., in order to expand the focus of the march from a narrow pro-choice abortion rights agenda to a broad-based reproductive rights agenda. While this broader agenda was reflected in the march, it became co-opted by the pro-choice paradigm in the media coverage of the event. My survey of the major newspaper coverage of the march indicates that virtually no newspaper described it as anything other than a pro-choice or abortion rights march.9 To quote New Orleans health activist Barbara Major, "When you go to power without a base, your demand becomes a request" (2003). Base-building work, on which many women of color organizations are beginning to focus, is very slow work that may not show results for a long time. After all, the base-building of the Christian Right did not become publicly visible for 50 years (Diamond 1989). Perhaps one day, we will have a march for women's lives in which the main issues addressed and reported will include: (1) repealing the Hyde Amendment; (2) stopping the promotion of dangerous contraceptives; (3) decriminalizing women who are pregnant and who have addictions; and (4) ending welfare policies that punish women, in addition to other issues that speak to the intersections of gender, race, and class in reproductive rights policies. At a meeting of the United Council of Tribes in Chicago, representatives from the Chicago Pro-Choice Alliance informed us that we should join the struggle to keep abortion legal or else we would lose our reproductive rights. A woman in the audience responded, "Who cares about reproductive rights; we don't have any rights, period." What her response suggests is that a reproductive justice agenda must make the dismantling of capitalism, white supremacy, and colonialism central to its agenda, and not just as principles added to organizations' promotional material designed to appeal to women of color, with no budget to support making these principles a reality. We must reject single-issue, pro-choice politics of the mainstream reproductive rights movement as an agenda that not only does not serve women of color, but actually promotes the structures of oppression which keep women of color from having real choices or healthy lives.

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### This is best for critical education— This role of the judge allows us to have nuanced debates about social issues of our time.

#### Best for activism— Talking about methodologies to combat oppressive structures makes us better advocates in the future—this is a key pre-requisite to education and fairness claims, even if we learn from debate, that education is useless without the ability to put it to use.

### 1NC—Abortion K

#### The Affirmative’s invocation of the “choice paradigm” surrounding adolescent abortion promotes the consumerist notions of “free” choice underlying neoliberalism.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

The pro-choice camp claims a position that offers more choices for women making decisions about their reproductive lives. A variety of scholars and activists have critiqued the choice paradigm because it rests on essentially individualist, consumerist notions of "free" choice that do not take into consideration all the social, economic, and political conditions that frame the so-called choices that women are forced to make (Patchesky 1990; [End Page 127] Smith 1999; Solinger 2001). Solinger further contends that in the 1960s and 1970s, abortion rights advocates initially used the term "rights" rather than choice; rights are understood as those benefits owed to all those who are human regardless of access to special resources. By contrast, argues Solinger, the concept of choice is connected to possession of resources, thus creating a hierarchy among women based on who is capable of making legitimate choices (2001, 6). Consequently, since under a capitalist system, those with resources are granted more choices, it is not inconsistent to withdraw reproductive rights choices from poor women through legislation such as the Hyde Amendment (which restricts federal funding for abortion) or family caps for TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) recipients.4 Solinger's argument can be demonstrated in the writings of Planned Parenthood. In 1960, Planned Parenthood commissioned a study which concluded that poor and working-class families lacked the rationality to do family planning, and that this lack of "rationality and early family planning as middle-class couples" was "embodied in the particular personalities, world views, and ways of life" of the poor themselves (Rainwater 1960, 5, 167). As Solinger states: "Choice" also became a symbol of middle-class women's arrival as independent consumers. Middle-class women could afford to choose. They had earned the right to choose motherhood, if they liked. According to many Americans, however, when choice was associated with poor women, it became a symbol of illegitimacy. Poor women had not earned the right to choose. (2001, 199-200) What Solinger's analysis suggests is that, ironically, while the pro-choice camp contends that the pro-life position diminishes the rights of women in favor of "fetal" rights; the pro-choice position actually does not ascribe inherent rights to women either. Rather, women are viewed as having reproductive choices if they can afford them or if they are deemed legitimate choice-makers. William Saletan's (1998) history of the evolution of the pro-choice paradigm illustrates the extent to which this paradigm is a conservative one. Saletan contends that pro-choice strategists, generally affiliated with National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL), intentionally rejected a rights-based framework in favor of one that focused on privacy from big government. That is, government should not intervene in the woman's right to decide if she wants to have children. This approach appealed to those with libertarian sensibilities who otherwise might have had no sympathy with feminist causes. The impact of this strategy was that it enabled the pro-choice side to keep Roe v. Wade intact—but only in the most narrow sense. This strategy undermined any attempt to achieve a broader pro-choice agenda because the strategy could be used against a broader agenda. For instance, the argument that government [End Page 128] should not be involved in reproductive rights decisions could also be used by pro-life advocates against federal funding for abortions (Saletan 2003). Consequently, Saletan argues, "Liberals have not won the struggle for abortion rights. Conservatives have" (1998, 114). Furthermore, this narrow approach has contributed to some pro-choice organizations, such as Planned Parenthood and NARAL, often developing strategies that marginalize women of color. Both supported the Freedom of Choice Act in the early 1990s that retained the Hyde Amendment (Saletan 2003). The Hyde Amendment, besides discriminating against poor women by denying federal funding for abortion services, discriminates against American Indian women who largely obtain healthcare through Indian Health Services, a federal agency. One of NARAL's petitions stated: "The Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA) will secure the original vision of Roe v. Wade, giving all women reproductive freedom and securing that right for future generations [emphasis mine]."5 Apparently, poor women and indigenous women do not qualify as "women."6 Building on this analysis, I would argue that while there is certainly a sustained critique of the choice paradigm, particularly among women of color reproductive rights groups, the choice paradigm continues to govern much of the policies of mainstream groups in a manner that sustains the marginalization of women of color, poor women, and women with disabilities. One example is the extent to which pro-choice advocates narrow their advocacy around legislation that affects the one choice of whether or not to have an abortion without addressing all the conditions that gave rise to a woman having to make this decision in the first place. Consequently, politicians, such as former President Bill Clinton, will be heralded as "pro-choice" as long as they do not support legislative restrictions on abortion regardless of their stance on other issues that may equally impact the reproductive choices women make. Clinton's approval of federal welfare reform that places poor women in the position of possibly being forced to have an abortion because of cuts in social services, while often critiqued, is not viewed as an "anti-choice" position. On Planned Parenthood's and NARAL's websites (www.plannedparenthood.org; www.naral.org) there is generally no mention of welfare policies in these organizations' pro-choice legislation alerts. A consequence of the choice paradigm is that its advocates frequently take positions that are oppressive to women from marginalized communities. For instance, this paradigm often makes it difficult to develop nuanced positions on the use of abortion when the fetus is determined to have abnormalities. Focusing solely on the woman's choice to have or not have the child does not address the larger context of a society that sees children with disabilities as having worthless lives and that provides inadequate resources to women who may otherwise want to have them. As Martha Saxton notes: "Our society profoundly limits the 'choice' to [End Page 129] love and care for a baby with a disability" (1998, 375). If our response to disability is to simply facilitate the process by which women can abort fetuses that may have disabilities, we never actually focus on changing economic policies that make raising children with disabilities difficult. Rashmi Luthra (1993) notes, by contrast, that reproductive advocates from other countries such as India, who do not operate from this same choice paradigm, are often able to develop more complicated political positions on issues such as this one.

#### Neolib drives *all* existential scenarios—best empirical evidence

Deutsch 9 (Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” Peace Magazine, <http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm>)//Miro

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that mass extinction "can happen here." A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."¶ BESIDES PROLIFERATION¶ The use of nuclear weapons in wars would appear to be increasingly acceptable. "We have created a situation in the world where we have a very small number of people in control of nuclear arsenals - people whose competence is not necessarily proven, whose rationality is not necessarily at a high level, and whose ethical standards may or may not be acceptable. These people are in charge of making decisions about the use of weapons that could destroy civilization and most life on earth" (p. 245). In their recent collection of papers on nuclear weapons, Falk and Krieger further suggest that the grand military strategy is "largely to project power in order to reap the benefits of profitability for the few. To take control of resources, and to place our military bases strategically around the world in order to have greater degrees of control, sounds like a strategy to benefit corporate interests." They state that the power elite has cleverly manipulated the public by focusing almost exclusive attention on the issue of proliferation, "with corresponding inattention to possession, continuing weapons development, and thinly disguised reliance on threatened use."

#### *Turns case*—the medical-industrial complex uses “choice” framing to undermine informed consent and push dangerous drugs.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

Another example is the difficulty pro-choice groups have in maintaining a critical perspective on dangerous or potentially dangerous contraceptives, arguing that women should have the "choice" of contraceptives. Many scholars and activists have documented the dubious safety record of Norplant and Depo-Provera, two long-acting hormonal contraceptives (Krust and Assetoyer 1993; Masterson and Guthrie 1986; Roberts 1997; Smith 2001). In fact, lawsuits against Norplant have forced an end to its distribution (although Norplant that remains on the shelves can be sold to women). In 1978, the FDA denied approval for Depo-Provera on the grounds that: (1) dog studies confirmed an elevated rate of breast cancer; (2) there appeared to be an increased risk of birth defects in human fetuses exposed to the drug; and (3) there was no pressing need shown for use of the drug as a contraceptive (Masterson and Guthrie). In 1987, the FDA changed its regulations and began to require cancer testing in rats and mice instead of dogs and monkeys; Depo-Provera did not cause cancer in these animals, but major concerns regarding its safety persist (Feminist Women's Health Centers 1997). Also problematic is the manner in which these contraceptives are frequently promoted in communities of color and often without informed consent (Krust and Assetoyer 1993; Masterson and Guthrie 1986; Smith 2001).7 Yet none of the mainstream pro-choice organizations have ever seriously taken a position on the issue of informed consent as part of their agenda.8 Indeed, Gloria Feldt, president of Planned Parenthood, equates opposition to Norplant and Depo-Provera as opposition to "choice" in her book The War on Choice (Feldt 2004, 34, 37). Planned Parenthood and NARAL opposed restrictions against sterilization abuse, despite the thousands of women of color who were being sterilized without their consent, because they saw such policies as interfering with a woman's "right to choose" (Nelson 2003, 144; Patchesky 1990, 8). Particularly disturbing has been some of the support given by these organizations to the Center for Research on Population and Security, headed by Stephen Mumford and Elton Kessel, which distributes globally a form of sterilization, Quinacrine. Quinacrine is a drug that is used to treat malaria. It is inserted into the uterus where it dissolves, causing the fallopian tubes to scar, rendering the woman irreversibly sterile. Family Health International conducted four in vitro studies and found [End Page 130] Quinacrine to be mutagenic in three of them (Controversy Over Sterilization Pellet 1994; Norsigian 1996). It, as well as the World Health Organization, recommended against further trials for female sterilization, and no regulatory body supports Quinacrine. However, the North Carolina-based Center for Research on Population and Security has circumvented these bodies through private funding from such organizations as the Turner Foundation and Leland Fykes organization (which incidentally funds pro-choice and anti-immigrant groups). The Center for Research on Population and Security has been distributing Quinacrine for free to researchers and government health agencies. There are field trials in eleven countries, with more than 70,000 women sterilized. In Vietnam, a hundred female rubber plant workers were given routine pelvic exams during which the doctor inserted the Quinacrine without their consent. Thus far, the side effects linked to Quinacrine include ectopic pregnancy, puncturing of the uterus during insertion, pelvic inflammatory disease, and severe abdominal pains. Other possible concerns include heart and liver damage and exacerbation of pre-existing viral conditions. In one of the trials in Vietnam, a large number of cases that had serious side effects were excluded from the data (Controversy Over Sterilization Pellet 1994; Norsigian 1996). Despite the threat to reproductive justice that this group represents, Feminist Majority Foundation featured the Center for Research on Population and Security at its 1996 Feminist Expo because, I was informed by the organizers, they promoted choice for women. Then in 1999, Planned Parenthood almost agreed to sponsor a Quinacrine trial in the United States until outside pressure forced it to change its position (Committee on Women, Population and the Environment 1999). A prevalent ideology within the mainstream pro-choice movement is that women should have the choice to use whatever contraception they want. This position does not consider: (1) that a choice among dangerous contraceptives is not much of a choice; (2) the millions of dollars pharmaceutical companies and the medical industry have to promote certain contraceptives, compared to the few resources women's advocacy groups have to provide alternative information on these same contraceptives; and (3) the social, political, and economic conditions in which women may find themselves are such that using dangerous contraceptives may be the best of even worse options.

#### Resisting neoliberal ideology is our ultimate ethical obligation. Status quo modes of thought only serve to legitimize the system.

Zizek and Daly 4(Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Conversations with Zizek, 2004 page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront** the constitutive violence of today’s global **capitalism and its obscene** naturalization / **anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it** throughout the world. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as** if they were simply **a matter of** chance and **sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.

#### The alternative is to *lay siege*- this strategy allows us to resist the defining stories of injustice as *naturally occurring* in favor of an investigation of the way the drive for profit fuels it.

Nix-Stevenson 13 (Dara Nilajah Nix-Stevenson, PhD in philosophy @ UNC Greensboro, A QUERY INTO THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF (UN)NATURAL DISASTERS: TEACHING (ABOUT) THE BIOPOLITICS OF DISPOSABILITY, 2013)//Miro

These realities underscore the predominant vision that guides disaster relief and reconstruction, a vision that is “familiar” and rooted in Empire. Such a vision utilizes disasters as tools to accelerate preexisting economic, social, and political inequities that ensure suffering of the most vulnerable ultimately fueling the biopolitics of disposability. In this way, disasters become what Arundhati Roy characterizes as avatars of Empire suggesting that “what Empire does is to further entrench and exacerbate already existing inequalities” (Roy, 2004, 28). With this understanding that disaster exacerbates pre-existing inequality, it is clear that Empire affects both the production of disaster and the experience of recovery. Particularly as it relates to Hurricane Katrina and Haiti, languages of Empire are rooted in the global paradigm of colonialism, a macro discourse, that illuminates some of the micro dimensions of the post-hurricane recovery. In the North American context, colonialism refers to several transhistorical processes: the original and repeated European colonization of the indigenous land that would become the United States, the establishment of colonies abroad, and the ongoing internal colonization of people of African descent on American soil (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967) that have normalized the existence of Empire. In order to change Empire’s outcome, the defining stories which breed a ‘politics of complicity’ must also change such that counter narratives of mass resistance movements come to frame public policy outcomes. These stories then become the determinant of who benefits in post-disaster or crisis recovery environments. According to Mohanty (2006, p. 8), “one way to address the politics of complicity is to analyze the languages of imperialism and Empire deployed explicitly by the US State”. Seizing this opportunity to address the languages of imperialism is a way to utilize disaster or crisis as a lens for addressing social vulnerability and recovery as it relates to the ways in which recovery is stratified in both its delivery, and in how it is received according to the ascribed and achieved identity of the recipient. As Haiti and Katrina exemplify, institutions of Empire cannot be solely relied upon to lead the way towards disaster relief, recovery, and reconstruction. Instead they must be replaced with “mass resistance movements, individual activists, journalists, artists, and film makers [who’ve] come together to strip Empire of its sheen” (Roy, 2004, p. 29). Though a new critique, David Korten and Vandana Shiva ground mass resistance movements in what they respectively refer to as partnership cultures and Earth Community as a counter-pedagogical strategy to Empire Partnership cultures and Earth Communities employ pedagogical strategies that elevate subaltern voices deemed biopolitically disposable by privileging them in public policy decision making governing post-disaster resource allocation and “recovery” (Trujillo-Pagan, 2010, p. 35). This is a counter-neoliberal strategy that realigns who or what should assign rationality, efficiency, and success in an age of Empire while simultaneously disrupting existing racialized patriarchies and inequities of gender, class, and nation which can be considered the normal routine functioning of neoliberal capitalist economies embedded in Empire. As conceptualized by Arundhati Roy, Our strategy should be not only to confront Empire, but to lay siege to it. To deprive it of oxygen. To shame it. To mock it. With our art, our music, our literature, our stubbornness, our joy, our brilliance, our sheer relentlessness – and our ability to tell our own stories. Stories that are different from the ones we’re being brainwashed to believe. The corporate revolution will collapse if we refuse to buy what they are selling – their ideas, their version of history, their ways, their weapons, their notion of inevitability. Remember this: We be many and they be few. They need us more than we need them. Another world is not only possible, she is on her way. On a quiet day, I can hear her breathing (Roy, 2003, p. 112). From this vantage point, art, music, literature, stubbornness, joy, brilliance, and relentlessness embedded in the counterstory of the subaltern becomes the tool of mass resistance.

#### I’ll contextualize this to the Aff—instead of simply focusing on bringing “choice” to the medical sphere, we must question the structures of capitalism that remove this choice in the first place. Simply tacking on class struggle as an addendum is not sufficient.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

To develop an independent position, it is necessary to reject the pro-life versus pro-choice model for understanding reproductive justice. Many reproductive advocates have attempted to expand the definitions of either pro-life or pro-choice depending on which side of this divide they may [End Page 133] rest. Unfortunately, they are trying to expand concepts that are inherently designed to exclude the experiences of most women, especially poor women, women of color, indigenous women, and women with disabilities. If we critically assess the assumptions behind both positions, it is clear that these camps are more similar than they are different. As I have argued, they both assume a criminal justice regime for adjudicating reproductive issues (although they may differ as to which women should be subjected to this regime). Neither position endows women with inherent rights to their body—the pro-life position pits fetal rights against women's rights whereas the pro-choice position argues that women should have freedom to make choices rather than possess inherent rights to their bodies regardless of their class standing. They both support positions that reinforce racial and gender hierarchies that marginalize women of color. The pro-life position supports a criminalization approach that depends on a racist political system that will necessarily impact poor women and women of color who are less likely to have alternative strategies for addressing unwanted pregnancies. Meanwhile, the pro-choice position often supports population control policies and the development of dangerous contraceptives that are generally targeted toward communities of color. And both positions do not question the capitalist system—they focus solely on the decision of whether or not a woman should have an abortion without addressing the economic, political, and social conditions that put women in this position in the first place. Consequently, it is critical that reproductive advocates develop a framework that does not rest on the pro-choice versus pro-life framework. Such a strategy would enable us to fight for reproductive justice as a part of a larger social justice strategy. It would also free us to think more creatively about who we could work in coalition with while simultaneously allowing us to hold those who claim to be our allies more accountable for the positions they take. To be successful in this venture, however, it is not sufficient to simply articulate a women of color reproductive justice agenda—we must focus on developing a nationally coordinated women of color movement. While there are many women of color reproductive organizations, relatively few actually focus on bringing new women of color into the movement and training them to organize on their own behalf. And to the extent that these groups do exist, they are not generally coordinated as national mobilization efforts. Rather, national work is generally done on an advocacy level with heads of women of color organizations advocating for policy changes, but often working without a solid base to back their demands (Silliman et al. 2005/in press). Consequently, women of color organizations are not always in a strong position to negotiate with power brokers and mainstream pro-choice organizations or to hold them accountable. As an example, many women [End Page 134] of color groups mobilized to attend the 2004 March for Women's Lives in Washington, D.C., in order to expand the focus of the march from a narrow pro-choice abortion rights agenda to a broad-based reproductive rights agenda. While this broader agenda was reflected in the march, it became co-opted by the pro-choice paradigm in the media coverage of the event. My survey of the major newspaper coverage of the march indicates that virtually no newspaper described it as anything other than a pro-choice or abortion rights march.9 To quote New Orleans health activist Barbara Major, "When you go to power without a base, your demand becomes a request" (2003). Base-building work, on which many women of color organizations are beginning to focus, is very slow work that may not show results for a long time. After all, the base-building of the Christian Right did not become publicly visible for 50 years (Diamond 1989). Perhaps one day, we will have a march for women's lives in which the main issues addressed and reported will include: (1) repealing the Hyde Amendment; (2) stopping the promotion of dangerous contraceptives; (3) decriminalizing women who are pregnant and who have addictions; and (4) ending welfare policies that punish women, in addition to other issues that speak to the intersections of gender, race, and class in reproductive rights policies. At a meeting of the United Council of Tribes in Chicago, representatives from the Chicago Pro-Choice Alliance informed us that we should join the struggle to keep abortion legal or else we would lose our reproductive rights. A woman in the audience responded, "Who cares about reproductive rights; we don't have any rights, period." What her response suggests is that a reproductive justice agenda must make the dismantling of capitalism, white supremacy, and colonialism central to its agenda, and not just as principles added to organizations' promotional material designed to appeal to women of color, with no budget to support making these principles a reality. We must reject single-issue, pro-choice politics of the mainstream reproductive rights movement as an agenda that not only does not serve women of color, but actually promotes the structures of oppression which keep women of color from having real choices or healthy lives.

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

### 

### 1NC—AT: K Theory

#### Counter-interp: The NC gets to question the philosophical underpinnings of the AC.

#### Reasons to prefer:

#### Best for critical education: refusing to challenge the underpinnings of our thought makes it impossible to affirm any position. <<There’s no intrinsic reason their constructions are key to the plan which means *they can’t weigh the aff.*>>

#### Middle ground on fairness: The AC was 10 seconds advocacy, 7:50 value judgments- forcing the debate to be over those 10 seconds guts core neg ground.

#### Cross-apply Giroux here—in order to become more ethical citizens and participants in political activism, we must critically question the underpinnings of our own thought.

### 1NC—Ethical Fwk

#### Metaethical focuses locks in a grammar of suffering – turns the NC.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

In a market-driven system in which economic and political decisions are removed from social costs, the flight of critical thought and social responsibility is further accentuated by what Zygmunt Bauman calls "ethical tranquillization."6 One result is a form of depoliticization that works its way through the social order, removing social relations from the configurations of power that shape them, substituting what Wendy Brown calls "emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems."6 Consequently, it becomes difficult for young people too often bereft of a critical education to translate private troubles into public concerns. As private interests trump the public good, public spaces are corroded, and short-term personal advantage replaces any larger notion of civic engagement and social responsibility. Under such circumstances, to cite C. W. Mills, we are witnessing the breakdown of democracy, the disappearance of critical intellectuals and "the collapse of those public spheres which offer a sense of critical agency and social imagination."8 Mill's prescient comments amplify what has become a tragic reality. Missing from neoliberal market societies are those public spheres - from public and higher education to the mainstream media and digital screen culture - where people can develop what might be called the civic imagination. For example, in the last few decades, we have seen market mentalities attempt to strip education of its public values, critical content and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to consumerism, risk-free relationships and the disappearance of the social state in the name of individual, expanded choice. Tied largely to instrumental ideologies and measurable paradigms, many institutions of higher education are now committed almost exclusively to economic goals, such as preparing students for the workforce - all done as part of an appeal to rationality, one that eschews matters of inequality, power and the ethical grammars of suffering.9 Many universities have not only strayed from their democratic mission, they also seem immune to the plight of students who face a harsh new world of high unemployment, the prospect of downward mobility and debilitating debt.

### 1NC – Hotbeds K

#### The affirmatives creation of particular places as unstable hotbeds for violence ignores the spacial nature of violence within neoliberalism. The affirmatives imaginative geographies create self-fulfilling prophecies which guarantee the expansion of neoliberal violence. Only the negative interrogation of neoliberal violence can solve colonial wars.

Springer 11 /Simon, Department of Geography, University of Otago, New Zealand, “Violence sits in places? Cultural practice, neoliberal rationalism, and virulent imaginative geographies”, Political Geography 30 (2011) 90-98/

The idea that violence might be integral to cultural practice is¶ difficult to accept. In concert with the abuse that the concept of¶ culture has been subjected to as of late, where in keeping with geopolitical hegemony (see Harrison & Huntington, 2000), or¶ perhaps more surprisingly in an attempt to argue against such¶ hegemonic might (see Roberts, 2001), some cultures, particularly¶ ‘Asian’, ‘African’, or ‘Islamic’ cultures, are conferred with a supposedly¶ inherent predilection towards violence. Yet the relationship between culture and violence is also axiomatic, since violence is part of human activity. Thus, it is not the call for violence to be understood as a social process informed by culture that is problematic; rather it is the potential to colonize this observation with imaginative geographies that distort it in such a fashion that deliberately or inadvertently enable particular geostrategic aims to gain validity. The principal method of distortion is Orientalism,¶ which as ‘a distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic,¶ scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts’,¶ is ‘an elaboration not only of a basic geographical distinction’ but¶ a whole series of ‘interests’ which create, maintain, and have the¶ intention to understand, control, manipulate, and incorporate that¶ which is manifestly different through a discourse that is produced¶ and exists in an uneven exchange with various kinds of power:¶ political, intellectual, cultural, and moral (Said, 2003: 12). At base,¶ Orientalism is a form of paranoia that feeds on cartographies of fear by producing ‘our’ world negatively through the construction of a perverse ‘Other’. This is precisely the discourse colonialism mobilized to construct its exploitative authority in the past. In the¶ current context, a relatively new geostrategic aim appeals to the same discursive principles for valorization in its quest to impose an econometric version of global sovereignty (Hart, 2006; Pieterse,¶ 2004; Sparke, 2004). Neoliberalism is on the move, and in the¶ context of the global south, Orientalism is its latitude inasmuch as it affords neoliberalism a powerful discursive space to manuver.¶ This paper has two interrelated central aims. First, building on¶ the work of Arturo Escobar (2001) and Doreen Massey (2005), I¶ contribute to re-theorizations of place as a relational assemblage,¶ rather than as an isolated container, by calling into question the¶ relationship between place and violence. Second, informed by an understanding of Orientalism as performative (Said, 2003), and power/knowledge as productive (Foucault, 1977), I set out to¶ challenge how neoliberalism discursively assigns violence to particular peoples and cultures through its employment of the problematic notions of place that I dispute. I argue that Orientalism maintains an underlying assumption that violence sits in places,¶ and as an affect and effect of discourse, this Orientalist view is¶ enabled because the production of space and place is largely¶ a discursive enterprise (Bachelard, 1964; Lefebvre, 1991). But while violence can bind itself to our somatic geographies and lived experiences of place, in the same way that culture is not confined to¶ any particular place, so too do violent geographies stretch inwards and outwards to reveal the inherent dynamism of space as multiple sites are repeatedly entwined by violence. Thus, following Michel¶ Foucault’s (1977, 1980) insights on power, I am not interested in the why of violence, but rather the how and where of violence. A culturally sensitive critical political economy approach alerts us¶ to the power/knowledge-geometries at play (Hart, 2002; Peet,¶ 2000; Sayer, 2001), so that while violence is clearly mediated¶ through and informed by local cultural norms, it is equally¶ enmeshed in the logic of globalized capital.¶ In the setting of the global south, where and upon which the global north’s caricatural vision of violence repeatedly turns, authoritarian leaders may appropriate neoliberal concerns for market security as a rationale for their violent and repressive actions (Canterbury, 2005; Springer, 2009c). At the same time,¶ because of the performative nature of Orientalism, an exasperated populace may follow their ‘scripted’ roles and resort to violent means in their attempts to cope with the festering poverty and mounting inequality wrought by their state’s deepening neoliberalization¶ (Uvin, 2003). Far from being a symptom of an innate¶ cultural proclivity for violence, state-sponsored violence and systemic social strife can be seen as outcomes of both a state made ‘differently powerful’ via the ongoing ‘roll-out’ of neoliberal reforms (Peck, 2001: 447), and the discourses that support this¶ process (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2001; Springer, 2010b). Thus, when applied to the context of ‘the Other’, neoliberalism maintains¶ e in the double sense of both incessant reproduction and the construction of alterity as ‘Self’-perpetuating logic. Through the circulation of a discourse that posits violence as an exclusive¶ cultural preserve, and by inextricably linking itself to democracy, neoliberalism presents itself as the harbinger of rationality and the only guarantor of peace. Yet neoliberalism’s structural effects of poverty and inequality often (re)produce violence (Escobar,¶ 2004; Springer, 2008), and as such, neoliberalism perpetually renews its own license by suggesting it will cure that which neoliberalization ails.¶ To be clear from the outset, this paper is decidedly theoretical.¶ While writing about violence directly in empirical terms is¶ a worthwhile endeavor to be sure, it is one that e without significant¶ attention and attachment to social theory e risks lending itself to problematic and even Orientalist readings of place. Thus,¶ the purpose here is to critique the limitations of a placed-based¶ approach to violence that merely catalogs in situ, rather than appropriately recognizing the relational geographies of both violence and place. Accordingly, I do not offer empirical accounts of particular places, as my intention is to call such particularized interpretations of ‘place’ into question. The punctuation in the title¶ is very much purposeful in this regard. While violence sits in places in terms of the way in which we perceive its manifestation as a localized and embodied experience, this very idea is challenged when place is reconsidered as a relational assemblage. This re-theorization opens up the supposed fixity, separation, and immutability of place to recognize it instead as always co-constituted by, mediated through, and integrated within the wider experiences of space. Such a radical rethinking of place fundamentally transforms the way we understand violence. No longer confined to its material expression as an isolated ‘event’ or localized ‘thing’, violence can more appropriately be understood as an unfolding process, arising from the broader geographical phenomena and temporal patterns of the social world. In short,¶ through such a reinterpretation of place, geographers are much better positioned to dismiss Orientalist accounts that bind violence to particular peoples, cultures, and places, as was the mandate of colonial geography. We can instead initiate a more emancipatory geography that challenges such colonial imaginings by questioning how seemingly local expressions of violence are instead always imbricated within wider socio-spatial and political economic patterns. This allows geographers to recognize with more theoretical force how ongoing (neo)colonial frameworks, like neoliberalism, are woven between, within, and across places in ways that facilitate and (re)produce violence.

#### Neoliberalism produces crises to justify the expansion of the war machine. The aff impacts are hype which will be used to justify war.

Featherstone 2009

/Mark, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Keele University, “Appetite for Destruction: On Naomi Klein’s Neo-liberal Utopia-Dystopia”, Fast Capitalism 5.2, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/5\_2/Featherstone5\_2.html/

Given the existence of the corporate class, it is clear that there is no freedom of competition in the disaster capitalist state. Thus we might conclude that the official ideology of neo-liberalism, which turns off the idea that we should celebrate brutal conflict and natural inequality in civilized society, is a sham. As such, it is not only that we now have no welfare state, since the World Bank and IMF tell us that management of the economy is corruption of the economy, but that the start of the 21st century has seen the emergence of the welfare state’s evil twin, the warfare state, which regards war and natural catastrophe as opportunities to engage in plunder, corruption, and the redistribution of wealth from the poorest to the richest sectors of society. This is Klein’s thesis in a nutshell. In terms of her conclusion that the warfare state is committed to the redistribution of wealth from poor to rich, she is in agreement with David Harvey (2005), whose history of neo-liberalism summarises the rise of this new form of capitalism, but where Klein extends Harvey’s work is in her connection of neo-liberalism to warfare, catastrophe, and chaos. In her view chaos is today’s big business. Chaos opens up the Hobbesian state of nature, which is in itself the natural model of pure capitalism and enables the champions of neo-liberalism to fill its institutionless void with regulation set on the legalisation of brutal struggle. Although Hobbes name never appears in The Shock Doctrine, I think he is the philosophical father of Klein’s central concept, disaster capitalism. Consider Hobbes’ key work Leviathan (2007). Is disaster capitalism not about the destruction of the Keynesian state and the creation of a neo-liberal world system through the endless repetition of Hobbes’ theory of the birth of society? Hobbes tells us that before society existed there was chaos, the state of nature. The Leviathan, sovereign power, imposed law upon the state of nature in order to regulate the behaviour of men. Beyond the prevention of total violence, which would lead to the collapse of political society, the Leviathan would allow men freedoms, but what he would not allow would be the freedom to change the system itself.¶ In neo-liberalism Hobbes’ pre-social chaos is produced by either war or some natural catastrophe. Sovereign power, the neo-liberal elite, then roll into town to impose new order onto the chaotic situation. They impose neo-liberalism upon the native population, who have by this time become natural savages, and then legalise this ideology on the basis that it is the best way to manage society. The sticking point is, of course, that Hobbes’ theory of the state of nature was only ever a thought-experiment meant to apply to some originary condition before society had been invented in the first place. How, then, can this model be applied to neo-liberalism, which seems committed to regime change in order to further its objective of a worldwide corporate utopia? The answer to this question is that we have to think about Locke’s (2003) key addition to Hobbes’ original model of the liberal society. Locke took Hobbes’ original theory of the Leviathan and provided men with the right to overthrow the sovereign and install a new regime if the living God violated their natural rights to life, liberty, and property. What we have here is the model for neo-liberal ideology and the theory of regime change with Empire installed as representative of the people oppressed by the violent Leviathan. Although the necessary theory of political economy was introduced later by Adam Smith (1998), who spoke about the invisible hand of the market and the idea that individual greed could somehow benefit everybody, Friedrich Hayek (2001), who opposed the notion of the free market to the reality of Communist unfreedom, and Milton Friedman (2002), who repackaged these ideas in a theory of the scientific validity of laissez faire capitalism and then tried to sell it to successive American presidents, I maintain that the ideological roots of Klein’s theory of disaster capitalism reside in the strange fusion of Hobbes and Locke expressed in the works of Hayek and Friedman.¶ It may be that for the best part of the 20th century disaster capitalism was more or less held in check by the existence of Communism and the capitalist elite’s recognition that it need to appease the have nots to prevent them turning red, but as the century drew to a close this barrier was no longer effective. In the wake of the failure of the left, Klein explains that the capitalist elite embarked on their plan to neo-liberalise the entire world through the medium of chaos. She begins with a consideration of New Orleans and the effects of Hurricane Katrina. In her view Katrina presented the neo-liberal utopians, who are committed to the creation of a pure capitalist world, with the perfect opportunity to impose a new Hobbesian settlement upon the people of New Orleans. In other words, the catastrophe of Katrina transformed New Orleans into a state of nature, or tabula rasa, and the disaster capitalists were quick to exploit the situation. As the reconstruction effort took effect state schools became private schools and the entire infrastructure of the city was privatized under cover of public trauma. This later point about the ‘cover of trauma’ is essential because it explains the title of Klein’s book. Klein’s thesis is not simply that chaos is the new market for corporate utopians. The first step in Klein’s theory is that chaos is necessary to the transformation of social welfare states that limit extremes of poverty and wealth through legislation and regulation into warfare states that create extremes of poverty and wealth through legislation and regulation which institutionalise the state of everyday war that feeds the neo-liberal disaster capitalist complex. Her point here is to suggest that explosions of chaos and catastrophe tend to undermine the ability of people to resist processes of neo-liberalism and that the corporate utopians have understood that shock is a useful tool for the implementation of catastrophic reform.¶ In many ways this idea suggests a new theory of the ways in which neo-liberal, or totalitarian, capitalism has achieved mastery over the diverse scalings of contemporary reality, since what Klein’s thesis offers is a theory of the ways that the ideology of neo-liberal globalisation feeds through state policy to the psychological transformations of individuals who must then endure the new neo-liberal reality they find themselves occupying. Although I am not sure Klein is wholly successful in this effort to provide a comprehensive theory of the connections between of scalings of our novel neo-liberal reality, simply because she is clearly not versed in the works of Lacan and thus cannot offer an integrated theory of the ways in which our lives are ordered by the symbolic systems that surround us, I think she presents an interesting analysis of processes of subjective transformation under neo-liberal capitalism. The Lacanian thinker Dany-Robert Dufour (2008) covers similar terrain in his book The Art of Shrinking Heads, but where Dufour connects the evolution of neo-liberal culture, which destroys people’s ability to think critically about the world, to the rise of shopping and consumerism, Klein links the emergence of neo-liberal man to torture and the production of schizophrenic subjectivity. That is to say that where Dufour focuses on expansion of the culture industries and the commodification of everything, Klein considers a series of CIA experiments conducted in the 1950s set on the discovery of the psychological techniques necessary to re-pattern individuals.¶ In this way Klein shifts from a discussion of a particular episode of psychological torment, which caused the collapse of the psychic structures of particular individuals, through large scale shock therapy, meant to de-pattern individuals on a mass scale, to the emergence of what Lieven De Cauter (2004) calls entropic Empire, a convulsive world system that produces individuals who are either in a state of constant shock or evolve into perfect schizo capitalists able to roll with the blows of the new world dis-order. Reading Klein’s book it seems clear that neo-liberal man is a miserable, tortured, creature. In Klein’s work there is no happy schizo who, in Deleuze and Guattari’s language, takes flight whenever it appears that they are likely to find themselves stuck in some molar formation or other, but rather millions of old style Freudian (1989) subjects who need civilization to structure their lives. For evidence of the continued existence of the Freudian subject we simply need to consider how neo-liberal man has responded to the privatisation of civilization. He has not welcomed this process by transforming himself into a desiring machine, even though champions of the culture industry would say that that is exactly what the excessive subject of contemporary late capitalism has become, but has instead fallen into a state of paranoia. Of course, this is exactly what Klein’s monstrous system requires of neo-liberal man. The schizo subject, fearful of the outside world, in need of consolation, turns to the universe of commodities produced by the culture industry, and his specially constructed fortified community produced by the security industry, for comfort and protection from those less fortunate schizos, who want similar relief and protection from the endless shocks of convulsive capitalism. Perhaps I have mis-understood Deleuze and Guattari’s Schizophrenia and Capitalism (1983, 1984), but I am sure that this desperate situation is not what they had in mind when they wrote about the potential of the schizo to escape the paranoid formations of capitalism.¶ Far from transgressing paranoid formations it is clear that the contemporary neo-liberal schizo produces bunkers, walls, fortified communities, panic rooms, and surveillance systems in excess. In light of this explosion of paranoia the Belgian urbanist Lieven De Cauter (2004) claims that we live in a capsular civilization. In his view this paranoid culture, characterised by expressions of anxiety and fear, is perfectly suited to the new brand of capitalism, which is geared to the creation and management of chaos. Consider the contemporary global homeland security industry. Klein explains that this industry, which takes in the most unequal societies in the world, America, South Africa, Brazil, and Israel, is now even more profitable than the home of Adorno and Horkheimer’s (1997) culture industry, Hollywood. Moreover, she tells us that the masters of security, the Israelis, have proven that the traditional rule, which suggests that chaos and economic vitality are opposites that cannot co-exist, is no longer operative in the contemporary world. In 2007 the performance of the Israeli economy was comparable to that of the Chinese and Indian boom economies because, in her view, the security corporations, such as the wall builders Magal and Elbit, were so profitable. Thus we live in a security bubble, conditioned by mass surveillance, mass incarceration, urban warfare, eroded civil liberties, and legitimate torture, which requires the production of catastrophe to ensure its continued vitality.¶ Given this view, let us once more emphasise the problem with Retort’s (2005) idea that the situation in Israel-Palestine is somehow detrimental to the symbolic coherence of Empire. The endless war between Israel and Hamas is clearly not problematic to either Israel or the American Empire because it enables Israel to maintain its ‘competitive advantage’ in the homeland security market and America to keep its foot in the door of the same market. Where would the war on terror be without Israel-Palestine? All of this sounds like an enormous conspiracy theory. Surely it is insane to suggest that the situation in the Middle East is driven by economic considerations and that American interest in the area is conditioned by its desire to stimulate profitable chaos? The truth is that to see the rise of the disaster capitalism complex in the Middle East as a vast conspiracy theory thins out the evolution of the situation, underestimates the deep cultural connections between Israel, America, the idea of the frontier, and capitalist ideology suggested above, and misses the ways in which the new catastrophic form of capitalism emerged as an adaptation to already existing chaos in the region. What does this mean? Klein’s thesis is that disaster capitalism was extended to the Middle East in its completed state to take advantage of pre-existing chaos and expand American influence in the area. In other words, her view is that disaster capitalism came to Israel, Iraq, and the Middle East late, but that when it did emerge it took the form of a fully integrated system set on the extraction of surplus value from the production and exploitation of violence, destruction, and misery. In this respect discussions of the exploitation of urban war in Israel and Iraq and natural catastrophe in Indonesia, Thailand, the Maldives, and New Orleans represent the pinnacle of contemporary disaster capitalism in Klein’s account. But what about the origins of this new brand of capitalism? Where did disaster capitalism begin?¶ Beyond her consideration of the CIA’s experiments in torture, which set the scene for discussions of social deconstruction-reconstruction in the service of American capitalism, Klein focuses on Latin America in the post World War II period and in particular American fear of the potential of developmentalism to foster pro-communist sentiments in the Latin American masses. In response to these fears Klein shows how the CIA sponsored military dictatorships in Chile, Argentina, and Brazil and encouraged these regimes to implement neo-liberal economic reform. Since the Friedmanite reform programmes of the so-called Chicago Boys, the Chicago trained economists put in place to neo-liberalise the Latin economies, caused wide-spread poverty, misery, and hardship Klein explains that it was necessary for the military regimes to support them with brutal violence and indiscriminate terrorism. Thus the first example of the implementation of the shock doctrine entailed economic transformation through planned violence and organised terrorism. Violence became the means to the end of economic re-organisation and the redistribution of wealth from the poorest classes to the rich elites. But by the 1980s state violence was no longer the only engine of the American sponsored process of neo-liberalisation. In the early 1980s Margaret Thatcher embarked on the privatization of British society on the basis of success in the Falklands War. As the decade wore on Thatcher’s policy of privatisation was coupled with attacks on organised labour, the de-regulation of business, and the reduction of state welfare.¶ As the 1980s became the 1990s Klein tells us the neo-liberal system was ready to begin the transformation into full scale disaster capitalism. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, first Russia, then China, Poland, Mexico, South Africa, and the Asian Tigers fell foul of the neo-liberal system set on the exploitation of chaos. Although in Klein’s view it would be a mistake to imagine that the viral infections of the globalised neo-liberal system in the 1990s, most clearly evident in the economic collapse of the Asian Tigers which was correctly titled ‘Asian Flu’, were somehow natural catastrophes, since in the Friedmanite view the global economy needs convulsions, crashes, and shocks to drive innovation, creativity, and the production of surplus value, she does not think this is enough to qualify these episodes as examples of the intervention of disaster capitalism. The reason for this is that even though the notion of the productivity of chaos, which is perfectly symmetrical with Schumpeter’s (1984) idea of creative destruction, was present in the 1990s there was no clear sense that chaos could be engineered for the sake of the creation of surplus value. Thus Klein suggests that the final step in the emergence of the fully reflexive entropic empire was the invention of disaster capitalism proper, a complete social, political, cultural, and economic form set on the promotion, production, and exploitation of chaos on a global scale. Does this mean, then, that we should regard the Iraq War as the classic example of the disaster capitalism complex? I think that we must support this conclusion because it is only really in Iraq that we find the complete package of the promotion, production, and exploitation of chaos without outside intervention from natural catastrophe, quasi-natural economic crash, or entrenched political conflict ripe for insertion into the disaster capitalism complex.

### 1NC – dedev

#### The best models are pointing to an environmental and economic collapse *in the next decade*- culminating in extinction. Economic decline now allows for a stable transition to a sustainable society.

Ahmed 14 (Nafeez, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex, 2014, “Scientists vindicate 'Limits to Growth' – urge investment in 'circular economy',” http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-insight/2014/jun/04/scientists-limits-to-growth-vindicated-investment-transition-circular-economy/AKG) \*Added isn’t

According to a new peer-reviewed scientific report, industrial civilisation is likely to deplete its low-cost mineral resources within the next century, with debilitating impacts for the global economy and key infrastructures within the coming decade. The study, the 33rd report to the Club of Rome, is authored by Prof Ugo Bardi of the University of Florence's Earth Sciences Department, and includes contributions from a wide range of senior scientists across relevant disciplines. The Club of Rome is a Swiss-based global think tank consisting of current and former heads of state, UN bureaucrats, government officials, diplomats, scientists, economists and business leaders. Its first report in 1972, The Limits to Growth, was conducted by a scientific team at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology (MIT), and warned that limited availability of natural resources relative to rising costs would undermine continued economic growth by around the second decade of the 21st century. Although widely ridiculed, recent scientific reviews confirm that the original report's projections in its 'base scenario' remain robust. In 2008, Australia's federal government scientific research agency CSIRO concluded that The Limits to Growth forecast of potential "global ecological and economic collapse coming up in the middle of the 21st Century" due to convergence of "peak oil, climate change, and food and water security", is "on-track." Actual current trends in these areas "resonate strongly with the overshoot and collapse displayed in the book's 'business-as-usual scenario.'" In 2009, American Scientist published similar findings by other scientists. That review, by leading systems ecologists Prof Charles Hall of State University of New York and Prof John W Day of Louisiana State University, concluded that while the limits-to-growth model's "predictions of extreme pollution and population decline have not come true", the model results are: "... almost exactly on course some 35 years later in 2008 (with a few appropriate assumptions)... it is important to recognise that its predictions have not been invalidated and in fact seem quite on target. We are not aware of any model made by economists that is as accurate over such a long time span." The new Club of Rome report says that: "The phase of mining by humans is a spectacular but very brief episode in the geological history of the planet… The limits to mineral extraction are not limits of quantity; they are limits of energy. Extracting minerals takes energy, and the more dispersed the minerals are, the more energy is needed… Only conventional ores can be profitably mined with the amounts of energy we can produce today." The combination of mineral depletion, associated radioactive and heavy metal pollution, and the accumulation of greenhouse gases from fossil fuel exploitation is leaving our descendants the "heavy legacy" of a virtually terraformed world: "The Earth will never be the same; it is being transformed into a new and different planet." Drawing on the work of leading climate scientists including James Hansen, the former head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, the report warns that a continuation of 'business as usual' exploitation of the world's fossil fuels could potentially trigger runaway global warming that, in several centuries or thousands of years, permanently destroy the planet's capacity to host life. Despite this verdict, the report argues that neither a "collapse" of the current structure of civilisation, nor the "extinction" of the human species are [isn’t]\* unavoidable. A fundamental reorganisation of the way societies produce, manage and consume resources could support a new high-technology civilisation, but this would entail a new "circular economy" premised on wide-scale practices of recycling across production and consumption chains, a wholesale shift to renewable energy, application of agro-ecological methods to food production, and with all that, very different types of social structures. In the absence of a major technological breakthrough in clean energy production such as nuclear fusion – which so far seems improbable - recycling, conservation and efficiency in the management of the planet's remaining accessible mineral resources will need to be undertaken carefully and cooperatively, with the assistance of cutting-edge science. Limits to economic growth, or even "degrowth", the report says, do not need to imply an end to prosperity, but rather require a conscious decision by societies to lower their environmental impacts, reduce wasteful consumption, and increase efficiency – changes which could in fact increase quality of life while lowering inequality. These findings of the new Club of Rome report have been confirmed by other major research projects. In January last year, a detailed scientific study by Anglia Ruskin University's Global Sustainability Institute commissioned by the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries, found "overwhelming" evidence for resource constraints: "... across a range of resources over the short (years) and medium (decades) term… Resource constraints will, at best, increase energy and commodity prices over the next century and, at worse, trigger a long term decline in the global economy and civil unrest." The good news, though is that "If governments and economic agents anticipate resource constraints and act in a constructive manner, many of the worst affects can be avoided." According to Dr Aled Jones, lead author of the study and head of the Global Sustainability Institute: "Resource constraints will, at best, steadily increase energy and commodity prices over the next century and, at worst, could represent financial disaster, with the assets of pension schemes effectively wiped out and pensions reduced to negligible levels." It is imperative to recognise that "dwindling resources raise the possibility of a limit to economic growth in the medium term." In his 2014 report to the Club of Rome, Prof Bardi takes a long-term view of the prospects for humanity, noting that the many technological achievements of industrial societies mean there is still a chance now to ensure the survival and prosperity of a future post-industrial civilization: "It is not easy to imagine the details of the society that will emerge on an Earth stripped of its mineral ores but still maintaining a high technological level. We can say, however, that most of the crucial technologies for our society can function without rare minerals or with very small amounts of them, although with modifications and at lower efficiency." Although expensive and environmentally intrusive industrial structures "like highways and plane travel" would become obsolete, technologies like "the Internet, computers, robotics, long-range communications, public transportation, comfortable homes, food security, and more" could remain attainable with the right approach - even if societies undergo disastrous crises in the short-run. Bardi is surprisingly matter-of-fact about the import of his study. "I am not a doomster," he told me. "Unfortunately, depletion is a fact of life, not unlike death and taxes. We cannot ignore depletion - just like it is not a good idea to ignore death and taxes… "If we insist in investing most of what remains for fossil fuels; then we are truly doomed. Yet I think that we still have time to manage the transition. To counter depletion, we must invest a substantial amount of the remaining resources in renewable energy and efficient recycling technologies - things which are not subjected to depletion. And we need to do that before is too late, that is before the energy return on investment of fossil fuels has declined so much that we have nothing left to invest."

## 2NR

### 2NR O/V—L

#### <<Wrenn 13>>

#### The Affirmative’s focus on “individual choice” through their affirmation of adolescent autonomy is coopted by neoliberalism—neoliberalism is all about freedom and autonomy—“Freedom from government”, freedom from parents—Wrenn specifically says that when “we see social movements as something done by the individual, for the individual, we’ve lost the fight” and neoliberal cooptation has won.

#### <<Explain how individualist action/autonomy trades off with collectivism>>

#### <<Young 6>>

#### Struggles for adolescent autonomy within medical decisionmaking are *not* liberating—they are part of a movement to seek freedom within the existing medical-industrial complex while abandoning the goal of transforming neoliberalism.

#### <<Jacober 5>>

#### Adolescents are uniquely key—capitalists seek to inoculate teenagers with the idea of individualism as a “consumer right”, encouraging them to express their individualism, ironically, just like everyone else! The ideal of the rugged individual is a common thread underlying both the AC and the structure of neoliberalism.

#### <<Smith>>

#### The affirmative’s paradigm of medical choice rests on individualist, consumerist notions of free choice—adolescents are “free” to make choices, but only if they have the resources to do so, the resources to go to the doctor, to even have medical care in the first place—THE AFFIRMATIVE never addresses people who never have the opportunity to make these choices in the first place.

### 2NR O/V—Alt

#### The alternative is a strategy of *laying siege* on neoliberalism—this may sound vacuous, so let me break it down: more than anything, neoliberalism is a system of knowledge, a system of knowing and understanding the world. The aff perpetuates this kind of understanding—that’s <<going>> to be the link debate. Laying siege is obviously not an actual physical attack, but rather a denaturalizing of neoliberal discourse. By actively pointing out and where and how knowledge production supports this system, we dismantle neoliberalism from the bottom up.

#### Now let me contextualize this to the aff: Specifically in terms of adolescent medical autonomy, this means reframing the discussion from what sort of decisions adolescents get to make to a forefronting of neoliberalism and the way in which it restricts choice—that’s our Smith evidence. The Affirmative fundamentally never addresses the social and economic conditions that force adolscents to make hard medical decisions in the first place (a society that makes it so hard for women to raise children that they’re forced to abort, etc.)

#### This means that the alt solves the root cause of the case.

### 2NR ROTJ ext

#### The role of the judge is a *central framing question* in this round—the affirmative’s attempt to hide behind “objectivity” and reduce the judge to a “functionary engaged in a formalistic ritual” are strategies of neoliberalism. The judge must first consider the implications of the knowledge that we present in round before some imagined post-fiat impact—you must refuse neutrality in favor of voting for the methodology that best combats oppressive knowledge in this round. Academia has a unique role in cultivating forms of knowledge that counter neolib—that’s Giroux.

### 2NR !—Deutsch Ext

#### <<TURNS WARMING>>

#### Neoliberalism causes warming because the people and corporations who benefit from neoliberalism are the same ones who benefit from warming. They reap profits off of the mining companies that destroy the earth, the non renewable energy companies, the military and security companies that emit greenhouse gases, and the agriculture companies that destroy food resources by depleting soil.

#### Neoliberalism also demonizes social welfare programs, thus ensuring that projects that would reduce the impact of natural disasters don’t go into affect and thus magnify the impact of warming.

#### <<TURNS DISEASE>>

#### Neoliberalism causes disease because they demonize social safety nets while pushing for the privatization of health care and drug companies. This ensures that we will always have to pay more and more for healthcare to drive big corporations profits. This means that many will not have access to healthcare, ensuring the spread of pandemics.

#### <<TURNS POVERTY>>

#### Neoliberalism turns poverty because it creates a false narrative of improvement while glossing over the poverty and dehumanization of millions of people who work in the sweatshops and dirty mines that fuel corporations profits. It demonizes social safety nets, ensuring more poverty and increased social strife as the poor have no way to deal with poverty’s affects.

#### <<TURNS WAR>>

#### Neoliberalism turns war because the companies that produce weapons and military equipment have a vested interest in making sure the military constantly needs more and more of these products. Thus, they encourage the government to build more military bases, increase intervention, and drop more bombs. Even nuclear weapons use would be more likely as long as it is profitable.

### 2NR !—Turns oppression

#### Ending oppression is impossible without analyzing capitalism---clarity of root causes is necessary to resolve it

Katz-Fishman 14, W. Katz-Fishman -- Howard University, J. Scott -- Founder and Former Director, Project South K. Haltinner (ed.), Editor of Teaching Race and Anti-Racism in Contemporary America Adding Context to Colorblindness, Race, Class and Transformation: Confronting Our History to Move Forward, <http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/934/chp%253A10.1007%252F978-94-007-7101-7_26.pdf?auth66=1390670850_4076387ffba6f17ddf3a828859827d80&ext=.pdf>

From inside today’s bottom-up movement for equality, justice, democracy and social transformation, we share experiences and lessons for understanding race and class in the context of historical and contemporary U.S. capitalism and social struggle.**We cannot resolve a problem unless there is clarity about its root cause. America at its inceptionwas a Southern nation grounded in genocide and slavery. The colonial occupation and stealth of the land and resources of the western hemisphere from Indigenous peoples combined with the super-exploitation of Africanslave labor in the plantation system was extraordinarily proﬁtable for capital. To continue to produce and reproduce this source of capital accumulation and wealth, white supremacy and institutional racism were embedded in U.S.law, ideology, and society. Though no longer de jure, the content of white supremacy and racism remains de facto in every aspect of social life, even in the so-called “post-racial era” of the late twentieth and twenty-ﬁrst centuries**. (Bonilla-Silva 2010; Feagin 2006; Heagerty and Peery 2000). **The question of race in America – from Indigenous genocide and the slave system, to the attack on immigrant communities and the state execution of Troy Davis – inextricably links race and a racially exploitative and oppressive system to the very core of American class exploitation and super-exploitation, State power andrepression, ideological hegemony, and social and environmental crises.Based on this history of** U.S. **capitalism and the deep interpenetration of race and class**, we argue **that it is not possible to resolve** the fundamental problems of capitalism, especially**white supremacy and institutional racism, without ending capitalism** (Katz-Fishman and Scott 2004; Peery 2002). In the classroom of life – whether formal education settings, or the movement itself – theory, practice, and study around these questions is increasingly converging. **We offer as a pedagogical tool the critical study of social history – the debunking of historical myth and the claiming of ourreal history of domination, oppression, exploitation, and of resistance and social struggle. This means gaining clarity around the victories of past movements, what has and has not been won, where we are today and why, and the path forward** (Katz-Fishman et al. 2007).

### 2NR P—AT:/ All

#### <<Group the perms>>-- All perms that aren’t do both are intrinsic or severance—this makes the Aff into a moving target which guts my ground—without checks no advocacy is competitive—reject the arg.

#### NC Smith alternative *wrecks* the permutation—

#### Attempts to simply expand the choice/autonomy paradigm to include anti-neoliberal struggle are doomed to failure—they still are rooted in neoliberal conceptions of freedom to choose underlying property rights

#### We must forefront the struggle against neoliberalism, simply having struggle “added to organizations' promotional material” ensures inevitable cooption—the alt is net better. If the AC did not seem like part of a fight to get neoliberalism to you when you first heard it then you should reject their faux radicalism—that’s Smith.

#### All the links are disads to the permutation—

#### <<Extend links here>>

#### It’s impossible to simultaneously lay siege to neoliberalism while engaging in the neoliberal practices that our link evidence describes.

#### That means that if I win that the alternative is a good way of addressing the ACs problems, you should vote neg even if they win the perm because it’s not net beneficial.

### 2NR A—AT: Transition Wars

#### The alt isn’t a grand upheaval or totalized rejection, it’s a continued process of rejecting redactions and questioning the state of exception. This avoids the large scale paradigm shifts assumed by their impact scenarios.

#### They have no uniqueness: the status quo ARE the transition wars: Iraq, Afghanistan, continued drone strikes are all indicative of our desperate attempts to keep the system going after the post 9/11 shock. Their impacts are inevitable thus the only way to escape transition wars is to reject the neolib which makes the competition and war drive present in the first place.

## Links

### L—Abortion

#### The Affirmative’s invocation of the “choice paradigm” surrounding adolescent abortion promotes the consumerist notions of “free” choice underlying neoliberalism.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

The pro-choice camp claims a position that offers more choices for women making decisions about their reproductive lives. A variety of scholars and activists have critiqued the choice paradigm because it rests on essentially individualist, consumerist notions of "free" choice that do not take into consideration all the social, economic, and political conditions that frame the so-called choices that women are forced to make (Patchesky 1990; [End Page 127] Smith 1999; Solinger 2001). Solinger further contends that in the 1960s and 1970s, abortion rights advocates initially used the term "rights" rather than choice; rights are understood as those benefits owed to all those who are human regardless of access to special resources. By contrast, argues Solinger, the concept of choice is connected to possession of resources, thus creating a hierarchy among women based on who is capable of making legitimate choices (2001, 6). Consequently, since under a capitalist system, those with resources are granted more choices, it is not inconsistent to withdraw reproductive rights choices from poor women through legislation such as the Hyde Amendment (which restricts federal funding for abortion) or family caps for TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) recipients.4 Solinger's argument can be demonstrated in the writings of Planned Parenthood. In 1960, Planned Parenthood commissioned a study which concluded that poor and working-class families lacked the rationality to do family planning, and that this lack of "rationality and early family planning as middle-class couples" was "embodied in the particular personalities, world views, and ways of life" of the poor themselves (Rainwater 1960, 5, 167). As Solinger states: "Choice" also became a symbol of middle-class women's arrival as independent consumers. Middle-class women could afford to choose. They had earned the right to choose motherhood, if they liked. According to many Americans, however, when choice was associated with poor women, it became a symbol of illegitimacy. Poor women had not earned the right to choose. (2001, 199-200) What Solinger's analysis suggests is that, ironically, while the pro-choice camp contends that the pro-life position diminishes the rights of women in favor of "fetal" rights; the pro-choice position actually does not ascribe inherent rights to women either. Rather, women are viewed as having reproductive choices if they can afford them or if they are deemed legitimate choice-makers. William Saletan's (1998) history of the evolution of the pro-choice paradigm illustrates the extent to which this paradigm is a conservative one. Saletan contends that pro-choice strategists, generally affiliated with National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL), intentionally rejected a rights-based framework in favor of one that focused on privacy from big government. That is, government should not intervene in the woman's right to decide if she wants to have children. This approach appealed to those with libertarian sensibilities who otherwise might have had no sympathy with feminist causes. The impact of this strategy was that it enabled the pro-choice side to keep Roe v. Wade intact—but only in the most narrow sense. This strategy undermined any attempt to achieve a broader pro-choice agenda because the strategy could be used against a broader agenda. For instance, the argument that government [End Page 128] should not be involved in reproductive rights decisions could also be used by pro-life advocates against federal funding for abortions (Saletan 2003). Consequently, Saletan argues, "Liberals have not won the struggle for abortion rights. Conservatives have" (1998, 114). Furthermore, this narrow approach has contributed to some pro-choice organizations, such as Planned Parenthood and NARAL, often developing strategies that marginalize women of color. Both supported the Freedom of Choice Act in the early 1990s that retained the Hyde Amendment (Saletan 2003). The Hyde Amendment, besides discriminating against poor women by denying federal funding for abortion services, discriminates against American Indian women who largely obtain healthcare through Indian Health Services, a federal agency. One of NARAL's petitions stated: "The Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA) will secure the original vision of Roe v. Wade, giving all women reproductive freedom and securing that right for future generations [emphasis mine]."5 Apparently, poor women and indigenous women do not qualify as "women."6 Building on this analysis, I would argue that while there is certainly a sustained critique of the choice paradigm, particularly among women of color reproductive rights groups, the choice paradigm continues to govern much of the policies of mainstream groups in a manner that sustains the marginalization of women of color, poor women, and women with disabilities. One example is the extent to which pro-choice advocates narrow their advocacy around legislation that affects the one choice of whether or not to have an abortion without addressing all the conditions that gave rise to a woman having to make this decision in the first place. Consequently, politicians, such as former President Bill Clinton, will be heralded as "pro-choice" as long as they do not support legislative restrictions on abortion regardless of their stance on other issues that may equally impact the reproductive choices women make. Clinton's approval of federal welfare reform that places poor women in the position of possibly being forced to have an abortion because of cuts in social services, while often critiqued, is not viewed as an "anti-choice" position. On Planned Parenthood's and NARAL's websites (www.plannedparenthood.org; www.naral.org) there is generally no mention of welfare policies in these organizations' pro-choice legislation alerts. A consequence of the choice paradigm is that its advocates frequently take positions that are oppressive to women from marginalized communities. For instance, this paradigm often makes it difficult to develop nuanced positions on the use of abortion when the fetus is determined to have abnormalities. Focusing solely on the woman's choice to have or not have the child does not address the larger context of a society that sees children with disabilities as having worthless lives and that provides inadequate resources to women who may otherwise want to have them. As Martha Saxton notes: "Our society profoundly limits the 'choice' to [End Page 129] love and care for a baby with a disability" (1998, 375). If our response to disability is to simply facilitate the process by which women can abort fetuses that may have disabilities, we never actually focus on changing economic policies that make raising children with disabilities difficult. Rashmi Luthra (1993) notes, by contrast, that reproductive advocates from other countries such as India, who do not operate from this same choice paradigm, are often able to develop more complicated political positions on issues such as this one.

#### *Turns case*—the medical-industrial complex uses “choice” framing to undermine informed consent and push dangerous drugs.

Smith 5 (Andrea Smith, literally the best—founder of INCITE!, “Beyond Pro-Choice Versus Pro-Life: Women of Color and Reproductive Justice”, 2005)//Miro

Another example is the difficulty pro-choice groups have in maintaining a critical perspective on dangerous or potentially dangerous contraceptives, arguing that women should have the "choice" of contraceptives. Many scholars and activists have documented the dubious safety record of Norplant and Depo-Provera, two long-acting hormonal contraceptives (Krust and Assetoyer 1993; Masterson and Guthrie 1986; Roberts 1997; Smith 2001). In fact, lawsuits against Norplant have forced an end to its distribution (although Norplant that remains on the shelves can be sold to women). In 1978, the FDA denied approval for Depo-Provera on the grounds that: (1) dog studies confirmed an elevated rate of breast cancer; (2) there appeared to be an increased risk of birth defects in human fetuses exposed to the drug; and (3) there was no pressing need shown for use of the drug as a contraceptive (Masterson and Guthrie). In 1987, the FDA changed its regulations and began to require cancer testing in rats and mice instead of dogs and monkeys; Depo-Provera did not cause cancer in these animals, but major concerns regarding its safety persist (Feminist Women's Health Centers 1997). Also problematic is the manner in which these contraceptives are frequently promoted in communities of color and often without informed consent (Krust and Assetoyer 1993; Masterson and Guthrie 1986; Smith 2001).7 Yet none of the mainstream pro-choice organizations have ever seriously taken a position on the issue of informed consent as part of their agenda.8 Indeed, Gloria Feldt, president of Planned Parenthood, equates opposition to Norplant and Depo-Provera as opposition to "choice" in her book The War on Choice (Feldt 2004, 34, 37). Planned Parenthood and NARAL opposed restrictions against sterilization abuse, despite the thousands of women of color who were being sterilized without their consent, because they saw such policies as interfering with a woman's "right to choose" (Nelson 2003, 144; Patchesky 1990, 8). Particularly disturbing has been some of the support given by these organizations to the Center for Research on Population and Security, headed by Stephen Mumford and Elton Kessel, which distributes globally a form of sterilization, Quinacrine. Quinacrine is a drug that is used to treat malaria. It is inserted into the uterus where it dissolves, causing the fallopian tubes to scar, rendering the woman irreversibly sterile. Family Health International conducted four in vitro studies and found [End Page 130] Quinacrine to be mutagenic in three of them (Controversy Over Sterilization Pellet 1994; Norsigian 1996). It, as well as the World Health Organization, recommended against further trials for female sterilization, and no regulatory body supports Quinacrine. However, the North Carolina-based Center for Research on Population and Security has circumvented these bodies through private funding from such organizations as the Turner Foundation and Leland Fykes organization (which incidentally funds pro-choice and anti-immigrant groups). The Center for Research on Population and Security has been distributing Quinacrine for free to researchers and government health agencies. There are field trials in eleven countries, with more than 70,000 women sterilized. In Vietnam, a hundred female rubber plant workers were given routine pelvic exams during which the doctor inserted the Quinacrine without their consent. Thus far, the side effects linked to Quinacrine include ectopic pregnancy, puncturing of the uterus during insertion, pelvic inflammatory disease, and severe abdominal pains. Other possible concerns include heart and liver damage and exacerbation of pre-existing viral conditions. In one of the trials in Vietnam, a large number of cases that had serious side effects were excluded from the data (Controversy Over Sterilization Pellet 1994; Norsigian 1996). Despite the threat to reproductive justice that this group represents, Feminist Majority Foundation featured the Center for Research on Population and Security at its 1996 Feminist Expo because, I was informed by the organizers, they promoted choice for women. Then in 1999, Planned Parenthood almost agreed to sponsor a Quinacrine trial in the United States until outside pressure forced it to change its position (Committee on Women, Population and the Environment 1999). A prevalent ideology within the mainstream pro-choice movement is that women should have the choice to use whatever contraception they want. This position does not consider: (1) that a choice among dangerous contraceptives is not much of a choice; (2) the millions of dollars pharmaceutical companies and the medical industry have to promote certain contraceptives, compared to the few resources women's advocacy groups have to provide alternative information on these same contraceptives; and (3) the social, political, and economic conditions in which women may find themselves are such that using dangerous contraceptives may be the best of even worse options.

### L—Adolescent

#### The aff’s obsession with individual rights—especially for teens—reinforces capitalist notions of private ownership and individualism.

Jacober 5 (Amy Jacober, Seattle School of Theology and Psychology, “Does Adolescence lead to Capitalism or does Capitalism lead to Adolescence?”, April 4 2005)//Miro

Any discussion of teenagers and capitalism needs to begin with these two major themes – individualism and personal rights. Today’s teenagers express this by their very existence. They are self-focused. This is a normal developmental stage. It is also a normal stage in the lifecycle where personal consumption now trumps investment and deferred consumption.[4] In addition to the normal development, we now teach children from birth that they are important, so important in fact that each one has been nurtured and celebrated, not as they connect with their families, their community or larger society but for who they are individually. There are of course exceptions to every rule, but with emerging adulthood now commonly accepted as a developmental stage, the communal scene has shifted.[5] Individual rights are a precursor to private ownership. Initially, property was owned by individuals or individual families. This established wealth, status and power.[6] Today wealth, status and power are still being displayed. Teenagers may not own a house but they certainly spend money to establish their image through ownership of goods. What you own establishes your status regardless of how much debt you accumulate to create your image. Status carries with it an implication of wealth, whether it is true or not. The legacy of capitalism passed to adolescents today is a sense of entitlement and a preoccupation with image. I would say for anyone, but for teenagers in particular, capitalism is more about a lifestyle than economics. This plays out every day in millions of choices made by a group of people wielding over $155 billion in disposable discretionary spending each year since 2000 with no slowing in sight.[7] In fact regardless of overall economic trends, teen spending (ages 12-19) has continued to grow by 5% for the past 7 years. By 2006 the estimation is for adolescent spending to top $190 billion.[8] Children and adolescents working is not new, the amount and where they spend their money is. The end of sanctioned widespread child labor in the US is a great accomplishment. We no longer offer public approval for sending children into mines or accept the non-existence of classrooms in favor of the abundance of factories. (By no means is this to say that child labor has been eliminated, neither here in the US nor in many locations around the world. It would be an entirely different article to look at the disparity of what we publicly state and what occurs in reality…for now, I will stay with the pervasive implications of what we publicly state.) Children and teenagers once took on backbreaking works for long hours to aide their families in paying rent and buying dinner. Today, it is more common to have children mowing lawns or babysitting and adolescents working at the mall or a local shop to buy iPods, lattes, and a new pair of kicks. When asked to contribute toward a camp, school trip or other extra-curricular items, let alone clothing, books or household necessities, it is not uncommon to hear the refrain, “Why do I have to pay for that? I worked hard for my money!” Before being so hard on teenagers as to assume they are greedy and narcissistic, remember that they are a product not only of the home in which they were raised but of the culture that has developed over the centuries. They really believe others are as interested in them as they are in themselves.[9] They are a reflection, distorted as it may be, of individual entitlement before being tempered by the constraints of adulthood in an affluent capitalist society. I have rarely if ever had a conversation with a teenager where the acquisition of money was a goal. At least not a goal in and of itself. Money in a bank account offers nothing to show, it does not express their image. Image is an expression of who they are individually (everything for which they have been trained) and carries with it status. I wish I were the only one to know this. Unfortunately, not only am I not the only to know this but I am among the least to capitalize (excuse the pun) on this information. For a quick 101 on just how pervasive our adult world is into understanding (or is it exploiting?) adolescents, take a peek at The Merchants of Cool, a PBS Frontline special explaining an industry that has taken notice of the billions of discretionary spending done by adolescents.[10] This has become something of a tutorial for understanding adolescents, research focus groups and how capitalism reigns supreme seeking the accumulation of profit through the ownership…of knowledge. It is not a tangible product to be consumed but it is highly valued. By obtaining, by owning knowledge, image may be marketed through products for maximum profit. Perhaps one of the best known marketers of this knowledge is Teenage Research Unlimited (TRU), www.teenresearch.com. TRU is a force in the arena of teenage research. Their own proclamation states “We’re at the forefront of developing new and better methods for researching teens and sharing those learnings with clients. Founded in 1982 as the first marketing-research firm to specialize exclusively in teenagers, TRU’s initial vision remains true today: to develop an unparalleled expertise in the teenage market, and to offer our clients virtually unlimited methods for researching teens.” [11] And share they do…they have an impressive list of clients numbering over 240. These clients fall in the following categories: retail apparel and footwear, advertising and marketing agencies, food and beverage, media, entertainment and leisure, social marketing, electronics and technology, financial, health and beauty and other. Interestingly, in addition to Abercrombie and Fitch, Coca Cola, Time Warner and Verizon, Lifeway Christian Services is included. Several anti-tobacco agencies, American Cancer Society and the Partnership for a Drug Free America are also included. Their research is qualitative and quantitative, extensive and respected. Like rain, it falls on the just and the unjust. TRU is neutral, they gather the information better than anyone else and seek to make the greatest profit from selling their goods. It has become increasingly difficult to differentiate between an innocent victim and savvy participant in marketing. The Persuaders, another PBS Frontline special offered another perspective on this same subject.[12] Correspondent Douglas Rushkoff says America is an Enlightenment society. We were founded on the notion that individual freedoms are of paramount importance. This philosophy has dovetailed quite well with the market’s need to treat us as individuals. It’s easier to market to isolated individuals than to cohesive groups or collectives. The loneliest people can more easily be convinced to buy stuff to fill the void. Marketers tell us we matter – that we’re worth it. We deserve everything. They won’t tell us about sacrifice, participation, or sharing. People who share things, don’t need to buy as much stuff. So advertising exploits the American belief in individualism by recasting it as some sort of consumer right. We are led to think of our consumer choices as some version of true agency – when the choice between Coke and Pepsi really isn’t a choice, at all. On the same show, Douglas Atkin said I don’t believe that Americans are more or less susceptible than anyone else. In fact I don’t like the word `susceptible’ at all…it implies that people are passive receivers of manipulative messages. In general we are highly discriminating. We have to be. We’ve been forced to edit the thousands of messages that assault us and select the few that may have some relevance. We’ve become very marketing literate. Some brands do generate very strong commitment, even devotion from their customers. But this is not the result of any inherent sensitivity or vulnerability to the clever machinations of marketing professionals. The devotees that I interviewed reported that their brands provided a rallying point for people who shared the same values. As one Apple user told me: “literally it’s [the Apple community] based around a machine. But actually it’s based on a common way of thinking. Adolescents (as well as many Americans) are consumed with the idea of expressing their individualism… just like everyone else! See a bunch of friends in their sophomore year of high school and they will talk alike as well as own a small range of music and shop at the same stores. Image is everything and this comes not in the common products (we all wear clothes) but in the brands chosen. These brands come to express something much more, something much greater than a simple logo. They offer a lifestyle based around the product. The irony is that we all purchase a common lifestyle while insisting on individuality. Teenagers at least are honest enough to own this.[14] And own they do! Industrialization allowed for individualism among the masses. Capitalism opened the door for the veneration of youth and all that comes within this developmental arena. Michael Novak14 argues that capitalism may be interpreted to accept human sinfulness. So much so that it opens the possibility, that “rubs sinner against sinner, making even dry wood yield a spark of grace.”[15] He views the foundational concept of “enlightened self-interest” as proof that capitalism does not deny sinfulness, but embraces it! He believes that capitalism embraces our proclivity toward individualism while a system like socialism would be dangerous because it depends on human goodness rather than religion to improve society. There are some rejoinders to this argument. First, proponents of Adam Smith used the term “enlightened self-interest” to describe the primary motive for supplying goods and services. The adjective “enlightened” suggests that these capitalists did not believe they were describing our sinful nature. Secondly, socialism recognizes that some public goods such as healthcare and law enforcement, which everyone in society needs, will not be provided if they are left to the market mechanism. So it could be argued that socialism may be more realistic about human sinfulness. Nevertheless, an essential mechanism of both capitalism and mixed market socialism reflects the brokenness of the world

### L—Choice

#### The emphasis on individual freedoms is a neoliberal cooptation of social justice advocacy---the aff’s notion of choice abstracts individuals from their social context, precluding structural transformation

Corey Lee Wrenn 13, adjunct professor of Sociology with Dabney S. Lancaster Community College and an adjunct professor of Social Psychology with the Rocky Mountain College of Art and Design, The Neoliberalism Behind Sexy Veganism: Individuals, Structures, and “Choice”, veganfeministnetwork.com/tag/individualism/

I’m going to make a radical claim, well, actually it’s pretty widely accepted in the social sciences: There is no “choice.” This isn’t about the individual. This is about systems of oppression and social structures that shape our behavior and limit what choices are available to us based on our social identity. If you are a young, thin, white woman advocating for Nonhuman Animals in a pornified, hyper-sexualized society, one choice stands out loud and clear: Get naked. It’s supposed to be empowering, and we think maybe it helps animals. First, I’m not really sure why one has to feel sexually empowered when one is advocating against the torture and death of Nonhuman Animals. Why our movement is keen on making violence a turn on is a little disturbing. It probably speaks something to our tendency to juxtapose women with violence. The sexualization of violence against women and other feminized social groups like Nonhuman Animals is evidence to the rape culture we inhabit. Aside that, however, “choice” is often thrown around as a means of deflecting critical thought at systems of oppression. If it’s all about your individual choice, only you are responsible, only you are to blame. Anyone who has a problem with that must be judging you as a person. So often our advocacy is framed as personal choice, an individual expression. If you aren’t vegan, that’s your “choice.” If you want to have sex with vegetables and have it filmed by PETA, that’s your “choice.” This is a co-optation of anti-oppression social activism in a neo-liberal structure of exploitation. Neoliberalism is all about “freedom”: Freedom from government, freedom from regulation, freedom to buy, freedom to sell, freedom to reach your full potential, etc. It’s about individuals out for themselves. This is how capitalism thrives: many are free to do whatever they want in the name of open markets, but ultimately, that freedom comes at a cost to those who will inevitably be exploited to pay for that “freedom.” The ideology of neoliberalism and individualism works to benefit the privileged when individuals can attribute their success to their own individual hard work (when in reality they had extensive help from their race, gender, class, physical ability, etc.). It also works to blame those less fortunate for their failure. We call them lazy, stupid, leeches (when in reality they had extensive barriers placed upon them according to their race, gender, class, physical ability, etc.). This myth of freedom and meritocracy is actually pretty toxic for social movements. If we fail to recognize how structural barriers impede some, while structural privileges benefit others, we will find it difficult to come together as a political collective. When we soak in this neoliberal poison and start to view social movements–inherently collective endeavors designed to challenge unequal power structures–as something done by the individual, for the individual, we’ve lost the fight right off the bat. This isn’t about personal “choice;” there is no personal choice. Choice is socially constructed. Who you are and where you come from will influence exactly what “choices” are or are not available to you. Why the hell are so many young women (mostly white, as women of color aren’t allowed to be sexual under our white supremacy) “choosing” to masturbate vegetables to promote veganism and “choosing” to dance on mobile stripper poles on parade floats to promote kitten adoption? Why choose sex and stripping instead of some other “choice,” like leading a protest, writing a song, writing a book, etc.? Because sex and stripping are the “choices” forced on women, while leadership and innovation (social movement activities that respect the personhood of activists instead of objectifying them) is reserved for men. Making it all about the “individual” also means prioritizing one’s privilege to engage certain behaviors at the expense of other less fortunate groups who suffer as a result. Middle-class white women represent our movement with their thin, sexy forms, but where are the women of color? Where are the larger sized women? That’s right, they don’t get to be sexy. What about their “choice?” Not everyone is granted the “choice” to participate in the so-called “sexual revolution.” Furthermore, the sexual objectification of women and pornography are both linked to increased violence and rape against women. And guess which women have the highest rates of experiences with violence and rape? White women? Nope, guess again. Women of color, poor women, lesbian women, trans women, disabled women, etc. Young white women of privilege can enter public spaces and flaunt their sexuality and find it “liberating,” but it’s the masses of poor and disadvantaged women who bear the brunt of that “liberation” through rapes, sexual harassment, and beatings. Listen up, ladies: It’s a trick. The “individualization” of social advocacy divides. It masks privilege, otherizes, and excludes disadvantaged groups. Neoliberalism is what created the problem in the first place (the oppression of Nonhuman Animals), why would we think using more neoliberalism would fix it? Neoliberalizing our movement means we lose our collective power. And when we play by the rules of this patriarchy, with the bizarre assumption that we can only get people to drop that hamburger if they get a hard on, we simply reinforce oppression. Neoliberalism has co-opted our movement. We surrendered our power; we repackaged our social justice claimsmaking for pornified Playboy-speak. Instead of loudspeakers, pens, and protests, it’s thongs, butts, and boobies. This isn’t a social movement anymore, it’s quelled resistance. Not only are we disempowered, but we’re even further exploited because we become another site of sexual objectification. The bad guys not only get you to shut it up, but they get you to take it off, too. Take, for example, this Playboy image. Porn? Or Liberation? White woman in high heels twisting around to expose her buttocks and breasts. She is completely naked except a swirling robe. She holds a wine glass and smiles at the viewer. Reads, "Male Supremacy is alright--but I favor a different position." The caption reads, “Male supremacy is fine–but I favor a different position.” Ha! The feminist position or a sexual position? Porn? Or Liberation? Having trouble deciding? You should, because there is no difference. Feminism is being repackaged in a way that absolutely eliminates any female threat to male power, it is being repackaged in a way that benefits men. Women are stripping and performing for patriarchy, and they’re doing it willingly. They’re doing it under the mistaken assumption that they’re liberated, as though they are acting of their own free will and individual choice. Don’t for one second think that this hasn’t been happening in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement. PETA regularly hires Playboy “bunnies” to perform their pornographic demonstrations. There’s even a vegan pinup website and a vegan strip club. It’s liberating! Look at the following PETA/Playboy pinup. “Lettuce entertain you.” Ha! Get it! Veganism or sexy time? Which is it? Serious social movement, or more penis-focused noise in the crowded pornography landscape of Western culture?¶ DISCLAIMER Individuals vs. Systems Most of the content of this site is concerned with dismantling systems of oppression. We are cautious of personal "agency" and "choice" in human behavior and "individualism" in collective action. We seek to challenge the institutionalized forms of violence against humans and nonhumans. We urge our readers to refrain from misconstruing the content of this site as personal attacks on individuals.

#### The desire for autonomy is a neoliberal notion of having the illusion of choice. Their need for autonomy rein trenches demands for freedom within an existing system while abandoning of the totalizing goal of transforming capitalism.

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, "Putting Materialism back into Race Theory", http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm) 2006

Gilroy endorses the new social movements precisely because "the new movements are not primarily oriented towards instrumental objectives, such as the conquest of political power or state apparatuses" (226). Instead, the new social movements desire autonomy within the existing system (226) and therefore foreground the "sphere of autonomous self-realization" (233). In other words, they do not want to change an exploitative system, they merely want a little more (discursive) freedom within it, and this (reformist) project signals agency for Gilroy. For Gilroy, the new social movements represent agency, and in this regard, they replace the proletariat—the historic vehicle for social transformation—but their agency, to repeat, is directed toward reforming specific local sites, such as race or gender, within the existing system. In short, they have abandoned the goal of transforming existing capitalism—a totalizing system which connects seemingly disparate elements of the social through the logic of exploitation—for a new goal: creating more humane spaces for new movements within capitalism. So, then, what is so new in the new social movements? It is certainly very "old" in the way it rehabilitates liberal notions of the autonomous subject. Its newness is a sign of the contemporary crisis-ridden conjuncture in capitalist social relations. This crisis of capital and the ensuing rupture in its ideological narrative provides the historical condition for articulating resistance along the axes of race, class, gender, ecology, etc. Even though resistance may take place in very specific domains, such as race, gender, ecological, or sexuality, among others, this does not mean that the crisis is local. It simply indexes how capitalist exploitation brings every social sphere under its totalizing logic. However, rather then point up the systematicity of the crisis, the theorists of the new social movements turn to the local, as if it is unrelated to questions of globality. With Gilroy and the new social movements, we are returned, once again, to the local and the experiential sets the limits of understanding. Gilroy asserts that people "unable to control the social relations in which they find themselves…have shrunk the world to the size of their communities and begun to act politically on that basis" (245). If this is true, then Gilroy, at the level of theory, mirrors this as he "shrinks" his theory to the dictates of crude empiricism. Rather than opening the possibility of collective control over social relations, which points in an emancipatory direction, Gilroy brackets the question of "social relation" and consequently, he limits politics to the cultural (re)negotiations of identity.

### L—Intersectionality

#### Intersectionality fragments movements against capital---it’s too focused on discrete differences to see the system of class oppression underlying them

Esme Choonara and Yuri Prasad 14, author of A Rebel's Guide to Trotsky and author of The struggle for Tamil freedom. What’s wrong with privilege theory? www.isj.org.uk/?id=971

The body of work known as black feminism has produced some thought-provoking writings that have increased our understanding of elements of history, including slavery. Angela Davis, bell hooks and others have written widely and authoritatively on this subject53 as well as on debates in the struggle for women’s suffrage and analysis of racist sexual imagery. What has become known as an intersectional approach is also useful in the field of social policy to consider, for example as Crenshaw does, what specific needs black and other minority ethnic women might have. What are the additional barriers, for example, that migrant women might face trying to access domestic violence services? However, what intersectionality seems to do here, as Laura Miles has argued in this journal, is to “name the reality”, that is to remain at the level of description.54 Description is important, of course—it is useful to better understand the mechanisms of the slave trade, in part because history informs the present. It is useful to consider how sexist imagery is simultaneously racialised and vice versa, because it can help us to understand how oppressive ideology works. However, on its own, it is not enough. Intersectionality as a concept pulls in two directions. In many ways its current popularity reflects a desire for greater unity. Many feminists and other activists assert that they are “intersectional” to make clear that they want an inclusive politics that can acknowledge different experiences and in particular be welcoming to black women. This is clearly a positive development, particularly for those of us who have endured years of divisive and moralistic identity politics. However, intersectionality does not necessarily involve a rejection of identity politics or of post-Marxist notions of power. Crenshaw, for example, makes it clear that she explicitly sees intersectionality as an attempt to fuse struggles against oppression with elements of postmodernism.55 In fact, the whole framework of intersectionality hinges on questions of identity. The Combahee River Collective, for example, argue that: “the most profound and potentially most radical politics come directly out of our own identity, as opposed to working to end somebody else’s oppression”. Intersectional politics are therefore exposed to the same risk of fragmentation and moralistic division as previous forms of identity politics. Much of this approach shares with privilege theory and identity politics an elevation of subjective experience as the key source of understanding. This is why Collins is able to argue that: The overarching matrix of domination houses multiple groups, each with varying experiences with penalty and privilege that produce corresponding partial perspectives… No one group has a clear angle of vision. No one group possesses the theory or methodology that allows it to discover the absolute “truth”.56 Some authors and activists seem to suggest that just living at the intersections of oppression is resistance in itself. Yet for many others who embrace intersectionality, the aim is not just to name, but to struggle to challenge oppression. Many writers and activists talk about coalition building not just to challenge individuals but to strive for social justice. Socialists share these aims and these struggles. A shared commitment to common goals does not, however, remove the need to better understand what we are fighting or to debate strategies for resistance. One of the main limitations of intersectionality is that as an approach it is content to remain at the level of experience, rather than attempting to understand the sources of the intersecting oppressions that it describes. By contrast the method outlined by Marx involves moving beyond the recognition of the complexities of life through abstraction to find what Marx called the “simplest determinants”—in this case to locate the sources of oppression within class society. But this is not the end of the picture. Marxists have to apply the insights gained through abstraction to complicated concrete realities—what Marx calls “rising from the abstract to the concrete”.57 In this way, we can both understand the sources of oppression and, in grasping this, also better understand how people’s experiences are shaped under capitalism. Two other points flow from Marx’s method. First, Marx insists that seemingly separate phenomena must be seen as part of the totality of society—so forms and experiences of oppression cannot be understood in isolation from the wider questions of how society functions. Second, the concrete is always historical. In the case of oppression, this means recognising that particular forms and experiences of oppression change over time. For example, structural changes in capitalism over past decades have brought millions more women into the workforce worldwide, changing both the nature of how women experience oppression and the possibilities for resistance to that oppression. Marxism’s strategic insights flow from this method of understanding the world. By locating the sources of oppression in class society, we can see the structural capabilities and potential power that workers have within capitalism. While intersectionality rightly points out that there are many interrelated divisions in society, like privilege theory it relegates the question of class to just one of a series of oppressions. This misses out what is unique about class in capitalism. It is a source not just of oppression—but of power—and is the potential basis on which people of many backgrounds and intersecting oppressions can unite. Marx called the working class the universal class not because everyone in the working class is the same, but because all working class people share a common relationship to capitalism and together form the unique force that has the power to abolish class society altogether.

### L—Queering

#### Queering identity falls in line with neoliberal governmentality – the aff gets co-opted in favor of creating new markets for queers

Ladelle McWhorter 12 – Professor of Philosophy, Women, Gender, Sexuality, and Environmental Studies, University of Richmond, “Queer Economies”, Foucault Studies, No. 14, pp. 61-78, September 2012

Neoliberal Subjectivity My focus in this article, however, is not population management but the types of subjec-tivity that are generated through population management within neoliberal apparatuses of security. In other words, who (or what) are we becoming? Foucault’s work suggests that those of us who participate in markets are becoming entrepreneurs who invest in our own human capital in order to generate income streams. After explaining Foucault’s claim, in this section I will argue that this process reshapes the notion of identity, seriously fraying its ties to normalized development and rendering its variants quite a bit less rigid than they were previously. Ultimately, my contention will be that within neoliberal regimes, the practice of queering identities is not as resistant to dominant power networks as it might seem or as we might want it to be, and in some domains it may actually facilitate neoliberal governmentality rather than resist it at all. Neoliberal theory follows economist Lionel Robbins in his definition of economics as “the science of human behavior as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have mutually exclusive uses.”37 This definition, as Foucault points out, shifts the discipline away from analyses of processes and toward analyses of activities.38 Production, for exam-ple, is no longer central; rather, income acquisition and allocation are. This shift seriously blurs the distinction between labor and capital. Laborers’ wages are, simply, income, just as capitalists’ rent, interest, and profit from sales are income. There may be a difference in quantity (in fact, of course there is a difference in quantity), but there is no difference in quality between various incomes. Furthermore, neoliberal theorists, following Irving Fisher, define “capital” as anything from which an income can be derived, and hold that minds and bodies themselves can be capital. Voilà, wage earners are capitalists! Or, to be more precise, wage earners are entrepreneurs. They invest in their human capital, market themselves, and sell their time, energy, knowledge, and skills. As Nobel Prize winning economist Gary Becker puts it, “Persons investing in human capital can be considered ‘firms’ that combine such capital perhaps with other resources to produce earning capital…”39 Thus, “the basic element to be deciphered by economic analysis is not so much the individual, or processes and mechanisms, but enterprises,” Foucault writes. “An economy made up of enterprise-units, a society made up of enterprise-units, is at once the principle of decipherment linked to liberalism and its programming for the rationali-zation of a society and an economy.”40 In other words, these entrepreneurs-of-themselves are both theoretical assumptions that neoliberal theorists make in order to describe human market behavior and, at the same time, neoliberal prescriptions for how human beings should behave. Neoliberalism is both analytic and normative. Good neoliberal subjects, then, are more or less successful enterprise-units.41 The in-come streams they generate enable them to maximize their utility functions (or, at least, the purpose of generating income streams is to amass the resources necessary to maximize uti-lity, whether this is realized or not). Ultimately, what these enterprises produce (or at least endeavor to produce) is their own preference satisfaction. The income stream may be used to purchase (or attract) the raw materials—shelter, groceries, a mate, etc.—which may be combined with non-market labor to produce whatever the neoliberal subject wishes to con-sume (warmth, nutrients, orgasm, etc.). This way of construing human activity makes of each individual a self-interested bundle of sui generis [of its own kind] preferences calculating the costs and benefits of every available option for conduct and relationship in view of his or her own likelihood of satisfaction. Every-thing we do is to be understood as utility maximizing behavior based on preferences and calculation. Even our most intimate associations—with our parents, with our spouses, with our children—are explicable on this model, according to Becker.42 Generosity and self-sacri-fice are investments; genetically related offspring are commodities for which close substi-tutes are scarce;43 and friendships are valuable insofar as they maximize one’s utility function. Becker is famous for having analyzed criminal behavior in this way. Law-breaking, he argues, be it parking in a tow-away zone or selling narcotics, is market behavior, and if authorities want to reduce it, they have simply to reduce the incentives to engage in it. There is no qualitative difference between people who break laws and people who do not; the “delinquent” is not a special kind of person.44 Repetitions of the choice to break laws leading to multiple arrests and incarcerations might generate the label and even the sub- jective experience of oneself as “criminal” or “delinquent,” but those identities are simply shorthand for aggregated preferences as expressed and implemented choices over time. Obviously, the same case can be made for the “homosexual,” as well as for any of the other sexual identity categories generated through the twentieth century. Everybody starts with their own set of personal preferences. Neoliberal theorists are not interested in the whence and wherefore of those preferences; it simply does not matter (although adver-tisers are very interested in how to generate new preferences for market purposes). As neo-liberals see it, we all make predictions regarding what will satisfy our preferences and enhance our utility, and then we calculate the costs and risks of attempting to achieve satisfaction in each of the ways available to us at a given time. Our lives are made up of these thousands of calculated choices. Our identities are to be understood not as some underlying truth that comes into the world with us at conception or birth, or even as the names for biological and psychological developmental outcomes, but simply as names for relatively long-term patterns of behavior that can be thought of as manifestations of choice and strategy.45 For identities to have any value or meaning in neoliberal regimes, they must play some role in markets. And they do. “Lesbians” are a population with certain preferences cohesive enough to form a market—for four-wheel drive vehicles, Birkenstocks, power tools, wedding planners, and reproductive technologies. Likewise “gay men” are a population with certain preferences (and statistically, being [white] men, with about 30% more income to allocate than lesbians); so they are a market—for vodka, magazines, sophisticated household furnishings, men-only cruise lines.46 We call these stereotypes, which make them seem detrimental, and they do have detrimental effects. But unlike older stereotypes, the detrimental effects fall not so much on those who do but rather on those who do not fit them. Whereas it was terrible to be a limp-wristed sissy, it is not so bad to be an urban sophisticate with artistic flare; in fact, it might greatly increase one’s income stream. What is terrible is to be bullied out of an education, to try to survive among the ranks of the working poor, to be ill without insurance, or to raise children or care for a disabled partner without the civil rights necessary to protect their interests. Neoliberalism has an answer to whatever discrimination people suffer, however. It is to let the market handle it. Some people have a taste for racism or homophobia, a pre-ference for avoiding contact with blacks or Jews or gays. They calculate the costs and risks of satisfying that preference, and then they do so in whatever manner best maximizes their utility. However, as Milton Friedman notes, “The man who exercises discrimination pays a price for doing so.”47 If he happens to be an entrepreneur, this price interferes with opera-tional efficiency. “A businessman or entrepreneur who expresses preferences in his busi-ness activities that are not related to productive efficiency is at a disadvantage compared to other individuals who do not. Such an individual is in effect imposing higher costs on him-self than are other individuals who do not have such preferences. Hence, in a free market they will tend to drive him out.”48 Indeed, markets have remedied some discrimination against non-heterosexuals.49 As of 2008, according to an Equality Forum survey, 473 of Fortune 500 companies included sexual orientation in their non-discrimination policies.50 Increasingly, such companies offer partner benefits to employees in same-sex relationships. And the job market is not the only market to address discrimination. For example, for many years the Commonwealth of Vir-ginia prohibited insurance companies from selling domestic partner health insurance poli-cies in Virginia. Having discovered a lucrative market niche outside the state that they felt sure could be replicated within it, the companies lobbied hard to change the law. In fact, when gay and lesbian activists attempted to attend the General Assembly hearings on the question, insurance representatives urged them to stay away, so as not to confuse a free market issue with a social issue; the companies’ spokespeople would handle everything. And they did. The legal change that ensued was thus a result of market pressure, not of de-mands for equality or justice. Of course, this market approach only works to end discrimination if inclusion of the groups of people in question is profitable. When it is not, there simply is no remedy. Those lesbians and gay men, transpeople and queers of all sorts who are without sufficient human capital and resources to allocate in markets may well still be subject not only to discrimination but to harassment and violence. But to return to the question at hand, within a neoliberal framework, an identity is not coincident with a subject position. Neoliberal subjects are (or should be, if they are rational) self-entrepreneurs; it is up to them to acquire whatever discipline is needed to en-hance their human capital and compete in the marketplace. Identities, when they come into play at all, are simply labels imposed on aggregated choices, which in turn are based on sui generis preferences; they are not the names of developmental trajectories, as they are in regimes of disciplinary normalization. Consequently, they will not be strictly enforced on every individual human body. And this brings us back to queer theory and politics. Queering in the Absence of Firm Identities The project of queering identities began in the early 1990s as a way of breaking down rigid delineations of experience and desire. Queer theorists pointed out numerous examples of ambiguous or veiled homosexual desire in apparently heterosexual images, tropes, charac-ters, and plot lines in classical literature, drama, and film, as well as in popular culture. They showed us that our own real-life sexual and gender identities were simulacra, con-stantly requiring reenactment, reiteration, and representation to bolster and sustain them-selves. They resisted and challenged homogeneity of identification by inciting identities to proliferate and endlessly differ from themselves. In short, where our normalized identities defined and imprisoned us, they excavated exits and melted bars. They showed us that those identities had histories and political investments and interests that transcended and sometimes opposed our individual lives and well-being. They laid bare the mechanisms of disciplinary normalization. They encouraged us to experience dis-identification and estrangement. In Foucault’s terms, they helped us to get free of ourselves.51 Now, however, if disciplinary normalization is receding where it is in tension with expanding regimes of security wherein circulation (of money, commodities, information, human bodies, etc.), not development, is paramount, how are queer theory and politics situated? If “queer” resists the forces that would contain us in normalized identities, can “queer” also resist the forces that would transform us into utility maximizers operating as entrepreneurial firms? Or is it more likely just to render us all more open to marketing across what used to be our normalized identity boundaries? The question is pressing because, on some fronts at least, it looks like queering identities facilitates the expansion and multiplication of markets. To attract a desired mate, a straight man might need to invest in his human capital by learning from—and then by purchasing the same products as—men with fashionable “queer eyes,” as depicted on an early twenty-first century reality TV show, “Queer Eye for the Straight Guy.” Straight masculinity needs to be softened or refined; hence, a little queerness is good for everybody. In some queer youth cultures, boundary breaking and gender-bending strategies rely very heavily on deploying purchased products; one announces one’s challenges to identification through clothes, jewelry, hair styles, tattoos, personal electronics, and similar accoutrements and often through relatively rapid changes in these modes of personal stylization. After all, in a neoliberal world, what does refusing to be contained in an identity mean other than refusing to make consistent consumer choices? It will be argued that this popular culture appropriation of “queer” has little or nothing to do with the queer politics of the 1970s and 1980s or with the queer theory and politics of the 1990s. And there is merit in that argument. My point is not that the work done in those decades was misguided, only that, with the changes in notions of identity that have occurred with the advance of neoliberalism over the last four decades, that sort of work now will inevitably be appropriated and, to use a very old word, co-opted. It does not challenge neoliberal subjectivities directly enough not to be; its focus was disciplinary normalization. But can we turn queering into resisting neoliberalism? I believe so, and I believe we should.

## !

### !—Ethical

#### Resisting neoliberal ideology is our ultimate ethical obligation. Status quo modes of thought only serve to legitimize the system.

Zizek and Daly 4(Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Conversations with Zizek, 2004 page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront** the constitutive violence of today’s global **capitalism and its obscene** naturalization / **anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it** throughout the world. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as** if they were simply **a matter of** chance and **sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.