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#### The resolution should define the division of ground. It was negotiated and announced in advance providing both teams a reasonable opportunity to prepare. Only a textual reading of the resolution provides a predictable basis for research.

#### USFG means the three branches.

OECD 87. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The Control and Management of Government Expenditure. 179. Google Book.

1. Political and organizational structure of government The United States America is a federal republic consisting of 50 states. States have their own constitutions and within each State there are at least two additional levels of government, generally designated as counties and cities, towns or villages. The relationships between different levels of government are complex and varied (see Section B for more information). The Federal Government is composed of three branches: the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch. Budgetary decisionmaking is shared primarily by the legislative and executive branches. The general structure of these two branches relative to budget formulation and execution is as follows.

#### ‘Resolved’ means to enact a policy by law.

Words and Phrases 64. Permanent Edition. Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### ‘Antitrust laws’ are statutes.

Grimes ’20 [Charles W; 2020; editor of this Licensing Update and Law Professor at Ava Maria Law School; Wolters Kluwer, “Licensing Update,” https://www.crowell.com/files/20200401-Licensing-Update-Chapter-13.pdf]

§13.02 ANTITRUST LAW IN THE UNITED STATES

U.S. antitrust law is defined by federal and state statutes, as interpreted by the courts. The core federal statutes are the Sherman Act,1 passed by Congress in 1890, and the Federal Trade Commission2 and Clayton Acts,3 both passed in 1914. The United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) and the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”) (together the “agencies”) share enforcement of most areas of federal antitrust law but with some differences in the scope of their authority. The FTC has sole authority to enforce Section 5 of FTC Act, which prohibits (1) unfair methods of competition and (2) unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The FTC almost always pursues claims for anticompetitive conduct as unfair methods of competition and reserves charges of unfair or deceptive acts or practices for consumer protection violations. Though the FTC's authority to challenge unfair methods of competition goes beyond conduct prohibited by the Sherman and Clayton Acts, in practice the FTC brings most unfair methods of competition cases under the same standards that courts apply to Sherman Act claims. The most prominent exception is the invitation to collude offense, which falls outside the scope of the Sherman Act (if the invitation is not accepted, there is no agreement). The FTC challenges invitations to collude as so-called “standalone” violations of Section 5.4 The DOJ has sole authority to pursue criminal violations of the antitrust laws. Most states have their own state antitrust and unfair competition statutes. State law follows federal law to some extent, though as discussed below, may differ from federal law in meaningful ways that vary state to state. State attorneys general and private parties can also typically file suit to enforce both federal and state antitrust law.

#### Their ‘scope’ is defined by government.

Sagers ’15 [Christopher L; 2015; the James A. Thomas Distinguished Professor of Law and Faculty Director of the Cleveland-Marshall Solo Practice Incubator; Handbook on the Scope of Antitrust, “Introduction,” Ch. 1, p. 9]

B. Sources of the Scope of Antitrust Law

The scope of federal antitrust law is governed by three separate authorities: (1) the U.S. Constitution, (2) the language of the antitrust statutes themselves, and (3) the language of other federal statutes and regulations.

#### Vote Neg:

#### 1. Clash: debate requires a predictable topic to motivate in depth research that yields the values of negation and argument refinement. Their interp explodes limits, allows affirmative conditionality, and makes debate a one-sided monologue devoid of argumentation which turns the case.

#### 2. Fairness: the neg should win on average 50% of the time. Entering a competitive activity proves their arguments are shaped by a drive to win. The insurmountable advantage of being affirmative under their unfair model is a reason they should lose.

### Off

K

#### Neolib isn’t a monolithic root cause but pervasive – micropolitics disseminates post-Fordist productivity into remote terrains of lived experience to corrupt dissent.

Papadopoulos 8 (Dimitris, School of Social Science @Cardiff U, Leicester Reader in Sociology and Organisation. “In the ruins of representation: Identity, individuality, subjectification”, British Journal of Social Psychology, 47.1, ebsco//shree)

The turn to micropolitics and the dissolution of the foundationalist understandings of identity (either in its essentialist or discursive reductionist versions) enable political analyses of previously neglected and effaced domains of everyday life. But do micropolitics effectively challenge state regulation and open pathways for the emergence of a multiplicity of different modes of embodied subjectification? Or does embodied subjectification become a new mode of state regulated existence? The power of micropolitics is thought to lie in the fact that they bypass the reproduction of the state as an intact and paramount entity of power. Micropolitics harness everyday lived and embodied experience as a vital matter of political struggles which aim to reinvigorate civil society, that is, the struggles of associations of people which develop outside of state institutions (Warner, 2002). However, seen historically, since the 1980s micropolitics have increasingly become integral to the effective realization of neoliberal governance. This is because this mode of engagement is aligned with transformations which have occurred at the level of the state. The neoliberal state is not a monolithic container, rather it disseminates into the most remote terrains of everyday experience. The dismantling of welfare systems has accelerated, and finally consolidated, the state’s withdrawal from the traditional role of centralized organizer of society. However, the result has not been the disappearance of the state itself, rather we are witnessing the disappearance of the welfare state and the emergence of new one (Fairbrother & Rainnie, 2005; Jessop, 2002; Sassen, 1999). Social control is primarily performed through the colonization of previously regarded private areas of individual existence: the body, health, fashion and well-being, sexuality, your living-room. In this process, embodied subjectification and micropolitics have become necessary elements for the functioning of the neoliberal state. The neoliberal state needs, more than self-regulating individuals, networked actors who actively forge the structures necessary for the transformation from centralized state powers to disseminated modes of neoliberal regulation (Marazzi, 1998; Neilson & Rossiter, 2005; Papadopoulos, 2003; Stephenson, 2003). Hence, although they arose as an attempt to challenge the overly narrow focus on the state, micropolitics have played a vital role in shifting the historical function of the state from centralized control into a disseminated form of control which operates effectively in the terrain of social and cultural life. In this sense, both state- and micropolitics articulate their political agenda inside the terrain of the state and affirm its function and centrality in social life. This is the moment where embodied subjectification and the broader project of critical psychology amplify the production of affirmative subjectivity, a subjectivity which paradoxically solidifies state regulation by operating at its margins. However, the generation of affirmative subjectivity is more than a form of political regulation in contemporary North-Atlantic societies. It is also a productive force in the literal sense. The traditional apparatus for measuring and diagnosing individual differences was insufficient as a response to the social and economical transformations related to post-Fordist labour (Bowring, 2002; Gorz, 2004; Lazzarato, 2002; Moulier Boutang, 2003; Williams, 1994). This is because post-Fordism appropriates as productive resources precisely these forms of individual action and experience, which refer to the totality of individual subjectivity: relationality, emotions, memory, communication, creativity and primarily, the totality of the body. Critical psychology’s conceptualization captures the core tenet of the post-Fordist transformation in a magnificent way: embodied subjectification becomes the algorithm for the realization of the process of the ‘subjectivization of work’, a process which lies in the heart of post-Fordist productivity (Lohr & Nickel, 2005; Moldaschl & Voss, 2003; Scho¨nberger & Springer, 2003). Yet critical psychology neither traces possible ruptures in the post-Fordist arrangement nor explores everyday forms of exodus and disobedience (Moulier Boutang, 1998; Virno, 2004). In other words, the critical psychological view of subjectification can elucidate, or diagnose, the productive role of the psychology in the social earthquake which accompanied the post-Fordist reorganization of labour and everyday sociality in North-Atlantic societies (Gordo-Lo´pez & Pujol Tarre´s, 2004; Papadopoulos, 2004). However, critical psychology is unable to engage with the suppressed potentialities of post-Fordist social relations which could lead to forms of political engagement that question post-Fordism itself (Karakayali & Tsianos, 2005; Negri, 1999; Santos, 2001; Stephenson, 2004). The reason for this is, as I argued above, that embodied subjectification is the core productive form of today’s sociality. Embodied subjectification is not only a heuristic tool which enables social researchers to understand power relations in post-Fordist North-Atlantic societies, but also the very guarantor of what Weber (1978) calls ‘legitimate domination’. A form of domination which is actively and willingly performed differently by each individual and congeals a form of power, which, following Hannah Arendt (1970), emerges not as a means to dominate but by the very fact that people act together. Embodied subjectification (and its very theoreticization by governmentality studies) is a form of obedience to today’s configuration of power in North-Atlantic societies. In this sense, micropolitics and embodied subjectification constitute a form of affirmative subjectivity in neoliberal and post-Fordist conditions. In the last part of the paper, I will briefly discuss Jacques Rancie`re’s concept of politics as a means for interfering in the production of affirmative subjectivity (for a more broad discussion of this issue s. Stephenson & Papadopoulos, 2006).

#### The disappearance of antitrust law from public discourse has cemented corporate power. A paradigm shift is possible, but requires making monopolies a political issue again, and advocating legal change.

David Dayen 15, author of *Monopolized: Life in the Age of Corporate Power (2020)* and *Chain of Title: How Three Ordinary Americans Uncovered Wall Street's Great Foreclosure Fraud*, “Bring Back Antitrust,” The American Prospect, Vol. 26, No. 4, Fall 2015, lexis.

In 1964, historian Richard Hofstadter gave a speech at the University of California, Berkeley, titled "What Happened to the Antitrust Movement?" He wondered why anti-monopoly sentiment ceased to become the subject of public agitation. "Once the United States had an antitrust movement without antitrust prosecutions," Hofstadter said. "In our time, there have been antitrust prosecutions without an antitrust movement."

Now we have lost both the movement and the prosecutions. When we talk about banks that are too big to fail, we're talking about antitrust. When we talk about the high cost of health care, we're talking about antitrust. So many of our key domestic issues are fundamentally questions about whether we should tolerate monopolies, or dismantle them. But this formulation-a centerpiece of public debate in the last robberbaron era between the 1880s and 1910s-has all but disappeared from popular discourse.

Can anti-monopoly sentiment be revived? When New York's Working Families Party first recruited Zephyr Teachout to run for governor, she said she would only do it if she could talk about monopolies. "They polled it, and they were correct that nobody knew what I was talking about," Teachout says. But when she eventually ran an insurgent campaign against incumbent Andrew Cuomo, she was determined to talk about it anyway.

"The minute you got past the sound-bite level, people responded to the concentration of power," Teachout says. They did campaign events at places where people paid their cable bills, using the pending Comcast-Time Warner merger, eventually abandoned, as the hook. She engaged farmers in upstate New York about monopsony power, and discussed Amazon and big banks on the stump. And it resonated. After only one month of campaigning, Teachout won 35 percent of the vote, with particular strength in upstate counties where farming issues were prominent.

"The Tea Party talks to people and says, 'You're out of power because government is taking it away from you,"' Teachout says. "Far too often, Democrats say, 'You're wrong, you're not out of power.' That's dissonant with our lived experience. You're out of power ... because your priorities don't matter and JPMorgan's do."

Beyond Teachout, you can see through the haze the stirrings of a grassroots antitrust agenda. The greatest anti-monopoly victory of the modern age, the Federal Communications Commission's net-neutrality rules, owed much to a smart, tech-savvy movement that leveraged big protest platforms. Web-native activists fought for the decentralized power of the Internet, without gatekeepers collecting tolls along the way. And they made the connection to things like the Comcast-Time Warner merger, which failed amid public outcry.

"After this existential threat to the Web, you see the same groups becoming interested in the deep history of anti-monopoly laws," Teachout says. "It's kind of an exciting intellectual moment, a fusion between old-school farmers who have been complaining for 30 years and new net-neutrality dreamers."

Monopolists have long used technological advances to consolidate power, from Gilded Age tycoons leveraging control of railroads and telegraphs to Amazon using its first-mover status in e-commerce to squeeze book producers, or Google harvesting traffic to their market-leading search engine to serve ads. It's easy to translate the need for a neutral platform for websites into the same need for book sales or car ride-sharing.

The European Union, in fact, did file formal antitrust charges against Google, accusing it of forcing search engine users into its own shopping platforms, and bundling Android phones with their own apps, to prevent competitors from performing the same functions. The FTC shut down its own investigation into Google over the same concerns in 2013. But an inadvertent disclosure revealed that the agency's Bureau of Competition recommended bringing a lawsuit, arguing that Google's conduct "has resulted-and will result-in real harm to consumers and to innovation in the online search and advertising markets." The political leadership ignored the recommendation.

The next administration must show "leadership that has a certain intellectual curiosity," says Maurice Stucke, pointing to the Google case as a missed opportunity. An alteration in posture would make enforcement far more vigorous, and bringing more cases will give litigators more experience and confidence to negotiate the judicial barriers. The American Antitrust Institute plans to create a transition document for the incoming administration, as they did for the Obama transition.

But at a time of political disempowerment, teaching about the dangers of monopolies and how we have the laws on the books to fight them, and creating upward pressure to do it, offers great potential for a paradigm shift. Connecting Senator Elizabeth Warren's fight against a rigged financial system and Al Franken's fight against media concentration can spark broader political energy.

You could see this potential in Washington, D.C., where in August, the city's Public Service Commission rejected a merger between energy firms Exelon and Pepco, citing "more active participation by parties and interested persons than any other proceeding in the Commission's more than a century of operations." Activists argued a giant Exelon conglomerate would fail to devote resources to the city's clean-energy goals, connecting anti-monopolization with fighting climate change.

There are a lot of reasons for runaway monopolies: an intellectual hijacking by Chicago-school conservative economists, the over-financialization of the economy, a failure of federal antitrust enforcement. But perhaps the biggest reason is that antitrust policy has become divorced from politics, confined to specialized lawyers and mathematicians instead of citizens and activists. Without grassroots momentum, politicians and enforcement agencies can safely ignore the issue. That's the challenge for a small band of academics, think-tank fellows, and activists: to make monopolies a vital issue again, connecting with the severe economic anxiety Americans feel.

#### The 1AC forecloses institutional counter-hegemony capable of transforming capitalism.

Srnicek and Williams 15. (Nick Srnicek, lecturer at City University London, and Alex Williams, lecturer at City University London. Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work. Verso Books: 2015. Pg. 27-31. iBooks.)

DEFINING FOLK POLITICS

What is folk politics? Folk politics names a constellation of ideas and intuitions within the contemporary left that informs the common-sense ways of organising, acting and thinking politics. It is a set of **strategic assumptions** that threatens to **debilitate the left**, **rendering it unable to** scale up, create lasting change or expand beyond particular interests. **Leftist movements under the sway of folk politics are not only unlikely to be successful – they are in fact** incapable of transforming capitalism. The term itself draws upon two senses of ‘folk’. First, it evokes critiques of folk psychology which argue that **our intuitive conceptions of the world are both historically constructed and often mistaken**.11 Secondly, it refers to ‘folk’ as the locus of the small-scale, the authentic, the traditional and the natural. Both of these dimensions are implied in the idea of folk politics.

As a first approximation, we can therefore define folk politics as a collective and historically constructed political common sense that has become **out of joint with** the actual mechanisms of power. As our political, economic, social and “technological world changes, tactics and strategies which were previously capable of transforming collective power into emancipatory gains have now become drained of their effectiveness. As the common sense of today’s left, folk politics often operates intuitively, uncritically and unconsciously. Yet common sense is also historical and mutable. It is worth recalling that today’s familiar forms of organisation and tactics, far from being natural or pre-given, have instead been developed over time in response to specific political problems. Petitions, occupations, strikes, vanguard parties, affinity groups, trade unions: all arose out of particular historical conditions.12 Yet the fact that certain ways of organising and acting were once useful does not guarantee their continued relevance. Many of the tactics and organisational structures that dominate the contemporary left are responses to the experience of state communism, exclusionary trade unions, and the collapse of social democratic parties. Yet the **ideas that made sense in the wake of those moments no longer present effective tools for political transformation.** **Our world has moved on, becoming more complex, abstract, nonlinear and global than ever before.**

Against the abstraction and inhumanity of capitalism, folk politics aims to bring politics down to the ‘human scale’ by emphasising temporal, spatial and conceptual immediacy. At its heart, folk politics is the guiding intuition that **immediacy is always better and often more authentic, with the corollary being a deep suspicion of abstraction and mediation**. In terms of temporal immediacy, contemporary folk politics typically remains reactive (**responding to actions initiated by corporations and governments, rather than initiating actions**);13 ignores long-term strategic goals in favour of tactics (mobilising around **single-issue politics** or emphasising process);14 **prefers practices that are often inherently fleeting** (such as occupations and temporary autonomous zones);15 chooses the familiarities of the past over the unknowns of the future (for instance, the repeated dreams of a return to ‘good’ Keynesian capitalism);16 **and expresses itself as a predilection for the** voluntarist and spontaneous over the institutional (as in the romanticisation of rioting and insurrection).17

In terms of **spatial immediacy**, **folk politics privileges the local as the site of authenticity** (as in the 100-miles diet or local currencies);18 habitually chooses the small over the large (as in the veneration of small-scale communities or local businesses);19 favours projects that are **un-scalable** beyond a small community (for instance, general assemblies and direct democracy);20 **and often** rejects the project of hegemony, valuing withdrawal or exit rather than building a broad counter-hegemony.21 Likewise, folk politics prefers that actions be taken by participants themselves – in its emphasis on direct action, for example – and sees decision-making as something to be carried out by each individual rather than by any representative. **The problems of scale and extension** are either ignored or smoothed over in folk-political thinking.

Finally, in terms of **conceptual immediacy**, there is a preference for the everyday over the structural, valorising personal experience over systematic thinking; for feeling over thinking, emphasising individual suffering, or the sensations of enthusiasm and anger experienced during political actions; for the particular over the universal, seeing the latter as intrinsically totalitarian; and for the ethical over the political – as in ethical consumerism, or **moralising critiques** of greedy bankers.22

Organisations and communities are to be transparent, **rejecting in advance any conceptual mediation, or even modest amounts of complexity.** **The classic images of universal emancipation and global change have been transformed into a prioritisation of the suffering of the particular and the authenticity of the local.** As a result, any process of constructing a universal politics is rejected from the outset.

#### Neolib is a discursive politics that relies on the work of the market metaphor. The Aff’s articulation of the social world in economic language re-constitutes all life as market, cementing the neoliberal dream and leading to the economization of life.

P.W. Zuidhof 12, Associate Professor in European political economy in the European Studies program in the Department of History, European Studies and Religious Studies at the University of Amsterdam, *Imagining Markets: The Discursive Politics of Neoliberalism,* 2012, Pages 4-11.

Neoliberalism as a Discursive Politics of the Market

Many critics of neoliberalism have tried to capture the exuberance of the market imagery in neoliberalism. The cultural critic Thomas Frank for instance, documents in One Market under God (2001) how the market has become an important cultural icon which invaded public discourse and our cultural imaginations. Frank (2001, 29) for instance points out how a variety of cultural techniques, ranging from advertising, business journalism, management books, to cultural studies have created a brand of “market populism” – he cites Newsweek columnist Robert Samuelson’s locution “the Market ‘R’ Us” – in which ‘the market’ is equated with ‘the people’ to the point that the market became to be seen as more democratic than conventional institutions of a democracy. In an attempt to address the excessive market imagery of neoliberalism, critics resort to all sorts of market-based neologisms. Like Thomas Frank, one turns for instance to religious imagery to speak of neoliberalism as a “market theology,” or the gospel of “freemarket religion” (e.g. Cox 1999). In secular terms, one invokes the image of a “free market mythology” (viz. Perelman 2006) or “The Cult of the Market” (Boldeman 2011). The market is especially concatenated with political images, as in Frank’s “market populism,” or when neoliberalism is put down as a form of “market democracy” (Chomsky 1999), “market liberalism,” or instead described as a form of “market dictatorship” (Attali 1997). The specter of terrorism is once more raised to bring out the character of neoliberalism, for instance by Henry Giroux in his book, The Terror of Neoliberalism (2004). It has especially become fashionable to refer to neoliberalism and its policies as a form of “market fundamentalism,” a depiction that has been popularized by the likes of George Soros (e.g. 1998) and notably Joseph Stiglitz (2002) in his critique of the IMF. These examples indicate that with neoliberalism, the market has emerged as a powerful image that spectacularly altered our thought and speech not only in political and policy discourse but public discourse at large. I imagine that major market philosophers from the past such as Adam Smith, Karl Marx and even Friedrich Hayek or Milton Friedman would have great difficulties understanding what is meant by some of these terms. The perceived exuberance of neoliberalism can therefore be traced to how the image of the ‘market’ was mobilized and developed into a powerful signifier to re-imagine and rearticulate many important spheres of life.

The New Yorker cartoon pointedly makes clear that neoliberalism relies on the work of metaphor. Rather than straightforwardly instructing the participants in the boardroom that terrorism should be fought at the market, the message is to fight terrorism as if it were a market. Neoliberalism, I would claim, always entails mobilizing the market in a metaphorical sense. The message of neoliberalism is consistently a metaphorical one: think of … as a market, (and govern it accordingly).6 Neoliberalism invites us to imagine virtually everything as a market, ranging from health care, universities to the military, pensions, personal relationships, families, ethics, aesthetics and the state and politics itself. The excessive quality of neoliberalism is therefore found in its use of the market as a metaphor and its ability to displace the state.

The assessment in this thesis of the challenge of neoliberalism and its politics of the market, will therefore begin by distinguishing literal references to the market from metaphorical ones. Others pointed out before that in assessing the politics of markets it is important to recognize that we often speak of markets in metaphorical terms. In Contested Commodities, the legal philosopher Margaret Radin (1996) begins her analysis of what goods can properly be bought and sold, by distinguishing literal from metaphorical markets. As against literal markets where goods are exchanged for money, at metaphorical markets there are no actual exchanges involving money but entails interactions that “are talked about as if they did” (3). Radin employs the term market rhetoric to refer to the vocabulary or discourse in which metaphorical markets emerge. Radin claims that on a theoretical level for instance, Chicago scholars such as Becker and Posner engage in market rhetoric, and “in doing so they extend the market, metaphorically at least, beyond what we are conventionally comfortable with” (4). In her view, by conflating literal and metaphorical markets, market rhetoric may give way to what she calls universal commodification. It means that goods are solely viewed as alienable market goods and only have exchange value. In her book, Radin argues for the importance of incomplete commodification. This is the view that complete commodification is not, and should not be applicable to most cases of goods. Without further engaging with the details of Radin’s account, her conceptual distinction between literal and metaphorical markets raises an important insight. Among other things, her book analyzes some of the normative implications of the metaphorical extension of the market. While she exclusively concentrates on the metaphorical extension of the market in (mostly economic) theory, I would argue that neoliberalism is founded on an analogous use of metaphorical markets, but in political discourse. Neoliberalism relies on metaphorical markets and market rhetoric to rearticulate our political understandings. Without her calling it as such, Radin’s book could be read as a normative analysis of the metaphorical politics of neoliberalism.

By drawing attention to the fact that neoliberalism relies on metaphorical markets and market rhetoric, the intellectual challenge posed by neoliberalism is to further specify the nature of its political project. Apart from the question which will be addressed in chapter 3, whether neoliberalism should be construed as either ideology, policy agenda or rather something else, it needs to be determined what kind of political project it amounts to. The hypothesis of this thesis is that neoliberalism is best understood as a kind of discursive politics. By discursive politics, I broadly mean a type of politics that achieves its goals discursively, by rearticulating a prior structure of understanding. Every form of politics of course avails itself of discourse, for example when ‘neoliberals’ call for the liberalization of certain markets. The concern here is however not with this more narrowly defined discourse of politics, but rather with the politics of discourse (viz. Connolly 1993, 221).

Put very schematically – although the dividing lines are ultimately hard to draw – my idea of neoliberalism as a discursive politics differs from conventional conceptions of politics in claiming that in important respects neoliberalism depends on language and discursive means to attain political effects. The basic idea is that discursive interventions impact the way we perceive the organization of the social world and how we conceive of the good life. Where traditional, for instance liberal conceptions of politics take the organization of social life largely as given and view politics as a contest of preferences and opinions, discursive politics affects the constitution of our social world and our conceptions of the good life. Rather than asking for the liberalization of markets, the discursive politics of neoliberalism mobilizes the metaphor of the market to rearticulate how we to think of a certain area of life.

The idea of discursive politics as pursued in this thesis, is not unique but inspired by a longer tradition within poststructural political thought and discourse theory as found with Laclau and Mouffe (2001), Butler (1993, 1997), Shapiro (1981, 1984), or Connolly (1993). One of its insights is that discourse is inherently political because discursive constructions inevitably privilege certain aspects over others. The flip-side of this insight is however that any discursive construction is fundamentally unstable and subject to rearticulation. Laclau (e.g. Laclau 1996, 2000, 2008) at times emphasizes that rhetorical displacements or “tropological substitutions” are indispensable in mediating the rearticulation of existing discursive structures. Shifts in discourse are always tropological as they allow for the making and breaking of the discursive field. The political power of metaphor then is its capacity to rearticulate a certain discursive field. Since the market metaphor performs such a function in neoliberalism, it seems particularly relevant to approach neoliberalism as a discursive form of politics. Neoliberalism is then best characterized as the discursive politics of the market metaphor. Not all politics surrounding neoliberalism is always necessarily discursive in this strong sense and no doubt also amounts to conventional contests over preferences and opinions. Our first brush with neoliberalism here however suggests that its most important challenge is its discursive politics.

This thesis studies the discursive politics of neoliberalism, both theoretically and empirically. Since the discursive politics of the market continues to have a tremendous impact on contemporary political discourse, it is relevant to assess its effects. As the discursive market politics of neoliberalism particularly challenges our traditional views of the interrelation between the market and the state, the main question is to determine how the discursive politics of neoliberalism re-imagines the way this relation is perceived. This way, neoliberalism calls for a re-evaluation of the intersections between economics and politics. How do the manifold ways of spreading market metaphors displace and destabilize existing understandings of the relation between markets and states? What is at stake in the invitation of neoliberalism to imagine markets for everything and especially as a substitute for the state? As we will see, the central issue behind neoliberalism’s rewriting of the relation between the market and the state is that the latter challenge our traditional view of how to govern and how to conceive of government. The argument of this thesis is that the discursive market politics of neoliberalism inaugurates new ways of conceiving of government. The main task of this thesis is to assess exactly how neoliberalism is rewriting our view of government, and to determine what its political consequences are.

#### Neolib commoditizes life, ensures inequality, eco-crisis

Harvey 5 (David, FBA is the Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography @ the Graduate Center of the City Univ. of New York, A Brief History of Neoliberalism, pgs 165-171//shree)

To presume that markets and market signals can best determine all allocative decisions is to presume that everything can in principle be treated as a commodity. Commodification presumes the existence of property rights over processes, things, and social relations, that a price can be put on them, and that they can be traded subject to legal contract. The market is presumed to work as an appropriate guide––an ethic––for all human action. In practice, of course, every society sets some bounds on where commodification begins and ends. Where the boundaries lie is a matter of contention. Certain drugs are deemed illegal. The buying and selling of sexual favours is outlawed in most US states, though elsewhere it may be legalized, decriminalized, and even state-regulated as an industry. Pornography is broadly protected as a form of free speech under US law although here, too, there are certain forms (mainly concerning children) that are considered beyond the pale. In the US, conscience and honour are supposedly not for sale, and there exists a curious penchant to pursue ‘corruption’ as if it is easily distinguishable from the normal practices of influence-peddling and making money in the marketplace. The commodification of sexuality, culture, history, heritage; of nature as spectacle or as rest cure; the extraction of monopoly rents from originality, authenticity, and uniqueness (of works or art, for example)––these all amount to putting a price on things that were never actually produced as commodities.17 There is often disagreement as to the appropriate- ness of commodification (of religious events and symbols, for example) or of who should exercise the property rights and derive the rents (over access to Aztec ruins or marketing of Aboriginal art, for example).¶ Neoliberalization has unquestionably rolled back the bounds of commodification and greatly extended the reach of legal contracts. It typically celebrates (as does much of postmodern theory) ephemerality and the short-term contract––marriage, for example, is understood as a short-term contractual arrangement rather than as a sacred and unbreakable bond. The divide between neoliberals and neoconservatives partially reflects a difference as to where the lines are drawn. The neoconservatives typically blame ‘liberals’, ‘Hollywood’, or even ‘postmodernists’ for what they see as the dissolution and immorality of the social order, rather than the corporate capitalists (like Rupert Murdoch) who actually do most of the damage by foisting all manner of sexually charged if not salacious material upon the world and who continually flaunt their pervasive preference for short-term over long-term commitments in their endless pursuit of profit.¶ But there are far more serious issues here than merely trying to protect some treasured object, some particular ritual or a preferred corner of social life from the monetary calculus and the short-term contract. For at the heart of liberal and neoliberal theory lies the necessity of constructing coherent markets for land, labour, and money, and these, as Karl Polanyi pointed out, ‘are obviously not commodities . . . the commodity description of labour, land, and money is entirely fictitious’. While capitalism cannot function without such fictions, it does untold damage if it fails to acknowledge the complex realities behind them. Polanyi, in one of his more famous passages, puts it this way:¶ To allow the market mechanism to be sole director of the fate of human beings and their natural environment, indeed, even of the amount and use of purchasing power, would result in the demolition of society. For the alleged commodity ‘labour power’ cannot be shoved about, used indiscriminately, or even left unused, without affecting also the human individual who happens to be the bearer of this peculiar commodity. In disposing of man’s labour power the system would, incidentally, dispose of the physical, psychological, and moral entity ‘man’ attached to that tag. Robbed of the protective covering of cultural institutions, human beings would perish from the effects of social exposure; they would die as victims of acute social dislocation through vice, perversion, crime and starvation. Nature would be reduced to its elements, neighborhoods and landscapes defiled, rivers polluted, military safety jeopardized, the power to produce food and raw materials destroyed. Finally, the market administration of purchasing power would periodically liquidate business enterprise, for shortages and surfeits of money would prove as disastrous to business as floods and droughts in primitive society.18¶ The damage wrought through the ‘floods and droughts’ of fictitious capitals within the global credit system, be it in Indonesia, Argentina, Mexico, or even within the US, testifies all too well to Polanyi’s final point. But his theses on labour and land deserve further elaboration.¶ Individuals enter the labour market as persons of character, as individuals embedded in networks of social relations and socialized in various ways, as physical beings identifiable by certain characteristics (such as phenotype and gender), as individuals who have accumulated various skills (sometimes referred to as ‘human cap- ital’) and tastes (sometime referred to as ‘cultural capital’), and as living beings endowed with dreams, desires, ambitions, hopes, doubts, and fears. For capitalists, however, such individuals are a mere factor of production, though not an undifferentiated factor since employers require labour of certain qualities, such as physical strength, skills, flexibility, docility, and the like, appropriate to cer- tain tasks. Workers are hired on contract, and in the neoliberal scheme of things short-term contracts are preferred in order to maximize flexibility. Employers have historically used differentiations within the labour pool to divide and rule. Segmented labour markets then arise and distinctions of race, ethnicity, gen- der, and religion are frequently used, blatantly or covertly, in ways that redound to the employers’ advantage. Conversely, workers may use the social networks in which they are embedded to gain privileged access to certain lines of employment. They typically seek to monopolize skills and, through collective action and the creation of appropriate institutions, seek to regulate the labour market to protect their interests. In this they are merely construct- ing that ‘protective covering of cultural institutions’ of which Polanyi speaks.¶ Neoliberalization seeks to strip away the protective coverings that embedded liberalism allowed and occasionally nurtured. The general attack against labour has been two-pronged. The powers of trade unions and other working-class institutions are curbed or dismantled within a particular state (by violence if necessary). Flexible labour markets are established. State withdrawal from social welfare provision and technologically induced shifts in job structures that render large segments of the labour force redun- dant complete the domination of capital over labour in the market- place. The individualized and relatively powerless worker then confronts a labour market in which only short-term contracts are offered on a customized basis. Security of tenure becomes a thing of the past (Thatcher abolished it in universities, for example). A ‘personal responsibility system’ (how apt Deng’s language was!) is substituted for social protections (pensions, health care, protec- tions against injury) that were formerly an obligation of employers and the state. Individuals buy products in the markets that sell social protections instead. Individual security is therefore a matter of individual choice tied to the affordability of financial products embedded in risky financial markets.¶ The second prong of attack entails transformations in the spa- tial and temporal co-ordinates of the labour market. While too much can be made of the ‘race to the bottom’ to find the cheapest and most docile labour supplies, the geographical mobility of capital permits it to dominate a global labour force whose own geographical mobility is constrained. Captive labour forces abound because immigration is restricted. These barriers can be evaded only by illegal immigration (which creates an easily exploitable labour force) or through short-term contracts that permit, for example, Mexican labourers to work in Californian agribusiness only to be shamelessly shipped back to Mexico when they get sick and even die from the pesticides to which they are exposed.¶ Under neoliberalization, the figure of ‘the disposable worker’ emerges as prototypical upon the world stage.19 Accounts of the appalling conditions of labour and the despotic conditions under which labourers work in the sweatshops of the world abound. In China, the conditions under which migrant young women from rural areas work are nothing short of appalling: ‘unbearably long hours, substandard food, cramped dorms, sadistic managers who beat and sexually abuse them, and pay that arrives months late, or sometimes not at all’.20 In Indonesia, two young women recounted their experiences working for a Singapore-based Levi-Strauss subcontractor as follows:¶ We are regularly insulted, as a matter of course. When the boss gets angry he calls the women dogs, pigs, sluts, all of which we have to endure patiently without reacting. We work officially from seven in the morning until three (salary less than $2 a day), but there is often compulsory overtime, sometimes––especially if there is an urgent order to be delivered––until nine. However tired we are, we are not allowed to go home. We may get an extra 200 rupiah (10 US cents) . . . We go on foot to the factory from where we live. Inside it is very hot. The building has a metal roof, and there is not much space for all the workers. It is very cramped. There are over 200 people working there, mostly women, but there is only one toilet for the whole factory . . . when we come home from work, we have no energy left to do anything but eat and sleep . . .21¶ Similar tales come from the Mexican maquila factories, the Taiwanese- and Korean-operated manufacturing plants in Honduras, South Africa, Malaysia, and Thailand. The health haz- ards, the exposure to a wide range of toxic substances, and death on the job pass by unregulated and unremarked. In Shanghai, the Taiwanese businessman who ran a textile warehouse ‘in which 61 workers, locked in the building, died in a fire’ received a ‘lenient’ two-year suspended sentence because he had ‘showed repentance’ and ‘cooperated in the aftermath of the fire’.22¶ Women, for the most part, and sometimes children, bear the brunt of this sort of degrading, debilitating, and dangerous toil.23 The social consequences of neoliberalization are in fact extreme. Accumulation by dispossession typically undermines whatever powers women may have had within household production/ marketing systems and within traditional social structures and relocates everything in male-dominated commodity and credit markets. The paths of women’s liberation from traditional patri- archal controls in developing countries lie either through degrad- ing factory labour or through trading on sexuality, which varies from respectable work as hostesses and waitresses to the sex trade (one of the most lucrative of all contemporary industries in which a good deal of slavery is involved). The loss of social protec- tions in advanced capitalist countries has had particularly negative effects on lower-class women, and in many of the ex-communist countries of the Soviet bloc the loss of women’s rights through neoliberalization has been nothing short of catastrophic.¶ So how, then, do disposable workers––women in particular–– survive both socially and affectively in a world of flexible labour markets and short-term contracts, chronic job insecurities, lost social protections, and often debilitating labour, amongst the wreckage of collective institutions that once gave them a modicum of dignity and support? For some the increased flexibility in labour markets is a boon, and even when it does not lead to material gains the simple right to change jobs relatively easily and free of the traditional social constraints of patriarchy and family has intangible benefits. For those who successfully negotiate the labour market there are seemingly abundant rewards in the world of a capitalist consumer culture. Unfortunately, that culture, however spectacular, glamorous, and beguiling, perpetually plays with desires without ever conferring satisfactions beyond the limited identity of the shopping mall and the anxieties of status by way of good looks (in the case of women) or of material possessions. ‘I shop therefore I am’ and possessive individualism together con- struct a world of pseudo-satisfactions that is superficially exciting but hollow at its core. But for those who have lost their jobs or who have never managed to move out of the extensive informal economies that now provide a parlous refuge for most of the world’s disposable work- ers, the story is entirely different. With some 2 billion people condemned to live on less than $2 a day, the taunting world of capitalist consumer culture, the huge bonuses earned in financial services, and the self-congratulatory polemics as to the emancipa- tory potential of neoliberalization, privatization, and personal responsibility must seem like a cruel joke. From impoverished rural China to the affluent US, the loss of health-care protections and the increasing imposition of all manner of user fees adds considerably to the financial burdens of the poor.24
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Today the terms “world economy”, “world market”, and “globalization” are commonplace, appearing in the sound-bites of politicians, media commentators, and unemployed workers alike. But few know that the most important source for these phrases lies with work started by sociologists in the early Seventies. At a time when the mainstream assumption of accepted social, political, and economic science held that the “wealth of nations” reflected mainly on the cultural developments within those nations, a growing group of social scientists recognized that national “development” could be best understood as the complex outcome of local interactions with an aggressively expanding Europe-centered “world-system” (Wallerstein 1974; Frank 1978).1 Not only did these scientists perceive the global nature of economic networks 20 years before they entered popular discourse, but they also saw that many of these networks extend back at least 600 years. Over this time, the peoples of the globe became linked into one integrated unit: the modern world-system. Now, 20 years on, social scientists working in the area are trying to understand the history and evolution of the whole system, as well as how local, national and regional entities have been integrated into it. This current research has required broadening our perspective to include deeper temporal and larger spatial frameworks. For example, some recent research has compared the modern Europe-centered world-system of the last six hundred years with earlier, smaller intersocietal networks that have existed for millennia (Frank and Gills 1993; Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997). Other work uses the knowledge of cycles and trends that has grown out of world-systems research to anticipate likely future events with a precision impossible before the advent of the theory. This is still a new field and much remains to be done, but enough has already been achieved to provide a valuable understanding of the phenomenon of globalization. The discourse about globalization has emerged mainly in the last decade. The term means many different things, and there are many reasons for its emergence as a popular concept. The usage of this term generally implies that a recent change (within the last decade or two) has occurred in technology and in the size of the arena of economic competition. The general idea is that information technology has created a context in which the global market, rather than separate national markets, is the relevant arena for economic competition. It then follows that economic competitiveness needs to be assessed in the global context, rather than in a national or local context. These notions have been used to justify the adoption of new practices by firms and governments all over the world and these developments have altered the political balances among states, firms, unions and other interest groups. The first task is to put this development into historical context. The world-systems perspective has shown that intersocietal geopolitics and geoeconomics has been the relevant arena of competition for national-states, firms and classes for hundreds of years. The degree of international connectedness of economic and political/military networks was already important in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The first “transnational corpora-tions” (TNCs) were the great chartered companies of the seventeenth century. They organized both production and exchange on an intercontinental scale. The rise and fall of hegemonic core powers, which continues today with the relative decline of the United States hegemony, was already in full operation in the seventeenth century rise and fall of Dutch hegemony (see Arrighi 1994; Modelski and Thompson 1996; Taylor 1996). The capitalist world-economy has experienced cyclical processes and secular trends for hundreds of years (Chase-Dunn 1998:Chapter 2). The cyclical processes include the rise and fall of hegemons, the Kondratieff wave (a forty to sixty year business cycle)2 , a cycle of warfare among core states (Goldstein 1988), and cycles of colonization and decolonization (Bergesen and Schoenberg 1980). The world-system has also experienced several secular trends including a long-term proletarianization of the world work force, growing concentration of capital into larger and larger firms, increasing internationalization of capital investment and of trade, and accelerating internationalization of political structures. In this perspective, globalization is a long-term upward trend of political and economic change that is affected by cyclical processes. The most recent technological changes, and the expansions of international trade and investment, are part of these long-run changes. One question is exactly how the most recent changes compare with the long-run trends? And what are the important continuities as well as the qualitative differences that accompany these changes? These are the questions that I propose to explore. types of globalization There are at least five different dimensions of globalization that need to be distinguished. There are also several misunderstandings and misinterpretations that need to be clarified. Let us evaluate five different meanings of globalization: (1) Common ecological constraints This aspect of globalization involves global threats due to our fragile ecosystem and the globalization of ecological risks. Anthropogenic causes of ecological degradation have long operated, and these in turn have affected human social evolution (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997). But ecological degradation has only recently begun to operate on a global scale. This fact creates a set of systemic constraints that require global collective action. (2) Cultural globalization This aspect of globalization relates to the diffusion of two sets of cultural phenomena: • the proliferation of individualized values, originally of Western origin, to ever larger parts of the world population. These values are expressed in social constitutions that recognize individual rights and identities and transnational and international efforts to protect “human rights.” • the adoption of originally Western institutional practices. Bureaucratic organization and rationality, belief in a law-like natural universe, the values of economic efficiency and political democracy have been spreading throughout the world since they were propagated in the European Enlightenment (Meyer 1996; Markoff 1996). Whereas some of the discussions of the world polity assume that cultural components have been a central aspect of the modern world-system from the start (e.g. Meyer 1989; Mann 1986), I emphasize the comparatively non-normative nature of the modern world-system (Chase-Dunn 1998: Chapter 5). But I acknowledge the growing salience of cultural consensus in the last 100 years. Whereas the modern world-system has always been, and is still, multicultural, the growing influence and acceptance of Western values of rationality, individualism, equality, and efficiency is an important trend of the twentieth century. (3) Globalization of communication Another meaning of globalization is connected with the new era of information technology. Anthony Giddens(1996) insists that social space comes to acquire new qualities with generalized electronic communications, albeit only in the networked parts of the world. In terms of accessibility, cost and velocity, the hitherto more local political and geographic parameters that structured social relationships are greatly expanded. One may well argue that time-space compression (Harvey 1989) by new information technologies is simply an extension and acceleration of the very long-term trend toward technological development over the last ten millenia (Chase-Dunn 1994). Yet, the rapid decrease in the cost of communications may have qualitatively altered the relationship between states and consciousness and this may be an important basis for the formation of a much stronger global civil society. Global communication facilities have the power to move things visible and invisible from one part of the globe to another whether any nation-state likes it or not. This applies not only to economic exchange, but also to ideas, and these new networks of communication can create new political groups and alignments. How, and to what extent, will this undermine the power of states to structure social relationships? (4) Economic globalization Economic globalization means globe-spanning economic relationships. The interrelationships of markets, finance, goods and services, and the networks created by transnational corporations are the most important manifestations of this. Though the capitalist world-system has been international in essence for centuries, the extent and degree of trade and investment globalization has increased greatly in recent decades. Economic globalization has been accelerated by what information technology has done to the movement of money. It is commonly claimed that the market’s ability to shift money from one part of the globe to another by the push of a button has changed the rules of policy-making, putting economic decisions much more at the mercy of market forces than before. The world-system has undergone major waves of economic globalization before, especially in the last decades of the the nineteenth century. One important question is whether or not the most recent wave has actually integrated the world to a qualitatively greater extent that it was integrated during the former wave. All the breathy discussions of global capitalism and global society assume that this is the case, but careful comparative research indicates that this is not so (see below and Chase-Dunn, Kawano and Brewer 2000). (5) Political globalization Political globalization consists of the institutionalization of international political structures. The Europe-centered world-system has been primarily constituted as an interstate system—a system of conflicting and allying states and empires. Earlier world-systems, in which accumulation was mainly accomplished by means of institutionalized coercive power, experienced an oscillation between multicentric interstate systems and core-wide world empires in which a single “universal” state conquered all or most of the core states in a region. The Europe-centered system has also experienced a cyclical alternation between political centralization and decentralization, but this has taken the form of the rise and fall of hegemonic core states that do not conquer the other core states. Hence the modern world-system has remained multicentric in the core, and this is due mainly to the shift toward a form of accumulation based more on the production and profitable sale of commodities—capitalism. The hegemons have been the most thoroughly capitalist states and they have preferred to follow a strategy of controlling trade and access to raw material imports from the periphery rather than conquering other core states to extract tribute or taxes. Power competition in an interstate system does not require much in the way of cross-state cultural consensus to operate systemically. But since the early nineteenth century the European interstate system has been developing both an increasingly consensual international normative order and a set of international political structures that regulate all sorts of interaction. This phenomenon has been termed “global governance” by Craig Murphy (1994) and others. It refers to the growth of both specialized and general international organizations. The general organizations that have emerged are the Concert of Europe, the League of Nations and the United Nations. The sequence of these “proto-world-states” constitutes a process of institution-building, but unlike earlier “universal states” this one is slowly emerging by means of condominium among core states rather than conquest. This is the trend of political globalization. It is yet a weak, but persistent, concentration of sovereignty in international institutions. If it continues it will eventuate in a single global state that could effectively outlaw warfare and enforce its illegality. The important empirical question, analogous to the discussion of economic globalization above, is the relative balance of power between international and global political organizations vis a vis national states. We assume this to be an upward trend, but like economic globalization it probably is also a cycle. Measuring Economic Globalization The brief discussion above of economic globalization implies that it is a long-run upward trend. The idea is that international economic competition as well as geopolitical competition were already important in the fourteenth century and that they became increasingly important as more and more international trade and international investment occurred. In its simplest form this would posit a linear upward trend of economic globalization. An extreme alternative hypothesis about economic globalization would posit a completely unintegrated world composed of autarchic national economies until some point (perhaps in the last few decades) at which a completely global market for commodities and capital suddenly emerged. Let us examine data that can tell us more about the temporal emergence of economic globalization. There are potentially a large number of different indicators of economic globalization and they may or may not exhibit similar patterns with respect to change over time. Trade globalization can be operationalized as the proportion of all world production that crosses international boundaries. Investment globalization would be the proportion of all invested capital in the world that is owned by non-nationals (i.e. “foreigners”). And we could also investigate the degree of economic integration of countries by determining the extent to which national economic growth rates are correlated across countries. 3 It would be ideal to have these measures over several centuries, but comparable fi gures are not available before the nineteenth century, and indeed even these are sparse and probably unrepresentative of the whole system until well into the twentieth century. Nevertheless we can learn some important things by examining those comparable data that are available. Figure 1 shows trade and investment globalization. Trade globalization is the ratio of estimated total world exports (the sum of the value of exports of all countries) divided by an estimate of total world product (the sum of all the national GDPs). Investment globalization is the total book value of all foreign direct investment divided by the total world product. The trade globalization figures show the hypothesized upward trend as well as a downturn that occurred between 1929 and 1950. Note that the time scale in Figure 1 is distorted by the paucity of data before 1950. It is possible that important changes in trade globalization are not visible in this series because of the wide temporal gaps in the data. Indeed a more recent study has shown that this is the case. There was a shorter and less well-defined wave of trade globalization from 1900 to 1929 (Chase-Dunn, Kawano and Brewer 2000). Figure 1 also shows that the trade indicator differs in some ways from the investment indicator. Investment globalization was higher (or as high) in 1913 as it was in 1991, while trade globalization was considerably lower in 1913 than it was in 1992. We have fewer time points for the investment data, so we cannot tell for sure about the shape of the changes that took place, but these two series imply that different indicators of economic globalization may show somewhat different trajectories. More research needs to be done on investment globalization to determine its exact trajectory and for comparison with trade globalization and other world-system cycles and trends. A third indicator of economic globalization is the correlation of national GDP growth rates (Grimes 1993). This shows the extent to which periods of national economic growth and stagnation have been synchronized across countries. In a fully integrated global economy it would be expected that growth and stagnation periods would be synchronized across countries and so there would be a high correlation of national growth rates. Grimes shows that, contrary to the hypothesis of a secular upward trend toward increasing global integration, the correlation among national growth rates fluctuates cyclically over the past two centuries. In a data series from 1860 to 1988 Grimes found two periods in which national economic growth decline sequences are highly correlated across countries: - 1913-1927; and after 1970. Before and in between these peaks are periods of very low synchronization. Further research needs to be done to determine the temporal patterns of different sorts of economic globalization. At this point we can say that the step-function version of a sudden recent leap to globalization can be rejected. The evidence we have indicates that there are both long-term secular trends and huge cyclical oscillations. Trade globalization shows a long-term trend with a big dip during the depression of the 1930s. The investment globalization indicates a cycle with at least two peaks, one before World War I and one after 1980. Grimes’s indicator of synchronous economic growth indicates a cyclical fluctuation with one peak in the 1920s and another since 1970. These results, especially those that imply cycles, indicate that change occurs relatively quickly and that the most recent period of globalization shares important features with earlier periods of intense international economic interaction. The question of the similarities and differences between the most recent wave and earlier waves of globalization is clearly an important one. systemic cycles of accumulation Giovanni Arrighi (1994) shows how hegemony in the modern world system has evolved in a series of “systemic cycles of accumulation” (SCAs) in which finance capital has employed different forms of organization and different relationships with organized state power. These qualitative organizational changes have accompanied the secular increase in the power of money and markets as regulatory forces in the modern world-system. The SCAs have been occurring in the Europe-centered world-system since at least the fourteenth century. Arrighi’s model shows both the similarities and the differences in the relationships that obtain between financial capital and states within the different systemic cycles of accumulation. The British SCA and the American SCA had both similarities and important differences. The main differences that Arrighi emphasizes are the “internalization of transaction costs” (represented by the vertical integration of TNCs) and the extent to which the U.S. tried to create “organized capitalism” on a global scale. The British SCA had fewer global firms and pushed hard for international free trade. The U.S. SCA is characterized by a much heavier focus on global firms and by a more structured approach to “global governance” possibly intended to produce economic growth in other core regions, especially those that are geopolitically strategic. Arrighi argues that President Roosevelt used the power of the hegemonic state to try to create a balanced world of capitalist growth. This sometimes meant going against the preferences of finance capital and U.S. corporations. For example, the Japanese miracle was made possible because the U.S. government prevented U.S. corporations from turning Japan (and Korea) into just one more dependent and peripheralized country. This policy of enlightened global Keynesianism was continued in a somewhat constrained form under later presidents, albeit in the guise of domestic “military Keynesianism” justified by the Soviet threat. In this interpretation the big companies and the finance capitalists returned to power with the decline in competitiveness of the U.S. economy. The rise of the Eurodollar market forced Nixon to abandon the Bretton Woods financial structure, and this was followed by ReaganismThatcherism, IMF structural adjustment, streamlining, deregulation and the delegitimation of anything that constrained the desires of global capital investment. The idea that we are all subject to the forces of a global market-place, and that any constraint on the freedom to invest will result in a deficit of “competitiveness,” is a powerful justification for destroying the institutions of the “Second Wave” (e.g. labor unions, welfare, agricultural subsidies, etc.).4 Under conditions of increased economic globalization the ability of national states to protect their citizens from world market forces decreases. This results increasing inequalities within countries, and increasing levels of dis-satisfaction compared to the relative harmony of national integration achieved under the Keynesian regimes. It is also produces political reactions, especially national-populist movements.5 Indeed, Philip McMichael (1996) attributes the anti-government movements now occurring in the U.S. West, including the bombing of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City, to the frustrations caused by the deregulation of U.S. agriculture. It would also be useful to investigate the temporal patterns of the other types of globalization: cultural,6 political, technological and ecological. Of interest too are the relationships between these and economic globalization. Much empirical work needs to be done to operationalize these concepts and to assemble the relevant information. Here, for now, I will hypothesize that all these types exhibit both long-run secular and cyclical features. I will also surmise that cultural and political globalization are lagged behind the secular upward trend of economic globalization. the politics of globalization This last hypothesis bears on the question of adjustments of political and social institutions to increases in economic and technological globalization. I would submit that the current period of economic globalization has occurred in part due to technological changes that are linked to Kondratieff waves, and in part because of the profit squeezes and declining hegemony of the U.S. economy in the larger world market. 7 The financial aspects of the current period of economic globalization began when President Nixon canceled the Bretton Woods agreement in response to pressures on the value of the U.S. dollar coming from the rapidly growing Eurodollar market (Harvey 1995). This occurred in 1967, and this date is used by many to mark the beginning of a K-wave downturn. The saturation of the world market demand for the products of the post-World War II upswing, the constraints on capital accumulation posed by business unionism and the political entitlements of the welfare states in core countries caused a profit squeeze that motivated large firms and investors and their political helpers to try to break out of these constraints. The possibilities for global investment opened up by new communications and information technology created new maneuverability for capital. The demise of the Soviet Union8 added legitimacy to the revitalized ideology of the free market and this ideology swept the Earth. Not only Reagan and Thatcher, but Eurocommunists and labor governments in both the core and the periphery, adopted the ideology of the “lean state,” deregulation, privatization and the notion that everything must be evaluated in terms of global efficiency and competitiveness. Cultural globalization has been a very long-term upward trend since the emergence of the world religions in which any person, regardless of ethnicity or kinship, could become a member of the moral community by confessing faith in the “universal” god. But moral and political cosmography has usually encompassed a smaller realm than the real dimensions of the objective trade and political/military networks in which people have been involved. What has occurred at the end of the twentieth century is a near convergence between subjective cosmography and objective networks. The main cause of this is probably the practical limitation of human habitation to the planet Earth. But the long-run declining costs of transportation and communications are also an important element. Whatever the causes, the emergent reality is one in which consciousness embraces (or goes beyond) the real systemic networks of interaction. This geographical feature of the global system is one of its uniquenesses, and it makes possible for the future a level of normative order that has not existed since human societies were very small and egalitarian (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997a). The ideology of globalization has undercut the support and the rationale behind all sorts of so-called Second Wave institutions—labor unions, socialist parties, welfare programs, and communist states. While these institutions have not been destroyed everywhere, the politicians of the right (e.g. Newt Gingrich in the U.S.) have explicitly argued for their elimination. At the same time, the very technologies that made capitalist economic globalization possible also have the potential to allow those who do not benefit from the free reign of capital to organize new forms of resistance, or to revitalize old forms. It is now widely agreed by many, even in the financial community, that the honeymoon of neo-liberalism will eventually end and that the rough edges of global capitalism will need to be buffed. Patrick Buchanan, a conservative candidate for the U.S. presidency in 1996, tried to capitalize on popular resentment of corporate downsizing. The Wall Street Journal has reported that stock analysts worry about the “lean and mean” philosophy becoming a fad that has the potential to delegitimate the business system and to create political backlashes. This was expressed in the context of a discussion of the announcement of huge bonuses for AT&T executives following another round of downsizing. I already mentioned the difficulties that states are having in controlling communications on the Internet. I do not believe the warnings of those who predict a massive disruption of civilization by hordes of sociopaths waging “cyberwar”9 But I do think that the new communications technologies provide new opportunities for the less powerful to organize themselves to respond should global capitalism run them over or leave them out. The important question is what are the most useful organizational forms for resistance? What we already see are all sorts of nutty localisms, nationalisms and a proliferation of identity politics. The militias of the U.S. West are ordering large amounts of fertilizer with which to resist the coming of the “Blue Helmets”—a fantasized world state that is going to take away their handguns and assualt rifles.10 Localisms and specialized identities are the postmodern political forms that are supposedly produced by information technology, flexible specialization, and global capitalism (Harvey 1989). I think that at least some of this trend is a result of desperation and the demise of plausible alternatives in the face of the ideological hegemony of neoliberalism and the much-touted triumph of efficiency over justice. Be that as it may, a historical perspective on the latest phase of globalization allows us to see the long-run patterns of interaction between capitalist expansion and the movements of opposition that have tried to protect people from the negative aspects of market forces and exploitation. And this perspective has implications for going beyond the impasse of the present to build a more cooperative and humane global system (Boswell and Chase-Dunn 1999). the spiral of capitalism and socialism The interaction between expansive commodification and resistance movements can be denoted as “the spiral of capitalism and socialism.” The world-systems perspective provides a view of the long-term interaction between the expansion and deepening of capitalism and the efforts of people to protect themselves from exploitation and domination. The historical development of the communist states is explained as part of a long-run spiraling interaction between expanding capitalism and socialist counter-responses. The history and developmental trajectory of the communist states can be explained as socialist movements in the semiperiphery that attempted to transform the basic logic of capitalism, but which ended up using socialist ideology to mobilize industrialization for the purpose of catching up with core capitalism. The spiraling interaction between capitalist development and socialist movements can be seen in the history of labor movements, socialist parties and communist states over the last 200 years. This long-run comparative perspective enables one to see recent events in China, Russia and Eastern Europe in a framework that has implications for the future of social democracy. The metaphor of the spiral means this: both capitalism and socialism affect one another’s growth and organizational forms. Capitalism spurs socialist responses by exploiting and dominating peoples, and socialism spurs capitalism to expand its scale of production and market integration and to revolutionize technology. Defined broadly, socialist movements are those political and organizational means by which people try to protect themselves from market forces, exploitation and domination, and to build more cooperative institutions. The sequence of industrial revolutions, by which capitalism has restructured production and taken control of labor, have stimulated a series of political organizations and institutions created by workers to protect their livelihoods. This happened differently under different political and economic conditions in different parts of the world-system. Skilled workers created guilds and craft unions. Less skilled workers created industrial unions. Sometimes these coalesced into labor parties that played important roles in supporting the development of political democracies, mass education and welfare states (Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens 1992). In other regions workers were less politically successful, but managed at least to protect access to rural areas or subsistence plots for a fall-back or hedge against the insecurities of employment in capitalist enterprises. To some extent the burgeoning contemporary “informal sector” in both core and peripheral societies provides such a fall-back. The mixed success of workers’ organizations also had an impact on the further development of capitalism. In some areas workers or communities were successful at raising the wage bill or protecting the environment in ways that raised the costs of production for capital. When this happened capitalists either displaced workers by automating them out of jobs or capital migrated to where fewer constraints allowed cheaper production. The process of capital flight is not a new feature of the world-system. It has been an important force behind the uneven development of capitalism and the spreading scale of market integration for centuries. Labor unions and socialist parties were able to obtain some power in certain states, but capitalism became yet more international. Firm size increased. International markets became more and more important to successful capitalist competition. Fordism, the employment of large numbers of easily-organizable workers in centralized production locations, has been supplanted by “flexible accumulation” (small firms producing small customized products) and global sourcing (the use of substitutable components from broadly dispersed competing producers), are all production strategies that make traditional labor organizing approaches much less viable. communist states in the world-system Socialists were able to gain state power in certain semiperipheral states and use this power to create political mechanisms of protection against competition with core capital. This was not a wholly new phenomenon. As discussed below, capitalist semiperipheral states had done and were doing similar things. But, the communist states claimed a fundamentally oppositional ideology in which socialism was allegedly a superior system that would eventually replace capitalism. Ideological opposition is a phenomenon which the capitalist world-economy has seen before. The geopolitical and economic battles of the Thirty Years War were fought in the name of Protestantism against Catholicism. The content of the ideology may make some difference for the internal organization of states and parties, but every contender must be able to legitimate itself in the eyes and hearts of its cadre. The claim to represent a qualitatively different and superior socio-economic system is not evidence that the communist states were indeed structurally autonomous from world capitalism. The communist states severely restricted the access of core capitalist firms to their internal markets and raw materials, and this constraint on the mobility of capital was an important force behind the post-World War II upsurge in the spatial scale of market integration and a new revolution of technology. In certain areas capitalism was driven to further revolutionize technology or to improve living conditions for workers and peasants because of the demonstration effect of propinquity to a communist state. U.S. support for state-led industrialization of Japan and Korea (in contrast to U.S. policy in Latin America) is only understandable as a geopolitical response to the Chinese revolution. The existence of “two superpowers”—one capitalist and one communist—in the period since World War II provided a fertile context for the success of international liberalism within the “capitalist” bloc. This was the political/military basis of the rapid growth of transnational corporations and the latest revolutionary “time-space compression” (Harvey 1989). This technological revolution has once again restructured the international division of labor and created a new regime of labor regulation called “flexible accumulation.” The process by which the communist states have become reintegrated into the capitalist world-system has been long, as described below. But, the final phase of reintegration was provoked by the inability to be competitive with the new form of capitalist regulation. Thus, capitalism spurs socialism, which spurs capitalism, which spurs socialism again in a wheel that turns and turns while getting larger. The economic reincorporation of the communist states into the capitalist world-economy did not occur recently and suddenly. It began with the mobilization toward autarchic industrialization using socialist ideology, an effort that was quite successful in terms of standard measures of economic development. Most of the communist states were increasing their percentage of world product and energy consumption up until the 1980s. The economic reincorporation of the communist states moved to a new stage of integration with the world market and foreign firms in the 1970s. Andre Gunder Frank (1980:chapter 4) documented a trend toward reintegration in which the communist states increased their exports for sale on the world market, increased imports from the avowedly capitalist countries, and made deals with transnational firms for investments within their borders. The economic crisis in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union was not much worse than the economic crisis in the rest of the world during the global economic downturn that began in the late 1960s (see Boswell and Peters 1990, Table 1). Data presented by World Bank analysts indicates that GDP growth rates were positive in most of the “historically planned economies” in Europe until 1989 or 1990 (Marer et al, 1991: Table 7a). Put simply, the big transformations that occurred in the Soviet Union and China after 1989 were part of a process that had long been underway since the 1970s. The big socio-political changes were a matter of the superstructure catching up with the economic base. The democratization of these societies is, of course, a welcome trend, but democratic political forms do not automatically lead to a society without exploitation or domination. The outcomes of current political struggles are rather uncertain in most of the ex-communist countries. New types of authoritarian regimes seem at least as likely as real democratization. As trends in the last two decades have shown, austerity regimes, deregulation and marketization within nearly all of the communist states occurred during the same period as similar phenomena in non-communist states. The synchronicity and broad similarities between Reagan/Thatcher deregulation and attacks on the welfare state, austerity socialism in most of the rest of the world, and increasing pressures for marketization in the Soviet Union and China are all related to the B-phase downturn of the Kondratieff wave, as are the current moves toward austerity and privatization in many semiperipheral and peripheral states. The trend toward privatization, deregulation and market-based solutions among parties of the Left in almost every country is thoroughly documented by Lipset (1991). Nearly all socialists with access to political power have abandoned the idea of doing more than buffing off the rough edges of capitalism. The way in which the pressures of a stagnating world economy impact upon national policies certainly varies from country to country, but the ability of any single national society to construct collective rationality is limited by its interaction within the larger system. The most recent expansion of capitalist integration, termed “globalization of the economy,” has made autarchic national economic planning seem anachronistic. Yet, a political reaction against economic globalization is now under way in the form of revived ex-communist parties, economic nationalism (e.g., Pat Buchanan, the Brazilian military) and a coalition of oppositional forces who are critiquing the ideological hegemony of neo-liberalism (e.g., Ralph Nader, environmentalists, populists of the right, etc.). Political Implications of the World-System Perspective The age of U.S. hegemonic decline and the rise of post-modernist philosophy have cast the liberal ideology of the European Enlightenment (science, progress, rationality, liberty, democracy and equality) into the dustbin of totalizing universalisms. It is alleged that these values have been the basis of imperialism, domination and exploitation and, thus, they should be cast out in favor of each group asserting its own set of values. Note that self-determination and a considerable dose of multiculturalism (especially regarding religion) were already central elements in Enlightenment liberalism. The structuralist and historical materialist world-systems approach poses this problem of values in a different way. The problem with the capitalist world-system has not been with its values. The philosophy of liberalism is fine. It has quite often been an embarrassment to the pragmatics of imperial power and has frequently provided justifications for resistance to domination and exploitation. The philosophy of the enlightenment has never been a major cause of exploitation and domination. Rather, it was the military and economic power generated by capitalism that made European hegemony possible.

### Case---1NC

#### Vote Neg on presumption---their method does nothing to change dominant discourses or structures that perpetuate violence. Their challenge to this has no means of spilling outside of debate, which is necessary for them to solve any of their impacts---their belief that it does is cruel optimism, which turns case.

#### Deferring to the aff is worse for all of the impacts they cite---it reifies spirit murder, undermines community building, and marginalizes those who were never here to defer to in the first place, which causes elite capture

Olúfémi Táíwò 20. Assistant professor of philosophy at Georgetown University, “Being-in-the-Room Privilege: Elite Capture and Epistemic Deference,” The Philosopher, vol. 108, no. 4.

I think it’s less about the core ideas and more about the prevailing norms that convert them into practice. The call to “listen to the most affected” or “centre the most marginalized” is ubiquitous in many academic and activist circles. But it’s never sat well with me. In my experience, when people say they need to “listen to the most affected”, it isn’t because they intend to set up Skype calls to refugee camps or to collaborate with houseless people. Instead, it has more often meant handing conversational authority and attentional goods to those who most snugly fit into the social categories associated with these ills – regardless of what they actually do or do not know, or what they have or have not personally experienced. In the case of my conversation with Helen, my racial category tied me more “authentically” to an experience that neither of us had had. She was called to defer to me by the rules of the game as we understood it. Even where stakes are high – where potential researchers are discussing how to understand a social phenomenon, where activists are deciding what to target – these rules often prevail.

The trap wasn’t that standpoint epistemology was affecting the conversation, but how. Broadly, the norms of putting standpoint epistemology into practice call for practices of deference: giving offerings, passing the mic, believing. These are good ideas in many cases, and the norms that ask us to be ready to do them stem from admirable motivations: a desire to increase the social power of marginalized people identified as sources of knowledge and rightful targets of deferential behaviour. But deferring in this way as a rule or default political orientation can actually work counter to marginalized groups’ interests, especially in elite spaces.

Some rooms have outsize power and influence: the Situation Room, the newsroom, the bargaining table, the conference room. Being in these rooms means being in a position to affect institutions and broader social dynamics by way of deciding what one is to say and do. Access to these rooms is itself a kind of social advantage, and one often gained through some prior social advantage. From a societal standpoint, the “most affected” by the social injustices we associate with politically important identities like gender, class, race, and nationality are disproportionately likely to be incarcerated, underemployed, or part of the 44 percent of the world’s population without internet access – and thus both left out of the rooms of power and largely ignored by the people in the rooms of power. Individuals who make it past the various social selection pressures that filter out those social identities associated with these negative outcomes are most likely to be in the room. That is, they are most likely to be in the room precisely because of ways in which they are systematically different from (and thus potentially unrepresentative of) the very people they are then asked to represent in the room.

I suspected that Helen’s offer was a trap. She was not the one who set it, but it threatened to ensnare us both all the same. Broader cultural norms – the sort set in motion by prefacing statements with “As a Black man…” – cued up a set of standpoint-respecting practices that many of us know consciously or unconsciously by rote. However, the forms of deference that often follow are ultimately self-undermining and only reliably serve “elite capture”: the control over political agendas and resources by a group’s most advantaged people. If we want to use standpoint epistemology to challenge unjust power arrangements, it’s hard to imagine how we could do worse.

To say what’s wrong with the popular, deferential applications of standpoint epistemology, we need to understand what makes it popular. A number of cynical answers present themselves: some (especially the more socially advantaged) don’t genuinely want social change – they just want the appearance of it. Alternatively, deference to figures from oppressed communities is a performance that sanitizes, apologizes for, or simply distracts from the fact that the deferrer has enough “in the room” privilege for their “lifting up” of a perspective to be of consequence.

I suspect there is some truth to these views, but I am unsatisfied. Many of the people who support and enact these deferential norms are rather like Helen: motivated by the right reasons, but trusting people they share such rooms with to help them find the proper practical expression of their joint moral commitments. We don’t need to attribute bad faith to all or even most of those who interpret standpoint epistemology deferentially to explain the phenomenon, and it’s not even clear it would help. Bad “roommates” aren’t the problem for the same reason that Helen being a good roommate wasn’t the solution: the problem emerges from how the rooms themselves are constructed and managed.

To return to the initial example with Helen, the issue wasn’t merely that I hadn’t grown up in the kind of low-income, redlined community she was imagining. The epistemic situation was much worse than this. Many of the facts about me that made my life chances different from those of the people she was imagining were the very same facts that made me likely to be offered things on their behalf. If I had grown up in such a community, we probably wouldn’t have been on the phone together.

Many aspects of our social system serve as filtering mechanisms, determining which interactions happen and between whom, and thus which social patterns people are in a position to observe. For the majority of the 20th century, the U.S. quota system of immigration made legal immigration with a path to citizenship almost exclusively available to Europeans (earning Hitler’s regard as the obvious “leader in developing explicitly racist policies of nationality and immigration”). But the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act opened up immigration possibilities, with a preference for “skilled labour”.

My parents’ qualification as skilled labourers does much to explain their entry into the country and the subsequent class advantages and monetary resources (such as wealth) that I was born into. We are not atypical: the Nigerian-American population is one of the country’s most successful immigrant populations (what no one mentions, of course, is that the 112,000 or so Nigerian-Americans with advanced degrees is utterly dwarfed by the 82 million Nigerians who live on less than a dollar a day, or how the former fact intersects with the latter). The selectivity of immigration law helps explain the rates of educational attainment of the Nigerian diasporic community that raised me, which in turn helps explain my entry into the exclusive Advanced Placement and Honours classes in high school, which in turn helps explain my access to higher education...and so on, and so on.

It is easy, then, to see how this deferential form of standpoint epistemology contributes to elite capture at scale. The rooms of power and influence are at the end of causal chains that have selection effects. As you get higher and higher forms of education, social experiences narrow – some students are pipelined to PhDs and others to prisons. Deferential ways of dealing with identity can inherit the distortions caused by these selection processes.

​But it’s equally easy to see locally – in this room, in this academic literature or field, in this conversation – why this deference seems to make sense. It is often an improvement on the epistemic procedure that preceded it: the person deferred to may well be better epistemically positioned than the others in the room. It may well be the best we can do while holding fixed most of the facts about the rooms themselves: what power resides in them, who is admitted.

But these are the last facts we should want to hold fixed. Doing better than the epistemic norms we’ve inherited from a history of explicit global apartheid is an awfully low bar to set. The facts that explain who ends up in which room shape our world much more powerfully than the squabbles for comparative prestige between people who have already made it into the rooms. And when the conversation is about social justice, the mechanisms of the social system that determine who gets into which room often just are the parts of society we aim to address. For example, the fact that incarcerated people cannot participate in academic discussions about freedom that physically take place on campus is intimately related to the fact that they are locked in cages.

Deference epistemology marks itself as a solution to an epistemic and political problem. But not only does it fail to solve these problems, it adds new ones. One might think questions of justice ought to be primarily concerned with fixing disparities around health care, working conditions, and basic material and interpersonal security. Yet conversations about justice have come to be shaped by people who have ever more specific practical advice about fixing the distribution of attention and conversational power. Deference practices that serve attention-focused campaigns (e.g. we’ve read too many white men, let’s now read some people of colour) can fail on their own highly questionable terms: attention to spokespeople from marginalized groups could, for example, direct attention away from the need to change the social system that marginalizes them.

Elites from marginalized groups can benefit from this arrangement in ways that are compatible with social progress. But treating group elites’ interests as necessarily or even presumptively aligned with full group interests involves a political naiveté we cannot afford. Such treatment of elite interests functions as a racial Reaganomics: a strategy reliant on fantasies about the exchange rate between the attention economy and the material economy.

Perhaps the lucky few who get jobs finding the most culturally authentic and cosmetically radical description of the continuing carnage are really winning one for the culture. Then, after we in the chattering class get the clout we deserve and secure the bag, its contents will eventually trickle down to the workers who clean up after our conferences, to slums of the Global South’s megacities, to its countryside.

But probably not.

A fuller and fairer assessment of what is going on with deference and standpoint epistemology would go beyond technical argument, and contend with the emotional appeals of this strategy of deference. Those in powerful rooms may be “elites” relative to the larger group they represent, but this guarantees nothing about how they are treated in the rooms they are in. After all, a person privileged in an absolute sense (a person belonging to, say, the half of the world that has secure access to “basic needs”) may nevertheless feel themselves to be consistently on the low end of the power dynamics they actually experience. Deference epistemology responds to real, morally weighty experiences of being put down, ignored, sidelined, or silenced. It thus has an important non-epistemic appeal to members of stigmatized or marginalized groups: it intervenes directly in morally consequential practices of giving attention and respect.

The social dynamics we experience have an outsize role in developing and refining our political subjectivity, and our sense of ourselves. But this very strength of standpoint epistemology – its recognition of the importance of perspective – becomes its weakness when combined with deferential practical norms. Emphasis on the ways we are marginalized often matches the world as we have experienced it. But, from a structural perspective, the rooms we never needed to enter (and the explanations of why we can avoid these rooms) might have more to teach us about the world and our place in it. If so, the deferential approach to standpoint epistemology actually prevents “centring” or even hearing from the most marginalized; it focuses us on the interaction of the rooms we occupy, rather than calling us to account for the interactions we don’t experience. This fact about who is in the room, combined with the fact that speaking for others generates its own set of important problems (particularly when they are not there to advocate for themselves), eliminates pressures that might otherwise trouble the centrality of our own suffering – and of the suffering of the marginalized people that do happen to make it into rooms with us.

The dangers with this feature of deference politics are grave, as are the risks for those outside of the most powerful rooms. For those who are deferred to, it can supercharge group-undermining norms. In Conflict is Not Abuse, Sarah Schulman makes a provocative observation about the psychological effects of both trauma and felt superiority: while these often come about for different reasons and have very different moral statuses, they result in similar behavioural patterns. Chief among these are misrepresenting the stakes of conflict (often by overstating harm) or representing others’ independence as a hostile threat (such as failures to “centre” the right topics or people). These behaviours, whatever their causal history, have corrosive effects on individuals who perform them as well as the groups around them, especially when a community’s norms magnify or multiply these behaviours rather than constraining or metabolizing them.

For those who defer, the habit can supercharge moral cowardice. The norms provide social cover for the abdication of responsibility: it displaces onto individual heroes, a hero class, or a mythicized past the work that is ours to do now in the present. Their perspective may be clearer on this or that specific matter, but their overall point of view isn’t any less particular or constrained by history than ours. More importantly, deference places the accountability that is all of ours to bear onto select people – and, more often than not, a hyper-sanitized and thoroughly fictional caricature of them.

The same tactics of deference that insulate us from criticism also insulate us from connection and transformation. They prevent us from engaging empathetically and authentically with the struggles of other people – prerequisites of coalitional politics. As identities become more and more fine-grained and disagreements sharper, we come to realize that “coalitional politics” (understood as struggle across difference) is, simply, politics. Thus, the deferential orientation, like that fragmentation of political collectivity it enables, is ultimately anti-political.

Deference rather than interdependence may soothe short-term psychological wounds. But it does so at a steep cost: it can undermine the epistemic goals that motivate the project, and it entrenches a politics unbefitting of anyone fighting for freedom rather than for privilege, for collective liberation rather than mere parochial advantage.

How would a constructive approach to putting standpoint epistemology into practice differ from a deferential approach? A constructive approach would focus on the pursuit of specific goals or end results rather than avoiding “complicity” in injustice or adhering to moral principles. It would be concerned primarily with building institutions and cultivating practices of information-gathering rather than helping. It would focus on accountability rather than conformity. It would calibrate itself directly to the task of redistributing social resources and power rather than to intermediary goals cashed out in terms of pedestals or symbolism. It would focus on building and rebuilding rooms, not regulating traffic within and between them – it would be a world-making project: aimed at building and rebuilding actual structures of social connection and movement, rather than mere critique of the ones we already have.

The water crisis in Flint, Michigan presents a clear example of both the possibilities and limitations of refining our epistemic politics in this way. Michigan’s Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), a government body tasked with the support of “healthy communities”, with a team of fifty trained scientists at its disposal, was complicit in covering up the scale and gravity of the public health crisis from the beginning of the crisis in 2014 until it garnered national attention in 2015.

The MDEQ, speaking from a position of epistemic and political authority, defended the status quo in Flint. They claimed that “Flint water is safe to drink”, and were cited in Flint Mayor Dayne Walling’s statement aiming to “dispel myths and promote the truth about the Flint River” during the April 2014 transition to the Flint River water source. That transition was spearheaded under the tenure of the city’s emergency manager Darnell Earley (an African-American, like many of the city residents he helped to poison). After the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) circulated a leaked internal memo from the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in July of 2014 expressing concern about lead in Flint water, the MDEQ produced a doctored report that put the overall measure of lead levels within federally mandated levels by mysteriously failing to count two contaminated samples.

The reaction from residents was immediate. The month after the switch in water source, residents reported that their tap water was discoloured and gave off an alarming odour. They didn’t need their oppression to be “celebrated”, “centred”, or narrated in the newest academic parlance. They didn’t need someone to understand what it felt like to be poisoned. What they needed was the lead out of their water. So they got to work.

The first step was to develop epistemic authority. To achieve this they built a new room: one that put Flint residents and activists in active collaboration with scientists who had the laboratories that could run the relevant tests and prove the MDEQ’s report to be fraudulent. Flint residents’ outcry recruited scientists to their cause and led a “citizen science” campaign, further raising the alarm about the water quality and distributing sample kits to neighbours to submit for testing. In this stage, the alliance of residents and scientists won, and the poisoning of the children of Flint emerged as a national scandal.

But this was not enough. The second step – cleaning the water – required more than state acknowledgement: it required apportioning labour and resources to fix the water and address the continuing health concerns. What Flint residents received, initially, was a mix of platitudes and mockery from the ruling elite (some of this personally committed by a President that shared a racial identity with many of them). This year, however, it looks as though the tireless activism of Flint residents and their expanding list of teammates has won additional and more meaningful victories: the ongoing campaign is pushing the replacements of the problematic service lines to their final stage and is forcing the state of Michigan to agree to a settlement of $600 million for affected families.

This outcome is in no way a wholesale victory: not only will attorney fees cut a substantial portion of payouts, but the settlement cannot undo the damage that was caused to the residents. A constructive epistemology cannot guarantee full victory over an oppressive system by itself. No epistemic orientation can by itself undo the various power asymmetries between the people and the imperial state system. But it can help make the game a little more competitive – and deference epistemology isn’t even playing.

The biggest threats to social justice attention and informational economies are not the absence of yet more jargon to describe, ever more precisely or incisively, the epistemic, attentional, or interpersonal afflictions of the disempowered. The biggest threats are the erosion of the practical and material bases for popular power over knowledge production and distribution, particularly that which could aid effective political action and constrain or eliminate predation by elites. The capture and corruption of these bases by well-positioned elites, especially tech corporations, goes on unabated and largely unchallenged, including: the corporate monopolization of local news, the ongoing destruction and looting of the journalistic profession, the interference of corporations and governments in key democratic processes, and the domination of elite interests in the production of knowledge by research universities and the circulation of the output of these distorted processes by established media organizations.

Confronting these threats requires leaving some rooms – and building new ones.

The constructive approach to standpoint epistemology is demanding. It asks that we swim upstream: to be accountable and responsive to people who aren’t yet in the room, to build the kinds of rooms we could sit in together, rather than merely judiciously navigating the rooms history has built for us. But this weighty demand is par for the course when it comes to the politics of knowledge: the American philosopher Sandra Harding famously pointed out that standpoint epistemology, properly understood, demands more rigour from science and knowledge production processes generally, not less.

But one important topic stands unaddressed. The deferential approach to standpoint epistemology often comes packaged with concern and attention to the importance of lived experience. Among these, traumatic experiences are especially foregrounded.

At this juncture, scholarly analysis and argument fail me. The remainder of what I have to say skews more towards conviction than contention. But the life of books has taught me that conviction has just as much to teach, however differently posed or processed, and so I press on.

I take concerns about trauma especially seriously. I grew up in the United States, a nation structured by settler colonialism, racial slavery, and their aftermath, with enough collective and historical trauma to go round. I also grew up in a Nigerian diasporic community, populated by many who had genocide in living memory. At the national and community level, I have seen a lot of traits of norms, personality, quirks of habit and action that I’ve suspected were downstream of these facts. At the level of individual experience, I’ve watched and felt myself change in reaction to fearing for my dignity or life, to crushing pain and humiliation. I reflect on these traumatic moments often, and very seldom think: “That was educational”.

These experiences can be, if we are very fortunate, building blocks. What comes of them depends on how the blocks are put together: what standpoint epistemologists call the “achievement thesis”. Briana Toole clarifies that, by itself, one’s social location only puts a person in a position to know. “Epistemic privilege” or advantage is achieved only through deliberate, concerted struggle from that position.

I concede outright that this is certainly one possible result of the experience of oppression: have no doubt that humiliation, deprivation, and suffering can build (especially in the context of the deliberate, structured effort of “consciousness raising”, as Toole specifically highlights). But these same experiences can also destroy, and if I had to bet on which effect would win most often, it would be the latter. As Agnes Callard rightly notes, trauma (and even the righteous, well-deserved anger that often accompanies it) can corrupt as readily as it can ennoble. Perhaps more so.

Contra the old expression, pain – whether borne of oppression or not – is a poor teacher. Suffering is partial, short-sighted, and self-absorbed. We shouldn’t have a politics that expects different: oppression is not a prep school.

When it comes down to it, the thing I believe most deeply about deference epistemology is that it asks something of trauma that it cannot give. Demanding as the constructive approach may be, the deferential approach is far more demanding and in a far more unfair way: it asks the traumatized to shoulder burdens alone that we ought to share collectively. When I think about my trauma, I don’t think about grand lessons. I think about the quiet nobility of survival. The very fact that those chapters weren’t the final ones of my story is powerful enough writing all on its own. It is enough to ask of those experiences that I am still here to remember them.

Deference epistemology asks us to be less than we are – and not even for our own benefit. As Nick Estes explains in the context of Indigenous politics: “The cunning of trauma politics is that it turns actual people and struggles, whether racial or Indigenous citizenship and belonging, into matters of injury. It defines an entire people mostly on their trauma and not by their aspirations or sheer humanity”. This performance is not for the benefit of Indigenous people, but “for white audiences or institutions of power”.

I also think about James Baldwin’s realization that the things that tormented him the most were “the very things that connected me with all the people who were alive, who had ever been alive”. That I have survived abuse of various kinds, have faced near-death from both accidental circumstance and violence (different as the particulars of these may be from those around me) is not a card to play in gamified social interaction or a weapon to wield in battles over prestige. It is not what gives me a special right to speak, to evaluate, or to decide for a group. It is a concrete, experiential manifestation of the vulnerability that connects me to most of the people on this Earth. It comes between me and other people not as a wall, but as a bridge.

#### Deferral on the basis of identity is a merely symbolic gesture that sabotages radical politics---it diverts us away from transforming material commitments and justifies agreeing with Black women like Condi Rice or Diamond and Silk, which hollows out substantive policies

Nicholas Whittaker 21. Doctoral student in the philosophy department at the City University of New York graduate center. “Case Sensitive​ | Why We Shouldn't Capitalize "Black"”. Issue 5. September 17, 2021. https://www.thedriftmag.com/case-sensitive/

Tharps’s New York Times op-ed was published six years before the paper heeded her arguments (without, of course, acknowledging her in doing so). Were the periodicals that altered their style guides last summer really motivated by the earnest realization of their own complacency, one made possible by murder and unrest? Perhaps. That is a question only editors, diversity committees, and boards of directors can answer. But I am skeptical. The abrupt reactivity of the capitalization shift, the scramble for a symbolic gesture of solidarity, can also be read as a manipulative sabotage of a radical and dangerous black politics.

Perhaps The New York Times and The Associated Press acted not from genuine conviction — after all, these arguments have been circulating for quite some time— but from a desire to appease the black voices they had previously ignored. The philosopher Olúfẹmi Táíwò has warned against the “deference” he sees in calls to “center marginalized voices,” like those of the employees of major newspapers who apparently advocated for capitalization. Táíwò warns of many dangers inherent in this practice, including the risk that making deference the primary goal diverts a pragmatic politics away from actually transforming material conditions and into a sentimental fawning over appointed tokens of “marginalized identities.” Deferring to members of the social category associated with the oppression in question, irrespective of their actual knowledge or political commitments regarding the subject matter, is a strategy primarily aimed at making them feel “heard” and “respected” simply on the basis of their identity. If capitalization is a pat on the head, the decision to embrace it does not reflect any kind of substantive politics or constitute a step towards radical social transformation. To reduce black politics to deference and appeasement is to turn away from a radicalism concerned with eradicating material, ideological, and spiritual evil.

We are all too familiar with the ability of guilty institutions to stave off real change by signalling faux solidarity and symbolic progress. In point of fact, maneuvers like that of the Times serve primarily to mischaracterize the demands of black radicals — these being calls for the abolition of the police, and the literal protection of black life from a state bent on its extermination — as mere pleas for acknowledgement and respect. Yet what work has The New York Times (or The Atlantic, or Fox News) truly done to excise the deep rot of antiblackness, even from its own organizing structure and principles? Symbolic changes like “B” may cover up those questions, or distract us from posing them.

#### Their method must account for the context and consequences of theoretical uptake outside of debate, and how institutions respond—otherwise they reproduce material exclusion. Empowering collective legal actions is emancipatory—social oppression determines psychic oppression, not the other way around.

Suryia Nayak and Chris Sheehy, 20. Senior lecturer in social work at the University of Salford AND graduate student in International Labour and Trade Union Studies at Ruskin College, citing numerous scholars internally, “Black feminist methods of activism are the tool for global social justice and peace,” Critical Social Policy, 2020, Vol. 40(2): 234–257. [\*\*NOTE: This card references sexual violence]

Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward: ‘the chief question to be examined must inevitably be the relationship between what the protestors do, the context in which they do it, and the varying responses of the state’ (Fox Piven and Cloward, 1979: xx)

Suryia Nayak: In my experience, the context and responses of the establishment become dislocated from the thinking and shaping of our activist actions. Consequently, too often, the constraints on our activist actions and outcomes become internalized; this fuels burn-out, reinforces feelings of failure and risks cessation. The relationship between the establishment and what we do as activists is complicated by the inherent tension that it is the establishment that we are both dependent upon and fighting against. Context includes our personal domestic responsibilities like paying bills, raising our children, being unwell and generally staving off pressures on multiple fronts. Context also includes prevailing social structures such as, patriarchy, racism and capitalism. The constraining dynamics between, what we do, context, and the responses we receive, must be explicit in evaluating all of our activist work. Recriminations, fragmentation and exhaustion must be re-positioned from ourselves to the source of the problem, namely context and establishment responses. Angela Davis: ‘In the heat of our pursuit of fundamental human rights, black people have been continually cautioned to be patient. We are advised that as long as we remain faithful to the existing democratic order, the glorious moment will eventually arrive when we will come into our own as full-fledged human beings. But having been taught by bitter experience, we know that there is a glaring incongruity between democracy and the capitalist economy which is the source of our ills.’ (Davis, 1971: 39, emphasis in original)

Chris

Sheehy: The incongruity is that the establishment uses all manner of force when the oppressed lose their ‘patience’ and respond in the same vein. A meagre amount, if any, commitment is given to interrogating injustice.

The activist refuses to be indifferent to the acts and alienating consequences of structural oppression. The activist is hungry to challenge the words and actions of the powerful. In addition to offering individual support, proportionate to loss, and context, the activist, imagines social transformation, and organises using ideological persuasion, negotiation, advocacy, protest, education, and militancy, to achieve change (Sewell, 2003; Schock, 2015).

June Jordan: ‘Nevertheless, people lose their jobs or their lives and still the reaction is cooperative. We try to speak clearly and to spare the feelings of the listener. We shave and shower and put on a clean shirt for the meeting. We volunteer to make phone calls, or coffee, or submit to the outcome of a vote about what shall I do. I have been raped: Who will speak for me? What are the bylaws? The courtesies of order, of ruly forms pursued from a heart of rage or terror or grief defame the truth of every human crisis. And that, indeed, is the plan: To defuse and to deform the motivating truth of critical response to pain’ (Jordan, 1981: 178)

Suryia Nayak: One of the earliest messages given me in ending violence against women and girl campaigns and services, was, that our refusal as women of colour to remain silent goes against every message, strategy and plan this oppressive world has for us. We are not meant to realise our power to resist and transform. We are swimming against the tide. It is little wonder that the truth of women’s pain is defused, defamed and deformed – the function of which is to shut us up. In the 2012 ‘Declaring the Activism of Black Feminist Theory’ gathering in Manchester, Black women asked why people could not hear what they were saying, ‘Do I need to be more articulate? Is it the words I am using? How can I say it clearer? How do I make it more accessible? Kimberlé Crenshaw replied, ‘the problem is not a matter of how your message is transmitted, the problem is a refusal of the message.’ The point is, re-position the problem!

I am reminded of the tension between talking about what needs to be done and actually doing what needs to be done! Of course, strategies, policies and mechanisms of accountability and quality assurance are necessities, particularly in a commissioned funding economy. In my experience within Rape Crisis centres, there must be vigilance around the balance between holding onto non-hierarchical Black feminist collective working practices and the requirement to construct governance structures that fit with the likes of the Charity Commission and funding bodies. In order to sustain ourselves, each other and our activism, the ‘motivating truth of critical response to pain’ must shape everything we do and say. This keeps the relationship between what we do, contexts in which we do it, and the responses we receive, explicit; this requires a level of conscious rigorous consistency and discipline of thinking. I argue for ‘[p]utting a hypervigilant anti-racist remembering to work’ (Nayak, 2017: 205). I have found that having Black feminist texts like Lorde’s ‘Sister Outsider’ (1984) and the Combahee River Collective Statement (1977) present and referred to at activist meetings, gatherings and discussions, function as invaluable orientating touch-stones.

Chris Sheehy: Revisiting our own and others’ past activism is essential; not a sentimental melancholic missing to longingly retire to past familiar struggles for reminiscence sake. Revisiting activist struggles across a temporal spectrum is for reflexive scrutiny, to identify the elements of the current crisis. This historical comparative method reveals what has been achieved and what still has to be done. Scrutiny has to enable an intersectional acuity that goes beyond a single issue frame: a Black feminist intersectional lens (Kanneh, 1998).

Patricia Hill Collins: ‘What criteria, if any, can be applied to ideas to determine whether they are in fact Black and feminist?’ (Hill Collins, 2000: 18)

Suryia Nayak: Black feminist ideas are constituted of the dialectic and the dialogical; the dialectic is that Black feminist concepts are born out of Black women’s intersectional experiences of racist oppression, in order to confront that very same intersectional racist oppression. The dialogical is that Black feminist ideas are born out of a continual dialogue with struggles for intersectional anti-racist social justice – and this is what sets Black feminist methodologies of activism apart from other methodologies.

Solidarity: Organizing across difference

Chris Sheehy: History is a ‘moment’ in time. This ‘moment’ is characterised by crisis: lack of solidarity across differences; inability to organise due to the perceived enormity of the task; struggling conceptually; and the establishment failing the poorest and powerless (Fanon, 2008; Jones, 2015; Sassoon, 2014).

Building inclusive, active coalitions is urgently required. Despite the crisis, the losses, the failed attempts, dialogue across difference must continue. I am conscious of having this dialogue with Black women, me a white woman, each living a different experience, and communicating with one another about oppression, power, vulnerability, and imagining change about what is to be done, separately, and in alliance, and what we can win!.

Barbara Smith: ‘The only way that we can win – and before winning, the only way we can survive is by working with each other, and not seeing each other as enemies’ (Taylor, 2017: 64)

Chris Sheehy: You imagine the gains of struggle across difference when taking a socialist stance. ‘Not seeing each other as enemies’, does not negate differences, deny apprehensions and discord, or suspend healthy scepticism. Black Trade Unionists positively use models of separate organising, separate reflective spaces, to advise specific strategies for specific intersectional oppressions.

Claudia Jones: ‘We can accelerate the militancy of Negro women to the degree with which we demonstrate that the economic, political and social demands of Negro when are not just ordinary demands, but special demands flowing from special discrimination facing Negro women as women, as workers, and as Negroes . . . Yes, and it means that a struggle for social equality of Negro women must be boldly fought in every sphere of relations between men and women so that the door of Party membership doesn’t become a revolving door because of our failure to conduct the struggle’ (BoyceDavies, 2008: 29)

Chris Sheehy: My own activism included casework, organising, and supporting Black Trade Unionists’ grievances concerning intersections of racism, which disproportionately also denied the professional recognition our Black members deserved. Black members spoke about racism and how their voices were ignored, their research marginalised, their right to promotion ignored, and their Black Feminist scholarship attacked. Black members endured a shortage of Black representatives available as caseworkers, when it was important to have access to experienced skilled Black representatives who recognised the specificity of racism. I viewed equality cases as structural oppression, and was simultaneously tenacious to ensure that individual equality cases had the strength of our union to overcome the toughest resistance, made their way on to the collective bargaining table, and were escalated and prioritised within the national Union. We represented all cases from Black members to ensure the best possible advice and strongest action. Our Black members’ cases became collective campaigns, locally, regionally, and nationally; and became Union legal priorities. My experience of working on cases of intersectional racisms is that they should receive expert legal advice as early as possible, to develop case law in this area. This would then constitute an intersectional strategic approach, which simultaneously addresses racism, identity and context. An intersection of strategic approaches to intersectional racism, including, from the local and national to the global, would build a context of remedy; thereby serving the need of the individual bringing the case and future collective protection for the broader membership to import a preventative function, provoking change in all workplaces. To date, I have not attended one formal employee complaint where an intersectional lens was suggested, other than when I forced the issue. Without the entirety of the workplace having proper access and ongoing inclusion, a Trade Union is lost. My learning is, when a member is assisted and welcomed; when representations of the diversity of membership is publicised; when word of mouth recommendations testify that equality is fought for vociferously; this begins to assist in building hard won solidarity across intersectional differences.

Activism includes the headache of resourcing; logistics; logistical arguments; long hours; mental and physical exhaustion; lack of sleep; witnessing hostility; prematurely ending of action; bureaucratic controls; and vicarious trauma. In my experience, activism across difference is complex to organise but vital for building solidarity.

Suryia Nayak: Speaking as a woman of colour, for whom Trade Union advocacy and support was instrumental in confronting racism, I ask, can the racial grief of Black women speak? The difference between mourning and melancholia is that mourning is a grief that can be gotten oven. In contrast, melancholia is a grief that cannot be gotten over. I believe that, as long as there is racism, there is no getting over the grief racism causes. So, in this racist world, I am in racial melancholia. The multiple interconnected losses of racism are far reaching. My racial melancholia, shaped by daily micro-aggressions of intersectional racism, and the specificity of formally confronting racism through available institutional processes, include: finding out, who is there for me/us and who is not; finding out, what is bearable in terms of being knocked down, disappointed and exhausted and being able to rise up again; and, finding out, how easily my self-confidence can take a bashing. Mindful that it is not the job of Black people to educate white people about racism, I was conscious of the delicate balance of exposing my levels of vulnerability and teaching white Trade Union activists about the intimate details of the damaging psychological impact of intersectional racism.

Combahee River Collective: ‘As Black feminists we are made constantly and painfully aware of how little effort white women have made to understand and combat their racism, which requires among other things that they have a more than superficial comprehension of race, color, and Black history and culture. Eliminating racism in the white women’s movement is by definition work for white women to do, but we will continue to speak and demand accountability on this issue’ (Combahee River Collective, 1977: 270). Suryia Nayak: In my experience, this was and continues to be an extra task for Black Trade Union members in relation to white Trade Union representatives, on whom I was reliant for their skills of negotiation and advocacy; a task, white Trade Union members, and white people generally, don’t confront. Furthermore, I recognize that working with cases of racism isn’t easy for antiracist white Trade Union representatives, who have the challenge of not retreating into defensive responses, but have to hold the emotional and material pain of the issues of racism they are working with for Black members.

Barbara Smith: ‘There are ethical principles that you can see in any significant political intervention in history. You will see – one of the things that you should see in positive movements move forward toward justice – not toward power – because there are many interventions that were just about the accrual of power, where you didn’t really have that mentality and that principle of "We must all be in this together." But if it’s a forward movement towards justice, you will see that people with different backgrounds and different places in a social structure actually at times come together’ (Taylor, 2017: 64–65)

Suryia Nayak: I believe that showing and articulating my vulnerability due to my experiences of intersectional racism, strengthened the quality of my interactions with the white Trade Unionist who was helping me, which in turn strengthened the quality of how we were able to represent my grievances. Once I batted away insidious creeping suspicion that predominantly white Trade Unions use cases of racism, including my own, for the status, profile and power-base of the Trade Union movement, I do believe that we had solidarity across our differences in a united demand for justice.

Audre Lorde: ‘Our future survival is predicated upon our ability to relate within equality. As women, we must root out internalized patterns of oppression within ourselves if we are to move beyond the most superficial aspects of social change . . . The future of our earth may depend upon the ability of all women to identify and develop new definitions of power and new patterns of relating across difference. The old definitions have not served us, nor the earth that supports us . . . the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house [ ] Change means growth, and growth can be painful. But we sharpen self-definition by exposing self in work and struggle together with those whom we define as different from ourselves, although sharing the same goals. For Black and white, old and young, lesbian and heterosexual women alike, this can mean new paths to our survival’ (Lorde, 1980: 123)

The interregnum

Antonio Gramsci: ‘The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born: in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear’ (Gramsci, 1971: 276).

Chris Sheehy: I understand the term ‘interregnum’ to mean, a gap, a pause, an ‘in between’ position, loss of confidence in the old. The conditions of an ‘interregnum’ are consistent with an established power dying, not dead, and hence ‘crisis’and fracture. The transformation of social, political, economic relations is yet to be initiated, plans for transformation will meet resistance, and repressive reaction before the old order replaced.

Suryia Nayak: Taking the concept of the ‘interregnum’ into the lived experience of activism, we must think about an ‘interregnum’ functioning intersectionally on a material, structural, psychological, macro and micro level. The importance of placing the idea of an ‘interregnum under the lens of intersectionality, is that inhabiting an ‘interregnum’ space is inevitably a multidimensional context. In this intersectional frame, the sum of the variables is greater than the sum of the material (resources), plus the structural (institutional/organizational apparatus), plus the psychic (the emotional toll), and these operate simultaneously on a macro (national and international) and micro (daily interactions) dimension; where the macro level is re-produced on a micro level. The lens of intersectionality, offers high resolution pictures of the multifaceted nuances of the difficulties felt in a borderland space, where ‘the old is dying and the new cannot be born’. This level of scrutiny is vital for building strategies to survive and transcend the ‘interregnum’ borderlands. For example, in the early 1990s, I worked to establish a Black women’s Rape crisis service in a predominately white women’s service. Drawing on the legacy of Black feminism with the support of a Black feminist activist called Andrea Tara-Chand, I had an objective, yet to be ‘born’, and sure enough, just as Gramsci warned ‘in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear[ed]’ (Gramsci, 1971: 276). On a macro organizational level, morbid symptoms were manifest in the membership and structure of this Rape Crisis collective. Within months of designing and delivering a Black feminist Rape Crisis volunteer training course, one by one, for their own legitimate reasons, the existing white women volunteers and paid workers of this established Rape Crisis service left. In addition, the new Black women members questioned the viability of the existing collective structure in regards to transparency of power and responsibility.

I hung onto the belief that these ‘morbid symptoms’ were not a measure of the legitimacy or value of the objective, methodology and outcome of creating a Black women’s Rape Crisis service. As Black women, the internalised ‘injurious interpellations’ (Butler, 1997: 104) of racism can too quickly become equated with the morbid symptoms of being in the in- between space of giving birth to a new way of doing things. It is no coincidence that the final stages of labour, before giving birth, is called the ‘transition’ phase; contractions are intense and the woman’s body makes the shift, from opening the cervix, to the beginning of the baby’s descent. It is a painful, exhausting stage, typified by physical symptoms of shaking, nausea and vomiting, interwoven with feeling overwhelmed.

On a micro level, such was the power of this Black feminist Rape Crisis consciousness raising process, that the Black women on the course, including Andrea and myself, experienced our own personal, psychological ‘interregnum’ and our own particular ‘variety of morbid symptoms’. For example, we all started to question, the power dynamics in our marriages and personal relationships; our silences; the inadequacy of language to express our sensuality and sexuality; the putting up with aspects of our lives that went beyond compromises; and our internalised racist hatred and harm of self and each other. On a collective and personal level, this was/is not an easy questioning – hence the ‘morbid’. The training created a space of thinking and feeling as Black women together, where old, established patterns of thinking and feeling were fading; for example, the equation of ‘vulnerability as weakness’ and the yet to be born, equation of ‘vulnerability as strength’. Through deep connection with the activism of Black feminist theory, we gained increasing confidence in questioning the ‘cannot’ in our lives and ultimately Gramsci’s idea that ‘the new cannot be born’.

Antonio Gramsci: ‘The question I ask is ‘[w]ill the interregnum, the crisis whose historically normal solution is blocked in this way, necessarily be resolved in favour of a restoration of the old?’ (Gramsci, 1971: 276).

Chris Sheehy: To avoid ‘a restoration of the old’, we use this interregnum to build something solid, to struggle for socioeconomic and political justice, Globally. Our songs and beliefs are hopeful, but, in truth, there isn’t the solidarity that is anywhere near what is required.

Dan Gallin: ‘Comrades: The European labour movement is today the target of an onslaught not experienced since the 1930s. This is not a passing phase. There will not be a return to what was considered normal social relations in the thirty years after the war. The project of contemporary capitalism is the destruction of the labour movement, in Europe in North America and eventually everywhere else. Their project is the reorganization of world society without organized labour. What they want is a society of slaves.’ (Gallin, 2014: 258)

Chris Sheehy: We undermine fellow workers across the world, we buy cheap disposable clothing, made in unsafe sweat shops, where workers receive barely enough to exist, then we discard the same products, our planet is further threatened. As a Health and Safety Rep, recalling dialogue with comrades seeking justice since Bhopal, reminds us, we fail to organise around workers safety globally. Our comrades, in the sweat shops are driven harder, and we are further alienated from one another. We, as workers witness other workers and their communities’ suffer for profit. Deregulated corporate production of antibiotics, clothing and chemicals, means that safety is compromised to secure profit. The premises go on fire, exits are not visible, cheap goods are piled high and block exits, workers die, families and communities are devastated, the planet suffers, we all suffer further alienation, and solidarity moves further from our grasp.

Angela Davis: ‘But having been taught by bitter experience, we know that there is a glaring incongruity between democracy and capitalist economy, which is the source of our ills . . . The people do not exercise decisive control over the determining factors of their lives. Official assertions that meaningful dissent is always welcome, provided it falls within boundaries of legality, are frequently a smokescreen obscuring the invitation to acquiesce in oppression’ (Davis, 1971: 39).

Suryia Nayak: The ‘smokescreen’ is not just a mechanism of the oppressor; smokescreens are alive within spaces of activism. It brings to mind Bhabha’s’ idea of ‘sly civility’ (1994: 93–102), whereby, well intentioned mission statements, posters on walls, books on shelves and fair trade products in kitchens, constitute smokescreens that obscure silent ambivalence towards the giving up of privilege. In my experience of feminist collective working, where anti-hierarchical structures are a defiance of patriarchy, the ‘invitation to acquiesce in oppression’ (Davis, 1971: 39) is a tricky ‘smokescreen’, because it functions under the guise of feminist equality. However, the division of labour: who washes up; empties bins; photocopies; and lifts boxes, in contrast to, who chairs meetings; who takes and is given space to have voice; and who represents the organization externally, replicate unequal relationships of power and appropriation that collective working is meant to address. In short, activist or not, we are all implicated, because oppressive social structures create oppressive psychic structures (Nayak, 2015: 1, 51; Oliver, 2001: 34).

#### This means voting aff forecloses the active engagements necessary for combatting the oppression of queer and black women.

Tayler Mathews 20. PhD in political science and MA in sociology from Clark Atlanta University, “Queering Black Feminism The Political Thought of Cathy J. Cohen,” National Review of Black Politics, Vol. 1, Number 2, pp. 291–310.

Black queer feminism is a particular strand of Black feminism. The underlying paradigm of Black queer feminism is derived from Black feminist thought, a social and political theory with its own epistemological and ontological assumptions, as well as a worldview that originates from the experiences and subjectivities of Black womxn. Black queer feminism further derives its explanatory power from Black queer and trans thought, although it must be stressed that Black feminism and Black queer and trans thought cannot be neatly separated (Green and Bey 2017; Carruthers 2018; Ferguson 2018). As mentioned earlier, Black womxn are not a monolith: just as all Black womxn are not feminists, all Black feminists do not share the same ideological space (nor are they all womxn). Indeed, it is most accurate to speak of Black feminisms, a multifaceted ideological and theoretical space in which there are numerous (and sometimes conflicting) beliefs, ideals, and political commitments. Certainly, what is today named as Black queer feminism is not new (Carruthers 2018; Cohen 2019a). Its theoretical and activist lineage can be traced to Black lesbian feminists such as Audre Lorde, Barbara Smith, Cheryl Clarke, and Pat Parker, among others (Cohen 2019a); and Black trans womxn such as Marsha P. Johnson (Tourmaline 2013; Willis 2019). Black feminisms encompass a range of theories and methods across multiple academic fields in addition to and in concert with ideas that arise directly from community organizing.

Cathy J. Cohen’s theorizing on Black feminism and queer politics demonstrates what Julia Sudbury and Margo Okazawa-Rey (2016: 3) conceptualize as activist scholarship: “the production of knowledge and pedagogical practices through active engagements with, and in the service of, progressive social movements.” Cohen makes “interdisciplinary trouble” (Alexander-Floyd 2013) across the fields of political science, Black queer studies, Black Women’s Studies, Black studies, and “women, gender and sexuality studies.” As a Black lesbian feminist, she has been at the forefront of Black queer studies by intervening in the persistent queer masculinist focus on “Black gay exceptionals” (Cohen 2004: 28). Cohen’s political thought contributes an alternative frame of reference that is not only essential for advancing scholarship on Black politics but is equally useful for engaging in Black queer feminism as a praxis within and beyond academia. Her work is unmistakably leftist, foregrounding racial oppression and economic exploitation alongside processes of gender and sexual normalization.

Through Cohen’s ideas one discovers that Black queer feminism adds greater nuance to our understanding of gender, sexuality, race, and class. Cohen’s political thought broadens where we locate power struggles, exposes oppressive systems, and inspires counter-hegemonic knowledge that challenges the rigidity of what and who counts as “legitimate” subjects for political science inquiries. Below, I employ the constituent elements that characterize a frame of reference (Barker, Jones, and Tate 1999) to synthesize Cohen’s political thought in an effort to outline a Black queer feminist frame of reference. The assumptions, concepts and categories of analysis, levels of analysis, and questions vis-a`-vis Black queer feminism are presented. These elements assist in conceptualizing Black queer feminism while illuminating the sociopolitical context of nonnormative Black political experiences.

Assumptions

When exploring the possibilities of a Black queer feminist frame of reference through the works of Cohen, one ascertains quickly that this frame is premised upon an analysis of power. Specifically, Black queer feminism accentuates relationships to normative power: “normative meaning the structured nature of power that comes from traditional institutions like the state and the government ...[the] economic system and capitalism ...[and] from practices of identity that are thought to be normal” (Cohen 2017). Within this frame it is assumed that politics and analyses should be organized around the most marginal within Black communities and the larger body politic. That is, all “those who stand on the (out)side of state-sanctioned, normalized, White, middle- and upper-class, male heterosexuality” (Cohen 2004: 29), those with the least influence over the hegemonic apparatuses that dominate their lives. Cohen’s political thought inspires us to think beyond the current sociopolitical organization in order to address unjust distributions of power, access, and resources. She rejects assimilationist strategies that seek to move those on the margins into “dominant institutions and normative social relationships,” arguing alternatively for radical and transformational politics that strive to shift the “values, definitions, and laws [that] make these institutions and relationships oppressive” (Cohen 1997: 444–45).

Furthermore, Cohen complicates assumptions concerning the structures governing individuals and groups within Black communities. In addition to the oppressive systems of white supremacy, racial capitalism, and heteropatriarchy, there is also the struggle against institutionalized heteronormativity that attempts to regulate and constrain nonnormative conceptions and expressions of gender and sexuality. Heteronormativity “privilege[s] heterosexuality and heterosexual relationships as fundamental and ‘natural’ within society” (Cohen 1997: 440) while also enforcing a strict cisnormative gender binary. Heteronormativity operates by way of sociopolitical normalizing processes, the precepts of conservative cisheterosexist moral beliefs, and is sanctioned by the heteropatriarchal state.

Concepts and Categories of Analysis

Cohen foregrounds ideas that add depth to extant concepts and categories of analysis. Cohen’s broad assertion regarding the concept queer has led her to argue for queer as a verb; that is, the queering of politics and analyses. This idea of queering informs much of Cohen’s political thought. Although other scholars also view gender categories and identities as political, when discussing Black womxn, scholars most often conceptualize gender as a binary comparative category of analysis against (presumably cisgender and heteronormative) Black men or white womxn. Cohen’s theorizing on gender moves us beyond these conventional notions. To queer gender is to emphasize that even within gender categories there is nuance, fluidity, and various connections to power. Cohen remarks that “the possibilities that come from a Black queer feminist analysis” are in the recognition that “queer, at its best, can move us away from the simple binaries of difference, binaries of man/woman, straight/gay, I dare say even cis/trans which sometimes can flatten the complexity of our relationship to power and our relationship to each other” (Cohen 2018). Oversimplified conceptions of gender and sexuality are not merely the result of individual lack of imagination. These conceptions stem from efforts of white supremacist state power and dominant institutions to oppress our collective imaginations and agency (Cohen 1997; Cohen and Jackson 2016).

One need not claim queer as a personal identity to practice Black queer feminist politics. Many nonqueer self-identified people are nevertheless queered by racial capitalism and the state (Cohen 2019a). “The radical potential of queer politics,” says Cohen (1997), is in its ability to unite those on the outside of hegemonic state and capitalist power, those who share a common material reality in that “numerous systems of oppression interact to regulate and police” their lives (441). It is this shared, though nuanced and multifaceted, plight that can generate the “radical coalition” and collective resistance to bring about change (452). By opening up to the idea of an active queer, rather than limiting queer to a static identity, radical reinterpretations can occur. When analyses are queered, for instance, concepts like deviance become filled with possibility. For Cohen, what is pejoratively labeled as deviant behavior may in fact hold tremendous potential for social movements. When deviance is combined with the intent to challenge unjust power distributions it is “transformed into politicized resistance” (Cohen 2004: 38). In fact, intentionality is an orienting idea underlying Black queer feminist politics. As Cohen explains, “Black queer feminism is an intentional radical politics, pushing back against dominant and community-based identities and institutions that prescribe and reify hetero-gendered, or normalized understandings of family, of sex, of desire, or joy, and the presentation of self, including gender” (Cohen 2018).

Levels of Analysis

When using Black queer feminism to frame studies on Black womxn, gender, and sexuality politics, multiple levels of analysis can be employed. Cohen’s political thought emphasizes that unjust power at the macro level originates in the sociopolitical structure in which harms such as “exploitation and violence [are] rooted in state-regulated institutions and economic systems” (Cohen 1997: 442). At the meso or community and group level, Cohen theorizes that within both Black and LGBTQ communities, and of course Black LGBTQ communities, there are multiple stratifications and relationships to power (Cohen 1997, 2004; Cohen and Jackson 2016). Intracommunity power distributions impact how and if community members can access key resources and relationships within and outside of one’s various groups (Cohen 1999). When examining politics at the individual level, it is helpful to return to Cohen’s articulation of deviance. Micro choices can engender both meso and macro effects such that “it is possible that through deviant choices individuals open up a space where public defiance of the norms is seen as a possibility and an oppositional worldview develops” (Cohen 2004: 41). This multilevel approach to analyzing Black politics found within a Black queer feminist frame of reference lends scholars another foundation that enables alternative knowledge about the scope, possibility, and relevance of political science.

#### Investing within the political is good.

Chandler 9. David. Prof of international relations, University of Westminster. “Questioning Global Political Activism,” in What is Radical Politics Today? ed. Jonathan Pugh. 81-4.

Today more and more people are ‘doing politics’ in their academic work. This is the reason for the boom in International Relations (IR) study and the attraction of other social sciences to the global sphere. I would argue that the attraction of IR for many people has not been IR theory but the desire to practise global ethics. The boom in the IR discipline has coincided with a rejection of Realist theoretical frameworks of power and interests and the sovereignty/anarchy problematic. However, I would argue that this rejection has not been a product of theoretical engagement with Realism but an ethical act of rejection of Realism's ontological focus.

It seems that our ideas and our theories say much more about us than the world we live in. Normative theorists and Constructivists tend to support the global ethical turn arguing that we should not be as concerned with 'what is' as with the potential for the emergence of a global ethical community. Constructivists, in particular, focus upon the ethical language which political elites espouse rather than the practices of power. But the most dangerous trends in the discipline today are those frameworks which have taken up Critical Theory and argue that focusing on the world as it exists is conservative problem-solving while the task for critical theorists is to focus on emancipatory alternative forms of living or of thinking about the world. Critical thought then becomes a process of wishful thinking rather than one of engagement, with its advocates arguing that we need to focus on clarifying our own [END PAGE 81] ethical frameworks and biases and positionality, before thinking about or teaching on world affairs. This becomes 'me-search' rather than research. We have moved a long way from Hedley Bull's (1995) perspective that, for academic research to be truly radical, we had to put our values to the side to follow where the question or inquiry might lead.

The inward-looking and narcissistic trends in academia, where we are more concerned with our reflectivity- the awareness of our own ethics and values - than with engaging with the world, was brought home to me when I asked my IR students which theoretical frameworks they agreed with most. They mostly replied Critical Theory and Constructivism. This is despite the fact that the students thought that states operated on the basis of power and self-interest in a world of anarchy. Their theoretical preferences were based more on what their choices said about them as ethical individuals, than about how theory might be used to understand and engage with the world.

Conclusion

I have attempted to argue that there is a lot at stake in the radical understanding of engagement in global politics. Politics has become a religious activity, an activity which is no longer socially mediated; it is less and less an activity based on social engagement and the testing of ideas in public debate or in the academy. Doing politics today, whether in radical activism, government policy-making or in academia, seems to bring people into a one-to-one relationship with global issues in the same way religious people have a one-to-one relationship with their God.

Politics is increasingly like religion because when we look for meaning we find it inside ourselves rather than in the external consequences of our 'political' acts. What matters is the conviction or the act in itself: its connection to the global sphere is one that we increasingly tend to provide idealistically. Another way of expressing this limited sense of our subjectivity is in the popularity of globalisation theory - the idea that instrumentality is no longer possible today because the world is such a complex and interconnected place and therefore there is no way of knowing the consequences of our actions. The more we engage in the new politics where there is an unmediated relationship between us as individuals and global issues, the less we engage instrumentally with the outside world, and the less we engage with our peers and colleagues at the level of political or intellectual debate and organisation. [END PAGE 82]

You may be thinking that I have gone some way to describing or identifying what the problems might be but I have not mentioned anything about a solution. I won't dodge the issue. One thing that is clear is that the solution is not purely an intellectual or academic one; the demand for global ethics is generated by our social reality and social experiences. Marx spent some time considering a similar crisis of political subjectivity in 1840s Germany and in his writings - The German Ideology, Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Theses on Feuerbach, and elsewhere - he raged against the idealism of contemporary thought and argued that the criticism of religion needed to be replaced by the criticism of politics - by political activism and social change based on the emerging proletariat (see Marx, 1975, for example). Nearly two centuries later it is more difficult to see an emerging political subject which can fulfil the task of 'changing the world' rather than merely 'reinterpreting it' through philosophy.

I have two suggestions. Firstly, that there is a pressing need for an intellectual struggle against the idealism of global ethics. The point needs to be emphasised that our freedom to engage in politics, to choose our identities and political campaigns, as well as governments' freedom to choose their ethical campaigns and wars of choice, reflects a lack of socialties and social engagement. There is no global political struggle between 'Empire' and its 'Radical Discontents'; the Foucauldian temptation to see power and resistance everywhere is a product of wishful or lazy thinking dominated by the social categories of the past. The stakes are not in the global stratosphere but much closer to home. Politics appears to have gone global because there is a breakdown of genuine community and the construction of fantasy communities and fantasy connections in global space. Unless we bring politics back down to earth from heaven, our critical, social and intellectual lives will continue to be diminished ones.

Secondly, on the basis that the political freedom of our social atomisation leads us into increasingly idealised approaches to the world we live in, we should take more seriously Hedley Bull's (1995) injunction to pursue the question, or in Alain Badiou's (2004: 237-8) words subordinate ourselves to the 'discipline of the real'. Subordination to the world outside us is a powerful factor that can bind those interested in critical research, whereas the turn away from the world and the focus on our personal values can ultimately only be divisive. To facilitate external engagement and external judgement, I suggest we experiment with ways to build up social bonds with our peers that can limit our freedoms and develop our sense of responsibility and accountability to others. We may have to construct these social connections artificially but their [END PAGE 83] value and instrumentality will have to be proven through our ability to engage with, understand, critique and ultimately overcome the practices and subjectivities of our time.

#### Cohesion around institutional change is key to solve racism.

Mina Cikara & Jay Van Bavel **15**. \*Assistant Professor of Psychology and Director of the Intergroup Neuroscience Lab at Harvard University. \*\*Assistant Professor of Psychology and Director of the Social Perception and Evaluation Laboratory at New York University. Scientific American. “The Flexibility of Racial Bias: Research suggests that racism is not hard wired, offering hope on one of America’s enduring problems”. 6-2-2015. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-flexibility-of-racial-bias/>

It would be easy to see in all this powerful evidence that racism is a permanent fixture in America’s social fabric and even, perhaps, an inevitable aspect of human nature. Indeed, the mere act of labeling others according to their age, gender, or race is a reflexive habit of the human mind. Social categories, like race, impact our thinking quickly, often outside of our awareness. Extensive research has found that these implicit racial biases—negative thoughts and feelings about people from other races—are automatic, pervasive, and difficult to suppress. Neuroscientists have also explored racial prejudice by exposing people to images of faces while scanning their brains in fMRI machines. Early studies found that when people viewed faces of another race, the amount of activity in the amygdala—a small brain structure associated with experiencing emotions, including fear—was associated with individual differences on implicit measures of racial bias. This work has led many to conclude that racial biases might be part of a primitive—and possibly hard-wired—neural fear response to racial out-groups.

There is little question that categories such as race, gender, and age play a major role in shaping the biases and stereotypes that people bring to bear in their judgments of others. However, research has shown that how people categorize themselves may be just as fundamental to understanding prejudice as how they categorize others. When people categorize themselves as part of a group, their self-concept shifts from the individual (“I”) to the collective level (“us”). People form groups rapidly and favor members of their own group even when groups are formed on arbitrary grounds, such as the simple flip of a coin. These findings highlight the remarkable ease with which humans form coalitions.

Recent research confirms that coalition-based preferences trump race-based preferences. For example, both Democrats and Republicans favor the resumes of those affiliated with their political party much more than they favor those who share their race. These coalition-based preferences remain powerful even in the absence of the animosity present in electoral politics. Our research has shown that the simple act of placing people on a mixed-race team can diminish their automatic racial bias. In a series of experiments, White participants who were randomly placed on a mixed-race team—the Tigers or Lions—showed little evidence of implicit racial bias. Merely belonging to a mixed-race team trigged positive automatic associations with all of the members of their own group, irrespective of race. Being a part of one of these seemingly trivial mixed-race groups produced similar effects on brain activity—the amygdala responded to team membership rather than race. Taken together, these studies indicate that momentary changes in group membership can override the influence of race on the way we see, think about, and feel toward people who are different from ourselves.

Although these coalition-based distinctions might be the most basic building block of bias, they say little about the other factors that cause group conflict. Why do some groups get ignored while others get attacked? Whenever we encounter a new person or group we are motivated to answer two questions as quickly as possible: “is this person a friend or foe?” and “are they capable of enacting their intentions toward me?” In other words, once we have determined that someone is a member of an out-group, we need to determine what kind? The nature of the relations between groups—are we cooperative, competitive, or neither?—and their relative status—do you have access to resources?—largely determine the course of intergroup interactions.

Groups that are seen as competitive with one’s interests, and capable of enacting their nasty intentions, are much more likely to be targets of hostility than more benevolent (e.g., elderly) or powerless (e.g., homeless) groups. This is one reason why sports rivalries have such psychological potency. For instance, fans of the Boston Red Sox are more likely to feel pleasure, and exhibit reward-related neural responses, at the misfortunes of the archrival New York Yankees than other baseball teams (and vice versa)—especially in the midst of a tight playoff race. (How much fans take pleasure in the misfortunes of their rivals is also linked to how likely they would be to harm fans from the other team.)

Just as a particular person’s group membership can be flexible, so too are the relations between groups. Groups that have previously had cordial relations may become rivals (and vice versa). Indeed, psychological and biological responses to out-group members can change, depending on whether or not that out-group is perceived as threatening. For example, people exhibit greater pleasure—they smile—in response to the misfortunes of stereotypically competitive groups (e.g., investment bankers); however, this malicious pleasure is reduced when you provide participants with counter-stereotypic information (e.g., “investment bankers are working with small companies to help them weather the economic downturn). Competition between “us” and “them” can even distort our judgments of distance, making threatening out-groups seem much closer than they really are. These distorted perceptions can serve to amplify intergroup discrimination: the more different and distant “they” are, the easier it is to disrespect and harm them.

Thus, not all out-groups are treated the same: some elicit indifference whereas others become targets of antipathy. Stereotypically threatening groups are especially likely to be targeted with violence, but those stereotypes can be tempered with other information. If perceptions of intergroup relations can be changed, individuals may overcome hostility toward perceived foes and become more responsive to one another’s grievances.

The flexible nature of both group membership and intergroup relations offers reason to be cautiously optimistic about the potential for greater cooperation among groups in conflict (be they black versus white or citizens versus police). One strategy is to bring multiple groups together around a common goal. For example, during the fiercely contested 2008 Democratic presidential primary process, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama supporters gave more money to strangers who supported the same primary candidate (compared to the rival candidate). Two months later, after the Democratic National Convention, the supporters of both candidates coalesced around the party nominee—Barack Obama—and this bias disappeared. In fact, merely creating a sense of cohesion between two competitive groups can increase empathy for the suffering of our rivals. These sorts of strategies can help reduce aggression toward hostile out-groups, which is critical for creating more opportunities for constructive dialogue addressing greater social injustices.

Of course, instilling a sense of common identity and cooperation is extremely difficult in entrenched intergroup conflicts, but when it happens, the benefits are obvious. Consider how the community leaders in New York City and Ferguson responded differently to protests against police brutality—in NYC political leaders expressed grief and concern over police brutality and moved quickly to make policy changes in policing, whereas the leaders and police in Ferguson responded with high-tech military vehicles and riot gear. In the first case, multiple groups came together with a common goal—to increase the safety of everyone in the community; in the latter case, the actions of the police likely reinforced the “us” and “them” distinctions.

Tragically, these types of conflicts continue to roil the country. Understanding the psychology and neuroscience of social identity and intergroup relations cannot undo the effects of systemic racism and discriminatory practices; however, it can offer insights into the psychological processes responsible for escalating the tension between, for example, civilians and police officers.

Even in cases where it isn’t possible to create a common identity among groups in conflict, it may be possible to blur the boundaries between groups. In one recent experiment, we sorted participants into groups—red versus blue team—competing for a cash prize. Half of the participants were randomly assigned to see a picture of a segregated social network of all the players, in which red dots clustered together, blue dots clustered together, and the two clusters were separated by white space. The other half of the participants saw an integrated social network in which the red and blue dots were mixed together in one large cluster. Participants who thought the two teams were interconnected with one another reported greater empathy for the out-group players compared to those who had seen the segregated network. Thus, reminding people that individuals could be connected to one another despite being from different groups may be another way to build trust and understanding among them.

A mere month before Freddie Gray died in police custody, President Obama addressed the nation on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday in Selma: “We do a disservice to the cause of justice by intimating that bias and discrimination are immutable, or that racial division is inherent to America. To deny…progress -- our progress -- would be to rob us of our own agency; our responsibility to do what we can to make America better."

The president was saying that we, as a society, have a responsibility to reduce prejudice and discrimination. These recent findings from psychology and neuroscience indicate that we, as individuals, possess this capacity. Of course, this capacity is not sufficient to usher in racial equality or peace. Even when the level of prejudice against particular out-groups decreases, it does not imply that the level of institutional discrimination against these or other groups will necessarily improve. Ultimately, only collective action and institutional evolution can address systemic racism. The science is clear on one thing, though: individual bias and discrimination are changeable. Race-based prejudice and discrimination, in particular, are created and reinforced by many social factors, but they are not inevitable consequences of our biology. Perhaps understanding how coalitional thinking impacts intergroup relations will make it easier for us to affect real social change going forward.

#### Engaging in legal and policy debates over antitrust is important---ceding antitrust to conservative control has caused decades of enhanced corporate power, but it can be reversed.

Sandeep Vaheesan 20. Legal director at the Open Markets Institute and previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. He has published articles and essays on a variety of topics in antimonopoly law and policy. “HOW ANTITRUST PERPETUATES STRUCTURAL RACISM.” <https://theappeal.org/how-antitrust-perpetuates-structural-racism/>.

Congress enacted the antitrust laws to check corporate power, but today these laws maintain the corporate domination of people of color. Corporations, which are overwhelmingly owned and run by whites, exploit and control Black and brown workers and business proprietors, thanks, in part, to conservative reinterpretations and applications of antitrust. White workers and business owners suffer similar injuries too. But like so many nominally race-neutral laws, policies, and practices in American society, antitrust appears to inflict a disparate impact on people of color, from college athletes and Rocky Mountain shepherds left at the mercy of colluding employers to fast-food franchisees dominated by multinational chains to Uber drivers thwarted from forming unions.

Antitrust law is not destined to remain a tool of racial injustice. Its present perpetuation of hierarchy is a product of the conservative takeover of the federal judiciary and executive branch that began in the 1970s. Supreme Court justices and antitrust officials appointed by Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Reagan reoriented antitrust law to focus on “consumer welfare” and, to advance this aim, loosened various restrictions on corporate behavior—legal and policy choices that the Clinton and Obama administrations accepted. What judges and technocrats did, the American public can reverse. A reconstructed antitrust would control the size and discretion of corporations and permit workers and independent firms to build power. It would serve as an important weapon against corporate hegemony over the working and small proprietor classes and advance the freedom of people of color in the United States.

The Chamber and Uber and Lyft had an important ally in their legal fight—the federal government. In November 2017, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Trade Commission (FTC) filed a joint amicus brief arguing that Seattle did not have the authority to enact the ordinance and that the drivers’ potential unionization and collective bargaining would violate antitrust law. This anti-worker deployment of antitrust law has a long, ugly history, dating back to the early years of the Sherman Act. The FTC has brought numerous antitrust suits against independent contractors and professionals for organizing—targeting workers outside traditional employment relationships. While the DOJ and the FTC have allowed powerful corporations to take over and dominate entire markets, they crush attempts by independent workers and small firms to challenge that power.

#### The solution isn’t to abandon antitrust law---it should be strategically deployed to undermine corporate power and redistribute wealth.

Sandeep Vaheesan 20. Legal director at the Open Markets Institute and previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. He has published articles and essays on a variety of topics in antimonopoly law and policy. “HOW ANTITRUST PERPETUATES STRUCTURAL RACISM.” <https://theappeal.org/how-antitrust-perpetuates-structural-racism/>.

Considering these four case studies, Americans fighting for racial and economic justice might simply conclude that repealing the antitrust laws is the right course—they appear impotent against corporate power and are unleashed against workers’ collective power. But this would be a mistake. Present-day antitrust dates only to the late 1970s. Starting in that decade, the Supreme Court, joined by the DOJ and the FTC of the Reagan administration in the 1980s, rolled back rules on corporate monopolies, mergers, and coercive practices. This intellectual and legal attack on the antitrust of the New Deal and postwar era was bankrolled by big businesses and succeeded in creating market rules extraordinarily favorable to the Fortune 500.

Antitrust law, which was once a top line cause of populist and progressive movements fighting for a fair and democratic society, did control corporate authority in the past and can do so again. Imagine laws that stopped employers from fixing wages, prevented franchisors from dominating independent franchisees through contract, prohibited firms like Uber from burning through billions of dollars in a campaign to monopolize markets, and protected the rights of workers and independent firms to organize. These rules would break the economic and political dominance of corporate executives and rentiers. Such an antitrust enforcement system, backed by a popular movement, would redistribute power downward from a class of mostly white economic royalists to the multiracial majority in American society.

#### Declarative anti-whiteness dissuades judges from pursuing truly radical politics.

Ahmed 4 (Sara Ahmed The University of Lancaster “Declarations of Whiteness: The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism” borderlands Vol. 3 no. 2, 2004)

11. My commentary on the risks of whiteness studies will involve an analysis of how **whiteness gets reproduced through being declared**, within academic texts, as well public culture. I will hence be reading Whiteness Studies as part of a broader shift towards what we could call a **politics of declaration**, in which institutions as well as individuals ‘admit’ to forms of bad practice, and in which **the ‘admission’ itself becomes seen as good practice**. By reading Whiteness Studies in this way, I am not suggesting that it is a symptom of bad practice: rather, I think it is useful to consider ‘turns’ within the academy as having something to do with other cultural turns. The examples are drawn from the UK and Australia, as the two places in which my own anti-racist politics have taken shape. My argument is simple: anti-racism is not performative. I use performative in Austin’s (1975) sense as referring to a particular class of speech. An utterance is performative when it does what it says: ‘the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action’ (1975, 6).

12. I will suggest that declaring whiteness, or even ‘admitting’ to one’s own racism, when the declaration is assumed to be ‘evidence’ of an anti-racist commitment, **does not do what it says**. In other words, **putting whiteness into speech, as an object to be spoken about**, however critically, **is not an anti-racist action, and nor does it necessarily commit a state, institution or person to a form of action that we could describe as anti-racist**. To put this more strongly, I will show how declaring one’s whiteness, **even as part of a** project of social **critique, can reproduce white privilege in ways that are ‘unforeseen’**. Of course, this is not to reduce whiteness studies to the reproduction of whiteness, even if that is what it can do. As Mike Hill suggests: ‘I cannot know in advance whether white critique will prove politically worthwhile, whether in the end it will be a friendlier ghost than before or will display the same stealth narcissism that feminists of color labeled a white problem in the late 1970s’ (1997, 10)

## 1NR

### Cap K---1NR

#### Cap is inherent in all communities – it reduces their rejection of anticompetitive activity in debate into a commodity thru alienation – the 1AC will have a voice but lose its soul as it’s reincorporated as a new item on the market

Robinson 14 – Professor of sociology at UC Santa Barbara [William, *Global capitalism and the crisis of humanity*, Cambridge Univ. Press, pp. 222-4]

How viable are transformative strategies based on the notion that local communities can withdraw from global capitalism? The attempt to create alter- native communities at the local level, to set up cooperatives, to decentralize circuits of food supply, to withdraw from the global agro-industrial regime, to decentralize energy distribution and consumption, and to construct cooperative enterprises and local solidarity economies are necessary and important. Yet they do not in themselves resolve the problem of power. In the absence of a strategy to confront the state and to transform the system from within we are left with the dangerous illusion that the world can be changed without resolving this matter of power. Global capitalism is now internal to practically all communities on the planet. It has spun webs of worldwide interdependency that link us all to a larger totality. Global capitalism is indeed totalizing. The notion that one can escape from global capitalism not by defeating it but by creating alternative spaces or islands of utopia ignores the unpleasant fact that no matter how one wills it to be so, these spaces cannot disengage from capitalism, if for no other reason than that capital and the state will penetrate – often forcibly – and continuously reincorporate these spaces.

Localized solutions are too piecemeal to confront the power of global capitalism – to change the global balance of class and social forces. There is no way to get around the fact that the TCC holds class power over humanity, and the TNS exercises multiple forms of direct, coercive power. The state exercises power over us. This fact will not go away by ignoring this power. It is illusory to suppose that it can be countered by constructing autonomous communities, which in fact are not autonomous because such communities cannot extricate themselves from the webs of global capitalism, and even if they could, in theory, the state would not allow them to; it would use the force of its law to reincorporate such communities. There is no getting around confrontation with the state, no avoiding a struggle to wrest state power away from capital, its agents and allies. The struggle to withdraw from global capitalism, no matter how important, must be coupled with a struggle to overthrow global capitalism, to destroy the transnational capitalist state.

#### Ethical positions against capitalism are insufficient---using political tools to break down monopoly through antitrust is necessary.

Zephyr Teachout 20. An associate professor of law at Fordham Law School. She is the author of Break ’Em Up: Recovering Our Freedom From Big Ag, Big Tech, and Big Money. “Boycotts Can’t Be a Test of Moral Purity” The Atlantic. 08-03-20. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/08/boycotts-cant-be-a-test-of-moral-purity/614821/>

For some people, when they hear about some bad corporate practice, their first reaction is to consider cutting ties to the company. So it is not surprising that each time I discuss the democratic dangers of Facebook, Amazon, or Google, people always bring up personal consumer choice. Instead of policy (antitrust, data rules, outlawing arbitration), the conversation veers quickly into pride or guilt. One woman worries she can’t leave Facebook without leaving her social life. One man sheepishly says he quit Facebook for a few weeks and crept back when he missed his friends. At the heart of this conversation is a thesis: Using a service is an endorsement of its business model. Or more pointedly: If someone is not strong enough to boycott, she lacks standing to object to the behavior of lawmakers and petition them for change. This belief is wrong, bad strategy, and dangerous for democracy. It is based on a confused idea of our obligations as consumers. This belief does not lead to more boycotts, but radically dampens activism: **Guilt gets in the way of protest**, and complicated chains of self-justification take the place of simple chains of democratic demand. This consumer model is most problematic when it comes to the **biggest monopolies**. Most **people can’t boycott them**, precisely because they are governmental and provide infrastructure services. We don’t ask people to boycott libraries in order to change library rules; we don’t ask people to boycott highways to ask for them to be safer; we don’t demand that you buy only bottled water while protesting water-utility governance. Of course, a strategic, organized, well-thought-through boycott with **political goals** can be transformational. And there is nothing wrong with people personally quitting products when they can. However, ethical consumerism has taken too central a role in progressive thinking, and **we shouldn’t require people to boycott essential communications infrastructure** such as Facebook and Google in order to demand that they be broken up. The railroads were regulated by anti-monopoly protesters who depended on the railroads, and the same can be true for the next generation of trust-busters. Boycotts can play a crucial role in political change, but not when they serve only as tests of individual integrity. Franklin Foer: The tech giants are dangerous, and Congress knows it The reason for this is that boycotts replace tension in the political sphere with **tension in the private sphere**, putting the central axis of tension between the firm and the activists. Will they or won’t they change practices? As such, boycotts can lead to small changes, or tangential promises to provide other kinds of community support that are not in line with the initial purpose of the boycott. As author Nicole Aschoff recently argued in Jacobin magazine, “When consumers and environmental NGOs channel their desire for environmental justice through the firm, their desires get absorbed into business strategies for growth and expansion.” In this way, ethical consumerism relies too heavily on partnerships with corporations to make change rather than challenging the leverage they have in our monopolized economy. This post was excerpted from Teachout’s recent book. Boycotts do have widespread appeal. The Vox columnist Matthew Yglesias has taken a look at why, writing, “Consumer brands are a leverage point for progressive politics because there’s no gerrymandering & marketers care more about young people. Consumer marketing is almost the exact opposite of voting and a younger, more urbanized, and more female demographic carries more weight.” This logic may lead to a short-term sense of empowerment, but to **longer-term disempowerment**—the more progressives lean into their consumer power as the key point of leverage, the **less they focus on exercising their political power**, the less long-term collective power they will amass. In other words, boycotts allow people to import virtuousness into their life **without the struggle of organizing and building a coalition.** Additionally, consumer politics is certainly less complicated than actually wielding power. The University of North Carolina sociology professor and Atlantic contributing writer Zeynep Tufekci argues that people “want to stay out of politics because they fear corruption and co-optation. They have a point. Modern representative democracies are being strangled in many countries by powerful interests.” But, she points out, the long-term impact of dropping out of politics may be to make individuals cleaner and **the system dirtier.** David Dayen: America’s monopoly problem goes way beyond the tech giants Today, there are hundreds of boycotts every year, and most do not have any appreciable impact. **People lose interest**, don’t maintain a public presence around a boycott, and the number of people involved is typically **too small to make a market difference**. What difference is made typically revolves around “the more modest goal of attracting media attention,” not the loss of income, the University of Pennsylvania professor Maurice Schweitzer says. The Chick-fil-A boycott, one of the largest in recent memory, came about when the Chick-fil-A CEO made anti-gay marriage comments. Organizers staged kiss-ins, and mayors said Chick-fil-A was not welcome in their towns. But Chick-fil-A ignored the protests, people forgot the comments after a few years, and little changed. As one commentator put it, “It is hard to stay mad at a ubiquitous and powerful brand.” While, in theory, people did commit to stop eating at Chick-fil-A until it changed its posture on marriage equality, the company outlasted the protest; it still rates a zero on the Human Rights Campaign’s Buyers Guide, and LGBTQ people are not included in its nondiscrimination policy. Ethical consumerism—and its close relatives corporate accountability and corporate social responsibility—is especially **poorly suited** to monopolized economies, and a tragic misfit for disciplining companies that play a quasi-governmental role. By accepting big corporations as partners, and not challenging their legitimacy as our rulers, the consumer-boycott model allows for short-term victories that appear to be progressive, while the partner corporation is building sufficient power to become boycott-proof. If Chick-fil-A was hard to boycott, think about what boycotting Google would mean. First, imagine a one-person boycott, someone angry about, say, Google-enabled job discrimination. He would have to get rid of his Android phone and switch from Gmail. He’d have to stop using Google Search and Google Maps. He’d have to refuse to watch anything on YouTube. He’d have to get rid of Nest. If he owned a business, he’d have to avoid Google ads, which he might rely on to reach customers. He’d have to refuse to use municipal Wi-Fi in cities where Google is behind “free” Wi-Fi. If he had children, he would have to tell them to refuse to use the technology required to interact with their teachers. And even if he succeeds in doing all these things, Google will not boycott him. If he uses the internet, he will necessarily see Google-served ads, and his responses and nonresponses to those ads will feed into Google’s data bank. Google will still collect information about him when he walks by a LinkNYC kiosk. Google will still collect his tax dollars in subsidies. Read: The tech companies already won Now try imagining an effective organized boycott of Google, large enough to actually dent the company’s profits. There are more than **5 billion Google searches a day.** Can we really imagine enough people switching to an alternate search engine or going without asking their question? Google will continue collecting information on those people regardless, and Search is just one part of the Google behemoth. As if that weren’t **daunting enough**, imagine a **sector-based boycott** of the data-collection practices of all the big tech companies—Facebook, Google, Amazon—for their shared behaviors. In a comic New York Times article, one reporter chronicled the social-media accounts that pushed boycotts using products from the companies they were boycotting. A quarter of the people who tweeted #boycottGoogle (a campaign organized to protest Google’s firing of the engineer James Damore) did so from Android phones. And people boycotting Amazon kept shopping at Amazon-owned Whole Foods. Cher protested Facebook’s role in the Cambridge Analytica scandal by leaving Facebook but remaining active on Facebook-owned Instagram. “I don’t know if I can get out of the ecosystem,” said one activist. “Where am I supposed to go?” said another. “I wish there was something else.” In 2019, the city of Richmond, California, ended its contract with Vigilant Solutions, a data-analytics company that does business with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. The city of Berkeley, following suit, debated boycotting all companies that provided services to ICE and Customs and Border Protection, including Amazon, because these federal agencies rely on Amazon Web Services. The Berkeley city manager, Dee Williams-Ridley, argued against boycotting Amazon, because it “would have a huge negative impact to the citywide operations.” Amazon helps manage city documents, and hosts housing and mental-health programs, and Amazon servers host many other tech companies that provide services to the city. People unwittingly using the thing they are supposedly boycotting to advertise their boycott can seem funny. But the lack of choice facing all boycotters actually represents a serious **narrowing of the window of moral political behavior.** The change in effectiveness can be confusing for people who remember the successful boycotts in the 1980s and ’90s of companies such as Nike, which came under fire for using sweatshops. Companies have reorganized their supply chains in a way that insulates them from liability and protest. Garment manufacturers no longer have direct relationships with big companies, who build systems of deliberate ignorance into their purchasing. According to Professor Richard Locke’s research on Nike, workplace conditions in almost 80 percent of its root suppliers remained either the same or worsened between 2001 and 2005, though the company’s records may appear better on paper. Most important, every part of Nike’s supply chain is monopolized, with just a few major players, so boycotters have nowhere else to go. A serious boycott would involve buying no foreign-manufactured garments, rather than targeting particular companies. Growing consolidation of power interacts with the rise of social media, leading to more boycotts that are less effective and shorter-lasting. As Tufekci has argued, these actions tend to the **ephemeral and episodic**, instead of the **effective and persistent**. The result is a combination of hyperactivity online and decreased power. Boycotts gin up social-media presence on an almost daily basis. **Unlike a demand for legislative action**—where inaction by a lawmaker grows in meaning over time—the longer a company does not change in the face of protests, **the more powerful it gets.** The lawmaker becomes vulnerable to a primary challenger; the company has proved that it is strong.

#### That creates disembodied cogito-economic subjects and turns the case.

Dr Carl Rhodes and Dr John Garrick 2, Rhodes is Professor of Organization Studies and Deputy Dean at UTS Business School, University Fellow in Law at Charles Darwin University, “Economic metaphors and working knowledge: enter the ‘cogito-economic’ subject,” Human Resources Development International, 5(1), 87-97, 2002.

Introduction

In this paper we ask the question: what are the effects of defining knowledge in economic terms? In addressing this question, we particularly look at how the language of commerce has appropriated knowledge by defining it in its own terms. We then examine the effects of the metaphorical language that has emerged out of recent theorizations of knowledge, arguing that this has generated a powerful discourse that defines people as ‘cogito-economic subjects’. By defining people in this way, we suggest, there are potential dangers of metaphors becoming reified, such that knowledge becomes describable only in economic terms and people become describable only in cogito-economic terms. This implies that subjects are both ‘knowledge workers’ (cogito) and ‘human resources’ (economic). We propose that this represents a conflation of knowledge and commercial interests. We further argue that this can be problematic in so far as the conflation attempts to bring knowledge ‘under control’. In this way the people through whom such ‘working knowledge’ is mediated are meant to become more manageable. Indeed, the knowledge management systems of postindustrial organizations are, in part, both products and producers of this discourse.

With the advent of the post-industrial economy, knowledge has entered the workplace in ways that it never had before. The use of the term ‘post-industrialism’ itself is suggestive of ‘a shift in the structure of industrial capitalism away from mass production and bureaucracy and indicating changing technologies of production, a growth in the service sector and changes in the knowledge requirements of work’ (White and Jacques 1995: 48). Further, in post-industrial economies the management of work has also changed through the impact of information technology and the development of alternative organizational forms (Alvesson and Berg 1992). These new organizations in turn need people who do work in correspondingly new and different ways as, in the ‘knowledge economy’, work has become less physical and more discursive. Gee et al. aptly put it this way:

Contemporary, globally competitive businesses don’t any longer compete on the basis of their products or services per se. They compete, rather, on the basis of how much learning and knowledge they can use as leverage in order to expeditiously invent, produce, distribute and market their goods and services, as well as to innovatively vary and customize them. (Gee et al. 1996: 5)

Against this complex backdrop of such post-industrial work conditions, where might we epistemologically locate the ‘working knowledge’ that is now thought to be even more important than it was in the past? Further, how might we evaluate the effects of this form of knowledge? The emerging discourse of ‘working knowledge’ is indicative of a pragmatic turn in our orientation towards what counts as knowledge. Epistemologically, working knowledge is not only in work; it is what works. The question of what works is invariably a matter of judgement of the effect of knowledge on economic imperatives, with outcomes shaped by criteria such as economic growth, commercial projections and company research into areas such as consumer satisfaction. Working knowledge can, as a consequence, easily become a vehicle for forging particular policies or projects that represent dominant perspectives that are legitimated by commercial considerations. An important part of this legitimization is the employ- ment of a new language through which the knowledge requirements of the new economy are both articulated and created. This language employs terms such as ‘human capital’, ‘knowledge assets’, ‘the knowledge economy’, ‘the information economy’ and ‘knowledge workers’ to explore, define and create new ways of looking at knowledge. The way that knowledge is theorized has become increasingly mediated through economic, commercial and accounting metaphors such as ‘the balanced scorecard’ and ‘intangible assets’. In turn, these metaphors construct social understandings of working knowledge and professional practices.

The advent of knowledge work

Corporate managers and many academics have increasingly recognized professional knowledge as being ‘valid’ in its own right. It is knowledge that does not rely on validation established by scientific research, nor is it beholden to the legitimizing practices of the academy or the ‘research centre’. Working knowledge emanates from actually doing the work. In The Reective Practitioner, Schön (1983) convincingly argued that knowledge, of an action-oriented character, is embedded in professional activity and can be subject to real-time critical reection by professional practitioners. In Schön’s sense of practice, professional knowledge is potentially open-ended – even in its action elements – with reective abilities being pivotal. In this knowledge, good professional practice involves making and reecting on the best judgements in specic contexts, for ethical as well as commercial considerations. Work is both site and instrument of evaluating such working knowledge. The business world and the corporate sector in particular now encourage new, even critical, ideas (Drucker 1995) (although thoroughgoing critique, we would argue, continues to be largely discouraged). If ‘working knowledge’ is to be a coherent construction and not just a fashionable description of particular elements of technological-age work, or a disguise for purely technical and financial interests, it should follow that adequate avenues for reexivity need to be built into its production. This is a key challenge for the action-oriented research approaches now favoured by many organizations. Transparency, openness, critical self-reection, highly developed systems that promote peer assessment and review, and the development of professional associations that have contact with the academic world would be among possible components of a new epistemological ‘infrastructure’ for working knowledge. And there are signs that such components are beginning to take shape. Government higher education policies across European Union member nations, the US, Canada and Australia are actively encouraging new university–industry partnering arrangements emphasizing collaborative research between faculties and particular companies and flexible and work-based (as distinct from classroom-based) approaches to learning. What is at stake is both the character of what we take knowledge to be and, even more seriously, the extent to which we are moving towards – or away from – a more open society. In a global world saturated by information available through the Internet, openness may turn out to be one pragmatic option. In the ‘knowledge society’, the issue arises as to where an organization is positioned in terms of knowledge – with which knowledge networks is it connected (Castells 1997)? Barnett expands on this ‘positioning’, pointing out that: We are seeing the rise of corporate universities – such as that in the UK spawned by British Aerospace – but they are not noted for their sponsorship among their employees of receptivity to Greek philosophy or the nineteenth century novel. A knowledge audit would reveal that they focus on technical and managerial knowledge; and, even there, will want to develop among their employees certain usable knowledges – and their associated skills – with likely productive value for the organization. (Barnett 2000: 20) Such developments are indicative of changes in knowledge that are brought about by the new role that corporations play in knowledge production. This new role, in turn, shapes the relationships that people can have with the corporations where they are employed and works to impose limits on the subjectivities available to them. Edwards and Tait (2000) argue that this ‘willing’ employee entails ‘an active subjectivity’ – aligned to organizational goals – producing what Casey (1995) terms ‘designer employees’. As we pointed out in our introduction, in the context of post-industrial work conditions, the epistemological location of ‘working knowledge’ is indeed problematic. The advent of ‘working knowledge’ demonstrates a pragmatic orientation to knowl- edge, where knowledge is not only in work; it is what works(Garrick and Rhodes 2000: 8). Based on such pragmatism, the ‘working’ in knowledge can become a way to dene workplace practices that seek to reinforce and privilege ways of being and knowing that are judged illegitimate if they do not reect commercial interests. The danger here is not that knowledge can be of value to commercial interests in itself, but rather that commerce becomes the sole criterion for judging knowledge. For instance, with modern information and communications technologies (and the call from shareholders for greater accountability), new possibilities for openness and mutual evaluation are being generated, but nonetheless commercial discourses certainly remain dominant. As such, Lyotard’s question: ‘who decides what knowledge is, and who knows what needs to be decided?’ (1984: 9) remains very pertinent to developing reexive approaches to knowledge work. Metaphors: signifying knowledge at work The very notion of ‘working knowledge’ is suggestive of a historicization that claims we have moved from an agrarian to an industrial and then, in the post-World War Two era, to a knowledge and information society. Hand in hand with the notion of the ‘knowledge society’ has come a new range of signiers used to dene people. Moving away from just referring to people as ‘workers’, ‘employees’ or ‘staff’, these new signiers rely heavily on terminology related to both economics and knowledge. One of the earliest examples of this was the idea of ‘human capital’ (Schultz 1961). Schultz’s argument was that much of what we call consumption constitutes investment in human capital – the productive capabilities of human beings. These capabilities, in Schultz’s human capital perspective, are acquired at a cost and, in turn, command a price in the labour market – the level of which depends on how useful they are in producing goods and services. Since then, there has been a proliferation of terms expanding on this basic premise to describe people in economic and/or knowledge terms. Such terms include ‘human resource development’ (HRD) and the related practices of ‘human resource management’ (HRM), ‘knowledge workers’, ‘intellectual capital’, ‘knowledge capital’ and, more recently, the managerial jargon of ‘employees are our greatest asset’. One common characteristic of this terminology is the use of economic metaphors such as capital, resources and assets to describe people at work. We believe that attention to the development of such metaphors is important as they provide valuable insights into life in commercial organizations. Palmer and Dunford (1996) also point out that some metaphors may be so embedded in particular contexts that they come to constitute an ‘authentic’ discourse that permits no flexibility or change in ways of looking at organizations and the people in them. Here attempts at introducing new ideas or metaphors might nd it hard not to be ‘colonized’ by existing dominant organizational metaphors. The notion of ‘human resources’ serves as a good example of part of such an ‘authentic discourse’ – one that has ‘graduated’ to now being a dead metaphor, that is, a metaphor whose metaphoricity is forgotten. The growth of the use of the term ‘human resources’ in popular management books, academic texts, management education subjects and the naming of functional departments in organizations has come to see the ‘human resource’ as being a dominant term used to refer to people in work organizations. The use of the term ‘resource’ to describe people here loses its metaphoric character and is readily seen as a literal term to describe people. The word ‘resource’, however, has a genealogy that relates back to the description of economic and nancial phenomena – where a resource refers to a means of producing wealth or property that can be converted into money. Here the use of the word ‘resource’ becomes a metaphor to describe people, but it is a metaphor borrowed from the corporate domain in which people are dened in terms of managerial prerogatives. Much of the terminology that has emerged to dene people in the postindustrial context uses this textual practice. Intellectual capital, knowledge capital and human capital are other prime illustrations, each working to dene people in terms of their central concept: capital itself. Capital is the wealth that is employed in order to produce goods and services, and people become linguistically subsumed as just another form of capital. The metaphor translates ‘being’ through the terminology of commerce – thus the cogito-economic subject.

The use of such metaphors to drive representations of people at work is a way of exerting control over the identities of those people. Defining people in particular terms and using particular metaphors foregrounds certain ways of understanding people and backgrounds others (Rhodes 2000) – in the case described here, the economic metaphors do this too, they draw attention to people as economic subjects (capital, assets, resources) that are inputs into an organizational system. This is a profound example of the politics of representation at work where overtly benign descriptions enact powerful controls over the subject positions open to people in particular social contexts. As Cooper puts it:

Technologies of representation convert the inaccessible, unknown and private into the accessible, known and public; they convert the deferred and faraway into the instantaneous and immediate; and their portability and mobility makes them easy to manipulate and control. (Cooper 1992: 267)

In terms of commercial organizations, Deetz has suggested that the development of industrialization replaced a set of representations based on ‘intrinsic’ values with one based on a system of exchange values represented by money. It is here that ‘labour became articulated as a “cost” to the organization’ (1995: 228). Deetz goes on to argue that, for the modern corporation, the reason for working is to make money and any alternative motives are considered only in terms of their effect on commitment, productivity and sales as translated in monetary terms. This is a privileging of a monetary code as a representation practice in which everything is economic: everything including people. Such privileging serves to enact a form of control through which economic subjects emerge out of the very interests that seek to define people in those (economic) terms.

In contemporary organization and management studies literature, definitions of people in economic terms have taken a further turn from that described by Deetz. The use of language such as ‘working knowledge’, ‘intellectual capital’, ‘knowledge assets’ and so forth takes the use of economic metaphor and adds to it another powerful linguistic substitution. The first turn is to use economic metaphor to describe people; the second turn is to introduce the synecdoche of knowledge and intellect. Synecdoche works in this way to use a part of something to describe the whole – it is people’s intellectual capacity and their knowledge that is used to describe their ‘whole’. The result is the creation of a disembodied subjectivity that defines people economically and focuses their ‘value’ in terms of their intellectual capacity – again as cogito-economic subjects. For instance, an economic person might be one whose person is knowledge. Deetz argues that such practices create a ‘closed politics . . . owing to a variety of practices which produce and privilege certain interests – principally managerial – in both public decision making and in the production of the type of person that exists in modern organizations and society’ (1995: 215). Our concern is that an arena is constructed where the only legitimate knowledge might be that which is deemed economically viable and the only legitimate subjectivity is one where people are defined in these terms.

Enter Jacques

Usure

In order to explore further how this play of metaphor works, this section of the paper will use Derrida’s (1982) discussion of the use of metaphor in philosophy to review analogously the use of cogito-economic metaphors to define selves. Derrida (1982) uses the term ‘usure’ to examine the use of metaphor in philosophy. He uses this term in relation to its double meaning in the French language – usure as usury (i.e. the acquisition of too much interest) and usure as using up or the deterioration through usage. The usure of metaphor, therefore, is simultaneously the rubbing away of the original and the creation of ‘linguistic surplus value’. A metaphor such as the ‘human resource’ can be used to illustrate this. In the metaphorical term ‘resource’ there is a suggestion that human resources were something else prior to the ‘resource’ metaphor being applied and becoming commonplace. It implies an original, concrete figure of a pre-economic subject, equivalent to what might have been considered the literal meaning of ‘being human’. The first move of the usure of metaphor, then, is to wear out an ‘original meaning’; for the metaphor to no longer be noticed and to be taken for the ‘proper’ meaning.1 The metaphor is used, ‘human resources’ is worn out as its apparent metaphoricity is suspended. People are no longer seen as resources but are resources.

At the same time as the wearing out occurs, the metaphor is also producing a surplus value – a ‘tropic supplementarity’ (Derrida 1982: 210): ‘The supplementary product of a capital, the exchange which far from losing the original investment would fructify its initial wealth, would increase its return in the form of revenue, additional interest, linguistic surplus value’ (1982: 210).

Here the distinction between the two parts of the word ‘usure’ is indistinguishable. There is a proliferation of the signifier that is created, as meaning is displaced from one term to another – for example from worker to resource. Describing people as workers focuses on their activity; as resource it focuses on their value to the enterprise. The usure of the metaphor thus creates a surplus of meaning. This is a supplement – a substitutive signification – ‘which could only come forth in a chain of differential references, the “real” supervening, and being added only while taking on meaning from a trace and from an invocation of the supplement’ (Derrida 1976: 7). Metaphor then creates surplus as one signier is replaced by another – in this case through the metaphor of person as signied as a ‘resource’: as well as what a person might have been before, now there is more; now a person is also a resource. The adoption of a new use of language to describe people is therefore not innocent. It is not just about using different words to signify the same thing. Rather, translating concepts from one signier to another (in our illustration from ‘person’ to ‘resource’) cannot be pure, transparent or unequivocal. Paraphrasing Derrida (1996), the meaning of a concept is not separable from the process of passage or from the signifying operation. The translation to the new signifier is generative – it is a supplement that does not just substitute for a signied or a previous signifier, but rather it emerges as something new. Describing people in cogito-economic terms therefore does not reflect the ‘reality’ of what it means to be a person, but rather it generates and potentially attempts to finalize that reality in a particular way.

We are not suggesting that the metaphor is ‘concrete’ so that it can be traced to its origins, for instance, to get at the true meaning of being a ‘person’. Our point, rather, is that the economic metaphor does work by producing and supplementing. But it does not replace a pre-metaphoric reality where people (subjects) were literal rather than gurative. Nor are we writing nostalgically; there is no turning back from the usure of metaphor. It follows that ‘working knowledge’ cannot be brought into question because it uses gurative language; but it can be questioned in terms of how it uses gurative language.

Scraped again

As we discussed earlier, post-industrial conditions and the so-called ‘information economy’ have further developed the economic metaphor by adding to it a knowledge element. This is a double substitution where an increasingly dominant way of looking at people is as cogito-economic subjects. The creation of the cogito-economic subject is the result of metaphor, but it is a metaphor without literal origin – a subject that cannot transcend its signiers. The debate then turns not to a longing for authentic experience, but to a discussion of the effects of the usure.

This effect is what Derrida describes (metaphorically) as a ‘palimpsest’. Palimpsest comes from the Greek meaning ‘scraped again’, and refers to a parchment, papyrus or other writing material where the original text has been removed so that it can be reused. Before paper became an easily available and inexpensive commodity, this common practice involved old surfaces being scrubbed so that they could be written on multiple times (Murn and Ray 1998). Despite this, even though the original text was scraped off, the older text is still recoverable by the use of means such as ultraviolet light. To consider a word a palimpsest draws attention to the multiple levels of signication that exist in that word. Despite the ‘scrubbing of meaning’ and its metaphorical replacement, a trace of what has been replaced always exists, ‘inscribed in white ink’. This is not to suggest that the meaning that has been replaced was in some way ‘original’ or non-metaphorical. Rather, one sign has been used to designate another in a chain of signification where new signs work to erode, rub out and use up the signs that they replace.

Working knowledge and the cogito-economic subject

Our argument is that contemporary times are seeing the cogito-economic subject emerging through a discourse that uses commercial language to re-write the palimpsest of the self. Indeed, the processes of industrialism have generated dominant discourses on selfhood that both ‘shape the character of the modern self throughout modern industrialism and delimit the context of our thinking on self’ (Casey 1995: 50). It is here that discursive processes of work shape industrial selves through a ‘hidden curriculum’ that produces ‘acculturated employees’(1995: 78). This type of economicself is constructed as desirable in the contemporary work order. Such a self is dened not as an autonomous object, but rather as a subject dened positionally and relationally. The question then changes from: ‘Who denes the terms of the organization to who is dened by them and how these denitions determine organizational identity?’(Baack and Prasch 1997: 136).

The cogito-economic self then exists in a discourse that works to define people in such terms and simultaneously rub out other forms of self, supplementing them with terms that resonate with organizational imperatives. In this way a discourse becomes powerful. When its metaphor is used up, people must contend with the emergent (powerful) discourse in terms of how they define themselves and are defined by others.

#### The literalization of the marketplace metaphor applied to debate tacitly endorses neoliberal ideology by assuming regulation is normatively undesirable.

Thomas W. Joo 14, Professor of Law, University of California, Davis, School of Law, “The Worst Test of Truth: The "Marketplace of Ideas" as Faulty Metaphor,” Tulane Law Review, 89, 383, December 2014, lexis.

IV. Conclusion

As every grade-school English student learns, a metaphor is a figure of speech stating that one thing "is" another. Metaphors can work considerable mischief when that equation is taken literally. First Amendment jurisprudence takes literally the metaphorical statement that speech "is" a market. That is, rather than merely drawing figurative parallels between public discourse and economic markets, it collapses them into a single concept called "markets." 319Link to the text of the note This literalization of the legal metaphor has been helped along by economic analyses of law and policy, which have insisted that nearly all forms of social activity are literally economic markets. 320Link to the text of the note

At the same time that the scope of "market" has been expanding, the scope of "speech" protected under the First Amendment has been expanding as well. Justice Holmes and Justice Brennan cleverly deployed market rhetoric when it fit the zeitgeist of the Lochner and Cold War eras. More recently, it has been argued, corporations and business interests have turned the tables and displayed similar rhetorical "opportunism" by reframing their economic rights arguments in the more appealing language of the First Amendment. 321Link to the text of the note A long line of campaign finance cases, culminating most recently in Citizens United, has treated spending in support of candidates as speech, regardless of the identity of the spender. Commercial speech, once considered outside the First Amendment, enjoys considerable [\*432] constitutional protection. The First Amendment also protects nonverbal conduct; it "does not end at the spoken or written word." 322Link to the text of the note

If everything is a market, and everything is speech, then everything is both market and speech, and the two categories are literally coterminous - but so broad as to be meaningless. If everything is a market, and markets should not be regulated, then nothing - neither speech nor anything else - should be regulated. As markets and speech (and everything else) collapse into a single notion, the "marketplace of ideas" rhetoric is no longer specifically about any of the values involved in free speech theory, such as expressive rights, listeners' interests, preventing government suppression of dissent, or the search for "truth" (whether normative or empirical). Nor is it about any of the important functions of markets, such as efficient allocation of resources or setting prices to reflect demand. It is simply antiregulatory. Skepticism of government is of course consistent with a long and fundamental libertarian tradition in Anglo-American thought. But the metaphor is more than skeptical. Because it lacks insights into how to limit regulation, it reduces to free-market and free-speech absolutism.

Furthermore, the marketplace of ideas metaphor advances an argument that fails on its own terms. It purports to be an instrumental theory based on the observed characteristics of markets - that is, it argues that speech deregulation will produce a good (i.e., "truth") in the way that unregulated markets allegedly do. But market processes do not produce truth, and the law polices markets vigorously for this very reason. There are of course many reasons to be skeptical of government regulation of both speech and of markets, but those reasons are specific to the distinct institutions of speech and those of economic markets. By claiming to identify "truth" as a shared reason for deregulating speech and markets, the marketplace metaphor ignores the actual, valuable functions of both speech and markets.

The marketplace rhetoric also illuminates the use of metaphor in legal argument and elsewhere. As this Article has argued, metaphors are often normative assertions disguised as reasoned analogical arguments. While a metaphor purports to use our knowledge about one phenomenon (such as "markets") to provide insights into a second phenomenon (such as "speech"), it is actually making arguments about [\*433] both the first and second phenomena. 323Link to the text of the note That is, the marketplace metaphor not only advances the assertion that speech should be unregulated like markets, but also tacitly advances the unexamined assertion that markets themselves should be unregulated.

#### 2 – Local to Global Bad – the question of this debate is which model translates collectives to overcome commoditization of dissent – the perm that scales up from “local” to “global” gets the direction of causality wrong by mystifying how world economies structure local relations – misdiagnosis turns solvency.

Engel-Di Mauro 9 – Associate Professor of Geography at SUNY New Paltz (Salvatore, “Seeing the local in the global: Political ecologies, world-systems, and the question of scale”, Geoforum (2009):116-125)

Despite the emphasis on multiple scales of analysis, ‘‘webs of relation” (Rocheleau and Roth, 2007), ‘‘chains of explanation” (Blaikie and Brookfield, 1987, p. 27), ‘‘bottom-up” (Blaikie, 1985, p. 82), or ‘‘progressive contextualisation” (Vayda, 1983), most of the work in political ecology privileges spatio-temporally limited social contexts over longer-term, macro-scale social processes (Bridge, 2002, p. 371). While this may be the outcome of a recent distancing from political economy perspectives (Brown and Purcell, 2005, p. 611), the problem was inherent from the very beginning, with a tendency to emphasise the ‘‘regional” or meso-scale (and then ‘‘local”, or micro-scale) as the starting unit of analysis. This analytical centring of smaller-scale dynamics has resulted in an inability to integrate general patterns and interconnections with ethnographic and eco- systemic data (Blaikie, 1999, p. 140; Brown and Purcell, 2005, p. 612). This is far from saying that micro- or meso-specificity is less important than macro-specificity (the two are equally important in my view). Micro- and meso-level analysis is pivotal in under- standing people–environment relations, especially given that the most tangible occur largely over small areas. Yet emphasis on the smaller scale becomes a hindrance when it guides, rather than builds the empirical foundations of a research project. With few exceptions, political ecology continues to suffer from a methodological insis- tence on explaining people–environment relations through the analysis of smaller-scale circumstances and/or starting points. Planet-wide environmental and, since at least 500 years ago, social processes enable and/or constrain smaller-scale people–environment relations, especially with recent human-induced shifts in atmosphere composition (radiative forcing through greenhouse gas emissions, stratospheric ozone layer disruption through the emissions of bromines and chlorofluorocarbons, regional releases of atmospheric pollutants through burning vegetation and coal com- bustion, etc.). The scale of analysis adopted in a research project may depend on the kind of question one wishes to answer (Blaikie and Brookfield, 1987, p. 65), but ultimately larger-scale processes must be included to arrive at explanations that go beyond appeals to complexity (Blaikie, 1985) or beyond eclecticism in the frameworks being combined (Blaikie, 1999, p. 139). The matter is exacerbated when phenomena in some parts of the whole are confused for evidence that negates either the existence of the entire system (or of any systemic process at all) or denies the possibility of a general theory on resource management (e.g., Black, 1990; Forsyth, 2003). There are other epistemological repercussions from such small locality-specific analyses and small-to-large scale approaches. One is treating places (or regions) as isolatable (often implicitly, by not paying attention to wider systemic processes), which enabled political ecology to circumscribe the range of social and environmental contexts to those far away from most political ecologists’ homes (McCarthy, 2002; Robbins, 2004). The underlying problem was reflected in the exclusion of places outside rural ‘‘third” world areas from the purview of political ecology (countries in the former state-socialist camp are still mostly ignored).2 Recent attention to wealthy industrialised capitalist societies and urban ecosystems is a helpful first step in moving political ecology away from a relatively narrow focus3 and into more promising cross-comparative terrain that can generate more systematic analy- sis (see works guest edited by Heynen and Robbins, 2005; Paulson and Gezon, 2005; Schroeder et al., 2006).

#### Structures determine distribution of violence, not interpersonal violence---their strategy on the level of imagination enacts change at the level of map rather than territory---the only way to solve is thru concrete party platforms---energy doesn’t generate self-love but is accumulated as currency

Davis 19 (Elizabeth Davis is a PhD candidate in Social Justice Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Beside(s) Love and Hate: The Politics of Consuming Black Culture. Theory & Event. Volume 22, Number 3, July 2019. Project Muse//shree)

For Wynter, this thinking beside(s) love and hate requires attending to the articulation of feelings with structures of feeling. She describes how the Black Power Movement, and other social movements of the 1960s and '70s, alongside the global anti-colonial movements, enacted a "psychic emancipation" by which subjugated peoples profoundly reimagined their conceptions of themselves (2006, 110). This shift marked a positive reaffirmation of identity exemplified in the slogan "Black is Beautiful." But it was a psychic emancipation, Wynter says, "effected at the level of the map, rather than at the level of the territory. That is, therefore, at the level of the systemic devalorization of blackness and correlated over-valorization of whiteness, which are themselves only proximate functions of the overall devalorization of the human species" (2006, 116). For Wynter, that these feelings effected a global psychic emancipation, does not mean they were the "right feelings." They were an insufficient challenge to the mode of sociogeny of the dominant global order.

To change the mode of sociogeny of a culture, to find the answer "on the objective as well as the subjective level" (Fanon 2008, xv) would take a stance beside(s) the affirmation that Black is Beautiful. A reimagination of the human that in Frank Wilderson's (2010) terms requires recognizing subjective capacity as itself built against blackness. For Wilderson, this imagining is a more difficult task today than in the 1960s and '70s: "though the semantic field on which subjectivity is imagined has expanded phenomenally through the protocols of multiculturalism and globalization theory, Blackness and an unflinching articulation of Redness are more unimaginable and illegible within this expanded semantic field than they were during the height of the FBI's repressive Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO)" (2010, 9). For Wilderson (in contrast to contemporary "feelings" of progress) blackness has become less legible, and to decipher the "grammar of [Black] suffering" that underwrites cinematic and political speech rests not on a question of love and hate but, drawing on Saidiya Hartman, of accumulation and fungibility.13

But if there are many different registers and orientations of feeling as it is lived in relation to structures of feeling, what would it be, how [End Page 590] would we know, at what level of feeling we are feeling? Or rather, how might we conceptualize subjective, intersubjective and collective feeling as articulated with the political—in particular historical moments, in social movements, and in the reproduction of the episteme? This unclarity about levels and modes of love, affirmation, and celebration of blackness, is one origin story of how both Jared Sexton and Fred Moten come to need to state that "Afro-pessimism is 'not but nothing other than' black optimism" (Moten 2013, 742; Sexton 2011, 37). Afro-pessimism is the insistence on thinking with and through the "subjectivity under erasure" (Wilderson 2010, xi) that is blackness, and black optimism is an orientation and opening up towards the possibilities of black life. They hold in tension that black social death and black social life do not negate each other (Sexton 2011, 28–29). If the misrecognition that would posit them as opposites marks a scene of dissensus, then it is not through the identity of black optimism and Afro-pessimism that an ethics is possible, but as Moten would have it, recognizing the difference between the two as infinitesimal: "…if Afro-pessimism is the study of [the impossibility of loving blackness], the thinking that I have to offer […] moves not in that impossibility's transcendence but rather in its exhaustion" (Moten 2013, 738).

Exhaustion, of the im/possibility of loving blackness, would take all of the steam out of the engines of progress that narratively frame representation—where consumption is conflated with both legibility and love. For who is to say that the white woman didn't love blackness who came up to Billie Holiday in an L.A. nightclub to request that she sing "Strange Fruit" by saying: "Why don't you sing that sexy song you're so famous for? You know, the one about the naked bodies swinging in the trees" (Davis 1998, 195). The point being not to validate such a love, but to be weary and wary of the terms of engagement by which "love" must be idealized and defended.

Economies of white enjoyment of black life have defined the brutal processes of racialization forged in the Middle Passage that shape who and how we are (Hartman 1997). In the "afterlife of slavery" (Hartman 2006), if we are to apprehend that term, we are obliged to study how these libidinal and affective economies are articulated with the formal economy. What neoliberal capitalist politico-economics has done best is to erode our capacity to imagine things differently. It feels like we have less with which to imagine ways of being together outside our current circuits of production, distribution, exchange, consumption. That Harriet Tubman is slated to be the new face of the US twenty-dollar bill calls me quite clearly to reject the prevailing notion that relations of consumption are good enough kinds of relations. [End Page 591]

#### Neolib turns self-expression of identity through psychic alienation

Srnicek & Williams 15 **–** Nick Srnicek is a Lecturer at City University London and a PhD from the London School of Economics; Alex Williams is a Lecturer at City University London [*Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*, Verso Books, p. 137-142]

As we have seen, neoliberalism propagated its ideology through a division of labour – academics shaping education, think tanks influencing policy, and popularisers manipulating the media. The inculcation of neoliberalism involved a full-spectrum project of constructing a hegemonic worldview. A new common sense was built that came to co-opt and eventually dominate the terminology of ‘modernity’ and ‘freedom’ – terminology that fifty years ago would have had very different connotations. Today, it is nearly impossible to speak these words without immediately invoking the precepts of neoliberal capitalism.

We all know today that ‘modernisation’ translates into job cuts, the slashing of welfare and the privatisation of government services. To modernise, today, simply means to neoliberalise. The term ‘freedom’ has suffered a similar fate, reduced to individual freedom, freedom from the state, and the freedom to choose between consumer goods. Liberal ideas of individual freedom played an important role in the ideological struggle with the USSR, priming the population of the Western world to mobilise behind any ideology that purported to value individual freedoms. With its emphasis on individual freedoms, neoliberalism was able to co-opt elements of movements organised around ‘libertarianism, identity politics, [and] multiculturalism’.55 Likewise, by emphasising freedom from the state, neoliberalism was able to appeal to anarcho-capitalists and the movements of desire that exploded in May 1968.56 Lastly, with the idea of freedom being limited to a freedom of the market, the ideology could co-opt consumerist desires. At the level of production, neoliberal freedom could also recruit emerging desires among workers for flexible labour – desires that were soon turned against them.57 In struggling for and successfully seizing the ideological terrain of modernity and freedom, neoliberalism has managed to wind its way inexorably into our very self-conceptions. In arrogating the meaning of terms such as modernisation and freedom, neoliberalism has proved itself to be the single most successful hegemonic project of the last fifty years.

Neoliberalism has thus become ‘the form of our existence – the way in which we are led to conduct ourselves, to relate to others and to ourselves’.58 It is, in other words, not just politicians, business leaders, the media elite and academics who have been enrolled into this vision of the world, but also workers, students, migrants – and everyone else. In other words, neoliberalism creates subjects. Paradigmatically, we are constructed as competitive subjects – a role that encompasses and surpasses industrial capitalism’s productive subject. The imperatives of neoliberalism drive these subjects to constant self-improvement in every aspect of their lives. Perpetual education, the omnipresent requirement to be employable, and the constant need for self-reinvention are all of a piece with this neoliberal subjectivity.59 The competitive subject, moreover, straddles the divide between the public and the private. One’s personal life is as bound to competition as one’s work life. Under these conditions, it is no surprise that anxiety proliferates in contemporary societies. Indeed, an entire battery of psychopathologies has been exacerbated under neoliberalism: stress, anxiety, depression and attention deficit disorders are increasingly common psychological responses to the world around us.60 Crucially, the construction of everyday neoliberalism has also been a primary source of political passivity

marked

. Even if you do not buy into the ideology, its effects nevertheless force you into increasingly precarious situations and increasingly entrepreneurial inclinations. We need money to survive, so we market ourselves, do multiple jobs, stress and worry about how to pay rent, pinch pennies at the at the grocery store, and turn socialising into networking. Given these effects, political mobilisation becomes a dream that is perpetually postponed, driven away by the anxieties and pressures of everyday life.

At the same time, we should recognise that this production of subjectivity was not simply an external imposition. Hegemony, in all its forms, operates not as an illusion, but as something that builds on the very real desires of the population. Neoliberal hegemony has played upon ideas, yearnings and drives already existing within society, mobilising and promising to fulfill those that could be aligned with its basic agenda. The worship of individual freedom, the value ascribed to hard work, freedom from the rigid work week, individual expression through work, the belief in meritocracy, the bitterness felt at corrupt politicians, unions and bureaucracies – these beliefs and desires pre-exist neoliberalism and find expression in it.61 Bridging the left–right divide, many people today are simply angry at what they see as others taking advantage of the system. Hatred for the rich tax evader combines easily with disgust for the poor welfare cheat; anger at the oppressive employer becomes indistinguishable from anger at all politicians. This is linked with the spread of middle-class identities and aspirations – desires for home ownership, self-reliance and entrepreneurial spirit were fostered and extended into formerly working-class social spaces.62 Neoliberal ideology has a grounding in lived experience and does not exist simply as an academic puzzle.63 Neoliberalism has become parasitical on everyday experience, and any critical analysis that misses this is bound to misrecognise the deep roots of neoliberalism in today’s society. Over the course of decades, neoliberalism has therefore come to shape not only elite opinions and beliefs, but also the normative fabric of everyday life itself. The particular interests of neoliberals have become universalised, which is to say, hegemonic.64 Neoliberalism constitutes our collective common sense, making us its subjects whether we believe in it or not.65

#### The alt solves---party politics is collective care that transcends the self---the labor of struggle can be a source of energy

Loewe 12, B. an organizer and communicator, has served as NDLON's Communications Director, supported the Alto Arizona work against SB 1070 and Sheriff Arpaio, and participated in the organizing of the 2010 US Social Forum in Detroit [“An End to Self Care,” *Organizing Upgrade*, October 15 12, http://www.organizingupgrade.com/index.php/blogs/b-loewe/item/729-end-to-self-care]

As long as self-care is discussed as an individual responsibility and additional task, it will be something that middle-class people with leisure time will most easily relate to and will include barriers to the lives of people without time to spare. It becomes one more unchecked box on a to-do list to feel bad about, an unreal expectation, or a far-off dream.

The movement is my self-care not my reason for needing it.

Don Andres awoke every morning at 5:00am to arrive at a street corner to look for work by 6:00am. He’d work a full day of heavy construction and still arrive at the 7:00pm meeting. He’d routinely fall asleep but he was there. Why? Because organizing together to improve conditions, to create alternatives, to band together, was the only option for how care could be anything but alien in his life as a day laborer. Being at the meeting was self-care.

Lack of care is systemic. Therefore resistance to those systems is the highest affirmation of care for oneself and one’s community. Movement work is healing work.

What self-care often misses is the reality that for the majority of people engaged in social justice movements, participation is out of necessity. That a collective effort in the form of social movement is the highest articulation of caring for one’s own self in a world designed to deny your worthiness of care. Too many people discussing self-care overlook the structural barriers that make access to the care they are speaking of impossible without the struggle they often discuss as the cause of their need to ‘take care of themselves.’

Even for someone like myself who has the majority of my materials needs met, I feel most alive, most on fire, most able to go around the clock, when I’m doing political work that feels authentic, feels like it pushes the bounds of authority, and feels like it is directly connected to advancing my individual and our collective liberation.

The truth is that we cannot knit our way to revolution. The issue is not that movements are taxing, because truly they are. It’s called ‘struggle’ for a reason. But they go from strain to overtaxing when we seek to fulfill our political aspirations through vehicles never meant to carry them like in non-political formations or some 501c3s.

The crisis of care is also a crisis of organization. Non-profits are built to do a lot of good, but they have inherent limitations that mean they are rarely built to fulfill our visions of the transformative organizing that would usher in a world where we could feel whole. Most engaged in social movements today are originally driven out of either a concrete material necessity and/or a deep connection to the wrong that accompanies inequality and a drive to make it right. However the majority of organizations available to us today are designed for gentle reforms but not the fundamental transformation our spirits crave. As a result, we try to transform a model unfit to nourish our hearts and then treat that frustration with tonics and diets and stretches instead of placing our efforts in creating a collective space that unleashes our heart’s creative desires.

Maria Poblet of Causa Justa Just Cause once said, “Burnout is not about the amount of hours you work, it is about the amount of political clarity you have.” What that means is that there is no chance of us consistently burning the midnight oil if we don’t at our core believe what we’re working on will get us to a new day and no amount of yoga or therapy or comfort food we supplement our work with will compensate for that. However, if we can see a better world just over the horizon, like a marathon runner nearing a finish line, we can find endless wells to draw upon as we work to usher it in. I have literally gone from being in debilitating pain and only being able to accomplish three hours of work each day to working 18 hour shifts the same week in a completely different context. The difference was not the conditions of my work. It was my connection to my purpose.

The problem with self-care is that there is an underlying assumption that our labor is draining. The deeper question is how do we shape our struggles so that they are life-giving instead of energy-taking processes. When did activities that are aimed to move us closer to freedom stop moving us?