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#### The aff’s anti-institutional politics re-entrenches the power of capital by leaving intact broader structures of global political economy---it creates catharsis that prevents action against climate change and crises of neoliberalism

Parenti & Emanuele 15

(Christian Parenti, former visiting fellow at CUNY's Center for Place, Culture and Politics, as well as a Soros Senior Justice Fellow, teaches in the Liberal Studies program at New York University, interview with Vincent Emanuele, writer, activist and radio journalist who lives and works in the Rust Belt, “Climate Change, Militarism, Neoliberalism and the State,” May 17, 2015, http://ouleft.sp-mesolite.tilted.net/?p=1980)

You mention mutual aid and how it was overhyped by the left in the aftermath of Katrina. I’m thinking of the same thing in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy. You’ve been critical of the left in the US for not approaching and using the state apparatus when dealing with climate change and other ecological issues. Can you talk about your critique of the US left and why you think the state can, and should, be used in a positive manner?¶ Just to be clear, I think it is absolutely heroic and noble what activists have done. My critique is not of peoples’ actions, or of people; it’s of a lack of sophistication, and I hold myself partly accountable, as part of the US left, for our deficiencies. With Hurricane Sandy, the Occupy folks did some amazing stuff. Yet, at a certain level, their actions became charity. People were talking about how many meals they distributed. That’s charity. That is, in many ways, a neoliberal solution. That’s exactly what the capitalist system in the US would like: US citizens not demanding their government redistribute wealth from the 1% to the 99%. The capitalists love to see people turn to each other for money and aid. Unwittingly, that’s what the anarcho-liberal left fell into.¶ This is partly due a very American style of anti-state rhetoric that transcends left and right. The state is not just prisons or the military. It’s also Head Start, quality public education, the library, clean water, the EPA, the City University of New York system – a superb, affordable set of schools that turns out top-notch, working-class students with the lowest debt burdens in the country. There’s a reason the right is attacking these institutions. Why does the right hate the EPA and public education? Because they don’t want to pay to educate the working class, and they don’t want the working class educated. They don’t want to pay to clean up industry, and that’s what the EPA forces them to do. When the left embraces anarcho-liberal notions of self-help and fantasies of being outside of both government and the market, it cuts itself off from important democratic resources. The state should be seen as an arena of class struggle.¶ When the left turns its back on the social democratic features of government, stops making demands of the state, and fails to reshape government by using the government for progressive ends, it risks playing into the hands of the right. The central message of the American right is that government is bad and must be limited. This message is used to justify austerity. However, in most cases, neoliberal austerity does not actually involve a reduction of government. Typically, restructuring in the name of austerity is really just a transformation of government, not a reduction of it.¶ Over the last 35 years, the state has been profoundly transformed, but it has not been reduced. The size of the government in the economy has not gone down. The state has become less redistributive, more punitive. Instead of a robust program of government-subsidized and public housing, we have the prison system. Instead of well-funded public hospitals, we have profiteering private hospitals funded by enormous amounts of public money. Instead of large numbers of well-paid public workers, we have large budgets for private firms that now subcontract tasks formerly conducted by the government.¶ We need to defend the progressive work of government, which, for me, means immediately defending public education. To be clear, I do not mean merely vote or ask nicely, I mean movements should attack government and government officials, target them with protests, make their lives impossible until they comply. This was done very well with the FCC. And my hat goes off to the activists who saved the internet for us. The left should be thinking about the ways in which it can leverage government.¶ The utility of government was very apparent in Vermont during the aftermath of Hurricane Irene. The rains from that storm destroyed or damaged over a hundred bridges, many miles of road and rail, and swept away houses. Thirteen towns were totally stranded. There was a lot of incredible mutual aid; people just started clearing debris and helping each other out. But within all this, town government was a crucial connective tissue.¶ Due to the tradition of New England town meeting, people are quite involved with their local government. Anarchists should love town meetings. It is no coincidence that Murray Bookchin spent much of his life in Vermont. Town meetings are a form of participatory budgeting without the lefty rigmarole. More importantly, the state government managed to get a huge amount of support from the federal government. The state in turn pushed this down to the town level. Without that federal aid, Vermont would still be in ruins. Vermont is not a big enough political entity to shake down General Electric, a huge employer in Vermont. The Vermont government can’t pressure GE to pay for the rebuilding of local infrastructure, but the federal government can.¶ Vermont would still be a disaster if it didn’t get a transfer of funds and materials from the federal government. Similarly in New York City, the public sector does not get enough praise for the many things it did well after super storm Sandy. Huge parts of the subway system were flooded, yet it was all up and running within the month.¶ As an aside, one of the dirty little secrets about the Vermont economy is that it’s heavily tied-up with the military industrial complex. People think Vermont is all about farming and boutique food processing. Vermont has a pretty diverse economy, but agriculture plays a much smaller role than you might think, about 2 percent of employment. Meanwhile, the state’s industrial sector, along with the government, is one of the top employers, at about 13 percent of all employment. Most of this work is in what’s called precision manufacturing, making stuff like: high performance nozzles, switches, calibrators, and stuff like the lenses used in satellites, or handcrafting the blades that go in GE jet engines. But I digress … As we enter the crisis of climate change, it’s important to be aware of the actually existing legal and institutional mechanisms with which we can contain and control capital.¶ I often joke with my anarchist and libertarian friends and ask if their mutual-aid collectives can run Chicago’s sanitation system or operate satellites. Of course, on one level, I’m joking, but on another level, I’m being quite serious. I don’t think activists on the left properly understand the complexity of modern society. A simple example would be how much sewage is produced in a single day in a country with 330 million people. How do people expect to manage these day-to-day issues? In your opinion, is there a lack of sophistication on the left in terms of what, exactly, the state does and how it functions in our day-to-day lives?¶ It’s sobering to reflect on just how complex the physical systems of modern society are. And though it is very unpopular to say among most American activists, it is important to think about the hierarchies and bureaucracies that are necessarily part of technologically complex systems. A friend of mine is a water engineer in Detroit, and he was talking to me about exactly what you’re mentioning. The sewer system in Detroit is mind-bogglingly enormous and also very dilapidated and very expensive. To not have infrastructure publicly maintained, even though the capitalist class might not admit this, would ultimately undermine capital accumulation.¶ You asked if there is a lack of sophistication. Look, I’m trying to make helpful criticisms to my comrades on the left, particularly to activists who work so hard and valiantly. I’ve criticized divestment as a strategy, yet I support it. I criticized the false claims that divesting fossil fuels stocks would hurt fossil fuel companies. The fossil fuel divestment movement started out making that claim. To its credit, the movement has stopped making such claims. Now, they say that it will remove the industries "social license," which is a problematic concept that comes from the odious world of "corporate social responsibility." However, now, students are becoming politicized, and that’s always great news.¶ For several years, some of us have been trying to get climate activists, the climate left, to take the EPA and the Clean Air Act seriously. The EPA has the power to actually de-carbonize the economy. The divestment logic is: Schools will divest, then fossil fuel companies will be held in greater contempt than they are now? Honestly, they’re already hated by everybody. That does what? That creates the political pressure to stop polluting? We already have those regulations: the Clean Air Act. There was a Supreme Court Case, Massachusetts v. EPA, that was ruled on in 2007. It said the EPA must regulate greenhouse gas emissions. Lots of professional activists in the climate movement, at least up until very recently, have been totally unaware of this.¶ Consequently, they are not making demands of the EPA. They are not making demands of their various local, state and federal environmental agencies. These entities should be enforcing the laws. They have the power. It’s not because the people in the climate movement are bad people or unintelligent. They’re dedicated and extremely smart. It’s because there’s an anti-state ethos within the environmental movement and a romanticization of the local. On a side note, I don’t think all of this stuff about local economies is helpful. Sometimes I think this sort of thinking doesn’t recognize how the global political economy works. The comrades at Jacobin magazine have called this anarcho-liberalism. I think that is a great way to describe the dominant ideology of US left, which is both anarchist and liberal in its sensibilities. This ideology is fundamentally about ignoring government, and instead, being obsessed with scale, size, and, by extension, authenticity. Big things are bad. Small things are good. Planning is bad. Spontaneity is good. It is as insidious as it is ridiculous. But it is the dominant worldview among the US left.¶ Do you really think that this is the best way to approach the industry, through mobilizing state resources?¶ Look, the fossil fuel industry is the most powerful force the world has ever seen. Be honest, what institution could possibly ~~stand up to~~ rebuff them? The state. That doesn’t mean it will. Right now, government is captured by these corporate entities. But, it has, at least in theory, an obligation to the people. And it also has the laws that we need to wipe out the fossil fuel industrial complex. This sounds fantastical and nuts, but I don’t think it is. I’ve been harping on this in articles and a little bit at the end of Tropic of Chaos. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, Nixon-era laws can be used to sue developers, polluters, etc. You might not be able to stop them, but you can slow them down. The Clean Air Act basically says that if science can show that smoke-stack pollution is harmful to human health, it has to be regulated.¶ If there was a movement really pushing the government, and making the argument that the only safe level of CO2 emissions is essentially zero … We have the laws in place. We have the enabling legislation to shut down the fossil fuel industry. We should use the government to levy astronomical fines on the fossil fuel companies for pollution. And we should impose them at such a level that it would undermine their ability to remain competitive and profitable.¶ Part Two:¶ Vincent Emanuele: Much of the green washing, or capitalism’s attempt to brand itself as green, focuses on localism and anti-government, market-driven programs. Do you think this phobia of the state among the US left is a result of previous failed political experiments? How much of this ideology is imposed from outside forces?¶ Christian Parenti: Some state phobia comes from the American political mythology of rugged individualism; some comes from the fundamentally Southern, Jeffersonian tradition of states’ rights. Fear of the federal government by Southern elites goes back to the founding of the country. The Hamiltonian versus Jeffersonian positions on government are fundamental to understanding American politics. I wrote about this for Jacobin magazine in a piece called "Reading Hamilton from the Left."¶ Lurking just beneath the surface of states’ rights is, of course, plantation rights. Those plantations, places like Monticello, were America’s equivalent of feudal manors where, in a de facto sense, economic, legal and military power were all bound up together and located in the private household of the planter. Those Virginian planters were the original localistas.¶ Nor did that project end with the fall of slavery, or the end of de jure segregation in the 1960s. Southern elites didn’t want Yankees telling them what to do; how to treat their slaves, how to organize their towns, how to run their elections, how to treat the environment – none of that! The South is a resource colony and its regional elites, some of them now running multinational corporations and holding important posts in the US government, believe they have a right to do what they wish with the people and landscape. Historically, that’s a large part of what localism and local democracy meant in the South. It meant that White local elites were "free" – free to push Black people around, free to feed racist fantasies to the White working class. They didn’t want interference from the outside. So, some of that anti-statist ideology comes from that plantation tradition. Another part of it comes from the real failures and crimes of state socialism, though state socialism also had, and in Cuba still has, many successes. The social welfare record of what we used to call "actually existing socialism" was pretty impressive. But there were also the problems of repression, surveillance and bureaucratization, which were partly the result of capitalist encirclement, partly the result of the ideological hubris rooted in ideological overconfidence in the allegedly scientific power of Marxism, partly the result of simple corruption among socialism’s political class. These real problems were central themes in the Cold War West’s educational and ideological apparatus of (generally right-wing) messaging from the press and the political class. In this discourse, communism was the state, while freedom was the private sector. Thus, the United States and freedom became embodied in popular notions of the private sector and individualism.¶ Of course, the great, unmentioned contradiction in this self-fantasy is the fact that American capitalism has always been heavily, heavily dependent on the state. Modern society, despite its fantasies about itself, is intensely cooperative and collective. Look at how complex its physical systems are; that cannot be achieved without massive levels of coordination and collective cooperation, much of it provided by the rules and regulations of government. The knee-jerk anti-statism, what the folks at Jacobin call "anarcho-liberalism," is also rooted in experience. The less social power you have, the more the state is experienced as an invasive, demeaning, oppressive and potentially, very violent bureaucracy. Neoliberalism would not have gotten this far if there wasn’t an element of truth to this critique of its bureaucracy and regulation. It has also used ideas that have old cultural tractions, like freedom.¶ Such are the contradictions of the modern democratic state in capitalist society. Government is rational, supportive, humane, [and offers] redistribution in the form of Social Security, high-quality public schools, environmental regulation, the Voting Rights Act and other federal civil rights laws that have helped break hegemonic power of local and regional bigots. But government is also militarized policing, the bloated prison system, spying on a vast scale; it is child protective services taking children from loving mothers on the basis of bureaucratic traps, corrupt corporate welfare at every level from town government to federal military contracting. The racist, sexist, plutocratic and techno-bureaucratic features of the state create fertile ground for people to turn their backs on the whole idea of government. What has been the impact of the right’s ability to effectively propagandize the White working class in the US?¶ Rightist intellectuals, academics, journalists, media tycoons, university presidents and loudmouth politicians work diligently to capture and form the raw experience of everyday oppression into an ideological common sense. To be clear, I use that term in the Gramscian sense, in which common sense refers to ruling class ideology that is so hegemonic as to be absorbed and naturalized by the people. The constant libertarian assault on the radio, in newspapers, on the television, this drumbeat of anti-government discourse is an old story – but still very important for understanding the anarcho-liberal sensibility. Just tune in to AM radio late on a weekday evening and listen to the anti-government vitriol. It’s sort of wild.¶ Someone could do an interesting study, Ph.D., in unpacking the cultural history of all this. It is tempting to speculate that deindustrialization, having disempowered and made anxious many huge sections of the working class, opens the way for fantasies of empowerment. The anti-statist, rugged individualist common sense is also always simultaneously a fantasy of empowerment. White men are particularly vulnerable to these fantasies. The classic guy who calls into the batshit crazy, late night, right-wing talk radio show is a middle-aged White man. Listen closely to the rage and you hear fantasies of independence. In this rhetoric, guns and gun rights become an obviously phallic symbol of individual empowerment, agency, self worth, responsibility etc. But most importantly, we have to think about how all of this anti-state ideology is being stirred up with investments from elites. The neoliberal project is to transform the state through anti-statist rhetoric and narratives. They sell the idea that people need to be liberated from the state. But then push policies that imprison people while liberating and pampering capital. It is hard for the left to see itself in this sketch – the angry, beaten-down, middle-aged White guy calling in from his basement or garage. But I think these much-documented corporate efforts to build neoliberal consent permeate the entire culture and infect us all, if even just a little bit.¶ This is the intellectually toxic environment in which young activists are approaching the question of the climate emergency. Young activists should be approaching the climate crisis the way the left approached the economic crisis during the Great Depression. We need to drastically restructure the state. We need it mobilized and able to transform the economy. The New Deal was imperfect, of course. It left domestic workers and farm workers out of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It was inherently racist. It dammed rivers and was environmentally destructive. However, the New Deal was radical in its general empowerment of labor; its distributional outcomes were progressive and it achieved a modernizing transformation of American capitalism. Not to overstate the case, but the New Deal could be a reference point for thinking about the beginning of a green transformation that seeks to euthanize the fossil fuel industry. We have to precipitously reduce greenhouse gas emissions and build a new power sector. That much is very clear.¶ However, let me be clear: Shutting down the fossil fuel industry – mitigating the climate crisis – is not a solution for the environmental crisis. Climate change is only one part of the multifaceted environmental crisis. Shutting down the fossil fuel industry would not automatically end overfishing, deforestation, soil erosion, habitat loss, toxification of the environment etc. But carbon mitigation is the most immediately pressing issue we face. The science is very clear on this. Climate change is the portion of the overall crisis that must be solved immediately so as to buy time to deal with all the other aspects of the crisis. Because I take the political implications of climate science very seriously, I am something of a carbon fundamentalist.

**Reject anti-scientism – the science of historical materialism is key to grapple with technology, strategy, tactics, and historical failure**

**Moufawad-Paul 16** THE COMMUNIST NECESSITY J. MOUFAWAD-PAUL, Foreign Languages Press, Utrecht, 2016 Pages 37-43 ND.

Before examining the phenomenon of movementism in more detail, however, it is worth pausing to think about the word science that, from its very first utterance, places us beyond the pale of polite activist discourse. We now live in a time where this word is treated as suspect by many involved in anti-capitalist projects; **woe betide those who would connect it to the word revolutionary and speak of a scientific assessment of struggle!**There are, of course, laudable reasons behind this suspicion. We know how the scientific method and scientific labour have been used by capitalism. We understand the horrors of technologies adapted to military logic, of the vicious and exclusionary nature of the medical-industrial complex, of the sciences harnessed by colonial and imperial projects to categorize, control, and dehumanize subject 38 populations, of the ways in which science has acted as a discourse to promote the interests of the ruling classes. **We rightly mock the “scientific” gibberish of evolutionary psychology and other bio-determinist nonsense**. Decades of **critical theory and philosophy has made us cynical**. But **what has this totalizing cynicism produced**? On the one hand, a scornful mistrust of the word science when it is used to speak of history and social change on the part of those who benefit, by living at the centres of global capitalism, from a monopoly of scientific advancement. On the other hand, a conscious anti-scientism and flight back into mysticism that was not only evident in the US hippy movement of the 1960s, but in every contemporary collaboration with religious obscurantism––activists who visit psychics, leftists who fetishize the spirituality of colonized nations’ oppressed cultures, radical ecological movements chasing a “primitivism” that existed only in an imaginary state of nature. Both rejections of science combine and diverge in every movementist space. It is not uncommon to witness, at an activist meeting, someone from an indigenous nation hired to pray to their ancestors and perform a tobacco smudging ceremony. While we should be aware that colonial conquest was, in part, 39 achieved through a cultural suppression where the spirituality of the colonizer (i.e. Judeo-Christianity) was treated as “rational” (and perhaps even, though wrongly, scientific) in comparison to the supposed “barbaric” spirituality of the colonized––a cultural strategy aimed at dehumanization––there is something quite patronizing, about these kinds of practices. In one sense they are cynical, because the majority of people present do not believe in anything, neither science nor religion, but are simply tolerating the ceremony out of a sense of a “decolonial” duty that is driven by colonial guilt––we would not expect the same people to tolerate the prayers of a priest, a rabbi, or even an imam. In another sense such a practice represents a conscious anti-scientism where science is treated as a colonial practice and spirituality the business of the colonized; the latter is fetishized and, in this fetishism, appropriated in the most racist, though implicit, sense of the term. After all, by **assuming that science is something “invented” by Europeans is to erase all of the scientific practices and discoveries of those peoples European colonialism genocided and colonized**, stealing and claiming scientific discoveries in the process. But **if we are to reclaim the immediacy of communism-as-necessity then we must also reclaim the conceptual meaning of science**. In the crudest 40 sense of scientific advancement––of **technological instruments**––this fact should be obvious. **Capitalism possesses a monopoly over** those technologies that are capable of maintaining social control: **guns, tanks, drones**, etc. **We will not topple this brutal system through meditation of any sort,** let alone our moral and spontaneous will to “speak truth to power” in innumerable demonstrations where the state’s police and military are better prepared than the average protestor. Movementism has already produced a mythology of struggle that would lead us to believe otherwise, little more than a moralism that runs counter to reality––wishful thinking that if we are all out in the streets, all spontaneously producing an insurrection, the state’s technological machines will refuse to initiate a blood bath. Let us go deeper into this problem, though, so as to think the possibility of scientific thought. To reclaim the concept of science is more than simply recognizing the efficacy of instruments; it concerns anti-capitalist theory itself. And to argue that there is such a thing as a revolutionary science is even bolder than arguing for the necessary recognition of the scientific instruments monopolized by the ruling classes. Here is a totalizing assumption: **science should find its home at the heart of theories of organization and strategy** because science, the only thing **capable of** 41 **generating facts and truths**, is superior to non-science. What do we mean, then, by science? In the previous chapter there was an appeal to Engels and a brief recognition that science was open to the future, a process in development that produced, through historical struggle, universal truths (that is, facts that are applicable in every particular context, though also mediated by these contexts). But let us go further: a science is that which speaks to material conditions without mystification––a natural explanation of natural phenomena. Physics is a physical (broadly understood) explanation of physical phenomena; biology is a biological explanation of biological phenomena; chemistry is a chemical explanation of chemical phenomena; and **historical materialism is an historical/social explanation of historical/social phenomena**. Why, then, is historical materialism a revolutionary science? Because the historical/social explanation of the same phenomena is the mechanism of class struggle, i.e. revolution… And **this scientific hypothesis is that which is capable of demystifying the whole of history** and myriad societies, a way in which to gauge any and every social struggle that is capable of producing historical change. Hence, without a scientific understanding of social struggle we are incapable of recognizing when and 42 where failed theories manifest. The physicist has no problem banning Newtonian speculation to the past where it belongs; ~~s/he~~ possesses a method of assessment based on the development of hir scientific terrain**. If we resist** a similar **scientific engagement** with social struggle **we have no method of making sense of the ways in which revolutionary hypotheses have been disproven** in the historical crucible due to historical “experiments” of class struggle. To reject a scientific understanding of struggle is to assert that these past experiments––the complete failures, the half-successes, the half-failures––have taught us nothing, and so we are doomed to successive attempts of directionless reinvention. A scientific understanding of struggle, however, teaches us something about the theoretical terrain of struggle that has been presented by history, through humanity’s past endeavours, and is still open to the future. What social struggles established new truths due to marginal, but universalizable successes? What successive social struggles learned from these past establishments of truth and went a little further before also meeting failure? How, then, do we apply what has been scientifically proven in these social experiments to our particular circumstances so as to go even further? These are questions that can only be asked if we have the meter of science to gauge our 43 practice––that demands, at every moment of struggle, an attention to necessity. **Without such an understanding of reality, we have no way of making sense of our practice;** **we might as well forget the past**, act as if everything is particularly unique, and ignore every moment when the repetition of failure ought to be treated as obvious. **Movementism receives its strength in this grand project of forgetting**.

**The aff will only perpetuate the societal exclusion of disabled persons because it misdiagnoses the problem and precludes the critical analysis of capitalism necessary to create meaningful structural change**

**Russell 2** MARTA RUSSELL in 2k2 Disability & Society, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2002, pp. 117–135, What Disability Civil Rights Cannot Do: employment and political economy, ebscohost

To explain such outcomes, I have sought to examine the relationship between politics, policy and economics—particularly with regard to the interests of business. **Disability scholars** such as Victor Finkelstein, Michael Oliver, Colin Barnes, Paul Abberley, Nirmala Erevelles, Lennard Davis, Brendan Gleeson and others **have advanced the position that the capitalist system**—**particularly the commodi cation of labour**—**is a crucial contributing factor to the lack of economic advancement of disabled people**. Going back to Marx’s theory of absolute impoverishment, Ernest Mandel clarifies Marx’s observation that **capitalism ‘throws out of the production process’ a section of the proletariat: unemployed, old people, disabled persons, the sick, etc**. (Mandel, 1962, p. 151) **Marx calls these groups a part of the poorest stratum ‘bearing the stigmata of wage labor’.** As Mandel says, **‘this analysis retains its full value, even under the “welfare” capitalism of today’ (**Mandel, 1962, p. 151). While others have made links between capitalism and disablement my purpose has been to expose how **modern capitalism perpetuates this substratum in the face of disabled peoples’ struggle for their place the US labour force**. In this vein I have sought to expose systemic economic discrimination against disabled workers in a capitalist economy that the ADA cannot address or remedy and will return to this matter below. I have also argued that **ADA** court **failures have been prompted by capitalist opposition made more powerful in a neoliberal era, where conservative forces have politically achieved a more laissez faire, deregulated economy**, successfully targeting regulationships they view as interfering with business for weakening or repeal (Russell 1998; pp. 109–111; 2000, p. 341). The philosophical momentum for social justice that spurred the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and subsequent progressive court decisions in the 1960s and 1970s was well into decline by the 1990s when the ADA was passed. For example, in the era following passage of civil rights laws in 1957, 1960, 1964 and 1968, the Republicans made dramatic inroads into Democratic victories that forged the civil rights movement, established the Of ce of Economic Opportunity and initiated the War on Poverty during the Great Society. Presidents Reagan and Bush dismantled the entire Community Services Administration, responsible for driving much of the 1960s social change agenda by advancing human services, occupational safety, consumer protection and environmental protection laws. On the way out were civil rights and economic entitlements, replaced by a conservative thrust to reduce ‘big bad government’. The dominant agenda of the late 1970s and 1980s was bolstered by corporate goals, which emphasised globalisation and political dominance of government (McMahan, 1985). Increased international capital mobility and liberalised international trade have resulted in the transfer of more power to management, at the expense of labour. (Parenti, 1995, pp. 99–119, 271) Conservative forces targeted protective regulations for repeal or rollback that, in their view, interfered with business (Wolman & Colamosca, 1997; Mishel et al., 1999). Economic policy in the post-1979 period moved decisively toward a more laissez faire, deregulated approach. Industries like transportation and communications have been largely deregulated. Social protections, including safety, health and environmental regulations, the minimum wage, government transfer payments (welfare) and the unemployment insurance system all have been weakened. The ADA was no exception. It was watered down substantially to achieve Congressional consensus and Bush’s presidential approval (Pheiffer, 2000, p. 43). The most recent evidence that these forces remain intact: the Supreme Court’s weakening of the ADA in Garrett, Sutton, Murphy and Albertson’s disability employment decisions; the striking down of the Age Discrimination Act in Kimel v. Florida; and the invalidation of the Violence Against Women’s Act in United States v. Morrison. After years of dedicated civil rights activism in the 1950–60s the American civil rights leader Dr Martin Luther King, Jr outgrew the liberal view that economic justice for blacks was possible through the enactment of civil rights laws geared to make race-based employment discrimination against the law. King realised that civil rights (even when coupled with economic expansion) could not solve the mass unemployment of black Americans. At the 1967 Southern Christian Leadership Conference convention Dr King implored the movement to: address itself to the question of restructuring the whole of American society. There are 40 million poor people here. And one day we must ask the question, ‘Why are there 40 million poor people in America?’ And when you begin to ask that question, you are raising questions about the economic system, about a broader distribution of wealth. When you ask that question, you begin to question the capitalistic economy …’ (Washington, 1991, p. 250) For King, the theme of job creation in a capitalist economy was an ongoing and primary part of his peoples’ struggle for justice. ‘We need an economic bill of rights. This would guarantee a job to all people who want to work and are able to work …’ (King, 1968, p. 24) Today, almost 40 years since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, no economic rights have been enacted and black unemployment remains twice (8%) that of the of cial national rate (4.2%). This is so even when civil rights have been accompanied by af rmative action measures designed to promote hiring and remedy past race discrimination. The ADA was not followed by af rmative action for disabled workers. There is no reason to believe disability civil rights outcomes will fair better. In practice, **civil rights, which primarily focus on attitudes and prejudice, have not given sufficient attention to the barriers that the economic structure and power relationships erect against the employment of disabled persons**. **This paper explores the shortcomings of the liberalist ‘equal opportunity’ approach to employment**. My **emphasis will be on the political economy of disablement, on** micro- and macro**economic realities systemic to capitalism, which contribute to the high disabled unemployment rate. Class interests perpetuate the exclusion of disabled persons from the workforce through systemic business accounting practices and compulsory unemployment. If we conceptualise disablement as a product of the exploitative economic structure of capitalist society; one which creates the so-called disabled body to permit a small capitalist class to create the economic conditions necessary to accumulate vast wealth, then it becomes clear that anti-discrimination legislation, by failing to acknowledge the contradictions of promoting equal opportunity in class-based (unequal) society, is insufficient to solve the unemployment predicament of disabled persons.** Instead, **the liberal rights model serves to forestall criticism of relationships of power at the centre of the exclusion from employment and inequality that disabled persons face.** This paper will offer such a criticism.

**Deconstructing a static identity for people with disabilities and incorporating multiple perspectives weakens the political efficacy of disabled groups—the critique of capitalism must precede their identity claims because privileging the body over markets just means that resistance gets dissolved**

**Vehmas & Watson ‘13** (Simo, dept. of disability studies, U of Helsinki; Nick, dept of disability studies, U of Glasgow, “Moral wrongs, disadvantages, and disability: a critique of critical disability studies,” Disability & Society)

The influence of CDS and its challenge to the assumption that disability is a uniform condition have enabled the emergence of new ideas on disability. In particular, this has enabled the development of a theory that can take account of not only impairment effects but also can include class, ethnicity, sexual orientation or cultural identities. It has also argued for the re-emergence of a new political identity, one where a solidarity that was previously built on a common single identity is replaced by one that incorporates multiple voices including representatives from across the range of constituencies. The politics that it seeks to develop will be the ending of the single interest group identity of the disability movement to be replaced by single-issue groups campaigning for different social issues. To paraphrase Lister (1998, 74), if disability and impairment are simply to be ‘deconstructed into a kaleidoscope of shifting identities’ and ableist discourses, there will be no disabled people left to either fight for the right to be, or to be a citizen. If the principles of CDS are evaluated critically in the light of disadvantage, its analytical and political value becomes questionable. Its relativism and its suggestions that impairments are ethically and politically merely neutral differences are false. Impairments often have very tangible effects on people’s well-being, many of which cannot be explained away by deconstruction (for example, Shakespeare 2006; Thomas 1999). Recognizing impairment effects is necessary in order to secure proper treatment and social arrangements that enhance disabled people’s well-being and social participation. CDS runs the risk of dismissing not only the personal experiences of living with impairment, but also the significance of the differences between socially created disadvantages. These disadvantages that often result from oppressive social arrangements, are very much real and take place in different ways for different disadvantaged groups. Disabled people typically experience disadvantage in relation to the market and capitalism, and they have to a large extent been excluded from employment and from equal social participation, respect and wealth (Wolff and De-Shalit 2007, 26). On top of these materialist disadvantages, disabled people are stigmatized as deviant and undesirable, and also subordinated to various oppressive hierarchical relations. For disabled people to achieve participatory parity, they require more than recognition; they need material help, targeted resource enhancement, and personal enhancement (Wolff and De-Shalit 2007). Disability is rooted in the economic structures of society and demands redistribution of goods and wealth. In contrast to some other oppressed groups, disabled people require more than the removal of barriers if they are to achieve social justice. This extra help might be small – for example, allowing a student with dyslexia extra time in an examination – through to complex interventions such as facilitated communication, a job support worker or 24-hour personal assistance. Whatever the size, it is an extra cost both to employers and to the state. These are real needs and represent real differences. Without an acceptance of these differences it is hard to see how we could move forward. Whilst these ‘real differences’ can be presented as the result of dominant ableist discourses where disabled people’s needs are regarded as extra cost, this does not solve the problem. The problems disabled people face require more than ideological change, and ideological change is of little use if it does not result in material change. CDS fails to account for the economic basis of disability and offers only the tools of deconstruction and the abolishment of cultural hierarchies to eradicate economic injustice. This, as Fraser (2000) has argued, would be possible in a society where there were no relatively autonomous markets and the distribution of goods were regulated through cultural values. In such a society, oppression based on identity would translate perfectly into economic injustice and maldistribution. This is far from the current reality where ‘marketization has pervaded all societies to some degree, at least partially decoupling economic mechanisms of distribution from cultural patterns of value and prestige’ (Fraser 2000, 111). Markets are not controlled by nor are they subsidiary to culture; ‘as a result they generate economic inequalities that are not mere expressions of identity hierarchies’ (Fraser 2000, 111–112). The disadvantage related to disability is to a great extent a matter of economic injustice, and before this injustice can be corrected we have to be able to identify those individuals and social groups that have been disadvantaged by social arrangements. Whilst this does create and foster categories and binaries between groups of people, it also requires some sort of categories to start with; namely, the various categories of disadvantage. Both the social and physical mechanisms that produce human diversity are real, and they produce tangible differences that cannot be challenged, let alone abolished, merely by pointing out the wanton nature of difference, and deconstructing the meanings attached to disability. Changing the social conditions that disadvantage and disable some people demands that the diverse, sometimes dualistic, reality of social advantage and disadvantage between different groups of people is recognized. This is exactly why group identities based on, for example, impairment, gender, or sexuality have been invaluable tools in the resistance against discrimination and oppression – in the fight against socially produced disadvantage. Confident, positive disability identity has enabled many disabled people to actively challenge the status quo that disadvantages them and to claim rights and power and participation in dominant institutions. Being different from the so-called normal majority is no longer considered to conflict with a good life, equality and respect. Quite the opposite, positive realization of one’s difference has been liberating and empowering to many disabled people (Shakespeare 2006; Morris 1991). For a radical and active disability movement to emerge and for disabled people to take action on their own account, they have to see themselves as an unfairly marginalized or disadvantaged constituency and a minority group (Shakespeare and Watson 2001). The category disabled/non-disabled is a good abstraction that can enable the development of communities of resistance, and without it is hard to see how these could develop. CDS is premised on the idea that difference acts as a precursor to the normalizing of behaviour and a requirement to treat people differently and, importantly, less favourably. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that the categories that are applied to disabled people create an unnecessary divide between disabled and nondisabled people. You could equally make the point that without these categories we would not know what it is we have to do, what actions we have to take or what services we have to put in place to include disabled people. Indeed, for many disabled people the disadvantages they are subjected to arise not as the result of domination but through neglect and the denial of services and through society failing to take responsibility for those in need. As Wolff (2009, 114) points out: ‘anti-discrimination policy needs to identify a group to be protected.’ In other words, it is impossible to fight the oppression of a group of people that does not exist. Recognition of impairment is also crucial regarding legislation and policy that aim to protect disabled people against discrimination. The point of anti-discrimination legislation is to protect people from discrimination on the basis of their physical and mental properties, not on their opportunity to achieve equal participation and respect. Thus, ‘the parallel to race and gender is not disability but impairment’ (Wolff 2009, 135).

#### Capitalism causes endless structural violence and extinction from climate change

Robinson 2016 (William I, PhD, professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/35596-sadistic-capitalism-six-urgent-matters-for-humanity-in-global-crisis>)

In these mean streets of globalized capitalism in crisis, it has become profitable to turn poverty and inequality into a tourist attraction. The South African Emoya Luxury Hotel and Spa company has made a glamorized spectacle of it. The resort recently advertised an opportunity for tourists to stay "in our unique Shanty Town ... and experience traditional township living within a safe private game reserve environment." A cluster of simulated shanties outside of Bloemfontein that the company has constructed "is ideal for team building, braais, bachelors [parties], theme parties and an experience of a lifetime," read the ad. The luxury accommodations, made to appear from the outside as shacks, featured paraffin lamps, candles, a battery-operated radio, an outside toilet, a drum and fireplace for cooking, as well as under-floor heating, air conditioning and wireless internet access. A well-dressed, young white couple is pictured embracing in a field with the corrugated tin shanties in the background. The only thing missing in this fantasy world of sanitized space and glamorized poverty was the people themselves living in poverty. Escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation. The "luxury shanty town" in South Africa is a fitting metaphor for global capitalism as a whole. Faced with a stagnant global economy, elites have managed to turn war, structural violence and inequality into opportunities for capital, pleasure and entertainment. It is hard not to conclude that unchecked capitalism has become what I term "sadistic capitalism," in which the suffering and deprivation generated by capitalism become a source of aesthetic pleasure, leisure and entertainment for others. I recently had the opportunity to travel through several countries in Latin America, the Middle East, North Africa, East Asia and throughout North America. I was on sabbatical to research what the global crisis looks like on the ground around the world. Everywhere I went, social polarization and political tensions have reached explosive dimensions. Where is the crisis headed, what are the possible outcomes and what does it tell us about global capitalism and resistance? This crisis is not like earlier structural crises of world capitalism, such as in the 1930s or 1970s. This one is fast becoming systemic. The crisis of humanity shares aspects of earlier structural crises of world capitalism, but there are six novel, interrelated dimensions to the current moment that I highlight here, in broad strokes, as the "big picture" context in which countries and peoples around the world are experiencing a descent into chaos and uncertainty. 1) The level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented in the face of out-of-control, over-accumulated capital. In January 2016, the development agency Oxfam published a follow-up to its report on global inequality that had been released the previous year. According to the new report, now just 62 billionaires -- down from 80 identified by the agency in its January 2015 report -- control as much wealth as one half of the world's population, and the top 1% owns more wealth than the other 99% combined. Beyond the transnational capitalist class and the upper echelons of the global power bloc, the richest 20 percent of humanity owns some 95 percent of the world's wealth, while the bottom 80 percent has to make do with just 5 percent. This 20-80 divide of global society into haves and the have-nots is the new global social apartheid. It is evident not just between rich and poor countries, but within each country, North and South, with the rise of new affluent high-consumption sectors alongside the downward mobility, "precariatization," destabilization and expulsion of majorities. Escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation: The transnational capitalist class cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to stagnation in the world economy. The signs of an impending depression are everywhere. The front page of the February 20 issue of The Economist read, "The World Economy: Out of Ammo?" Extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge to dominant groups. They strive to purchase the loyalty of that 20 percent, while at the same time dividing the 80 percent, co-opting some into a hegemonic bloc and repressing the rest. Alongside the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression is heightened dissemination through the culture industries and corporate marketing strategies that depoliticize through consumerist fantasies and the manipulation of desire. As "Trumpism" in the United States so well illustrates, another strategy of co-optation is the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled toward scapegoated communities. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization. Scapegoated communities are under siege, such as the Rohingya in Myanmar, the Muslim minority in India, the Kurds in Turkey, southern African immigrants in South Africa, and Syrian and Iraqi refugees and other immigrants in Europe. As with its 20th century predecessor, 21st century fascism hinges on such manipulation of social anxiety at a time of acute capitalist crisis. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend to projects of 21st century fascism. 2) The system is fast reaching the ecological limits to its reproduction. We have reached several tipping points in what environmental scientists refer to as nine crucial "planetary boundaries." We have already exceeded these boundaries in three areas -- climate change, the nitrogen cycle and diversity loss. There have been five previous mass extinctions in earth's history. While all these were due to natural causes, for the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system. We have entered what Paul Crutzen, the Dutch environmental scientist and Nobel Prize winner, termed the Anthropocene -- a new age in which humans have transformed up to half of the world's surface. We are altering the composition of the atmosphere and acidifying the oceans at a rate that undermines the conditions for life. The ecological dimensions of global crisis cannot be understated. "We are deciding, without quite meaning to, which evolutionary pathways will remain open and which will forever be closed," observes Elizabeth Kolbert in her best seller, The Sixth Extinction. "No other creature has ever managed this ... The Sixth Extinction will continue to determine the course of life long after everything people have written and painted and built has been ground into dust." Capitalism cannot be held solely responsible. The human-nature contradiction has deep roots in civilization itself. The ancient Sumerian empires, for example, collapsed after the population over-salinated their crop soil. The Mayan city-state network collapsed about AD 900 due to deforestation. And the former Soviet Union wrecked havoc on the environment. However, given capital's implacable impulse to accumulate profit and its accelerated commodification of nature, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system. "Green capitalism" appears as an oxymoron, as sadistic capitalism's attempt to turn the ecological crisis into a profit-making opportunity, along with the conversion of poverty into a tourist attraction. 3) The sheer magnitude of the means of violence is unprecedented, as is the concentrated control over the means of global communications and the production and circulation of knowledge, symbols and images. We have seen the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression that have brought us into the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control. This real-life Orwellian world is in a sense more perturbing than that described by George Orwell in his iconic novel 1984. In that fictional world, people were compelled to give their obedience to the state ("Big Brother") in exchange for a quiet existence with guarantees of employment, housing and other social necessities. Now, however, the corporate and political powers that be force obedience even as the means of survival are denied to the vast majority. Global apartheid involves the creation of "green zones" that are cordoned off in each locale around the world where elites are insulated through new systems of spatial reorganization, social control and policing. "Green zone" refers to the nearly impenetrable area in central Baghdad that US occupation forces established in the wake of the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The command center of the occupation and select Iraqi elite inside that green zone were protected from the violence and chaos that engulfed the country. Urban areas around the world are now green zoned through gentrification, gated communities, surveillance systems, and state and private violence. Inside the world's green zones, privileged strata avail themselves of privatized social services, consumption and entertainment. They can work and communicate through internet and satellite sealed off under the protection of armies of soldiers, police and private security forces. Green zoning takes on distinct forms in each locality. In Palestine, I witnessed such zoning in the form of Israeli military checkpoints, Jewish settler-only roads and the apartheid wall. In Mexico City, the most exclusive residential areas in the upscale Santa Fe District are accessible only by helicopter and private gated roads. In Johannesburg, a surreal drive through the exclusive Sandton City area reveals rows of mansions that appear as military compounds, with private armed towers and electrical and barbed-wire fences. In Cairo, I toured satellite cities ringing the impoverished center and inner suburbs where the country's elite could live out their aspirations and fantasies. They sport gated residential complexes with spotless green lawns, private leisure and shopping centers and English-language international schools under the protection of military checkpoints and private security police. In other cities, green zoning is subtler but no less effective. In Los Angeles, where I live, the freeway system now has an express lane reserved for those that can pay an exorbitant toll. On this lane, the privileged speed by, while the rest remain one lane over, stuck in the city's notorious bumper-to-bumper traffic -- or even worse, in notoriously underfunded and underdeveloped public transportation, where it may take half a day to get to and from work. There is no barrier separating this express lane from the others. However, a near-invisible closed surveillance system monitors every movement. If a vehicle without authorization shifts into the exclusive lane, it is instantly recorded by this surveillance system and a heavy fine is imposed on the driver, under threat of impoundment, while freeway police patrols are ubiquitous. Outside of the global green zones, warfare and police containment have become normalized and sanitized for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. "Militainment" -- portraying and even glamorizing war and violence as entertaining spectacles through Hollywood films and television police shows, computer games and corporate "news" channels -- may be the epitome of sadistic capitalism. It desensitizes, bringing about complacency and indifference. In between the green zones and outright warfare are prison industrial complexes, immigrant and refugee repression and control systems, the criminalization of outcast communities and capitalist schooling. The omnipresent media and cultural apparatuses of the corporate economy, in particular, aim to colonize the mind -- to undermine the ability to think critically and outside the dominant worldview. A neofascist culture emerges through militarism, extreme masculinization, racism and racist mobilizations against scapegoats. 4) We are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism. Capitalism is like riding a bicycle: When you stop pedaling the bicycle, you fall over. If the capitalist system stops expanding outward, it enters crisis and faces collapse. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion -- from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism. Meanwhile, the privatization of education, health care, utilities, basic services and public land are turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital's control into "spaces of capital." Even poverty has been turned into a commodity. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? With the limits to expansion comes a turn toward militarized accumulation -- making wars of endless destruction and reconstruction and expanding the militarization of social and political institutions so as to continue to generate new opportunities for accumulation in the face of stagnation. 5) There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a "planet of slums," alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins and subject to these sophisticated systems of social control and destruction. Global capitalism has no direct use for surplus humanity. But indirectly, it holds wages down everywhere and makes new systems of 21st century slavery possible. These systems include prison labor, the forced recruitment of miners at gunpoint by warlords contracted by global corporations to dig up valuable minerals in the Congo, sweatshops and exploited immigrant communities (including the rising tide of immigrant female caregivers for affluent populations). Furthermore, the global working class is experiencing accelerated "precariatization." The "new precariat" refers to the proletariat that faces capital under today's unstable and precarious labor relations -- informalization, casualization, part-time, temp, immigrant and contract labor. As communities are uprooted everywhere, there is a rising reserve army of immigrant labor. The global working class is becoming divided into citizen and immigrant workers. The latter are particularly attractive to transnational capital, as the lack of citizenship rights makes them particularly vulnerable, and therefore, exploitable. The challenge for dominant groups is how to contain the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity, the immigrant workforce and the precariat. How can they contain the explosive contradictions of this system? The 21st century megacities become the battlegrounds between mass resistance movements and the new systems of mass repression. Some populations in these cities (and also in abandoned countryside) are at risk of genocide, such as those in Gaza, zones in Somalia and Congo, and swaths of Iraq and Syria. 6) There is a disjuncture between a globalizing economy and a nation-state-based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and do not wield enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on runaway transnational capital. In the wake of the 2008 financial collapse, for instance, the governments of the G-8 and G-20 were unable to impose transnational regulation on the global financial system, despite a series of emergency summits to discuss such regulation. Elites historically have attempted to resolve the problems of over-accumulation by state policies that can regulate the anarchy of the market. However, in recent decades, transnational capital has broken free from the constraints imposed by the nation-state. The more "enlightened" elite representatives of the transnational capitalist class are now clamoring for transnational mechanisms of regulation that would allow the global ruling class to reign in the anarchy of the system in the interests of saving global capitalism from itself and from radical challenges from below. At the same time, the division of the world into some 200 competing nation-states is not the most propitious of circumstances for the global working class. Victories in popular struggles from below in any one country or region can (and often do) become diverted and even undone by the structural power of transnational capital and the direct political and military domination that this structural power affords the dominant groups. In Greece, for instance, the leftist Syriza party came to power in 2015 on the heels of militant worker struggles and a mass uprising. But the party abandoned its radical program as a result of the enormous pressure exerted on it from the European Central Bank and private international creditors. The Systemic Critique of Global Capitalism A growing number of transnational elites themselves now recognize that any resolution to the global crisis must involve redistribution downward of income. However, in the viewpoint of those from below, a neo-Keynesian redistribution within the prevailing corporate power structure is not enough. What is required is a redistribution of power downward and transformation toward a system in which social need trumps private profit. A global rebellion against the transnational capitalist class has spread since the financial collapse of 2008. Wherever one looks, there is popular, grassroots and leftist struggle, and the rise of new cultures of resistance: the Arab Spring; the resurgence of leftist politics in Greece, Spain and elsewhere in Europe; the tenacious resistance of Mexican social movements following the Ayotzinapa massacre of 2014; the favela uprising in Brazil against the government's World Cup and Olympic expulsion policies; the student strikes in Chile; the remarkable surge in the Chinese workers' movement; the shack dwellers and other poor people's campaigns in South Africa; Occupy Wall Street, the immigrant rights movement, Black Lives Matter, fast food workers' struggle and the mobilization around the Bernie Sanders presidential campaign in the United States. This global revolt is spread unevenly and faces many challenges. A number of these struggles, moreover, have suffered setbacks, such as the Greek working-class movement and, tragically, the Arab Spring. What type of a transformation is viable, and how do we achieve it? How we interpret the global crisis is itself a matter of vital importance as politics polarize worldwide between a neofascist and a popular response. The systemic critique of global capitalism must strive to influence, from this vantage point, the discourse and practice of movements for a more just distribution of wealth and power. Our survival may depend on it.

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the Party can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct unproductive tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation

Escalante 18  
(Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> cVs)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

**PIC**

**We affirm the entirety of the 1AC except the Zavitsanos evidence’s description of mutual dependency**

**1AC Zavitsanos 19** (Rebecca Sanchez and Mara Mills interviewing Constantina Zavitsanos. Constantina Zavitsanos – an artist who works in sculpture, performance, text, and sound; Zavitsanos lives in New York City and teaches at The New School. Mara Mills – associate professor of Media, Culture, and Communication and co-director of the Center for Disability Studies at New York University. Rebecca Sanchez – associate professor of English and co-director of the Disability Studies program at Fordham University. “Constantina Zavitsanos on Disability, Debt, Dependency” 1/9/19, <https://www.artpapers.org/giving-it-away/>. DOA: 5/19,20, kbb)

CZ: This is a question for Marxism as well. We are told how **capital depends on labor**, how the **dependency** of the boss or landlord is **parasitic on labor**, a powerful host. But the obvious problem here is that **dependency is not what’s wrong** with the boss. **We’re all dependent.** The reason that the boss is bad is the opposite: **the disavowal of that common dependency**, and **the cost at which that disavowal is extracted**.

**Reject framing of mutual dependency in terms of labor relations --**

**We answer this question for Marxism by saying: no, you don’t need a boss or landlord, you owe them nothing: two net benefits**

**1) Capital is parasitic towards labor – an emphasis on care work inevitably devolves into the liberal project of individual responsibility – turns the aff**

**Fisher 9** Mark Fisher, 2009, Capitalist Realism; excerpt from chapter 2, <https://www.atlasofplaces.com/essays/capitalist-realism/> ND.

Corporate anti-capitalism wouldn’t matter if it could be differentiated from an authentic anti-capitalist movement. Yet, even before its momentum was stalled by the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center, the so called anti-capitalist movement seemed also to have conceded too much to capitalist realism. Since it was unable to posit a coherent alternative political-economic model to capitalism, the suspicion was that the actual aim was not to replace capitalism but to mitigate its worst excesses; and, since the form of its activities tended to be the staging of protests rather than political organization, there was a sense that the anti-capitalism movement consisted of making a series of hysterical demands which it didn’t expect to be met. Protests have formed a kind of carnivalesque background noise to capitalist realism, and the anti-capitalist protests share rather too much with hyper-corporate events like 2005’s Live 8, with their exorbitant demands that politicians legislate away poverty. Live 8 was a strange kind of protest; a protest that everyone could agree with: who is it who actually wants poverty? And it is not that Live 8 was a ‘degraded’ form of protest. On the contrary, it was in Live 8 that the logic of the protest was revealed in its purest form. The protest impulse of the 60s posited a malevolent Father, the harbinger of a reality principle that (supposedly) cruelly and arbitrarily denies the ‘right’ to total enjoyment. This Father has unlimited access to resources, but he selfishly – and senselessly – hoards them. Yet it is not capitalism but protest itself which depends upon this figuration of the Father; and one of the successes of the current global elite has been their avoidance of identification with the figure of the hoarding Father, even though the ‘reality’ they impose on the young is substantially harsher than the conditions they protested against in the 60s. Indeed, it was of course the global elite itself – in the form of entertainers such as Richard Curtis and Bono – which organized the Live 8 event. To reclaim a real political agency means first of all accepting our insertion at the level of desire in the remorseless meat-grinder of Capital. What is being disavowed in the abjection of evil and ignorance onto fantasmatic Others is our own complicity in planetary networks of oppression. What needs to be kept in mind is both that **capitalism is a hyper-abstract impersonal structure and that it would be nothing without our co-operation**. The most Gothic description of Capital is also the most accurate**. Capital is an abstract parasite**, **an insatiable vampire and zombie-maker**; but the living flesh it converts into dead labor is ours, and the zombies it makes are us. There is a sense in which it simply is the case that the political elite are our servants; the miserable service they provide from us is to launder our libidos, to obligingly re-present for us our disavowed desires as if they had nothing to do with us. The ideological blackmail that has been in place since the original Live Aid concerts in 1985 has **insisted that ‘caring individuals’ could end famine directly**, **without the need for any kind of political solution or systemic reorganization**. It is necessary to act straight away, we were told; **politics has to be suspended in the name of ethical immediacy.** Bono’s Product Red brand wanted to dispense even with the philanthropic intermediary. ‘Philanthropy is like hippy music, holding hands’, Bono proclaimed. ‘Red is more like punk rock, hip hop, this should feel like hard commerce’. **The point was not to offer an alternative to capitalism** – on the contrary, Product Red’s ‘punk rock’ or ‘hip hop’ character consisted in its ‘realistic’ acceptance that capitalism is the only game in town. No, the aim was only to ensure that some of the proceeds of particular transactions went to good causes. The fantasy being that western consumerism, far from being intrinsically implicated in systemic global inequalities, could itself solve them. All we have to do is buy the right products.

**2) Refuse to flip the metaphor – doing so reinforces right-wing troupes and is tantamount to bourgeois apologetics**

**Flisfeder 20** Capitalism is the Parasite; Capitalism is the Virus July 26, 2020 Matthew Flisfeder, <https://socialistproject.ca/2020/07/capitalism-is-the-parasite-capitalism-is-the-virus/> ND.

**Popular opinion** is sure to read the parasite from the gaze of the elite, in which **case it is the poor who are parasitic upon the wealthy**. This, after all, is the leading practice of perceiving the abject and the excluded. The poor are typically portrayed as scum; vultures living off of the remainders and shreds of life of the rich. But by asking about the source of the wealth of the elite **we are able to understand the reverse**. Doing so lets us connect the film to a great number of issues facing us today, which intersect in the capitalist system. As Marx famously put it in Capital, Volume 1, **“Capital is dead labour which, vampire-like, lives only by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks**.” From the perspective of capital, then, Marx notes, the labour-power that it has paid for is its property and it is its right to so consume it during the time in which it has paid for the labour commodity. “If the worker consumes his [own] disposable time for himself, [it appears to capital that] he robs the capitalist.”1 As in a camera obscura, Marx’s words describe here **the inverted form with which the capitalist parasite is commonly misperceived or kept hidden** by the very form of its own crises. During the COVID-19 pandemic, most of us have had to limit and self-regulate our everyday lives, going into lockdown and quarantine. While millions of people are laid off of work as businesses have ceased operations and are no longer making any profit, the world’s wealthiest few, including big tech giants like Jeff Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg, and Elon Musk, have increased their wealth substantially.2 As the old socialist saying goes, during times of prosperity, profits are privatized and rise to the top, whereas during times of crisis, risk, debt, and loss are socialized, and endured by the expanding bottom. The neoliberal myth of trickle down, it would seem, is only true in the case of socializing losses. It is loss that trickles down while the parasitic capitalists appropriate the world’s wealth, especially and even during a time of great crisis for many. **What we see all too often is that the capitalist system, much like a parasite, exhausts and devours global resources, leaving the majority to scramble and fight amongst ourselves for access to basic needs**. In this sense, we should see the Park family, not the Kims, as the real parasites of the movie. We should think about the coronavirus in these terms, as well. The virus, not unlike a parasite, infects and replicates, and eats away at all forms of life confronting it. The culprit of the pandemic seems to be the virus itself, this nonhuman force of nature; but what we have been seeing is that, as another popular meme has put it, **the real virus is capitalism** – that is, the capitalist system that erects further barriers to our collective treatment of the virus. The true crisis is not simply the virus itself, but the limited capacities in the public health care system to meet the needs for treatment amongst the population.3 This is a system, we should add, that has become relatively starved due to decades of neoliberal austerity measures and cutbacks to social and public services, benefits, and institutions that subsidize the costs of life and living, and that provide access to needs. In this sense, capitalism is very much the real virus, indeed.4 Systemic crises are all around us, and not least as we are also currently seeing with the mass Black Lives Matter protests against racism, police violence, and police murders of African Americans, like George Floyd, in the United States.5 The police, Donald Trump, and much of **the Right Wing media all want to make the protesters look parasitic upon society**.6 Trump has referred to the protesters as “thugs,” while Fox News personality, Tucker Carlson has said that debates about racism are driven by “hysteria” that is spreading like a “disease.”7 But we must remember that, while the corporate media creates the illusion that the people are the robber-looters of society – just as it appears to the capitalist that workers’ use of their own disposable time robs the capitalist from consuming the labour commodity – **it is in fact the capitalist, neoliberal and very much white supremacist system that continues to be the true vampire-like parasite**, sucking the lifeblood out of the people.8 Beyond Posthumanism Viewed from this angle, we can see how truly topsy-turvy is the parasite metaphor when it originates in the ruling ideology that deflects attention from the parasitic system of capital and projects its own contradictions onto false enemies. This practice is even deployed in much of the critical literature on climate change and the environment. For instance, we should even be hesitant deploying concepts like the Anthropocene and subscribing the fashionable idea that there is an Anthropocentrism at the core of our environmental troubles, for this merely abstracts from the historical relations of empire, capital, and class, as Jason W. Moore describes, displacing environmental and ecological crises onto an ill-conceived notion of humanity as a collective actor, and ignoring the class disparities so well represented in films like Parasite.9 Also unhelpful are the Object-Oriented Ontology and New Materialist thinkers, like Timothy Morton, who are on the brink of declaring that humans are the real parasite of the Earth.10 As Morton himself puts it, “In symbiosis, it’s unclear which is the top symbiont… Am I simply a vehicle for the numerous bacteria that inhabit my microbiome? Or are they hosting me? Who is the host and who is the parasite?”11 The danger in Morton’s contrasting of innocent and alive but nonhuman nature with the guilty and parasitical human species, is that it has the potential to devolve into nihilistic activism, such as “death politics.” For example, Patricia MacCormack’s The Ahuman Manifesto advocates for the cessation of human reproduction and the death of humans with calls for “an end to the human both conceptually as exceptionalized and actually as a species.”12 The risk in seeing humans (as a whole) as the uniform culprit of the global environmental catastrophe is that it misses the systemic forest for the individual trees. While right-wing governments compel and guilt the working class back to work to revivify the coronavirus-slumping economy, and while the anti-racist protesters are labelled “thugs” when demonstrating against a system that degrades and even murders their comrades, the theory of the Anthropocene ends up portraying the victims of the vampiristic system as themselves virus-like and parasitic. In this way, **the theory** of the Anthropocene **ends up supporting the ruling capitalist ideology by portraying humanity, not the capitalist system, just as so much of the historical portrayals of racialized and colonized peoples, as well as the working class, as viruses and parasites leeching off of the system**. With so much attention being paid to the problems of the Anthropocene, and less to those of the social relations of capitalism, it is no wonder that post-humanism is becoming the dominant ideology of twenty-first century capitalism. Post-humanism, that is, both as a critique of the hubris of previous historical humanisms, and as an ideology of transhumanist technological transcendence of the limitations of corporeal humanity. On both ends, the critique of humanism displaces the cause of our collective inter-species problems from the capitalist system onto humanity as such. Instead, we should focus our critical attention on the capitalist system, and demonstrate how capitalism is incompatible with all life. We need to move from the prism of the Anthropocene to that of the Capitalocene. Capitalism, rather than the people, is the real virus**, the true parasite upon our thriving in the world today**. What we need to learn is, not how to be post-human, but how to build and rethink a neo-humanism, in which, as Kate Soper puts it, human beings acknowledge our collective responsibility to each other, to the planet, and to other species – a humanism, that is, in which emancipation is both universal and equitably post-capitalist, and in which human agency drives action rather than the “objective” laws of the market.13 In other words, if capitalism is the parasite, then perhaps the project of Democratic Socialism, or something like it, is the cure. Fantasies of Emancipated Futures Parasite concludes, first with a bloody and violent climax where Ki-taek stabs Mr. Park to death in the middle of the family’s backyard party in a burst of violent outrage. Ki-taek then flees the scene and disappears from sight, confusing the police and the media about his whereabouts. Rather than read the film’s conclusion as an expression of the inevitable violence of the degraded and humiliated working class in the absence of a Socialist alternative, we might instead reflect upon the final moments of the film in which Ki-woo fantasizes about his father’s survival. It is unclear whether or not the final moments of the film are a fantasy scenario that he dreams up about his father. He seems to imagine that his father was able to go back into the bunker, hiding and evading the authorities after killing Mr. Park. Ki-woo imagines that one day he will be able to then earn enough money to buy the house and in that way set his father free. For some Posthumanist thinkers, such as Donna Haraway, the problem of the Anthropocene is in perceiving a time called the future that prohibits us from being fully present.14 Futurisms, according to her are what inevitably lead us toward our demise in a kind of dystopian chaos. We need to, as the title of her book claims, “stay with the trouble.” But can we really imagine telling those suffering from the exploitative and degrading conditions of capitalism, or those suffering from the COVID-19 pandemic, or those affected by rampant racism from an integrated system of white supremacy – can we really imagine saying to the abject: “don’t worry, just stay with the trouble”? Far from offering this un-sagely advice we should instead reflect upon the strategy of the film. **It is not by staying with the trouble, but by imagining emancipated futures that we will be driven to set ourselves free from the capitalist parasite.**

# Case

**Violence is a historical necessity for revolution- their position is ahistorical and privileged**

**Moufawad-Paul, 12** (Joshua holds a PhD in philosophy from York University, “Normative Pacifism and the Necessity of Violence”, http://moufawad-paul.blogspot.co.uk/2012/06/normative-pacifism-and-necessity-of.html)

Pacifism as revolutionary, the peaceful transition to socialism, is an ideology that consistently creeps into anti-capitalist circles. Although many of us feel that this ghost should have been exorcized long ago––and indeed there are innumerable great works that have been written to do just that––appeals to non-violence as a "moral principle", to Martin Luther King Jr. and Gandhi, or even to seizing power through a parliamentary party continue to linger. Especially at the centres of capitalism. Some of the students in a course I'm teaching part-time this summer, for example, truly believe that the anti-racist gains in the US during the 1960s and 1970s were all because of King's non-violent movement. Educated by a discourse that refuses to recognize that an armed movement existed parallel to, as well as eclipsed, King's the non-violent civil rights movement––and that these armed movements were actually the primary reason for any victories against racism––these students believe that non-violence works, is the only "just" way to achieve social change, and are psychologically resistant to other interpretations. Similarly, we are always taught about the "moral rightness" of Gandhi's struggle in India without any understanding of the other and violent struggles that had already broken British colonial rule, let alone any understanding that there are armed revolutions that have been going in India since British departure. In any case, there are only two significant examples of supposed non-violent "revolutions"; and the truth is that neither of these examples produced anything approaching socialism. Nor did they even succeed, by themselves, in making radical gains: they were dependent upon the armed revolts of other forces; when successes were gained because of the violence of the oppressed, the retreating oppressors, in an attempt to safe-guard their power from future and more damaging attacks, promoted a story about the morality of non-violence. A morality promoted at the expense of millions starving each year, crushed beneath the violence of the ruling classes who have worked very hard to teach us that pacifistic resistance––civil disobedience and legal struggle––is the only "ethical" way to change the world. Several months back I wrote about the universal applicability of Protracted Peoples War [PPW]. I was contrasting PPW with the theory of insurrection (the October Road where insurrection follows a period of protracted legal struggle), which is the only other general revolutionary method I take seriously. That is, I did not bother contrasting PPW with some nebulous theory of peaceful transition because I do not consider pacifism to possess methodological rigour (it lacks any serious understanding of history) or revolutionary potential (it has not, by itself, produced a revolution let alone a world historical revolution). Whatever my problems with the theory of insurrection, at least this theory admits that ruling class power needs to be smashed and that this smashing can only, in the end, be accomplished through violence. This is because those of us who take revolution seriously understand that revolutionary change can only happen when the ruling class and its institutions are smashed and placed under the class rule of the oppressed. Moreover, we understand that this will never happen if we simply wait for the ruling class to be convinced by our morality and rational arguments. The class that exists and persists only through the exploitation of those upon whom its existence is predicated will never concede without a violent struggle; they will (and they have) do everything to maintain their power. They even have, in Lenin's words, "special bodies of armed people" (police and soldiers), along with entire legal and ideological apparati, to ensure that they stay in power. And when they are challenged, they temporarily abandon the hegemonic wing of consent (the ideological realm where the ruled accept their oppression because they see the ideas of the ruling class as "common sense") and rely on coercion (where the state manifests as police and soldiers to suppress any challenge to ruling class power) to maintain their power. If a revolution is when the expropriators are expropriated, it isn't very difficult to understand that those who live a pretty good life expropriating others are going to fight tooth and nail to keep things as they are. **Parasites never quit being parasites because they're presented with a good argument.** (As an aside, just a week ago, when I was at a family wedding, I had a chance to speak with my partner's aunt's husband. Being a former soldier in the Canadian Army––who thankfully quit after observing the reality of Canada's brutal occupation of Afghanistan––he had a very basic and visceral understanding of political power. After starting a conversation about what I thought of the Quebec Student Strike, he asked "you're a communist, right?" I replied that I was and asked what he thought about that. His response was that, back when he was a soldier, he thought communism was wrong but, now that he works in the public sector and is observing the effects of the current economic crisis as well as all of the rebellions springing up around the world, he believes it is probably the only way to go. But then he told me that he didn't see how all of these chaotic and disorganized uprisings could change anything, especially if and when they were pacifistic. As a former soldier he understood that the state possessed organized armies and police that could smash any disorganized resistance and that, if there was to be any change, the people needed to have a similar force. Nor is his perspective anachronistic; the Black Panther movement, for example, was filled with former soldiers returning from Vietnam. And former soldiers understand, having been part of a force that exists to prosecute ruling class power, resistance cannot be peaceful.) While it might be true that some of those who advocate violent revolution are doing so for rather macho and masculinist reasons (these are the people, socialized by action movies, who think it is "exciting" rather than horrific to be running around with guns and kung-fu kicking class enemies), those who have thought through the theoretical problem of violence soberly, such as Mao Zedong or Frantz Fanon, generally understand that **violence is a tragic necessity**. Obviously, it would be better if the oppressors would just listen to our arguments, say "golly gee you make a good point and you're ethically correct!", and bow to the revolution. After all, why would anyone want to die fighting for a better society? Thus, the point is that violence is a factual necessity for revolution and factual necessities shouldn't be celebrated––they just are. We do not doubt that violent revolutions are tragic and that they have haunted post-revolutionary orders; **but this violence is far less tragic than the violent nightmare of everyday existence under capitalism**, and it will haunt us less than the bourgeois ideology that lingers after a revolution. But there is still that claim, common amongst those who argue for a peaceful tradition, that the "immorality" of violence is the main reason why revolutions fail. Revolutions eat their children, we are told, because they produce violent people and this violence is internalized. And though we cannot ignore the fact that there might be some truth to this claim, we also need to realize that this is a simplistic and ahistorical explanation for revolutionary failure. Not only is violence a tragic necessity, its post-revolutionary internalization is not the reason why revolutions have failed. Revolutions have failed primarily because class struggle continues under socialism, bourgeois ideology lingers, and sometimes bourgeois factions attempt to restore––also violently on their part––the previous state of affairs. The bigger problem is figuring out how to succeed in encouraging the past mode of production's ideology to wither away; it is not the violence of the children of the revolution that is the problem, but the fact that these children were socialized under the previous mode of production. Furthermore, those who imagine that the only "moral" strategy of social change is non-violence are generally unwilling to investigate why the bourgeois revolution(s) succeeded in establishing capitalism. Aside from shedding tears about the French Terrors, they really do not understand that the guillotining of the French aristocracy––as well as all of the violent revolutions that spread throughout Europe and succeeded in placing the former ruling class under the dictatorship of the rising bourgeoisie––are the only reason that those of us who live in capitalist modes of production aren't beholden to divine right and the Great Chain of Being. Really, are we still haunted by a moment in history when a bunch of vicious aristocrats were made to pay for centuries of oppression? And if the pacifist would like to claim that, yes, we are still haunted by historical moments like the French Revolution, then how far back does this haunting go: are we haunted by every act of historical violence, stretching back to primordial times, is this some sort of "original sin" we can never escape and, if so, then why bother imagining we can break this infinite chain of violence by practicing pacifism now? Better to simply concede to some Hobbesian state of nature and let things take their course… Whatever the case, I have always been interested in how the psychology of the proponent of non-violence creeps into the broader leftwing movement. Everyone who seeks to be respectable (as I discussed in the previous post about the concept of the lumpenproletariat) also seeks to abide by rules of pacifism––regardless of how much they celebrate past violent revolutions. Those who cringe at militancy, who argue that we need to take the "moral high-ground" or that direct action "harms the people" (this is not to say, I should point out here, that there are some acts of militant adventurism that might indeed harm the interests of the masses), who push for a "diversity of tactics" when they really mean "diversity of strategy"––these are all symptoms of this desire for a peaceful transition to socialism. Thus, this pacifism is another symptom of petty bourgeois ideology that affects all of us at the centres of capitalism, where a default opportunism (because of the labour aristocracy) is often normative. The continuous emergence of self-righteous pacifism at the imperial centres, then, should not be surprising. Considering the ideological state of these ruling territories of world capitalism, it makes sense that those who have lived their life in comfort will choose a comfortable form of resistance against their ruling class. Just as it makes sense that this ideology of comfortable resistance will affect even those who, theoretically, reject pacifism. And so, just as we at the centres of capitalism need to be attentive to all forms of default opportunism, we also need to be attentive to how we have been pacified into pacifism. None of this is to say that non-violent resistance cannot, sometimes, be a useful tactic––at points it might produce a media spectacle, drawing attention to the normative terror of the state. But we need to reject pacifism as a strategy, along with its ahistorical moralism, as well as be critical of how it is part of a normative discourse promoted by the state.

**Obviously, viewing disability within a social model is fine—but the aff’s fascination with technology as a method of becoming and transgression is what dissociates the physical pain of technology.**

**Reeve 12** (Donna, Honorary Research Fellow with the Centre for Disability Research, “Disability and Social Theory New Developments and Directions,” 2012, Chapter 6: Cyborgs, Cripples and iCrip: Reflections on the Contribution of Haraway to Disability Studies, <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137023001_6>, DOA: 9-19-2019) //Snowball

As part of her critique of the post-structural disabled subject, Erevelles (2001) argues strongly that there is danger in viewing disabled subjects as being able to

seek a pleasurable survival as a border-crosser in the ironic political myth of a cyborgean materiality. (Erevelles, 2001: 97)

While many disabled people do have intimate relationships with technology, guide dogs and ventilators which are necessary to everyday survival, this playful transgressing of boundaries so favoured by Haraway and subsequent theorists neglects the materiality of disablism, in other words, the social practices and cultural beliefs that underpin the disadvantage and exclusion experienced by people with impairments (Thomas, 2007: 13). The ease with which cyborg politics offers a new language and possibilities for marginalised groups risks erasing the actual struggles that many disabled people face for economic survival, especially in the majority world. Here the extreme poverty in some countries is exacerbated by the high numbers of people who become amputees as a result of war and landmines (Yeo and Moore, 2003) – cyborg politics would appear to have little relevance to these disabled people struggling simply to survive.

**Only the alt’s materialist framework explains the rise of disability as a site of oppression grounded in the transition from feudalism to capitalism and the internalization of ableism- the affs cultural focus fails to change the material conditions that make oppression inevitable**

**Taylor, 4** (Sunny Taylor is a disabled activist and theorist, “The Right Not to Work: Power and Disability”, Monthly Review Volume 55, Issue 10, March 2004)

Disability theorists make this clear by making a subtle but significant distinction between disability and impairment. The state of being mentally or physically challenged is what they term being impaired; with impairment comes personal challenges and drawbacks in terms of mental processes and physical mobility. To be impaired is to be missing a limb or born with a birth defect; it is a state of embodiment. Being impaired is hard. Without a doubt, it makes things harder than if one is not impaired. However, more often than not, the individual accommodates for this impairment and adapts to the best of their ability. For example, I am impaired by arthrogryposis, which limits the use of my arms, but I make up for this in many ways by using my mouth. Disability, in contrast, is the political and social repression of impaired people. This is accomplished by making them economically and socially isolated. Disabled people have limited housing options, are socially and culturally ostracized, and have very few career opportunities. The disabled community argues that these disadvantages are thus not due to impairment by its nature, but due to a cultural aversion to impairment, a lack of productive opportunity in the current economy for disabled people, and the multi-billion dollar industry that houses and “cares” for the disabled population that has developed as a consequence of this economic disenfranchisement. This argument is known as the social model of disability.5 Disablement is a political state and not a personal one and thus needs to be addressed as a civil rights issue. **Viewing disability in a materialistic framework demonstrates how this political repression functions.** Take disability theorist Brendan Gleeson’s adaptation of the analysis of Karl Marx, who defined nature as existing prior to and independent of human experience, and yet simultaneously as something that “attains its qualities and meanings by means of a transformative relationship of human labor.” Nature exists outside society as an objective reality, but it is also used and changed by humans to meet their needs. Marx used the notion of “two natures” to describe this historical transformation and he argued that this change was formed through human labor. Almost all of the terrestrial “natural world” has been somehow altered through human intervention, and nature is indissolubly connected to human society. Marx used this analysis of nature to show how the capitalist mode of production “altered nature so as to deny for much of humanity their species potential.” Nature pre-exists social formations, but is itself evolving also, not only due to biological and ecological factors, but also through human intervention. Each human relates to nature through their own physical experience as gendered, as aged, and as abled, and each experience of embodiment should be seen as both historically and socially evolved through natural elements. The body is both a biological fact and cultural artifact; “the former constitutes a pre-social organic base upon which the latter takes form.”6 Disability activists and theorists see impairment as equivalent to “first nature” and disability as an example of “second nature.” Marx and later theorists have shown how capitalist development has privileged certain biological forms of embodiment (for example white able-bodied males). Because of this, it is important when trying to understand the impact of space on bodies (for instance inaccessible buildings and transportation), to consider who is forming (and has formed) spaces and who inhabits them. The extreme inaccessibility and alienation felt by impaired people may not be a natural consequence of their own personal embodiments in the twenty-first century, but instead a complex system of historical, cultural, and geographical discrimination that has evolved inside and alongside capitalism and that we now simply regard (and too frequently dismiss) as disability. Crippled and elderly people have an especially precarious relationship to the machine that is production and consumption. People work hard, they age, their efficiency inevitably lessens and, unless they are fortunate enough to have some savings stashed away, they are too often put in nursing homes where their new value will be as “beds.” As Marta Russell has astutely pointed out, the institutionalization of disabled people “evolved from the cold realization that people with disabilities could be commodified…People with disabilities are ‘worth’ more to the Gross Domestic Product when occupying a bed in an institution than when they’re living in their own homes.”7 **Gleeson argues that with the transition from feudalism to capitalism, impaired people became unproductive members of society and thus disabled**. The rise of commodity relations profoundly changed those processes of social embodiment that originated in work patterns. In particular this political-economic shift lessened the ability of impaired people to make meaningful contributions to their family and households. Markets introduced into peasant households an abstract social evaluation of work potential based upon the law of value; that is to say, the competition of labor-powers revealed as average socially necessary labor times. **This productivity rule devalorized the work potential of anyone who could not produce at socially necessary rates. As households were progressively drawn into dependence upon the competitive sale of labor-power, their ability to host “slow” or “dependent” members was greatly reduced**.8 Due to the social arrangement of peasantry in medieval Europe, impaired people were commonly integrated into the economic and social system, Gleeson explains. “The feudal peasantry was characterized by a relatively intimate union between domesticity and labor,” which allowed for the social use of the various skills and abilities of the impaired. Most of the impaired lived with their families and did contribute to their household’s economy. Due to the self-sufficient economy of feudal society each member of the household had to contribute some form of labor so as to balance out their own needs. Because of the abundance of jobs that needed to be done to keep a household fed and warm, it was almost always possible for an impaired member of the house to contribute. It seems the concept of the helpless had not been invented yet, and challenged people were expected to contribute what they could. **“The material context of feudal production allowed peasant households a great degree of liberty in designing everyday tasks that would match the corporeal capacities of each family member.”**9 **This is not to say the feudal era was a utopian time for the impaired, but instead is an attempt to demonstrate that our current conception of disability and the position of the disabled are not absolute and should be challenged and changed.** In contemporary American rhetoric there is a strong emphasis on independence and self-sufficiency. America is the country where everyone has the opportunity to become “independent.” A person, if strong enough, can lift herself up by her bootstraps and own the American dream of a nice new car, a big house, and a good retirement plan; or better yet, she can live the new American dream and become rich, famous, and beautiful. **Independence is perhaps prized beyond all else in this country and for disabled people this means that our lives are automatically seen as tragically dependent**. Michael Oliver, like many disability theorists, argues that dependence is relative. We as a society are all dependent on each other. The difference between the way the disabled community sees dependence, and how the rest of society views it, is that there is not so much emphasis on individual physical independence. “Professionals tend to define independence in terms of self-care activities such as washing, dressing, toileting, cooking and eating without assistance. Disabled people, however, define independence differently, seeing it as the ability to be in control of and make decisions about one’s life, rather than doing things alone or without help.”10 Today, independence is more about an individual being in control of their own services (be it education, plumbing, electrical, medical, dietary, or personal care), than it is about an individual being completely physically self-sufficient; this is true not only for the disabled population, but for the population in general. This ideal of physical self-sufficiency is a byproduct of the rhetoric of economic self-sufficiency. But no one partakes in American capitalism independently; there is no such thing as a “self-made” individual. In this respect, able-bodied people should take a second look at the position of disabled people; perhaps, ultimately, their position as interdependent is not so at odds with the position all able-bodied people occupy. A huge part of the stigma attached to being disabled is that due to disabled people’s physical dependence, they are seen as burdens (because they can’t work according to our current standardized economic system). The more impaired someone is the more of a burden they are. In actuality, the only reason that many people are a burden on their family and friends is that they have such limited options. People who try to live independently with the help of loved ones often find that it is next to impossible because the state has no independent living options and so the burden is indeed too great to take on individually. Thus many people, simply due to financial constraints, have no other option but to be put in an institution. **In our society it is not the impairment that is the only reason for dependence; it is our impaired system of social services.** In my life I have experienced both extreme physical dependence and relative physical independence. I spent years as a preteen trying to figure out how to dress myself and take myself to the bathroom. This was out of a complete conviction that if I were not physically independent I would forever be a burden on my family and that I’d never be free to have my own life. Because of the way the personal care system is set up now, it is true that being physically self-sufficient in these matters has made my life easier simply because I do not have to worry about institutionalization or fighting for a personal care attendant. However, my life has not changed that dramatically with the ability to pee or change my clothes when I want to, and I have since realized how little it affected my ego or my daily routine. The issues that caused me worry during this period were not things that directly were caused by my physical limitations (I was not embarrassed by needing help), but were indirectly caused because of the stigma others attached to needing help and by the worry that these physical necessities could lead me into a life without choices.

**Communism is uniquely key to abolish the violence of disability**

**RedEd ‘11** (May 22 2011 Communism: The real movement to abolish disability, https://libcom.org/library/communism-real-movement-abolish-disability)

The following article is a tentative attempt to combine communist theory with the insights of disability activists and theorists in order to promote revolutionary approaches to understanding and overcoming the oppression of disabled people. Communism: The real movement to abolish disability The dominant ideas of the ruling class are the dominant ideas of the age. As revolutionaries we know this and must constantly be alert to the ways in which they influence and limit our own conception of how things are and where they might go. We are alert to the fact that in our popular culture it is easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism. In the revolutionary milieu we reject -with varying degrees of success- the universality of wage labour, the state, the nuclear family and so on. In the piece I want to focus on an area most revolutionaries never bring into their analysis of political economy: disability. Disability, I will argue, is a feature of present day social relations, that it is specific to capitalism, that it will not go away as long as capitalism persists and finally that communism presents the answer to the problem of disability. In doing so I locate disability firmly in ‘the present state of things’ that Marx argued communists must seek to abolish. What is disability? Disability as it is commonly tacitly understood as the category we use to group together people whose bodies or minds are in some way defective. We have a certain conception of how bodies and minds ought to be, and people who deviate too much from that template we call disabled. Disability is usually thought of in terms of what people are not able to do: seeing, concentrating, walking, communicating and so on. Disabled people cannot do some important thing. Their ability to function is impaired. This conception of disability makes two important assumptions. First, it assumes that there is some ‘natural’ set of characteristics that non-defective people have, deviation from which we can call disability. Second, it assumes that society is, in some universal sense, a place where for a person to be living optimally they must be able to do all the things that the non-disabled reification Template Man (and he is a man) can do and that people who can’t present some sort of problem needing to be, by turns, managed, cared for and ignored. But where do these assumptions come from? Template Man is an elusive figure. He is usually only visible by inspecting his opposite. By seeing that a deaf person can’t hear and that a person with fatigue needs to sleep 11 hours a night, we know that Template Man can hear and sleeps eight hours a night. But quite why Template Man must be able to hear, we can’t say. These two features of Template Man are fairly universal throughout the capitalist world. But others are much more variable. For example in some parts of the world Template Man finds that meeting new people and moving jobs and houses comes easily to him. We know this because by examining pathologies such as social anxiety disorder, which are in part characterised by not being able to do these things, we know that Template Man can do these things. But in other parts of the world no such pathologies are apparent and Template Man neither has nor does not have these characteristics. So where is the key to this strange metaphysical entity defined only through deviations from him? Template Man is, of course, the ideal worker as defined by the needs of capital at any given moment and in any given place. Template man is negatively defined precisely because capital has no interest in nature of individual workers, or workers as individuals. Workers must be able to do certain things for certain periods of time. Everything else about them is irrelevant to the needs of capital. Workers must be able to sell their labour according to the needs of a large enough segment of the employing class that they can fulfil their role as commodities on the labour market. Workers must also be able to ‘reproduce’ (feed, rest, clean, relax, etc.) themselves for the cost of the wages they can command and in the time they are not having to sell their ability to work. Workers also need to take part in the purchasing of commodities capitalism uses to reproduce itself, from housing to entertainment to insurance. Bodies and minds which are not well adjusted to the tasks involved in carrying out these functions are disabled. They are at odds with the demands of capital in that place and time. To illustrate using the final example from the paragraph above, social anxiety stands in the way of the sale of labour power in Britain today since capital demands we be able to move around quickly and easily in order to do so and the content of much work in many industries involved interacting in a ‘friendly’ manner with strangers. There are plenty of communities in the world where almost none of the wage labour involves these things, and in these communities there is also no need for the idea of social anxiety disorder, and this is reflected in medical practice. You can't get a social anxiety disorder diagnosis in most of China, for instance (thought this may not last). To give another example, the explosion in Britain of diagnoses of specific learning disorders, such as dyslexia, has gone hand in hand with rising demand for more literate, numerate workers and the increased difficulty workers have reproducing themselves outside of work without these skills. We should also notice another implication of the fact that Template Man is negatively defined. Being able to do things well, or do things most people can’t, has nothing to do with disability. Disability is about what a person cannot do, not about what they can. The implications of this are quite important, as we will see later when we examine the first half of the dictum ‘from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs’. The failure of reformism In the reformist notion of disability the problem of disability is a problem of inclusion. The basic category ‘disabled’ is taken as given (or natural), and the task of the reformer is to win changes in the institutions, buildings, etc. that disabled people want to use so that they can start to approach the level of access to things that non-disabled people have. In the technical jargon of the movement ‘reasonable adjustments’ should be made so that a person’s impairment (a characteristic such as chronic illness, autism, down’s syndrome or whatever) does not stop them accessing things as easily as people who do not have impairments. The extent to which they cannot access these things on an equitable basis is the extent to which they are disabled according to this view. As usual, the revolutionary examining the reformists’ approach has a great deal of sympathy for their goals, but also sees the forces that contradict the aims of the reformists, and which will, at a certain point, overpower them. Our aim is to remove such forces, not fight an interminable battle against them. If, as we have seen, disabled people are people who, as a group, cannot be easily integrated into the logic of capital then there is only so far they can go towards equality before capital starts to push them back. Of course, the reformist approach will win victories. Indeed, they will often appeal to the smooth functioning of capital in order to do so. For example, in the UK a program called ‘access to work’ has helped disabled people get jobs by funding equipment, building alterations and so on which mean that the labour power of particular disabled people is raised in value so it can compete in the labour market with that of non-disabled people. To give a simple illustration of how this works, there is no point in a company hiring a wheel chair user if their building cannot be accessed by them, and there’s no point splashing out on ramps if a similar worker can be hired instead, but if the state pays for the ramps, then the wheelchair user represents good value to the employer in the labour market. The state wins in this deal too, since through access to work it shifts people off of benefits and into work, and the scheme payed for itself through the tax revenue of the disabled people it got into employment alone. However, when there is a glut of unemployed labour and when the state is cutting benefits for disabled people anyway, the logic of the scheme breaks down since non-disabled people are there to do the jobs without the state expending money, and disabled people are ‘costing’ the state less anyway. Given that those are the conditions we are now living in, access to work is being scrapped. We should not, of course, deny the important role of disabled people in winning concessions from the state. The dynamic is not simply one of the state managing disabled people so as to maximise profits for bosses. Disabled people, like the working class in general, struggle and win concessions and in doing so alter the operation of capitalism. But when these concessions start to get in the way of the functioning of capital, it becomes extremely difficult to defend them. In times like this, when the conditions of the entire working class are under attack, it should come as no surprise that those sectors of the working class who are least well integrated in capital should be hit the hardest and this includes disabled people. Finally, it is worth noting that as disabled people win more and more concessions from the state due to their desire to participate in capitalist society on an equal footing, the more dependent they will become on the state, and when, as inevitably will happen, the state rolls back their victories, it will hit them much harder. These contradictions within the disability rights movement must lead us on to look for more radical solutions to the problem. The abolition of disability The abolition of disability has been a goal of many social movements and popular fantasies under capitalism. Examples of this abound. Eugenics had its heyday in Nazi Germany, but significantly predates Nazism and is a tendency that is still with us in attempts to make sure no children with down’s syndrome are born by scanning and aborting foetuses, to ‘managing’ the sexual behaviour of people with profound learning difficulties or mental health conditions, to flat out murder dressed up as ‘mercy killing’. Less despicable, but structurally similar, are the techno-fantasies that imagine that with the right medical science, no one need be disabled in the future. What these approaches have in common is that they do not wish to do away with disability; they wish to do away with disabled people. Since disability is not simply a collection of individuals, but a feature of capitalist social relations, their approaches are doomed to failure regardless of how morally acceptable we do or don’t find them. If disability is a feature particular to capitalism, and if communism abolishes capitalism, it follows then that communism abolishes disability. But how does it do this? It’s always dangerous to sketch out, even in the broadest terms, possible future societies. However, we may risk a few comments explaining why disability cannot exist under communism. Taking communist society characterised to be characterised by self management of production and life in general, and where the slogan ‘from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs’ is applied, it is possible to see how disability can be done away with. It is easy to see how the phrase ‘to each according to their needs’ will abolish an aspect of disability. If we produce for need rather than profit there is no reason why we should not chose to produce buildings, equipment, technologies and so on that are designed on the assumption that physical and psychological variation of all sorts is a normal part of human society and that it is right to take this fully into account when producing thing for people to use. The phrase ‘from each according to their ability’ less obviously deals with disability, but is in fact more fundamental to understanding why communism abolishes it. As we have seen, disability is defined by people’s inability to do certain things that they are supposed, as good worker, to be able to do. Under capitalism workers are interchangeable. We are only allowed to produce (or, for that matter, consume) in ways designed to maximise profit. In a society where production is self managed and for use, it would be inconceivable to prevent people from contributing to society on the grounds of what they were unable to do, when there was a great number of things that they could do. In societies with less abundance than western capitalism, there simply has not been the surplus to allow people to go without contributing, albeit often in horrifically exploitative ways. Capitalism has created both the necessary surplus and the logic of production to stop disabled people in particular, and the working class in general, from contributing fully or often at all. Communism, through the self management of production according to the principle that people contribute in the ways they are most able to, overcomes capitalism’s exclusionary practice and overcomes the logic of alienation upon which capitalist production is built. The full and equal integration of all people into the reproduction of society, regardless of factors such as impairment, is surely the goal of communism and the foundation of a society in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

**You should be willing to affirm Humanism as a fundamentally African project to start working towards a better future.**

**Wilder 16** ― Gary Wilder, Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of New York, Ph.D. in anthropology and history from the University of Chicago, former Fellow at the Mellon Foundation, 2016. (“Here/Hear Now Aimé Césaire!”, The South Atlantic Quarterly, July 2016, Available Online at: <https://www.academia.edu/27869922/Here_Hear_Now_Aim%C3%A9_C%C3%A9saire_South_Atlantic_Quarterly_?auto=download> Accessed 9-8-17)

These key terms illuminate crucial aspects of what made Césaire a distinctive thinker whose critical voice may continue to resonate for us today. But in order to attend to Césaire as he did his predecessors—as a contemporary— we should recognize how his intellectual orientation and insights brush against the grain of many current theoretical tendencies. In both critical theory and postcolonial studies, the standard operation is to unmask purportedly universal categories as socially constructed, culturally particular, and implicated in practices, systems, and logics of domination. These are indispensable critical moves. But this approach often **devolves into a hunt for** traces of universalism or **humanism**, whether in textual artifacts or political projects, in order to reveal the regressive or oppressive essence of the object. This “aha” moment thus becomes the **punch line of the discussion** rather than the **starting point for analysis**. Such fears of complicity with power do not only belie a longing for intellectual and political purity. They also make it difficult to think dialectically, to identify aspects of given arrangements that may **point beyond their actually existing forms**. The current insistence on negative critique also makes scholars reluctant to identify desirable alternatives and **specify** the kind of world they might want to create. But **what do we concede** if we are unable or unwilling to risk affirming more just, more human, ways of being to which we can say “yes”? It is not easy for radical thinkers to reconcile a **nonprescriptive orientation** to a radically open future with the imperative to envision more desirable arrangements (Coronil 2011). But ignoring or deferring the challenge does not make it disappear. Following anticolonial thinkers like Césaire, especially those located within the black Atlantic critical tradition, may remind us **not to forfeit categories** such as freedom, justice, democracy, solidarity, and humanity to the dominant actors who have **instrumentalized and degraded them**. Given this dilemma, the attention paid to Vivek Chibber’s recent polemic against subaltern studies is not surprising. Such attention, however, seems to be less about the merits of his universalist Marxism than about a sense of some of the limitations and impasses into which certain currents of postcolonial thinking have led (Chibber 2013).7 Partha Chatterjee himself has recently written, “The task, as it now stands, cannot . . . be taken forward within the framework of the concepts and methods mobilized in Subaltern Studies . . . what is needed are new projects” (2012a: 44). He suggests that such projects should probably focus on “cultural history” and “popular culture” with a renewed focus on visual materials and embodied practices rather than written texts and on ethnography rather than intellectual history. Moreover, he links this invitation to study “the ethnographic, the practical, the everyday and the local” to a focus on subnational “regional formations” and “minority cultures” and languages whose specificities, he observes, had not been sufficiently engaged by earlier subaltern studies research on “India,” “Pakistan,” or “Bangladesh” (47–49). Valuable as such studies would surely be, it is not clear how a renewed focus on locality, with place-based assumptions about territory, consciousness, and categories, could do the kind of critical work necessary to grasp the deep shifts in political logics, structures, and practices that characterize the world-historical present. On the contrary, such approaches risk reproducing precisely the culturalist and territorialist assumptions about political identification and affiliation that need to be rethought in light of contemporary conditions.8 Chatterjee’s surprising emphasis on local ethnography seems consistent with one trend in postcolonial thinking that risks reviving the types of civilizational thinking, and associated assumptions about origins and authenticity, that it had earlier set out to dismantle (Chakrabarty 2007; Mah- mood 2005; Mignolo 2011). Consider the important ways that Talal Asad has invited us to rethink liberal assumptions about “tradition,” with respect to liberal and nonliberal forms of life. In dialogue with Ludwig Wittgenstein and Alasdair MacIntyre, Asad (1986) has developed a powerful critique of liberal secularism—and the secularist logic that subtends many modern liberal states—from the standpoint of embodied and discursive traditions. On the one hand, he reminds us that “Islamic tradition” is neither singular nor unchanging; it is a structured and dynamic space for reasoned argument. On the other hand, he reminds us that despite liberalism’s claims to post- traditional neutrality, it too constitutes a particular tradition (albeit one that defines itself in opposition to inherited, embodied, and practice-oriented forms of tradition-based reasoning). Asad’s genealogical insights have rightly informed recent critiques of Western liberal ideologies, states, and politics especially regarding their arrogant, condescending, and violent responses to tradition-rooted practices and practitioners, whether outside or inside the West. But his interventions, however unintentionally, have also led scholars to establish dubious chains of equivalence between modernity, the West, and liberalism. Such operations seem to disregard Asad’s important invitation to understand traditions as capacious, heterogeneous, and dynamic spaces of inquiry, disputation, and revision, **not simply** as a set of rigid behavioral scripts, unchanging cultural formulas, or dogmatic ideological precepts. This reduction of political modernity to a **one-dimensional liberalism obscures**, for example, the many currents of progressive antiliberalism within the tradition of modern Western political thought. It fails to recognize the significant number of non-European colonial intellectuals engaged in anti-imperial struggles who were **active participants** in such “traditions within traditions.” It also disregards the **contradictions within and redeemable fragments** of even liberal political thinking, fragments that, if realized, might **point far beyond**, and possibly **explode, liberalism itself**. **To reify modern or Western politics into a static and stereotypical liberalism is to risk practicing an unfortunate form of “Occidentalism”** that would **reinforce archaic civilizational assumptions about incommensurable and unrelated worlds** (and worldviews) and **disregard the actual history** and open possibilities for practices of cross-cultural solidarity whereby anti-imperial actors outside Europe could **enter into dialogue** or affiliate with, or even discover ways that they are **already situated** within, counterhegemonic “Western” political traditions. Critics have rightly mobilized singularity, incommensurability, or untranslatability against liberal attempts to discover an abstract humanity and thereby discount situated and embodied forms of life. But the question is whether we treat incommensurability or untranslatability as an epistemological or political limit or as an always imperfect starting point for practices of dialogue, coordination, affiliation, reciprocity, solidarity. For isn’t the impossibility of full transparency or undifferentiated unity simply the unavoidable condition within which all communication, sociality, and politics must be attempted?9 My point is not to congratulate dissident currents within the West, let alone to recuperate liberalism. It is rather to approach radical and emancipatory politics from a place of not-already-knowing, of not presuming to know a priori which aspects of a tradition are irredeemable, which traditions may become allies or habitations, what the boundaries of (thoroughly plastic) traditions must be. This nondogmatic and experimental orientation to politics, traditions, and concepts is one of the most precious and timely gifts that Césaire may offer to us now. He practiced a concrete cosmopolitan relationship to modern traditions of philosophy, aesthetics, and politics, one that was highly developed by the robust tradition of black Atlantic criticism within which he was firmly rooted along with predecessors (e.g., Toussaint and W. E. B. DuBois), contemporaries (e.g., C. L. R. James, James Baldwin, Suzanne Césaire, Senghor), and descendants (e.g., Fanon, Edouard Glissant, Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Achille Mbembe, David Scott). Understandable concerns about totalizing explanation and Eurocentric evaluation have led a generation of scholars to insist on the incommensurable alterity of non-European forms of thought. But perhaps we should be concerned less exclusively with unmasking universalisms as covert European particularism than with also challenging the assumption that the universal is European property. I read Césaire not in order to provincialize European concepts but to deprovincialize Antillean thinking. Césaire’s critical reworkings remind us that the supposedly European categories of political modernity properly **belong as much to the African and Caribbean actors who coproduced them** as to the inhabitants of continental Europe. Similarly, African and Caribbean thinkers, no less than their continental counterparts, produced abstract and general propositions about “humanity,” “history,” and “the world.” In contrast to invocations of multiple modernities, Césaire never granted to Europe possession of a modernity or universality or humanity that was **always already translocal and fundamentally Caribbean**. He never treated self-determination, emancipation, freedom, equality, or justice as essentially European and foreign. Césaire’s intellectual and political interventions radically challenged reductive territorialist approaches to social thought. He refused to concede that “France” was an ethnic or continental entity, that Martinique was not in some real way internal to “French” society and politics, or that he was situated outside of modern critical traditions. Thus his ongoing and unapologetic engagements with Hegel, Marx, Proudhon, Nietzsche, Lautréamont, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, Bergson, Freud, Breton, Frobenius, and Lenin, alongside his many African, Antillean, and African American interlocutors. The sonic blurring between “here” and “hear” in the title of this essay is meant to signal not only the contemporaneity of Césaire’s thought for us here now but the imperative that we open ourselves to his presence and recognize his actuality across the epochal divide by hearing what he actually said. This gesture builds on Walter Benjamin’s insight that every now is a “now of recognizability” whereby “what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation” through which past epochs become newly legible (1999: 462). I also follow Césaire himself, who engaged in dialogue with predecessors as if they were contemporaries and who addressed future interlocutors directly as if they were already present. Like Benjamin, Césaire practiced a form of **radical remembrance** that connected outmoded pasts to **charged presents**. This attention to vital histories was bound up with a poetic politics that identified transformative possibilities **dwelling within existing arrangements** and a proleptic politics that anticipated seemingly impossible futures by trying to enact them concretely in the here and now. But Césaire can only speak to us now if we listen rather than presume to know what someone like him in his situation must have, or should have, been saying. Until very recently, scholarship on his work has been overdetermined by methodological nationalism (that puzzles over his refusal to pursue state sovereignty), identitarian culturalism (that debates how adequately Césaire expressed Antillean lived experience and whether or not he was an essentialist), and a disciplinary division of labor (that too often splits his poetry, criticism, and politics into separate domains). Generally, Cold War scholarship was shaped by a need to evaluate him in relation to canonical anticolonial nationalists and fit him into a narrative of decolonization-as-national-independence. This has made it difficult to recognize the epochal character, world-making ambition, and global sensibility of his political reflections. Faced with the promise of decolonization, Césaire conjugated concrete acts with political imagination in ways that displaced conventional oppositions between aesthetics and politics, realism and utopia, pragmatism and principle. Such efforts were animated by what I have been calling radical literalism and utopian realism and which he called inflection and poetic knowledge. He regarded freedom as a problem whose institutional solution was not self-evident and could only be situational. His interventions demonstrated the nonnecessary relationship between colonial emancipation, popular sovereignty, and self-determination, on the one hand, and territorial state sovereignty and national liberation, on the other. He pursued cosmopolitan aims concretely through transcultural practices and by attempting to invent new political forms through which to ground plural and postnational democratic arrangements. We should recognize that Césaire formulated a critique not of Western civilization from the standpoint of African or Antillean culture but of modern Western racism, imperialism, and capitalism from the standpoint of Antillean and African historical situations and experiences. More generally, it was a critique of an alienated and alienating modernity from the standpoint of embodied and poetic ways of being, knowing, and relating (to self, others, and world). Above all, Césaire recognized residues of, and resources for, more just, human, and integrated ways of living together within Antillean, African, and European texts, traditions, forms, histories, and conditions. In his view, Antilleans—as culturally particular actors, imperial subjects, New World denizens, moderns, and humans—were their rightful heirs. He was concerned less with defining culturally authentic concepts, spaces, and arrangements for Antilleans (apart from Europe or uncontaminated by modernity) than with overcoming imperialism, in solidarity with other struggling peoples, in order to establish less alienated forms of human life globally. Remembering Césaire’s insistence that modern currents of radicalism were shared legacies and common property may help us to **rethink inherited assumptions** about the relation between territory, ethnicity, consciousness, and interest (Buck-Morss 2009, 2010). They invite us to deterritorialize social thought and to decolonize intellectual history. This is a matter not of valorizing non-European forms of knowledge, as important as such a move certainly is, but of questioning the presumptive boundaries of “Europe” itself—by recognizing the larger scales on which modern social thought was forged and of appreciating that colonial societies produced self-reflexive thinkers concerned with large-scale processes and future prospects. We can thereby recognize Césaire as a situated postwar thinker of the postwar world, one of whose primary aims was to place into question the very categories “France,” “Europe,” and “the West” by way of an immanent critique of late imperial politics. He envisioned postnational arrangements through which humanity could attempt to overcome the alienating antinomies that had impoverished the quality of life in overseas colonies and European metropoles. His **situated humanism and concrete cosmopolitanism** should thus be placed in a **constellation of modern emancipatory thinking** oriented toward **worldwide human freedom** that included antiracist, anti-imperial, internationalist, and socialist thinkers from a range of traditions: black Atlantic, First Internationalist, global anarchist, Western Marxist, Marxist humanist, Third Worldist.