## 1NC

### 1

#### A. Our interpretation is that the affirmative should have to instrumentally defend the institutional implementation of a topical plan.

#### B. Violation – the aff doesn’t defend a plan.

#### C. Best for fairness.

#### 1. Plan focus is the only predictable way of affirming the resolution. Philosophical and theoretical concerns certainly play into the ways that policies are made, but the resolution only calls for us to defend and/or question political-institutional implementations of these kinds of concerns.

#### 2. Plan focus is the only way to ensure a fair division of ground. The affirmative has the advantage of trying to solve the most heinous problems of the status quo—without plan focus, debates devolve into whether or not things like racism, sexism, classism, or homophobia are good or bad. While problems are often less contestable, solutions to these problems are—we can debate about whether or not a particular proposal will fix or worsen these problems and proffer our own solutions.

#### D. Best for education:

#### Their infatuation to theoretical purity makes political and institutional engagement impossible. Political engagement is always cast against the theoretical purity of abstract philosophizing. This also turns their argument because, despite their radical aspirations, critique smuggles metaphysical distinctions between thinking and acting, purity and impurity, and truth and falsity into the judge’s decisionmaking calculus.

Yar 2k (Majid, Ph.D in the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University, “Arendt's Heideggerianism: Contours of a `Postmetaphysical' Political Theory?,” *Cultural Values*, Volume 4, Issue 1, January, Academic Search Complete)

Similarly, we must consider the consequences that this 'ontological substitution' for the essence of the political has for politics, in terms of what is practically excluded by this rethinking. If the presently available menu of political engagements and projects (be they market or social liberalism, social democracy, communitarianism, Marxism, etc.) are only so many moments of the techno-social completion of an underlying metaphysics, then the fear of 'metaphysical contamination' inhibits any return to recognisable political practices and sincere engagement with the political exigencies of the day. This is what Nancy Fraser has called the problem of 'dirty hands', the suspension of engagement with the existing content of political agendas because of their identification as being in thrall to the violence of metaphysics. Unable to engage in politics as it is, one either [a] sublimates the desire for politics by retreating to an interrogation of the political with respect to its essence (Fraser, 1984, p. 144), or [b] on this basis, seeks 'to breach the inscription of a wholly other politics'. The former suspends politics indefinitely, while the latter implies a new politics, which, on the basis of its reconceived understanding of the political, apparently excludes much of what recognizably belongs to politics today. This latter difficulty is well known from Arendt's case, whose barring of issues of social and economic justice and welfare from the political domain are well known. To offer two examples: [1] in her commentary on the U.S. civil rights movement in the 1950s, she argued that the politically salient factor which needed challenging was only racial legislation and the formal exclusion of African-Americans from the political sphere, not discrimination, social deprivation and disadvantage, etc.(Arendt, 1959, pp. 45-56); [2] Arendt's pronounceraent at a conference in 1972 (put under question by Albrecht Wellmer regarding her distinction of the 'political' and the 'social'), that housing and homelessness were not political issues, that they were external to the political as the sphere of the actualisation of freedom as disclosure; the political is about human self-disclosure in speech and deed, not about the distribution of goods, which belongs to the social realm as an extension of the oikos.[20] The point here is not that Arendt and others are in any sense unconcerned or indifferent about such sufferings, deprivations and inequalities. Rather, it is that such disputes and agendas are identified as belonging to the socio-technical sphere of administration, calculation, instrumentality, the logic of means and ends, subject-object manipulation by a will which turns the world to its purposes, the conceptual rendering of beings in terms of abstract and levelling categories and classes, and so on; they are thereby part and parcel of the metaphysical-technological understanding of Being, which effaces the unique and singular appearance and disclosure of beings, and thereby illegitimate candidates for consideration under the renewed, ontological-existential formulation of the political. To reconceive the political in terms of a departure from its former incarnation as metaphysical politics, means that the revised terms of a properly political discourse cannot accommodate the prosaic yet urgent questions we might typically identify under the rubric of 'policy'. Questions of social and economic justice are made homeless, exiled from the political sphere of disputation and demand in which they were formerly voiced. Indeed, it might be observed that the postmetaphysical formulation of the political is devoid of any content other than the freedom which defines it; it is freedom to appear, to disclose, but not the freedom to do something in particular, in that utilising freedom for achieving some end or other implies a collapse back into will, instrumentality, teleocracy, poeisis, etc. By defining freedom qua disclosedness as the essence of freedom and the sole end of the political, this position skirts dangerously close to advocating politique pour la politique, divesting politics of any other practical and normative ends in the process.[21]

#### Institutions are inevitable – have to work through them in order to solve the affirmative.

Wight – Professor of IR @ University of Sydney – 6

(Colin, Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology, pgs. 48-50

One important aspect of this relational ontology is that these relations constitute our identity as social actors. According to this relational model of societies, one is what one is, by virtue of the relations within which one is embedded. A worker is only a worker by virtue of his/her relationship to his/her employer and vice versa. ‘Our social being is constituted by relations and our social acts presuppose them.’ At any particular moment in time an individual may be implicated in all manner of relations, each exerting its own peculiar causal effects. This ‘lattice-work’ of relations constitutes the structure of particular societies and endures despite changes in the individuals occupying them. Thus, the relations, the structures, are ontologically distinct from the individuals who enter into them. At a minimum, the social sciences are concerned with two distinct, although mutually interdependent, strata. There is an ontological difference between people and structures: ‘people are not relations, societies are not conscious agents’. Any attempt to explain one in terms of the other should be rejected. If there is an ontological difference between society and people, however, we need to elaborate on the relationship between them. Bhaskar argues that we need a system of mediating concepts, encompassing both aspects of the duality of praxis into which active subjects must fit in order to reproduce it: that is, a system of concepts designating the ‘point of contact’ between human agency and social structures. This is known as a ‘positioned practice’ system. In many respects, the idea of ‘positioned practice’ is very similar to Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus*. Bourdieu is primarily concerned with what individuals do in their daily lives. He is keen to refute the idea that social activity can be understood solely in terms of individual decision-making, or as determined by surpa-individual objective structures. Bourdieu’s notion of the *habitus* can be viewed as a bridge-building exercise across the explanatory gap between two extremes. Importantly, the notion of a habitus can only be understood in relation to the concept of a ‘social field’. According to Bourdieu, a social field is ‘a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions objectively defined’. A social field, then, refers to a structured system of social positions occupied by individuals and/or institutions – the nature of which defines the situation for their occupants. This is a social field whose form is constituted in terms of the relations which define it as a field of a certain type. A *habitus* (positioned practices) is a mediating link between individuals’ subjective worlds and the socio-cultural world into which they are born and which they share with others. The power of the habitus derives from the thoughtlessness of habit and habituation, rather than consciously learned rules. The habitus is imprinted and encoded in a socializing process that commences during early childhood. It is inculcated more by experience than by explicit teaching. Socially competent performances are produced as a matter of routine, without explicit reference to a body of codified knowledge, and without the actors necessarily knowing what they are doing (in the sense of being able adequately to explain what they are doing). As such, the *habitus* can be seen as the site of ‘internalization of reality and the externalization of internality.’ Thus social practices are produced in, and by, the encounter between: (1) the *habitus* and its dispositions; (2) the constraints and demands of the socio-cultural field to which the habitus is appropriate or within; and (3) the dispositions of the individual agents located within both the socio-cultural field and the *habitus*. When placed within Bhaskar’s stratified complex social ontology the model we have is as depicted in Figure 1. The explanation of practices will require all three levels. Society, as field of relations, exists prior to, and is independent of, individual and collective understandings at any particular moment in time; that is, social action requires the conditions for action. Likewise, given that behavior is seemingly recurrent, patterned, ordered, institutionalised, and displays a degree of stability over time, there must be sets of relations and rules that govern it. Contrary to individualist theory, these relations, rules and roles are not dependent upon either knowledge of them by particular individuals, or the existence of actions by particular individuals; that is, their explanation cannot be reduced to consciousness or to the attributes of individuals. These emergent social forms must possess emergent powers. This leads on to arguments for the reality of society based on a causal criterion. Society, as opposed to the individuals that constitute it, is, as Foucault has put it, ‘a complex and independent reality that has its own laws and mechanisms of reaction, its regulations as well as its possibility of disturbance. This new reality is society…It becomes necessary to reflect upon it, upon its specific characteristics, its constants and its variables’.

### 2

#### 1. Postmodernism and the deconstruction process reinforce capitalism – this methodology fails to produce any type of social change and serves to disempower the oppressed

Cole 3 (Mike, Professor of Communication and Psychology at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, United Kingdom, “Might It Be in the Practice That It Fails to Succeed? A Marxist Critique of Claims for Postmodernism and Poststructuralism as Forces for Social Change and Social Justice”, British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Sep., 2003), pp. 491-493, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3593317)

Whereas for Marxists the possibility of postmodernism leading to social change is a non sequitur, for Atkinson postmodernism is 'an inevitable agent for change' in that: it challenges the educator, the researcher, the social activist or the politician not only to deconstruct the certainties around which they might see as standing in need of change, but also to deconstruct their own certainties as to why they hold this view. (2002, p. 75) This sounds fine, but what do these constituencies actually do to effect meaningful societal change once their views have been challenged? What is constructed after the deconstruction process? Atkinson provides no answer. Nor does Patti Lather (nor, as we shall see, does Judith Baxter). This is because neither postmodernism nor poststructuralism is capable of providing an answer (Hill, 2001, 2003; Rikowski, 2002, pp. 20-25). Decon-struction 'seeks to do justice to all positions ... by giving them the chance to be justified, to speak originarily for themselves and be chosen rather that enforced' (Zavarzadeh, 2002, p. 8). Indeed, for Derrida (1990), 'deconstruction is justice' (cited in Zavarzadeh, 2002, p. 8; emphasis added). Thus, once the deconstruction process has started, justice is already apparent and there is no discernible direction in which to head. In declaring on the first page of the Preface of her book GettingSmart:FeministResearchand Pedagogy With/In the Postmodern,her 'longtime interest in how to turn critical thought into emancipatory action' (Lather, 1991, p. xv), Lather is, in fact, wasting her time. After more than 200 pages of text, in which indications are made of the need for emancipatory research praxis, in which proclamations are made of how the goals of research should be to understand the maldistribution of power and resources in society, with a view to societal change, we are left wondering how all this is to come about. Postmodernism cannot provide strategies to achieve a different social order and hence, in buttressing capitalist exploitation, it is essentially reactionary. This is precisely what Marxists (and others) mean by the assertion that postmodernism serves to disempower the oppressed [7] According to Atkinson, postmodernism 'does not have, and could not have, a "single" project for social justice' (2002, p. 75). Socialism then, if not social change, is thus ruled out in a stroke [8]. Atkinson then rehearses the familiar postmodern position on multiple projects (2002, p. 75). Despite Atkinson's claims that postmodernism views 'the local as the product of the global and viceversa'and that postmodernism should not be interpreted as limiting its scope of enquiry to the local (2002, p. 81), since post modernism rejects grand meta- narratives and since it rejects universal struggle, it can by definition concentrate only on the local. Localised struggle can, of course, be liberating for individuals and certain selected small groups, but postmodernism cannot set out any viable mass strategy or programme for an emancipated future. The importance of local as well as national and international struggle is recognised by Marxists, but the postmodern rejection of mass struggle ultimately plays into the hands of those whose interests lie in the maintenance of national and global systems of exploitation and oppression. Furthermore, 'as regards aims, the concern with autonomy, in terms of organisation', postmodernism comprises 'a tendency towards network forms, and, in terms of mentality, a tendency towards self-limitation' (Pieterse, 1992). While networking can aid in the promotion of solidarity, and in mass petitions, for example (Atkinson, 2001), it cannot replace mass action, in the sense, for example, of a general or major strike; or a significant demonstration or uprising that forces social change. Indeed, the postmodern depiction of mass action as totalitarian negates/renders illicit such action. Allied to its localism is postmodernism's non-dualism (Lather, 1991). This does have the advantage of recognising the struggles of groups oppressed on grounds in addition to or other than those of class. However, non-dualism prevents the recognition of a major duality in capitalist societies, that of social class (Cole & Hill, 1995, pp. 166-168, 2002; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 1999; Sanders et al., 1999: Hill et al., 2002b). This has, I believe, profoundly reactionary implications, in that it negates the notion of class struggle. Marxism, on the other hand, allows a future both to be envisioned and worked towards. This vision can and has been extended beyond the 'brotherhood of man' concept of early socialists, to include the complex subjectivities of all (subjectivities which the postmodernists are so keen to bring centre stage). Socialism can and should be conceived of as a project where subjective identities, such as gender, 'race', disability, non-exploitative sexual preference and age all have high importance in the struggle for genuine equality (Cole & Hill, 1999a, p. 42). In her attempt to present the case that '[p]ostmodern deconstruction ... is not the same as destruction' (Atkinson, 2002, p. 77), Atkinson cites Judith Butler (1992), who argues that: [t]o deconstruct is not to negate or to dismiss, but to call into question and, perhaps most importantly, to open up a term ... to a reusage or redeployment that previously has not been authorized. (cited in Atkinson, 2002, p. 77) This is precisely what Marxism does. The difference is that Marxist concepts such as, for example, the fetishism inherent in capitalist societies, whereby the relationships between things or commodities assume a mystical quality hiding the real (exploitative) relation- ships between human beings, provide a means of both analysing that society, understanding its exploitative nature and pointing in the direction of a non-exploitative society. The Marxist concept of the Labour Theory of Value is a good example (see later for a discussion).

#### 2. Their focus on subjects excluded from normative conceptions of the human has malicious political consequences – this argument for expanding our conception of the human doesn’t actually change any of the underlying conditions of representation. Even worse, this focus on representations gives rise to a politics in which people whose identities are defined by class and capitalism and have no relation to ‘normative conceptions of the human’ are excluded from view. This isn’t just a link of omission – it’s a structural necessity of their politics of representation, which makes it just as exclusive as the sovereign politics they critique.

Smith 4 (Paul Smith, Professor of Cultural Studies at George Mason University, 2004, symploke, Vol. 12, No. 1-2, p. 256-257

The nub of all this comes early in the book, when Butler proposes to consider "the conditions under which certain human lives are more vulnerable than others, and thus certain human lives more grievable than others" (30).Thus, she asks why it is that Americans cannot grieve the Muslim dead in the post 9/11 conflicts. The absence of the Muslim dead from the news and the obituaries is immediately aligned with the struggles of "sexual minorities . . . transgendered people . . . intersexed people . . . [the] physically challenged" and racial minorities, all of whom struggle with the social imposition of parameters of the human, with normative values and "culturally viable notions of the human" (35). This sweeping homology is driven home by reference to "the queer lives that vanished on September 11," who went unrecognized in the obituaries and whose relatives were "belatedly and selectively . . . made eligible for benefits" (35). This rather breathtaking alignment has perhaps the opposite effect to that intended. Here and elsewhere Butler is at pains to say that she's not calling for simply some warm and fuzzy inclusion of excluded subjective into the faulty normative schemes that she sees all around her. Instead, she is calling for what she calls "an insurrection at the level of ontology" (33). (If that's to be the new slogan of radicalism, Bush, Ashcroft, Rumsfeld and their ilk probably aren't going to be losing a lot of sleep!) But rather than offering ways to reconceive relational subjectivity, or even simply highlighting the specific struggles of different subjects, Butler in effect produces nothing more than some rough equivalency amongst all those who somehow don't fit neatly into the "culturally viable notions of the human." To conceive of such an equivalency you have to do a lot of stripping away of materiality and you have to be virtually impervious to levels of specificity. At best, what Butler is pointing to here is a purely discursive or ideological homology, and it turns out to be a very incomplete homology even in its own terms. That is, there's something analytically wrong when Butler's highlighting of the "vanished lives" from the WTC can't include the laborers, janitors, food workers, homeless people and undocumented immigrants who died there, and whose struggles for recognition were not just about their access to "culturally viable notions of humanity" but equally about their economic value. In mostly unpublicized struggles to gain compensation and benefits, the relatives of many of these people, as well as attack survivors themselves, confronted the simple fact that their lives were simply not valued. The struggles of many of these people continue, three years after the attacks. These kinds of people don't appear in Butler's pantheon of victims—and nor do her victims themselves appear as labor, or as subjects whose identity is in any way at all constituted by their relation to capitalism (even though this might well be why they were attacked, as representatives of a predatory capitalist imperium). This elision, executed during Butler's cheerleading for the principles of inculsivity and relationality, is more than simply symptomatic of Butler's approach; it is a reminder of the weakness of any consideration of identity that cannot or will not entertain the historical and material conditions under which such identities are formed. In the end, what divides and differentiates subjects is not some factitious, contingent and unsatisfactory use of the category "human;" rather more it is the continual and relentless depredations of capital. So it's not really "conditions" that Butler investigates in this book; she isn't asking about American imperialism, or media power, or any of the material factors that inflect contemporary ideologies. Rather, she is simply pointing to some of the discursive structures and attitudinal habits that express those conditions. Butler will no doubt be familiar with the criticism that she is unable or unwilling to investigate those conditions or to see subjects as in any significant part produced by them. Similar issues are notably at stake in her exchanges with Nancy Fraser (in New Left Review) or with Gayle Rubin (in differences) in the last decade; and they arise again in her conversations with Laclau and Zizek in Contingency, Hegemony, Universality (2000). In my view, in all of these exchanges Butler comes across as more obstinate than correct in dealing with the challenge to her thinking that political-economic factors pose. Indeed, in the last named text, when called to account for these lapses, she comes out with one of the most perverse formulations in all of her writing: "It's unclear that the subject is not, for instance, from the start structured by certain general features of capitalism, or that capitalism does not produce certain quandaries for the unconscious and, indeed, for the psychic subject more generally" (277). Such circumphrasis (a spectacular double negative and a vagueness masquerading through the repeated word "certain") can only confirm the suspicion that, if an examination of "conditions" entails thinking in terms of political economy, Butler doesn't in fact want anything to do with it.

#### 3. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear

Foster 5 [John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol. 57, Issue 4, “Naked Imperialism”, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>]

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China,that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

#### 4. Vote negative to adopt the historical material criticism of the 1NC - historical analysis of the material conditions of capital is the only way to break free from is contradictions and social inequalities it causes

Tumino 1 (Steven, teaches at the City University of New York, Spring, What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before)

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### 5. Class divisions are the root of all other oppressions

Kovel 2 (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124)

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

#### 6. Historical materialism must come first - it predetermines consciousness and the very possibilities of reflective thinking

**Marx 1859** (Karl, a pretty important dude. “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface” http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm) JM

>edited for gendered language<

In the social production of their existence, [people] inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which [people] become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

### Case

#### The ethics of infinite responsibility are fundamentally an attempt to purify the political from violence and conflict – this self-defeating attempt at purification means the weight of infinite responsibility collapses in on itself and results in paralysis. <We do not endorse the ableist rhetoric of this card>

Jacob Schiff, Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, 2003, online: http://ptw.uchicago.edu/schiff03.pdf, accessed September 8, 2005

What has gone wrong here? I believe that this dismal response to genocide reflects an insistence upon redemptive politics; upon politics that seek to purify us and deliver us from that which we hate, fear and resent, of that which shames us and makes us feel dirty, evil, wrong, or bad. Such politics seek perfect peace, justice, order, virtue, and the like, but they are ultimately self-defeating. In this case, the aspiration that gives voice to our “Never again!”, that spurs us to rid the world of genocide forever, imposes upon us an absolute, infinite responsibility that paralyzes us into inaction--and so genocide continues. The lessons of history amply demonstrate the ongoing frustration to which redemptive politics seem condemned. Given these lessons, the persistence of redemptive language and logic in some of our political claims--like those concerning genocide--deserves attention.3 We are unlikely ever to escape the trap of redemptive politics altogether--to suggest that we could, would reinforce its logic. But we can work harder to articulate political claims in ways that resist redemptive temptations, ways that reflect the urgency of combating cruelty and injustice whenever we confront them, but that resist the intolerable burden of an elusive future in which we will be forever rid of them. We should, I will suggest, urge not “Never again!” but, rather, “Not this time!” Emmanuel Levinas provides an argument for and an example of such articulations. Levinas is often regarded as the theorist of responsibility. Accordingly, a number of scholars frustrated by the state of normative IR theory have turned to him in search of ethical resources for world politics (see, e.g., Campbell, 1999; Dillon, 1995, 1999; Franke, 2000; Molloy, 1999, 2000; Neumann, 1996, 1999; Shapiro, 1999; Warner, 1996).4 Some of Levinas’ interlocutors (notably Campbell, Shapiro, and Neumann) ascribe to Levinas a redemptive vision of politics. This vision may--or may not--be theirs, but it is not his. This misunderstanding prevents them from appreciating Levinas’ sober--and more promising--account of a politics that calls redemptive aspirations into question. The trouble began with a radio interview in which Levinas participated in 1982, following the massacre of hundreds of Arabs inside Palestinian camps at Sabra and Chatila at the apparent behest of the Israeli Defence Forces during Israel’s war with Lebanon (in Hand, 1989: 289-97; see, e.g., Fisk, 2001). According to Campbell, Shapiro, and Neumann, Levinas’ strong support for Israel and his faith in the state as such led him to betray his own claims about responsibility and justice, and to pay insufficient attention to competing historical narratives. These charges are misplaced insofar as they rest on a misunderstanding of Levinas’ account of politics as a redemptive one, and upon a conflation of Levinas’ ethics with his politics. In Levinas’ defense, I will argue that he offers a very different account of politics, one that counsels us against seeking redemption without either justifying inaction or urging resignation in the face of cruelty and injustice. At times, Levinas’ position highlights the difference between framing political claims in redemptive and non-redemptive terms, and suggests the merits of the latter.

#### Redemptive politics turns the case – the lure of redemption ensures that politics backslides into a flight from responsibility

Jacob Schiff, Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, 2003, online: http://ptw.uchicago.edu/schiff03.pdf, accessed September 8, 2005

While they work in contradictory ways, these aspects of redemptive politics may be mutually reinforcing: The desire for purity and deliverance reflected in our political claims contributes to our flight from responsibility; and our flight from responsibility, by leaving so much undone, maintains the urgency of those redemptive aspirations. In the end, genocide remains a persistent feature of world politics. Perhaps it is time for us to “believe the unbelievable” (in Powers, 2002: 33). Perhaps redemption through politics is a dangerously seductive illusion. Perhaps we need politics that resist our redemptive aspirations, and ways of articulating claims that reflect that resistance.

#### The logic of redemptive politics underlies genocidal campaigns just as it does the politics of human rights – only a refusal to couch politics in the terms of infinite responsibility solves

Jacob Schiff, Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, 2003, online: http://ptw.uchicago.edu/schiff03.pdf, accessed September 8, 2005 gender modified

But to leave matters here is misleading, because Levinas cautions against “the idyllic messianism of universal pardon”, reminding us that [people]“[men] are not only the victims of injustice; they are also the perpetrators” (p. 91-2). Because we are perpetrators, universal pardon is out of the question, and he [sic] Levinas derides those who pine for justice “[a]s though they were innocent” (p. 91). In fact, for Levinas, the coming of the Messiah depends upon humanity first being shrouded in darkness (p. 93). Furthermore, he suggests that redemption is always a fragile possibility at best: “To speak of Redemption in a world that remains without justice is to forget that the soul is not the demand for immortality but the impossibility of assassinating, and that consequently the spirit is the proper concern of a just society” (1997b:101). Levinas ties redemption to the attainment of (perfect?) justice in this world, and this produces a dilemma: We can’t speak of redemption in an unjust world, but the spirit-- the object of redemption--is the “proper concern” only of the “just society”. Given that we do live in an unjust world--or at least a world of imperfect justice-- is redemption in a sense impossible? I think that this might be so for Levinas, but I will defer my reasons for thinking so until later on. Levinas’ account of redemption, mediated by his conversation with the Rabbis and Samuel, suggests that ideals of purity and deliverance are not confined to religious or theological matters, but often penetrate political conversations, and this is why I call politics that are animated by such ideals “redemptive politics”. Redemptive politics work in the service of projects that most people would probably recognize as “good”--for instance, in calls to end all war (UNOPI, 1965; Lipsky, 1971), genocide, hunger, poverty, homelessness, drug use, racism, and violent crime. But redemptive politics also work in the service of projects that most people would probably recognize as “bad”. For instance, redemptive politics seem to underpin genocide. During the Rwandan genocide, Hutu extremists referred to Tutsis as inyenzi, or cockroaches, as pests that needed to be exterminated (Prunier, 1995). Similarly, Nazi ideology portrayed Jews as dirty, a plague infesting German stock. These depictions tied genocidal campaigns to the achievement and maintenance of purity for a given identity, whether Rwandan or German.6 Furthermore, many scholars have characterized genocidal projects in redemptive terms. Leo Kuper, for instance, has highlighted scape-goating in genocides (1981: 43). In times of social and economic turmoil--say, Germany in the 1930s--it is easy to blame prominent minority groups for social economic, and political ills. That which we cannot abide--military defeat, economic depression and so on—we may cast off by locating responsibility for our condition elsewhere.7 Ronald Aronson (1982:144) has characterized genocide as “a kind of ultimate denial of reality: a madness of those in power who are impotent to use that power effectively to change reality, and who, lost in visions of omnipotence, instead seek to destroy it”. Finally, Robert Jay Lifton has argued that genocide involves “a perception of collective illness, a vision of cure, and a series of motivations, experiences, and requirements of perpetrators in their quest for that cure” (Lifton 1986, p. 467; in Fein, 1993, p.46). Scape-goating, denial of reality, and metaphors of illness and cure all call up drives to purification that are symptomatic of redemptive politics.

#### The status quo solves their aff – Butler needs to cut some updates. The media is no longer hostile to public critique, their aff has already happened.

Paul Smith, Professor of Cultural Studies at George Mason University, 2004, symploke, Vol. 12, No. 1-2, p. 255-256

In that light, the opening words of Precarious Life—where Butler points to "the rise of anti-intellectualism and a growing acceptance of censorship within the media"—are already somewhat outdated (1). Predictably, the pace of events has also affected many of the other positions Butler adopts in this book. As the post-9/11 wave of hysteria and narcissistic agitation has abated somewhat in America, and as the Iraqi war has come to seem even less justifiable than it was at the start, public discourse has admitted the critique of all aspects of the administration's conduct since 9/11. You no longer have to be some maverick, unpatriotic leftie to be able to complain, for example, about Ashcroft's assault on civil liberties, Rumsfeld's barbaric policies in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib, civilian casualties in Iraq, and the monstrous crimes of the current Israeli regime. These are positions that many on the political spectrum have now taken, continue to take, and presumably will have to keep on taking. During the last two years people like Jonathan Schell in *The Nation* or Sidney Blumenthal on Salon.com have tirelessly made the same essential arguments as Butler makes in this book, but in venues and in language that are more widely accessible. Many of her points have been more concisely made in national newspaper editorials, or even by John Kerry on the campaign trail—not to mention in Michael Moore's Fahrenheit 911. They are, that is to say, positions that *pace* Butler's numerous asides about the poverty of "contemporary conditions of representation" have been made increasingly available in the mainstream media—certainly in the world media, and now more and more in the US media. So it's just as hard to credit Butler's positions with any originality as it is to disagree with them. The question would then be why Butler is producing these arguments at such great length, for whose benefit, and with what agenda?

#### They don’t solve – Butler’s theory of discursive politics can’t account for the nature of the contemporary state. Their model of critical citizenship is outdated and never even rises to the level of directly challenging those in power.

Eva Cherniavsky, Assistant Professor of English at Indiana University, June 2005, Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 189

The turn to Foucault and to a direct engagement with new modes of state and other administrative power is particular to the chapter on the new war prison, in this book which otherwise thinks primarily through the philosophy of ethics (Levinas) and psychoanalysis. Precarious Life has much to say about people’s affective orientation to power—how we often remain “unmoved,” in Butler’s phrase, and might yet learn to be “moved,” through a recognition of the precariousness of other lives. “It was from that apprehension of the precariousness of those lives we destroyed,” Butler points out, “that many US citizens came to develop an important and vital consensus against the war” (150). Yet, the question remains how our affective “movements’” will matter to state power, when it no longer proceeds by manufacturing consent, but by regulating information flows—when, we might say, citizenship refers to a bureaucratic category that regulates the mobility of bodies in and across national, regional, and global space, rather than a mode of civic agency, to which, therefore, the affective orientation of the citizen is critical. I am suggesting that the category of democratic citizenship is at present a nostalgic reference that must be critically reconstructed as a precondition for engaging the new state formation Butler describes. From this vantage, where Precarious Life fails productively—which is to say, and by no means ingenuously, that it succeeds—is in marking the discontinuities between the psychic lives of political subjects and the operation of administrative power that it sets out to overcome.

#### They can’t stop dehumanization – dominant cultural and media forces will just shift to a different target to exclude from the sphere of the human.

Robin Schott, Ph.D., lecturer at the Department of Philosophy, Education, and Rhetoric, University of Copenhagen, December 20, 2004, online: http://www.kvinfo.dk/side/563/article/297/, accessed September 30, 2006

Butler's discussion of dependency and vulnerability in this book leads her also to use the language of relationality. Feminist philosophers have focused a good deal of attention on the relations that constitute human subjectivity, ethics and politics, though Butler has not previously used these terms. In *Bodies that Matter*, she writes of "subjectivation" and "subjection" to highlight the framework by which power, discourse, and the imaginary precede any actual encounter between people. In *Precarious Life*, however, she explicitly states her affinity to the term "relationality", but adds, "we may need other language to approach...how we not only are constituted by our relations but also dispossessed by them as well." Butler's primary position in this book in terms of identity politics is not that of a feminist or lesbian, but that of a "progressive Jew". She turns to Levinas to work through "what an ethic of Jewish non-violence might be.". She boldly criticizes current Israeli politics, arguing against the tendency to identify anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. And she argues for the possibility of a revised form of Zionism, a post-Zionist Israel, an autonomous Palestinian state, or a secular, one-state solution. Why does Jewishness have such a prominent position in her current reflection? On the theoretical level, she draws inspiration from Jewish philosophers like Levinas and Derrida. On the political level, by speaking publicly as a Jew who criticizes Israeli policies, she displaces the position of Jew as eternal victim. She notes that the victim is transposable: "it can shift from minute to minute from the Jew atrociously killed by suicide bombers on a bus to the Palestinian child atrociously killed by Israeli gunfire." Butler's essays are a very timely intervention in the political crises since September 11, 2001. She demonstrates how theories developed to analyze gender and sexuality provide important resources for addressing issues of political violence. Nonetheless, engaging with her work raises a number of questions. First, what is the relation between human vulnerability and politics? Thomas Hobbes also thought that human beings are vulnerable when he wrote in 1660 that human life is nasty, brutish and short *(Leviathan* I, 13). Yet the politics that Hobbes endorses is far from what Butler has in mind. The politics that she envisions is one that many progressives want. It is a politics that is opposed to war, to American imperialism, to the violation of human rights and the destruction of human lives. What is the connection between her starting point, that we are vulnerable, and her conclusion, that we must struggle for "a politics that seeks to diminish suffering universally"? Although Butler charts her course through the ethical theory of Levinas, many other progressives reach this political vision by a critique of capitalism, imperialism, racism and war. So her ethical theory is not a necessary step for reaching this political vision. Second, I wonder whether her own theory can support her call for us to widen the concept of the human. Her theoretical work has elaborated on how the process of dehumanization, which excludes certain lives from being recognized as human, is also constitutive of the concept of the human. If this is right, can one ever eliminate the logic by which some lives are treated as non-human? Is the ethical task to try to limit the number of lives who fall into this category? Or do we merely shift who is considered non-human in different places and times?

## 2NC

### Cap

#### We diagnose the root cause for the war on terrorism and we are violent to others in the first place.

Strickland 13 (patrick o. writer for socialist news organizations on Middle East issues, Profiting off islamophobia, http://socialistworker.org/2013/10/09/profiting-off-islamophobia)

The CAIR report identifies 37 groups that constitute what it calls the "inner core" of the U.S. Islamophobia network. Jihad Watch, ACT! For America, Atlas Shrugs and the Investigative Project on Terrorism are among the more influential of these groups.¶ Another 32 groups make up the "outer core"--these include organizations, funds, endowments and radio shows. Some of the best-known mouthpieces of right-wing America make an appearance: the Rush Limbaugh Show, the Mark Levin Show, the Washington Times, Fox News and the Christian Broadcasting Network, to name a few.¶ Sitting at the top of this growing empire is veteran neoconservative commentator Daniel Pipes, who has a long history of issuing sweeping condemnations of all Muslims and is a key financer in the Islamophobia industry. In a period of just three years, Pipes' Middle East Forum has funneled nearly $2 million to just seven groups among the inner core--all of which are known for harsh criticism of Islam and Muslims in general, coupled with staunch support of Israel.¶ Pipes' organization financed Steve Emerson's Investigative Project on Terrorism to the tune of $1.2 million between 2009 and 2011. Emerson made headlines in April following the Boston Marathon bombing when he falsely claimed that a Saudi national was responsible for the attacks.¶ Another noteworthy name is Yigal Carmon, a former Israeli military intelligence officer and founder of Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI), a pro-Zionist organization that seeks to paint all Palestinians and Arabs as hatemongers. Pipes' Middle East Forum gave some $450,000 to MEMRI between during the same period.¶ Furthermore, the report found that the 37 organizations, many of which have overlapping high-ranking staff, in the "inner core of America's Islamophobia network enjoyed access to at least $119,662,719 in total revenue between 2008 and 2011."¶ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -¶ THE WAY the network is structured, according to the report, is that the inner-core groups exist for the sole purpose of discriminating against Islam, while the outer core consists of groups that "do not openly appear to include promoting prejudice against or hatred of Islam and Muslims, but whose work regularly demonstrates or supports Islamophobic themes."¶ This highly sophisticated and well-funded edifice has been erected--and continues to be expanded--towards the end of criminalizing Islam and Muslims in the U.S. Furthermore, it demonstrates the extensive overlap of right-wing America, Christian evangelical groups and pro-Zionist organizations.¶ This network serves the purpose of furthering ugly myths about irreconcilable differences between "West" and "East"--divvying up and lumping together tens of millions of people from heterogeneous societies into simplistic categories, disregarding an array of cultural, historical and political factors.¶ This crude Orientalist division of the world into two competing demographics has enabled the U.S. to package its hegemonic expansion and imperial designs in the rhetoric of civilizing missions, freedom and national security. A few of the more horrifying examples are the ongoing occupation of Afghanistan, the recent surveillance scandal at the National Security Agency, the endless U.S. military and financial backing of Israeli apartheid, and the murderous drone program under the auspices of the Obama administration.

#### Only a stable capitalist versus non capitalist binary is key to solve our alt. This fluidity is made only possible under capitalist control - it emerged as a result of the preference for a more flexible system of the market for financial services and labor

Gonzalez 4 [Marcial, “Historical Materialism and Chicana/o Cultural Studies,” *Science & Society* 68.2]

In arguing that Chicana/o studies has been influenced by post- modernist theory, I am not declaring that all Chicana/o critics are postmodernists. Nor am I alleging that Chicana/o criticism has cate- gorically rejected all approaches to the study of literature that are not postmodernist. Rather, I make two claims. First, the interpre- tive methods employed in Chicana/o studies have been substantially informed by postmodernist theory. Second, despite its status as a form of social critique, postmodernist theory mystifies social relations and, consequently, limits rather than enhances the possibility for critical class consciousness. Presumably, few cultural critics would disagree with my first claim. José Saldívar, for example, encourages readers to consider "the effects of shifting critical paradigms in American Studies away from linear narratives of immigration, assimilation, and nationhood. Is it possible," he asks, "to imagine new cultural affilia- tions and negotiations in American studies more dialogically, in terms of multifaceted migrations across borders?" (J. Saldívar, 1997, 1). Similarly, as Renato Rosaldo explains, "a sea change in cultural stud- ies has eroded once-dominant conceptions of truth and objectivity. The truth of objectivism - absolute, universal, and timeless - has lost its monopoly status. It now competes, on more nearly equal terms, with the truths . . . embedded in local contexts, shaped by local in- terests and colored by local perceptions" (Rosaldo, 1989, 21). Addi- tionally, Rafael Pérez-Torres more pointedly exclaims, "postmodern- ism marks the end of teleological thinking in the secular sphere. The ideas of Project and Progress give way to positions of locality and negotiation, issues we have seen inform the discussion of contempo- rary Chicano politics" (Pérez-Torres, 1995, 14). These comments substantiate my first assertion that a methodological change has taken place in Chicana/o cultural studies in the direction of the postmodern. Disagreement, however, will likely surface in response to my second claim - that postmodernism mystifies rather than cri- tiques social relations. In anticipation of this disagreement, the rest of this essay is divided into three parts. In the first part, after briefly discussing the emergence of postmodernism as a cultural condition, I review two relevant works on the relation between postmodernism and Chicana/o literature: Rosaura Sanchez's essay, "Postmodernism and Chicano Literature," and Ellen McCracken's provocative study, New Latina Narrative: The Feminine Space of Postmodern Ethnicity. In the sec- ond part of the essay, I analyze the limitations of two postmodernist- inspired concepts - cultural schizophrenia and heterotopia - that have been employed by critics to explain ideological ambivalence in Chicana/o literature. Throughout this essay, I endeavor to put into practice a historical materialist criticism for the study of Chicana/o literature. In the final section, I outline some key aspects of this criti- cal approach. For the sake of clarity, it is important to distinguish postmodern- ism as a cultural condition from postmodernist theory. Far from being a mere illusion, postmodernism marks the emergence of an actual condition, characterized by extreme social fragmentation and differ- entiation, skepticism toward universal systems, a preference for local- ized politics as opposed to mass movements, and the depthlessness of aesthetic production. This condition, according to David Harvey, began to emerge around 1970 with the development of advanced manufacturing and marketing technologies, resulting in a more "flex- ible" system for managing financial services, markets and labor. These changes in turn produced new cultural values, beliefs and practices, consistent with the overall anarchy and irrationality of this new chaotic form of capitalist control. Harvey's analysis of postmodernity of- fers a way to understand its emergence from within a traditional base- superstructure model, where ideas, values, and ideologies can be traced back to social class contradictions within the mode of production. It must be pointed out, of course, that the shift to a "flexible" social mode has not affected all sectors of the working class equally. In Dancing With the Devil, José Limon explains that "industrialization and urbanization came to Texas" (Limón, 102) in the period that Harvey characterizes as the zenith of Fordism, specifically the post- World War II period. Yet, "Texas and its Mexican population experi- enced an 'uneven development,' a less than ideal version of the Fordist contract" {ibid.). In other words, Mexican immigrants in south Texas and other locations along the border working in agriculture and the service industries have never benefited from a "truce" between capi- tal and labor, nor from the kinds of concessions that may have been granted to workers in other industries. One might even consider the conditions for many immigrants and other unskilled minimum-wage (or lower) workers as pre-Fordist, and in some cases perhaps even pre- modern. For example, in a cultural anthropological study of Latino undocumented immigrants who enter the United States to work, Leo Chavez explains that many undocumented immigrants are drawn to northern San Diego County by the demand for labor in the strawberry, tomato and avocado fields, as well as in large nurseries and flower farms. Scattered throughout this area, workers live in temporary camps near the fields that they tend. . . . Workers set up makeshift sleeping shelters of plastic, cardboard, tar paper, discarded wood, and anything else that is at hand. These encampments can be found on hillsides covered by dense brush, and in canyons with pleasant-sounding names. . . . Even though they are just moments away from middle and upper- middle class neighborhoods and communities, they stand in stark contrast to the growing affluence of north San Diego County. These camps resemble the living conditions I have seen in Third World countries. (Chavez, 1992, 63.) Of course, not all Latino workers live under such dire circumstances, but the effects of the super-exploitation of Latino immigrants (espe- cially along the border) have left their mark on literary representa- tions of Chicana/ o social experiences historically. These experiences have been represented in part as ideological ambivalence - as the characterization of human subjects that vacillate between different languages, cultures, countries and classes, caught up in a state of perpetual betweenness, articulated through such concepts as "borderlands thinking." Postmodernist theory misinterprets literary am- bivalence as a subversive force in itself, rather than analyzing this ambivalence as the product of capitalist exploitation.

#### Intellectuals on the left have been critical in normalizing the economic structure of capitalism while criticizing the textures and contours of the system – they preclude the fundamental reality that all social dynamics rely on the mode of production and not the other way around.

Ebert and Zavarzadeh 8(Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p. 36-38)

Thecultural **activism of capital against labor**, however, **was not limited to conservative thinkers. It also** energetically **recruited Left intellectuals and "socialists of the** heart." The defense of free enterprise from the Left has always been of great cultural value to capitalism. **When Left intellectuals defend the market directly-in the guise, for example, of "market socialism"** *(Market Socialism: The Debate among Socialists,* ed. Oilman; *Why Market Socialism? Voices from Dissent,* ed. Roosevelt and Belkin)--**or denounce the enemies of capital as totalitarian, as violators of human rights, and for repressing the play of cultural meanings and thus singularity and heterogeneity** (e.g., Sidney **Hook**, Emesto **Laclau**, Jean-Francois **Lyotard**, Jacques **Derrida**), **their discourses seem more authoritative and sound more credible coming from the supposed critics of capital than do the discourses of conservative authors.** To put it precisely: **the Left has been valuable to capitalism because it has played a double role in legitimating capitalism. It has criticized capitalism as a culture, but has normalized it as an economic system** (e.g., Deleuze and Guat-tari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia;* Duncombe, ed., *Cultural Resistance Reader;* Kraus and Lotringer, eds., *Hatred of Capitalism).* **It** has **complained about capitalism's** so-called corporate **culture**, **but** has **normalized it as a system of wage-labor that** is **grounded on exchange-relations and produces the corporate culture**. **The normalization of capitalism by the Left takes many forms**, **but** all **involve the justification of exploitation, which the Left represents as redemptive. They are** all **versions**-with various degrees of conceptual complexity- -**of** Nicholas D. **Kristof's argument in** his "In **Praise of the Maligned Sweatshop**." **He writes that** the sweatshops in Africa set up by capitalists of the North are in fact "opportunities" and advises that "**anyone who cares about** fighting **poverty should campaign in favor of sweatshops**." His argument is summed up by two sentences printed in boldface and foregrounded in his essay: **"What's worse than being exploited? Not being exploited**" *(The New York Times,* 6 June 2006, A-21). **What** has **made this** double **role** of postwar Left writers **so effective for capitalism is the way their** innovative **writing**, unorthodox **uses of language, and** captivating **arguments have generated** intellectual **excitement**. Jean-Paul **Sartre**, Theodor **Adorno,** Jean-Francais **Lyotard**, Jacques **Derrida**, Judith **Butler**, Jean **Baudrillard**, Jacques **Lacan**, Michel **Foucault**, Gilles **Deleuze**, Giorgio **Agamben**, Slavoj **Zizek**, **and** Stuart **Hall**, to name the most familiar authors, **have each used** quite **different**, **but** still **intellectually intriguing idioms**, **to de-historicize capitalism**. In highly subtle and nuanced arguments, **they have translated capitalism's Authoritarian economic practices**-which quietly force workers to concede to the exploitation of their labor-**into cultural values of free choice and self-sovereignty** (at the same time that they question traditional subjectivity). **Their most effective contributions to capitalism and its economic institutions have been to represent capitalism as a discursive system of meanings and** thus **divert attention away from its economic violence to its semantic transgressions-its homogenizing of meanings** in, for example, popular culture **or its erasure of difference** in cultural lifestyles. **They** have **criticized capitalism**, in other words, **for its** cultural **destruction of human imagination, but** at the same time, they **have condoned its logic of exploitation by dismantling** almost all **the conceptual apparatuses and analytics that offer a materialist understanding of capitalism as an economic system**. More specifically, **they have discredited any efforts to place class at the center of understanding and to grasp the extent and violence of labor practices**. They have done so, in the name of the "new" and with an ecstatic joy bordering on religious zeal (Ronell, *The Telephone Book;* Strangelove, *The Empire of Mind: Digital Piracy and the Anti-Capitalist Movement;* Gibson-Graham, *A Postcapitatist Politics).* **Left thinkers,** for example**, have argued that "new" changes in capitalism**-**the shift**, they claim, **from production to consumption**-**have triggered "a revolution in human thought around the idea of 'culture" which**, under new conditions, **has** itself **become material, "primary and constitutive"** (Hall, "The Centrality of Culture" 220, 215), **and is no** longer secondary and **dependent on** such outside **matters as relations of production**. Consequently, Hall and **others have argued that the analytics of base/superstructure has become irrelevant to sociocultural interpretations because the "new" conditions have rendered such concepts as objectivity, cause and effect, and materialism questionable.** "**The** old **distinction**" **between "**economic **'base' and** the ideological **'superstructure**" therefore **can no longer be sustained because the new culture is** what Fredric Jameson calls **"mediatic**" *(Postmodernism* 68). According to Hall, "media both form a critical part of the material infrastructure ... and are the principal means by which ideas and images are circulated" (Hall 209) . . . The logic of Hall's argument is obtained by treating the "material" as materialist. Media, however, are "material" only in a very trivial sense, they have a body of matter, and are a material vehicle (as a "medium"), but **media are not "materialist**" because, as we argue in our theory of materialism below, **they do not produce "value" and are not "productive." They distribute values produced at the point of production**. The un-said of Hall's claim is that **production and consumption/distribution are no longer distinguishable and more significantly, labor has itself become immaterial-**which is now a popular tenet in the cultural turn (Hardt and Negri, *Multitude).* But, even Paul Thompson, who is not without sympathy for the tum to culture, argues that **"labour is never immaterial. It is not the content of labour but its commodity form that gives 'weight' to an object or idea in a market economy,"** and, he adds, **While it is true that production has been deterritorialised** to an extent, **network firms are not a replacement for the assembly line and do not substitute horizontal for vertical forms of coordination**. Network firms are a type of extended hierarchy, based, as Harrison observes, on concentration without centralisation: 'production may be decentralised, while power finance, distribution, and control remain concentrated among the big firms' *(Lean and Mean: The Changing Landscape of Corporate Power in the Age of Flexibility,* 1994: 20). **Internal networks do not exist independently of these relations of production.** and forms of cooperation, such as teams, are set in motion and monitored by management rather than spontaneously formed. ("Foundation and Empire: A Critique of Hardt and Negri" 84) **Relations of production have shaped and will continue to shape the cultural superstructure. Changes in its phenomenology-**the textures of everyday lifestyles, whether one listens to music in a concert hall, on the radio, or through an iPod-**should not lead to postmodern** Quixotic **fantasies about the autonomy of culture from its material base** [Ebert, *Cultural Critique (with an attitude)].* As Marx writes, the Middle Ages could not live on Catholicism, nor could the ancient world on politics. On the contrary, **it is the manner in which they gained their livelihood which explains why in one case politics, in the other case Catholicism, played the chief part** .... And then **there is** Don **Quixote who long ago paid the penalty for wrongly imagining that knight errantry was compatible with all economic forms of society**. (Marx, *Capital* l, 176)

#### This fluidity is made only possible under capitalist control - it emerged as a result of the preference for a more flexible system of the market for financial services and labor

Gonzalez 4 [Marcial, “Historical Materialism and Chicana/o Cultural Studies,” *Science & Society* 68.2]

In arguing that Chicana/o studies has been influenced by post- modernist theory, I am not declaring that all Chicana/o critics are postmodernists. Nor am I alleging that Chicana/o criticism has cate- gorically rejected all approaches to the study of literature that are not postmodernist. Rather, I make two claims. First, the interpre- tive methods employed in Chicana/o studies have been substantially informed by postmodernist theory. Second, despite its status as a form of social critique, postmodernist theory mystifies social relations and, consequently, limits rather than enhances the possibility for critical class consciousness. Presumably, few cultural critics would disagree with my first claim. José Saldívar, for example, encourages readers to consider "the effects of shifting critical paradigms in American Studies away from linear narratives of immigration, assimilation, and nationhood. Is it possible," he asks, "to imagine new cultural affilia- tions and negotiations in American studies more dialogically, in terms of multifaceted migrations across borders?" (J. Saldívar, 1997, 1). Similarly, as Renato Rosaldo explains, "a sea change in cultural stud- ies has eroded once-dominant conceptions of truth and objectivity. The truth of objectivism - absolute, universal, and timeless - has lost its monopoly status. It now competes, on more nearly equal terms, with the truths . . . embedded in local contexts, shaped by local in- terests and colored by local perceptions" (Rosaldo, 1989, 21). Addi- tionally, Rafael Pérez-Torres more pointedly exclaims, "postmodern- ism marks the end of teleological thinking in the secular sphere. The ideas of Project and Progress give way to positions of locality and negotiation, issues we have seen inform the discussion of contempo- rary Chicano politics" (Pérez-Torres, 1995, 14). These comments substantiate my first assertion that a methodological change has taken place in Chicana/o cultural studies in the direction of the postmodern. Disagreement, however, will likely surface in response to my second claim - that postmodernism mystifies rather than cri- tiques social relations. In anticipation of this disagreement, the rest of this essay is divided into three parts. In the first part, after briefly discussing the emergence of postmodernism as a cultural condition, I review two relevant works on the relation between postmodernism and Chicana/o literature: Rosaura Sanchez's essay, "Postmodernism and Chicano Literature," and Ellen McCracken's provocative study, New Latina Narrative: The Feminine Space of Postmodern Ethnicity. In the sec- ond part of the essay, I analyze the limitations of two postmodernist- inspired concepts - cultural schizophrenia and heterotopia - that have been employed by critics to explain ideological ambivalence in Chicana/o literature. Throughout this essay, I endeavor to put into practice a historical materialist criticism for the study of Chicana/o literature. In the final section, I outline some key aspects of this criti- cal approach. For the sake of clarity, it is important to distinguish postmodern- ism as a cultural condition from postmodernist theory. Far from being a mere illusion, postmodernism marks the emergence of an actual condition, characterized by extreme social fragmentation and differ- entiation, skepticism toward universal systems, a preference for local- ized politics as opposed to mass movements, and the depthlessness of aesthetic production. This condition, according to David Harvey, began to emerge around 1970 with the development of advanced manufacturing and marketing technologies, resulting in a more "flex- ible" system for managing financial services, markets and labor. These changes in turn produced new cultural values, beliefs and practices, consistent with the overall anarchy and irrationality of this new chaotic form of capitalist control. Harvey's analysis of postmodernity of- fers a way to understand its emergence from within a traditional base- superstructure model, where ideas, values, and ideologies can be traced back to social class contradictions within the mode of production. It must be pointed out, of course, that the shift to a "flexible" social mode has not affected all sectors of the working class equally. In Dancing With the Devil, José Limon explains that "industrialization and urbanization came to Texas" (Limón, 102) in the period that Harvey characterizes as the zenith of Fordism, specifically the post- World War II period. Yet, "Texas and its Mexican population experi- enced an 'uneven development,' a less than ideal version of the Fordist contract" {ibid.). In other words, Mexican immigrants in south Texas and other locations along the border working in agriculture and the service industries have never benefited from a "truce" between capi- tal and labor, nor from the kinds of concessions that may have been granted to workers in other industries. One might even consider the conditions for many immigrants and other unskilled minimum-wage (or lower) workers as pre-Fordist, and in some cases perhaps even pre- modern. For example, in a cultural anthropological study of Latino undocumented immigrants who enter the United States to work, Leo Chavez explains that many undocumented immigrants are drawn to northern San Diego County by the demand for labor in the strawberry, tomato and avocado fields, as well as in large nurseries and flower farms. Scattered throughout this area, workers live in temporary camps near the fields that they tend. . . . Workers set up makeshift sleeping shelters of plastic, cardboard, tar paper, discarded wood, and anything else that is at hand. These encampments can be found on hillsides covered by dense brush, and in canyons with pleasant-sounding names. . . . Even though they are just moments away from middle and upper- middle class neighborhoods and communities, they stand in stark contrast to the growing affluence of north San Diego County. These camps resemble the living conditions I have seen in Third World countries. (Chavez, 1992, 63.) Of course, not all Latino workers live under such dire circumstances, but the effects of the super-exploitation of Latino immigrants (espe- cially along the border) have left their mark on literary representa- tions of Chicana/ o social experiences historically. These experiences have been represented in part as ideological ambivalence - as the characterization of human subjects that vacillate between different languages, cultures, countries and classes, caught up in a state of perpetual betweenness, articulated through such concepts as "borderlands thinking." Postmodernist theory misinterprets literary am- bivalence as a subversive force in itself, rather than analyzing this ambivalence as the product of capitalist exploitation.

#### **Opening up deliberative democracy serves to cover material inequality. This means that the K is logically prerequisite to the affirmative.**

Spagnoli 8 (Filiph, PhD at the University of Brussels, http://filipspagnoli.wordpress.com/2008/05/20/marx-and-democracy/)

According to Marxism, democracy suffers from a contradiction between political equality on the one hand (equal votes but also equal rights, equality before the law etc. – see here and here) and economic or material equality on the other hand. The absence of the latter prevents the full realization of political and even judicial equality (equality before the law). Wealthy persons have more means (such as money, time, education etc.) to inform themselves, to lobby, to influence, to get themselves elected, to defend themselves in court etc. A merely formal principle such as political equality loses much of its effectiveness when some can use their wealth to control political debates and decisions. Even more so, political equality, democracy and equal human rights (not only the right to private property) serve to cover up, justify and even maintain material inequality, exploitation and class rule in a capitalist society.¶ Real material equality and therefore also real political and judicial equality can only be brought about by an anti-capitalist revolution which brings down the capitalist system of property along with the legal and political tools that are used to protect this property. Material redistribution is not enough because it does not affect material inequality in a substantial way. It only provides a minimum of basic goods. The remaining material inequality still affects political equality. Democracy is self-defeating. It can never deliver what it promises because it does not go far enough. It can only give people formal instead of substantial equality. Elections, rotation in office, economic rights etc. are superficial phenomena without effect on the deeper economic processes of exploitation and class rule. Democracy must therefore be replaced by something better.¶ Marxism claims that there can only be real political equality and real equality of power when the most important goods – the means of production – are the equal property of all citizens. In all other cases, the rich will have more opportunities to benefit from political participation and judicial protection. Equal rights will lead to an unequal outcome, and this is intentional.

#### Value determinations are ultimately affected by systems of wage labor.

Beck, Professor of Sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, ‘92

[Ulrich, Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, Published in association with Theory, Culture & Society, pgs.139-140, RSR]

The meaning of work for people's lives in industrial society is not based in the work itself, at least not fundamentally. Certainly it originates in the fact that the expenditure of labor force is the basis of earning of living, especially for the individualized way of life. But even this only explains a part of the shocks set off by the news of the decline of labor society. Wage labor and an occupation have become the axis of living in the industrial age. Together with the family this axis forms the bipolar coor- dinate system in which life in this epoch is situated. This can be illustrated in an ideal-typical longitudinal section of an intact industrial world. Already in childhood, while still completely tied to the family, the child experiences the occupation as the key to the world through his or her father. Later, education remains related through all stages to the missing 'other' of the occupation. Adult existence is held completely under the sway of wage labor, not merely because of the demands work itself makes on time, but also because of the time spent outside work, beforehand and afterwards, in pondering over it and planning for it. Even 'old age' is defined by non-occupation. Old age begins where the world of work discharges people - no matter if they feel old or not. Nowhere, perhaps, is the meaning of wage labor for people's lives in the industrial world so clear as in the situation where two strangers meet and ask each other, 'what are you?' They do not answer with their hobby, 'pigeon fancier', or with their religious identity, 'Catholic', or with reference to ideals of beauty, 'well, you can see I'm a redhead with a full bosom', but with all the certainty in the world with their occupation: 'skilled worker for Siemens'. If we know our interlocutor's occupation then we think we know him or her. The occupation serves as a mutual identification pattern, with the help of which we can assess personal needs and abilities as well as economic and social position. Strange, to equate the person with the occupation he or she has. In society, where life is strung along the thread of the occupation, the latter does indeed contain certain key information: income, status, linguistic abilities, possible interests, social contacts, and so on. As late as the mid sixties, Helmut Schelsky (1942) still spoke in this sense of family and occupation as the two great forms of security that had remained for people in modernity. They provide their lives with 'inner stability'. In their occupations individuals are provided with access to contexts of social activity. Perhaps it can even be said that the 'holder of an occupation' is able to pass through the needle's eye of his job and become a 'coshaper of the world' on a small scale. In that respect, the occupation (like the family as well) guarantees fundamental social experiences. The occupation is a social reality that can be experienced in participation, at first hand, so to speak.2 Leaving aside for a moment the question of whether this image accurately reflects the situation in the sixties, it is in many cases no longer valid today or in the probable future. Just like the family on the other side, the occupation has lost many of its former assurances and protective functions. Along with their occupations, people lose an inner backbone of life that originated in the industrial epoch. The problems and demands of wage labor radiate through the entire society. Even outside of work, industrial society is a wage labor society through and through in the plan of its life, in its joys and sorrows, in its concept of achievement, in its justification of inequality, in its social welfare laws, in its balance of power and in its politics and culture. If it is facing a systemic transformation of wage labor then it is facing a social transformation.

#### You cannot permute a method – it strips out all of the conceptual theory that allows us both understand the world and to create a praxis to end oppression

Tumino 1 [Stephen, Prof English at Pitt, ““What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online]

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups. The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

#### The permutation is severance – it severs out of the methodology of capitalism rooted in the 1AC. This a voting issue because it creates a moving target that steals neg ground a makes it impossible to debate.

## 1NR

### Case

#### Redemptive politics are self-defeating – their call to action in the name of human rights and an infinite responsibility to the Other is overwhelming as a basis for political mobilization. Levinas’s ethic of infinite responsibility cannot be translated into the political.

Jacob Schiff, Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, 2003, online: http://ptw.uchicago.edu/schiff03.pdf, accessed September 8, 2005

Redemptive politics, then, can serve good and bad ends, and this is reason enough to be suspicious of them. But even when they aim at something good, they are self-defeating because they work in two contradictory and mutually reinforcing ways. On the one hand, redemptive politics serve as a powerful rallying cry--“Never again genocide!”--a cry that prods us into action and awakens us from passivity, indifference or ignorance to defeat genocide for all time. Redemptive politics were behind Raphael Lemkin’s efforts to criminalize genocide. He argued that “[i]f the international community every hoped to prevent mass slaughter of the kind the Armenians had suffered [at Turkish hands in 1915]…the world’s states would have to unite in a campaign to ban the practice” (Powers, 2002: 19). Thus Lemkin universalized the Armenian tragedy and projected it into a boundless future. How could he, then, argue for anything but total eradication, total victory over genocide? The law behind Lemkin’s proposed ban was to rest upon “universal repression”, or what has become “universal jurisdiction” (ibid, 19-20; see Schabas, 2000)--in other words, universal responsibility. The intent behind the Genocide Convention was to insure that we “never again” look away, that we assume an absolute and infinite responsibility for eradicating that “odious scourge”. Accordingly, in 1979, President Carter insisted that “we must forge an unshakable oath with all civilized people that never again will the world stand silent, never again will the world fail to act in time to prevent this terrible crime of genocide” (in Power, 2002: xxi). President George H.W. Bush later expressed a similar sentiment (ibid). The redemptive language of “never again!” seems on its face to be a potentially powerful political tool. And yet its effects have been deeply disappointing. The reason might be connected to the second and conflicting way in which redemptive politics work--they overwhelm us. Is it any surprise, in the face of our responsibility to eradicate genocide, that we would behave precisely like the anti-Semite depicted by Jean-Paul Sartre? That, “burdened with an agonizing and infinite responsibility” (1948: 40), carrying “the weight of the whole world on” our shoulders (1956), we would follow the anti-Semite in his “fear of the human condition”, of his responsibility, and flee along with him (pp. 27-8, 53-4)? President Clinton’s rebuke of President Bush is haunting: “If the horrors of the Holocaust taught us anything…it is the high cost of remaining silent and paralyzed in the face of genocide” (Power, 2002: xxi). Yet that is exactly what has happened. Redemptive politics can make anti-Semites of us all.

#### There’s a specific impact to this argument – Butler’s refusal to understand the material basis of state power means her politics recreate the worst dualisms and exclusions of classical liberal politics – conceiving of the political as nothing more than a direct discursive encounter between self and Other literally forsakes any attempt to challenge institutions and create a better world.

Geoff Boucher, lecturer in literary studies at Deakin University, Australia, 2006, Parrhesia, No. 1, p. 132-133

“On the whole,” one commentator concludes, “there is a tendency in Butler’s work to confine discussion of the politics of the performative to a series of dualisms … which are far from adequate to capturing the complex dynamics of social change.”85 The abstract and formal theory of agency provided by performativity restricts gender politics to the question of symbolic identity, to the exclusion of considerations of material equality and social practices.86 Butler’s efforts to concretise agency and salvage performativity tend to consolidate these problems rather than rectify them. The consequence is that “the primacy that Butler’s model accords to the process of symbolic identification results … in a disregard of the specificity of socio-political power.”87 The force of these complaints can be explicated in the terms developed in this article: Butler’s theory of performativity lacks a focus on institutions because it constantly gravitates to the pre-social kernel of the individual in primary narcissism; so, it necessarily tends to reinscribe the dualisms characteristic of liberal political theory and neglect the material aspects of the social formation. These problems come to a head in the question of the relation between the self and the other. For Butler, the incompleteness of identity means that the shock of the encounter with the other sets permanent limits to my self-identity. Butler claims that: The “incompleteness” of each and every identity is a direct result of its differential emergence: no particular identity can emerge without presuming and enacting the exclusion of others, and this constitutive exclusion or antagonism is the shared and equal condition of all identity constitution. 88 The permanent stance of marginal subversion follows from this conception of the necessity for the self to exclude the other, so that while Butler formally advocates the development of an inclusive universality, no new social order can be imagined that would not, in fact, be based upon domination. Sartre’s impasse – that ethics is both necessary and impossible – is here repeated on the terrain of the politics of performativity, so that the norms that make sociality possible can only be conceptualised as a constraint upon the spontaneity of the self. The problem with this theory is that it reduces the social field to the sum of dyadic interpersonal collisions, flattening the institutional complexity of social formation onto a pseudo-dialectic of narcissistic identification and sibling rivalry. No wonder, then, that the “collective dimension is missing from Butler’s account of performative resignification, whose underpinnings in a theory of psychic dislocation confine its explanatory force to the private realm of individual action.”89

#### Turn, biopolitics:

#### The politics of respecting the Other’s fundamental vulnerability is the foundation of today’s biopolitics – Others are valorized only insofar as they maintain a safe distance and do not harass our vulnerability. This turns politics into nothing more than the administration of weak, vulnerable lives, enabling the ultimate reduction of everyone to bare life.

Slavoj Zizek, Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana University, September 25, 2003, Homo Sacer as the Object of the Discourse of the University, online: http://www.lacan.com/hsacer.htm, accessed October 1, 2006

In the University discourse, is not the upper level ($ — a) that of biopolitics (in the sense deployed from Foucault to Agamben)? Of the expert knowledge dealing with its object which is a - not subjects, but individuals reduced to bare life? And does the lower not designate what Eric Santner called the "crisis of investiture," i.e., the impossibility of the subject to relate to S1, to identify with a Master-Signifier, to assume the imposed symbolic mandate?[1](http://www.lacan.com/hsacer.htm#1) The key point is here that the expert rule of "biopolitics" is grounded in and conditioned by the crisis of investiture; this crisis generated the "post-metaphysical" survivalist stance of the Last Men, which ends up in an anemic spectacle of life dragging on as its own shadow. It is within this horizon that one should appreciate today's growing rejection of death penalty: what one should be able to discern is the hidden "biopolitics" which sustains this rejection. Those who assert the "sacredness of life," defending it against the threat of transcendent powers which parasitize on it, end up in a world in which, on behalf of its very official goal — long pleasurable life — all effective pleasures are prohibited or strictly controlled (smoking, drugs, food…). Spielberg's Saving Private Ryan is the latest example of this survivalist attitude towards dying, with its "demystifying" presentation of war as a meaningless slaughter which nothing can really justify - as such, it provides the best possible justification for the Colin Powell's "no-casualties-on-our-side" military doctrine. On today's market, we find a whole series of products deprived of their malignant property: coffee without caffeine, cream without fat, beer without alcohol... And the list goes on: what about virtual sex as sex without sex, the Colin Powell doctrine of warfare with no casualties (on our side, of course) as warfare without warfare, the contemporary redefinition of politics as the art of expert administration as politics without politics, up to today's tolerant liberal multiculturalism as an experience of Other deprived of its Otherness (the idealized Other who dances fascinating dances and has an ecologically sound holistic approach to reality, while features like wife beating remain out of sight…)? Virtual Reality simply generalizes this procedure of offering a product deprived of its substance: it provides reality itself deprived of its substance, of the resisting hard kernel of the Real - in the same way decaffeinated coffee smells and tastes like the real coffee without being the real one, Virtual Reality is experienced as reality without being one. Is this not the attitude of the hedonistic Last Man? Everything is permitted, you can enjoy everything, BUT deprived of its substance which makes it dangerous. (This is also Last Man's revolution — "revolution without revolution.") Is this not one of the two versions of Lacan's anti-Dostoyevski motto "If God doesn't exist, everything is prohibited"? (1) God is dead, we live in a permissive universe, you should strive for pleasures and happiness — but, in order to have a life full of happiness and pleasures, you should avoid dangerous excesses, so everything is prohibited if it is not deprived of its substance; (2) If God is dead, superego enjoins you to enjoy, but every determinate enjoyment is already a betrayal of the unconditional one, so it should be prohibited. The nutritive version of this is to enjoy directly the Thing Itself: why bother with coffee? Inject caffeine directly into your blood! Why bother with sensual perceptions and excitations by external reality? Take drugs which directly affect your brain! - And if there is God, then everything is permitted — to those who claim to act directly on behalf of God, as the instruments of His will; clearly, a direct link to God justifies our violation of any "merely human" constraints and considerations (as in Stalinism, where the reference to the big Other of historical Necessity justifies absolute ruthlessness). Today's hedonism combines pleasure with constraint — it is no longer the old notion of the "right measure" between pleasure and constraint, but a kind of pseudo-Hegelian immediate coincidence of the opposites: action and reaction should coincide, the very thing which causes damage should already be the medicine. The ultimate example of it is arguably a chocolate laxative, available in the US, with the paradoxical injunction "Do you have constipation? Eat more of this chocolate!", i.e., of the very thing which causes constipation. Do we not find here a weird version of Wagner's famous "Only the spear which caused the wound can heal it" from Parsifal? And is not a negative proof of the hegemony of this stance the fact that true unconstrained consumption (in all its main forms: drugs, free sex, smoking…) is emerging as the main danger? The fight against these dangers is one of the main investments of today's "biopolitics." Solutions are here desperately sought which would reproduce the paradox of the chocolate laxative. The main contender is "safe sex" — a term which makes one appreciative of the truth of the old saying "Is having sex with a condom not like taking a shower with a raincoat on?". The ultimate goal would be here, along the lines of decaf coffee, to invent "opium without opium": no wonder marijuana is so popular among liberals who want to legalize it — it already IS a kind of "opium without opium." The structure of the "chocolate laxative," of a product containing the agent of its own containment, can be discerned throughout today's ideological landscape. There are two topics which determine today's liberal tolerant attitude towards Others: the respect of Otherness, openness towards it, AND the obsessive fear of harassment — in short, the Other is OK insofar as its presence is not intrusive, insofar as the Other is not really Other… A similar structure is clearly present in how we relate to capitalist profiteering: it is OK IF it is counteracted with charitable activities — first you amass billions, then you return (part of) them to the needy… And the same goes for war, for the emergent logic of humanitarian or pacifist militarism: war is OK insofar as it really serves to bring about peace, democracy, or to create conditions for distributing humanitarian help. And does the same not hold more and more even for democracy: it is OK if it is "rethought" to include torture and a permanent emergency state, if it is cleansed of its populist "excesses," and if the people are "mature" enough to live by it… However, what we were describing what cannot but appear as two opposite ideological spaces: that of the reduction of humans to bare life, to homo sacer as the dispensable object of the expert caretaking knowledge; and that of the respect for the vulnerable Other brought to extreme, of the attitude of narcissistic subjectivity

which experiences itself as vulnerable, constantly exposed to a multitude of potential "harassments." Is there a stronger contrast than the one between the respect for the Other's vulnerability and the reduction of the Other to "mere life" regulated by the administrative knowledge? But what if these two stances nonetheless rely on the same root, what if they are the two aspects of one and the same underlying attitude, what if they coincide in what one is tempted to designate as the contemporary case of the Hegelian "infinite judgement" which asserts the identity of opposites? What the two poles share is precisely the underlying refusal of any higher Causes, the notion that the ultimate goal of our lives is life itself. Nowhere is the complicity of these two levels clearer as in the case of the opposition to death penalty — no wonder, since (violently putting another human being to) death is, quite logically, the ultimate traumatic point of biopolitics, the politics of the administration of life. To put it in Foucauldian terms, is the abolition of death penalty not part of a certain "biopolitics" which considers crime as the result of social, psychological, ideological, etc., circumstances: the notion of the morally/legally responsible subject is an ideological fiction whose function is to cover up the network of power relations, individuals are not responsible for the crimes they commit, so they should not be punished? Is, however, the obverse of this thesis not that those who control the circumstances control the people? No wonder the two strongest industrial complexes are today the military and the medical, that of destroying and that of prolonging life.