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#### The affirmative’s attempt to proliferate black knowledge production will be incorporated into the system and sold as a new market for capital’s infiltration. Their framing certainly does not resist capitalism commodification. Despite the best intentions, Difference and identity can and must only be understood from a class-based perspective. This is key to creating a successful movement capable of catalyzing ethical demands at the global level

D’Annibale and McLaren 2004(Valerie Catamburio, PhD, chairs the Graduate Program in Communication and Social Justice at the University of Windsor, and Peter, professor in the Division of Urban Schooling, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, UCLA, “The Strategic Centrality of Class in the Politics of "Race" and "Difference”,” Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies, Vol. 3, No. 2, 148-175 (2003))

Because post-al theories of difference often circumvent the material dimensions of difference and tend to segregate questions of difference from analyses¶ of class formation and capitalist social relations, we contend that it is necessary¶ to (re)conceptualize difference by drawing on Marx’s materialist and historical¶ formulations. Difference needs to be understood as the product of social contradictions and in relation to political and economic organization. Because systems of difference almost always involve relations of domination and oppression, we must concern ourselves with the economies of relations of difference¶ that exist in specific contexts. Drawing on the Marxist concept of mediation¶ enables us to unsettle the categorical (and sometimes overly rigid) approaches¶ to both class and difference for it was Marx himself who warned against creating false dichotomies at the heart of our politics—that it was absurd to choose¶ between consciousness and the world, subjectivity and social organization,¶personal or collective will, and historical or structural determination. In a similar vein, it is equally absurd to see “difference as a historical form of consciousness unconnected to class formation, development of capital and class politics”¶ (Bannerji, 1995, p. 30). Bannerji has pointed to the need to historicize difference in relation to the history and social organization of capital and class¶ (inclusive of imperialist and colonialist legacies) and to acknowledge the¶ changing configurations of difference and “otherness.” Apprehending the¶ meaning and function of difference in this manner necessarily highlights the¶ importance of exploring (a) the institutional and structural aspects of difference; (b) the meanings and connotations that are attached to categories of difference; (c) how differences are produced out of, and lived within, specific his torical, social, and political formations; and (d) the production of difference in¶ relation to the complexities, contradictions, and exploitative relations of¶ capitalism.¶ Moreover, it presents a challenge to “identitarian” understandings of difference based almost exclusively on questions of cultural and/or racial hegemony.¶In such approaches, the answer to oppression often amounts to creating greater¶ cultural space for the formerly excluded to have their voices heard (represented). Much of what is called the “politics of difference” is little more than a¶ demand for an end to monocultural quarantine and for inclusion into the metropolitan salons of bourgeois representation—a posture that reinscribes a¶ neoliberal pluralist stance rooted in the ideology of free market capitalism. In¶ short, the political sphere is modeled on the marketplace, and freedom¶ amounts to the liberty of all vendors to display their different “cultural” goods.¶A paradigmatic expression of this position is encapsulated in the following passage that champions a form of difference politics whose presumed aim¶ is to make social groups appear. Minority and immigrant ethnic groups have laid¶ claim to the street as a legitimate forum for the promotion and exhibition of traditional dress, food, and culture....[This] is a politics of visibility and invisibility. Because it must deal with a tradition of representation that insists on subsuming varied social practices to a standard norm, its struggle is as much on the¶ page, screen . . . as it is at the barricade and in the parliament, traditional¶ forums of political intervention before the postmodern. (Fuery& Mansfield,¶2000, p. 150)¶ This position fosters a “fetishized” understanding of difference in terms of primordial and seemingly autonomous cultural identities and treats such “differences” as inherent, as ontologically secure cultural traits of the individuals of¶ particular cultural communities. Rather than exploring the construction of¶ difference within specific contexts mediated by the conjunctural¶ embeddedness of power differentials, we are instead presented with an overflowing cornucopia of cultural particularities that serve as markers of ethnicity,¶ race, group boundaries, and so forth. In this instance, the discourse of difference operates ideologically—cultural recognition derived from the rhetoric of¶ tolerance averts our gaze from relations of production and presents a strategy¶ for attending to difference as solely an ethnic, racial, or cultural issue.¶What advocates of such an approach fail to acknowledge is that the forces of¶ diversity and difference are allowed to flourish provided that they remain¶ within the prevailing forms of capitalist social arrangements. The neopluralism¶ of difference politics cannot adequately pose a substantive challenge to the productive system of capitalism that is able to accommodate a vast pluralism of¶ ideas and cultural practices. In fact, the post-al themes of identity, difference,¶ diversity, and the like mesh quite nicely with contemporary corporate interests¶ precisely because they revere lifestyle—the quest for, and the cultivation of, the¶ self—and often encourage the fetishization of identities in the marketplace as they compete for “visibility” (Boggs, 2000; Field, 1997). Moreover, the¶ uncritical, celebratory tone of various forms of difference politics can also¶ lead to some disturbing conclusions. For example, if we take to their logical¶ conclusion the statements that “postmodern political activism fiercely contests¶ the reduction of the other to the same,” that post-al narratives believe that “difference needs to be recognized and respected at all levels” (Fuery& Mansfield,¶2000, p. 148), and that the recognition of different subject positions is paramount (Mouffe, 1988, pp. 35-36), their political folly becomes clear. Eagleton¶ (1996) sardonically commented on the implications:¶Almost all postmodern theorists would seem to imagine that difference, variability and heterogeneity are “absolute” goods, and it is a position I have long held¶ myself. It has always struck me as unduly impoverishing of British social life that¶ we can muster a mere two or three fascist parties. . . . The opinion that plurality is¶ a good in itself is emptily formalistic and alarmingly unhistorical. (pp. 126-127)¶ The liberal pluralism manifest in discourses of difference politics often means a¶ plurality without conflict, contestation, or contradiction. The inherent limitations of this position are also evident if we turn our attention to issues of class.¶Expanding on Eagleton’s observations and adopting the logic that seems to¶ inform the unqualified celebration of difference, one would be compelled to¶ champion class differences as well. Presumably, the differences between the¶ 475 billionaires whose combined wealth now equals the combined yearly¶ incomes of more than 50% of the world’s population are to be celebrated—a¶ posturing that would undoubtedly lend itself to a triumphant endorsement of¶ capitalism and inequitable and exploitative conditions. San Juan (1995) noted¶ that the cardinal flaw in current instantiations of culturalism lies in its decapitation of discourses of intelligibility from the politics of antagonistic relations.¶He framed the question quite pointedly: “In a society stratified by uneven¶ property relations, by asymmetrical allocation of resources and of power, can¶ there be equality of cultures and genuine toleration of differences?” (pp. 232-¶ 233).

#### Modern capitalism ensures that Differentiations exist between the ontological *worlds* of identity politics. These differentiations are central to violence and extermination and necessitate unending war. The alternatives presupposition of ethical equality is a prerequisite to dealing with zones of sacrifice like debate

Balibar, 2001 (Etienne, Emeritus Prof. of Philosophy @ U. of Paris X Nanterre and U. of Cal., Irvine, “Outlines of a Topography of Cruelty: Citizenship and Civility in the Era of Global Violence,” Constellations, Vol. 8.1)

this paper is based on a talk which I was asked to deliver in November 1999 for the opening of the Graduate Course in Humanitarian Action at the University of Geneva.2 This will explain why the issues of citizenship and segregation, asylum and migration, mass poverty and genocides in the globalized world order will play a central role in this discussion. These are to me the crucial “cosmopo- litical” issues which we should try to locate and connect if we want to understand how and why democratic citizenship in today’s world cannot be separated from an invention of concrete forms and strategies of civility.¶I shall focus on two sets of problems. The first is typically European. I am thinking of the negative counterpart of the post-national integration and introduc- tion of “European Citizenship,” which is not only a revival of so-called “commu- nitarian” demands and “identity politics,” but above all a development of quasi-Apartheid social structures and institutions. This forms a contradictory pattern, which in many respects is now becoming highly unstable. The second set of problems is global: it appears as a systematic use of various forms of extreme violence and mass insecurity to prevent collective movements of emancipation that aim at transforming the structures of domination. For this reason – and also with the pattern of state-construction that Thomas Hobbes once described in the Leviathan as preventive counter-violence in mind – I shall not hesitate to speak of a politics of global preventive counter-revolution or counter-insurrection. But from another angle this “politics” is really anti-political, since in a nihilistic way it leads to suppressing the very conditions of building a polity. Instead, we witness the joint development of various sorts of wars and a kind of “humanitarian” action or intervention, which in many cases becomes an instrument in the service of precisely those powers who created the distress. Not by chance, in these two sets of problems the traditional institution of borders, which I think can be defined in the modern era as a “sovereign” or non-democratic condition of democracy itself, mainly works as an instrument of security controls, social segregation, and unequal access to the means of existence, and sometimes as an institutional distri- bution of survival and death: it becomes a cornerstone of institutional violence. This explains in advance why I shall insist on the democratization of borders, not only as their opening (and perhaps least of all as their generalized abolition, which in many cases would simply lead to a renewed war of all against all in the form of wild competition among economic forces), but above all as a multilateral, negotiated control of their working by the populations themselves (including, of course, migrant populations). Perhaps new representative institutions should be set up in this regard which are not merely “territorial” and certainly not purely national. This is part of what I would call a “cosmopolitics of human rights,” where citizenship and civility are closely associated.¶Before giving more detail about the two sets of concrete problems I want to deal with here, I think that we need some philosophical instruments to place them in the broader perspective of a reflection on the relationship between human rights and politics. It is widely accepted – and I share this view to a large extent – that here Hannah Arendt’s work provides a necessary starting point. Allow me a few considerations on what we can draw from her. In her discussion of imperialism in The Origins of Totalitarianism she addresses the question of “stateless” popula- tions, deprived of any civil and civic rights, which had been immensely increased in Europe (and elsewhere) after the two world wars.3 In so doing, she inverts the perspective of political philosophy in a double manner.¶First, she reinstalls – right in the middle of debates about citizenship and polit- ical regimes – forms of exclusion and situations of extreme violence where the survival of humans, as mere representatives of the species, is threatened. She did not want only to assert a humanistic criterion with a view to doing justice, but to show that it is only through the discovery of a solution for such situations that we can find a new foundation for the public sphere, where collective political action (or praxis) takes place, and not only the management of population movements and policing of social conflicts. In a very similar way, the French philosopher Jacques Rancière more recently argued that, since the very origins of democracy, the measure of equal liberty for all in the political realm was based on “la part des sans part,” i.e., giving a fair share to those who hold no share in the common- wealth, or the political recognition of the have-nots. In other words, this would mean an active transformation of exclusion processes into processes of inclusion of the discriminated categories into the “city” or the “polity.”4 This is exactly what isonomia in Greek cities was about. In this respect, “politics” in the strong sense becomes inseparable from “permanent revolution,” a notion that Hannah Arendt might have inherited from Rosa Luxemburg.¶From this perspective, the juridical form of equal liberty is clearly not elimi- nated. But it has to be reworked completely. With respect to the principles of modern humanism-universalism, a notion of “persons without rights” is a contra- diction in terms, since de jure nobody is without rights, not even children or the handicapped. But if we view positively, for instance, such claims as those of prop- ertyless peasants in Brazil, whose motto is “justice for the rightless” when they demand that paramilitary forces who kill and terrorize the poor be tried and condemned, or those of migrant workers in France who protest against their being denied official documents by asking for a “droit de cité pour les sans papiers” (legal residence for the undocumented), we can view these demands based on resistance and the refusal of violence as partial but direct expressions of the process of the creation of rights, a dynamic which allows the political constitution to become recognized as “popular sovereignty” or democracy.¶ This is one aspect of the lessons we can draw from Arendt’s reflections on citi- zenship, but there is another which in a sense is even more relevant today. I am thinking of the famous argument showing that the history of nation-states has produced a reversal of the traditional relationship between “human rights” and “political rights” (or droits de l’homme and droits du citoyen) since they evolved from the originary democratic national revolutions to the generalization of inter- national conflicts and the development of imperialism. Human rights in general can no longer be considered a mere prerequisite and an abstract foundation for political rights that are set up and preserved within the limits of a given national and sovereign state, but neither can they be considered to set a limit to the domi- nation of the political over the juridical; it has become the opposite, as the tragic experiences of imperialism and totalitarianism in the twentieth century made manifest. We discovered that political rights, the actual granting and conditions of equal citizenship, were the true basis for a recognition and definition of “human rights” – to begin with, the most elementary ones concerning survival, naked life. Giving a new, “unpolitical” meaning to the zôonpolitikon itself, those who were not citizens of some state, who were “citizens of nowhere in the world,” were no longer practically recognized and treated as humans. When the positive institu- tional rights of the citizen are destroyed – e.g., when, in a given historical context where citizenship and nationhood are closely associated, individuals and groups are chased out of their national belonging or simply put in the situation of an oppressed national “minority” – the basic rights which are supposed to be “natural” or “universally human” are threatened and destroyed: we witness forms of extreme violence, creating a distinction between so-called Untermenschen (subhumans) and “humans” believed to be supermen, Übermenschen. This is by no means a contingent phenomenon; it results from an irreversible process that has become common in contemporary politics. It imposes upon democracy the immediate task of a renewed foundation. The very essence of politics is at stake, since politics is not a mere “superstructure” above the social and natural condi- tions of life, communication, and culture. The true concept of politics already concerns the very possibility of a community among humans, establishing a space for encounter, for the expression and dialectical resolution of antagonisms among its various constitutive parts and groups.¶Seen from this angle, the crucial notion suggested by Arendt, that of a “right to have rights,” does not feature a minimal remainder of the political, made of juridi- cal and moral claims to be protected by a constitution; it is much more the idea of a maximum. Or, better said, it refers to the continuous process in which a minimal recognition of the belonging of human beings to the “common” sphere of exis- tence (and therefore also of work, culture, public and private speech, etc.) already involves a totality of rights, and makes it possible. I call this the “insurrectional” element of democracy, which predetermines every constitution of a democratic or republican state. Such a state, by definition, cannot consist (or cannot only consist) of statuses and rights ascribed from above; it requires the direct partici- pation of the demos. I should say that Arendt’s argument clearly recognizes the importance of the egalitarian or insurrectional element constitutive of democratic citizenship, but there is more: what she displays is the dialectical relationship of this element and the politics of civility. This comes from the fact that the radically excluded, those who, being denied citizenship, are also automatically denied the material conditions of life and the recognition of their human dignity, do not provide only a theoretical criterion to evaluate historical institutions against the model of the ideal constitution. They also force us to address the reality of extreme violence in contemporary political societies – nay, in the very heart of their everyday life. This is only a seeming paradox: the limit or the “state of exception” (Schmitt) is noth- ing exceptional. On the contrary, it is “banal”; it permeates the functioning of social and political systems which claim or believe themselves to be “democra- tic.” It is both an instrument for the continuity of their vested interests in power, and a permanent threat to their vitality. This is why we should not consider the choice between access to and denial of the rights of citizenship – more generally, the possibility and impossibility of an inclusive political order – as a speculative issue. It is a concrete challenge. The (democratic) political order is intrinsically fragile or precarious; if not continuously recreated in a politics of civility, it becomes again a “state of war,” within or across borders.¶We know that Arendt’s argument was based on the experience of a “catastrophe” in European history: Nazism, World War Two, and the racist extermination of European Jews, Gypsies, and other groups. She tried to trace back its “origins” in the evolution of the nation-form towards imperialism, while at the same time carefully remaining aware of its uniqueness. We might summarize her idea by speaking of a deadly circle in which the national constitution of the state had trapped us. The nation-state was at the same time the sole positive or institutional horizon for the recognition of human rights and an “impossible” one, producing the destruction of the universal values it had supported. Now we must ask ourselves whether we are still living and acting in the same conditions. If not, we should ask what the claim of “a right to have rights” could become in today’s politics. This question becomes a burning one when we observe that, although the nation-form has not simply been withering away, the conditions of politics, the economy, and culture, the material distribution of power and the possibilities of controlling it, have become increasingly transnational. “Post- national” state or quasi-state institutions have emerged in the general framework of globalization. The “European Community” is a privileged case of these develop- ments. Let us first reflect on some of the contradictory and worrying aspects of this process, which, seen from another side, holds much promise.¶I take it to be a crucial issue to acknowledge that, along with the development of a formal “European citizenship,” a real “European Apartheid” has emerged. In the long or even the short run, it could obstruct or block the construction of a democra- tic European community. It could therefore block European construction altogether, since there is no real possibility of the supranational community being achieved in an authoritarian way, à la Bismarck, even for the sake of accumulating power or creating a regional power which would be able to match the world’s economic, political, and military superpower. A supranational European community will exist only if, compared with existing national constitutions, it means a democratic surplus for the majority. Let me clarify the issue by asking two symmetrical ques- tions: Why speak of a European Apartheid? Why speak of Apartheid in Europe?¶Why speak of a European “Apartheid”? This cannot be simply the case because foreigners are granted lesser rights (more precisely: some categories of foreigners, mainly immigrant workers and asylum seekers from the East and the South who legally or illegally crossed the frontiers protecting the wealthy “civilization” of Europe, the Balkan region featuring in this respect a kind of combination of both extraneities). There must be something qualitatively new. This is indeed the case with the new developments of the construction of Europe since the 1993 Treaty of Maastricht. In each and every one of the European nation-states, there exist structures of discrimination which command uneven access to citizenship or nationality, particularly those inherited from the colonial past. But the additional fact with the birth of the European Union (coming after a mere European Economic Community) is that a concept of CivisEuropeanus progressively acquires a specific content: new individual and collective rights, which progres- sively become effective (e.g., possibilities to appeal to European Courts against one’s own national administration and system of justice).¶Now the crucial question becomes: new rights for whom? It could be, abstractly speaking, either for the whole population of Europe, or simply for a more limited European people (I am expanding here the dilemma which is now taking place in Germany about the distinction between Volk and Bevölkerung, since this dilemma actually concerns all of Europe and the German controversy is paradigmatic). It proves very difficult and embarrassing to “define” the Euro- pean people as the symbolic, legal, and material basis for the European constituency. Maastricht solved the problem by simply stating that those and only those who already possess citizenship (i.e., are nationals) in one of the constituent national states will automatically be granted European citizenship. But this – which may remind us of debates among the Founding Fathers of the US Consti- tution – already determines an orientation. Given the quantitative and qualitative importance of the immigrant population permanently residing in Europe (what French political scientist Catherine de Wenden has called “the sixteenth member- state”5), it immediately transforms a project of inclusion into a program of exclu- sion which could be summarized by three metamorphoses:¶• from foreigners to aliens (meaning second-class residents who are deemed to be of a different kind);¶ • from protection to discrimination (this is a very sensitive issue, as shown by the Austrian case, but again, with some differences in degree and language, it is a general European problem: since some of the immigrant workers who are deprived of political citizenship enjoy some social rights, i.e., are included in “social citizenship,” it becomes a crucial political issue and an obsession for conservative forces to have them expelled from welfare, social protection, etc. – what the French National Front has called préférencenationale, but precisely because a degree of préférence already exists in the national institutions, it is likely to become a préférenceeuropéenne); and finally,¶ • from cultural difference to racial stigmatization, which is the heart of the creation of the “new racism,” postcolonial and post-national. Why suggest a parallel with South African “Apartheid”? This could only be a useless provocation. . . Should we really suggest that, while Apartheid has offi- cially disappeared in Africa, it is now reappearing in Europe (and perhaps also elsewhere) – a further development in the process of “the Empire striking back” (Paul Gilroy)? We could think of comparisons with other historical cases of insti- tutional racism, for example the US, which we know has never completely forgot- ten the Jim Crow system, and periodically seems to be on the way to recreating it when conservative policy is on the agenda. . . For his part, my German colleague Helmut Dietrich, who has long worked on refugees and migrants on the “Eastern Border” of Europe, particularly the Balkans, spoke of the Hinterland of the new European Reich, etc.¶ Leaving aside the question of how to measure the amount of suffering created by one or another system and focusing instead on the structures, I suggest two complementary reasons at least to borrow lessons from the historical example of Apartheid, i.e., to compare the situation of the regions whence most of the migrants come, in Africa, Asia, or other parts of Europe, with homelands in the South African sense. One is that the position of the important group of workers who “reproduce” their lives on one side of the border and “produce” on the other side, and thus more precisely are neither insiders nor outsiders, or (for many of us) are insiders officially considered outsiders, produces a steady increase in the amount and the violence of “security” controls, which spread everywhere in the society and ramify the borderline throughout the “European” territory, combining modern techniques of identification and recording with good old “racial profil- ing” (contrôle au faciès). This in particular is what the Schengen agreement was about. The second complementary reason is that the existence of migrant families (and their composition, their way of life) has become a true obsession for migra- tion policies and public opinion. Should the alien families be separated or united (that is, reunited)? If so, on which side of the border, which kind of families (traditional, modern), which kind of relatives (parents, children), with what kind of rights, etc.? As I have argued elsewhere, the interference of family politics, more generally a politics of genealogy, with the definition of the national “community” is a crucial structural mode of production of historical racism.6 Of course, this is also true when the national becomes multinational community.¶From all this we might draw the conclusion that a de-segregated Europe, i.e., a democratic Europe, is far from the agenda. Indeed, the situation is much more contradictory, since tendencies point in both directions; we are in the middle of a historical crossroad that is, only partially and reluctantly acknowledged. But I prefer to insist on another idea, which provides me with the necessary transition to the next point, namely the fact that these issues typically illustrate a global-local (“glocal”) problem. The contradictory and evolutionary pattern of “European citi- zenship-cum-Apartheid” (or statutory, ascriptive citizenship) (Rogers Smith) in a sense is a reaction to real and imaginary effects of globalization. In another sense it is a mere projection, albeit with historical specificities, of such effects. I shall now directly address the main issue that I announced, that of the “global counter-insurrection”: not the violence of the border, but the violence without borders or beyond borders.¶Allow me to quote from a recent study of humanitarian action, published by a Swiss expert, Pierre de Senarclens of the University of Lausanne, who rightly insists on the importance of official definitions of contemporary violence and also on the problematic aspects of the justifications they provide for an extension of the scope and meaning of “humanitarian interventions”:¶ In 1981, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution dedicated to a New International Humanitarian Order. . . . Shortly thereafter, the Assembly gave its support to the creation of an independent commission on international humani- tarian questions, which brought together eminent people. . . . The Commission’s 1986 report placed within the humanitarian project the principal political and social challenges of the age, such as environmental degradation, demographic transition, population movements, human rights violations, weapons of mass destruction, North-South polarization, terrorism, and drugs.7¶ He concludes: “We consider humanitarianism as a frame of reference for the iden- tification of important contemporary problems and a formula for their solution.” Later the author shows how, after 1989, the collapse of the Cold War system of “two camps” suppressed the limits which the confrontation between the super- powers had set to political violence, and blurred the borderlines between “war” and “peace”:¶No one foresaw the destruction of the Berlin Wall, the prelude to the swift end of the Cold War. Nor did anyone anticipate the transformations in international struc- tures and the violence that followed. Toward the mid-1990s, we count more than fifty new armed conflicts, essentially civil wars. Certain of these conflicts – in Rwanda, Yugoslavia, Chechnia, or Algeria – astonish by their violence and cruelty, by the extent of the destruction and the population movements they provoke. Inter- national society has never been confronted with so many wars making so many victims in such a short time.8¶ In such conditions, we can incline towards diverging conclusions. Either we think that the multifaceted phenomenon of mass violence and extreme violence has generally replaced politics, including internal and external relationships of forces among states, or we fully take into account the fact that the fields of poli- tics and violence – a violence that seems to lack rational organization, not except- ing self-destruction – are no longer separated; they have progressively permeated one another. It is precisely in such conditions that something called “humanitar- ian action” or “intervention,” both “private” and “public,” has become the neces- sary supplement of politics. I cannot discuss all the aspects of this mutation, but I would like briefly to address three questions which seem to me to have an importance for the concept of politics itself. 1. Are we facing an “unprecedented” spread of extreme violence (or violence of the extremes)?¶I should like to be very careful on this point, which raises a number of discussions ranging from the issue of “old and new wars”9 to the highly sensitive moral ques- tions of why and how to “compare genocides” in history. Perhaps what is unprecedented is basically the new visibility of extreme violence, particularly in the sense that modern techniques of media coverage and broadcasting and the transformation of images – in the end, as we could see for the first time on a grand scale during the Gulf War, of the production of “virtual reality” – transform extreme violence into a show, and display this show simultaneously before a world audience. We also know that the effect of such techniques is, at the same time, to uncover some violent processes, or scenes of horror (truly horrifying, such as hundreds of mutilated children in Angola or Sierra Leone), and to cover up others (equally horrifying, such as babies starving in Baghdad). We suspect that powerful ideological biases are at work when the coverage of extreme violence gives credit to such simple ideas as the political transition from the “equilibrium of terror” during the Cold War to the “competition among victims” through the undifferentiated uses of the legal and moral but hardly political notion of “crimes against humanity.” In the end, we become aware of the fact that talk- ing about and showing the images of everyday horror produces, particularly in the relatively wealthy and protected regions of humanity, a very ambivalent effect: raising compassion but also disgust, reinforcing the idea that humankind as such is really divided into qualitatively different cultures or civilizations, which, according to one political scientist, can only lead to a “clash” among them.¶I am aware of all these difficulties, but I would maintain that a reality lies behind the notion of something “unprecedented.” Perhaps it is simply the fact that a number of heterogeneous methods or processes of extermination (by which I mean eliminating masses of individuals inasmuch as they belong to objective or subjective groups) have themselves become “globalized,” i.e., operate in a simi- lar manner everywhere in the world at the same time, and so progressively form a “chain,” giving full reality to what E.P. Thompson anticipated 20 years ago with the name “exterminism.”10 In this series of connected processes, we must include, precisely because they are heterogeneous – they do not have one and the same “cause,” but they produce cumulative effects:¶• wars (both “civil” and “foreign,” a distinction which is not easy to draw in many cases – think of Yugoslavia or Chechnya);¶ • communal rioting, with ethnic and/or religious ideologies of “cleansing”;¶ • famines and other kinds of “absolute” poverty produced by the ruin of tradi-¶ tional or non-traditional economies;¶ • seemingly “natural” catastrophes which in fact are killing on a mass scale¶ because they are overdetermined by social, economic, and political structures, such as pandemics (think of the difference in the distribution of AIDS and the possibilities of treatment between Europe and Northern America on one side, and Africa and some parts of Asia on the other), draught, floods, or earthquakes in the absence of developed civil protection. . .¶ In the end it would be my suggestion that the “gobalization” of various kinds of extreme violence has produced a tendential division of the “globalized” world into life-zones and death-zones. Between these zones (which indeed are intricate, frequently reproduced within the boundaries of a single country or city) there exists a decisive and fragile superborder, which raises fears and concerns about the unity and division of mankind – something like a global and local “enmity line,” like the “amity line” which existed in the beginning of the modern Euro- pean seizure of the world.11 It is this superborder, this enmity line, that becomes at the same time an object of permanent show and a hot place for intervention. But also for nonintervention. We might consider whether the most worrying aspect of present international politics is “humanitarian intervention” or “gener- alized non-intervention,” or one coming after the other. . .¶ 2. Should we consider that extreme violence is “rational” or “functional” from the point of view of market capitalism (“liberal economics”)?¶This is a very difficult question – in fact, I think it is the most difficult question – but it cannot be avoided. Again, we should warn against a paralogism that is only too obvious but nonetheless frequent: that of mistaking consequences for goals or purposes. (But is it really possible to discuss social systems in terms of purposes? On the other hand, can we avoid reflecting on the immanent ends of a given structure, such as capitalism, or its “logic”?) It seems to me, very schematically, that the difficulty arises from the two opposite “global effects” which derive from the emergence of a chain of mass violence – as compared, for example, with what Marx called primitive accumulation when he described the creation of the preconditions for capitalist accumulation in terms of violent suppression of the poor.¶One kind of effect is simply to generalize material and moral insecurity for millions of potential workers, i.e., to induce a massive proletarianization or repro- letarianization (a new phase of proletarianization which crucially involves a return of many to the proletarian condition which they had more or less escaped, given that insecurity is precisely the heart of the “proletarian condition”). This process is contemporary with an increased mobility of capital and also humans, and so it takes place across borders. But, seen historically, it can also be distrib- uted among several political varieties:¶• in the “North,” it involves a partial or deep dismantling of the social policies and the institutions of social citizenship created by the welfare state, what I call the “national social state,” and therefore also a violent transition from welfare to workfare, from the social state to the penal state (the US showing the way in this respect, as has been convincingly argued by Loïc Wacquant12);¶ • in the “South,” it involves destroying and inverting the “developmental” programs and policies, which admittedly did not suffice to produce “take-off,” but indicated a way to resist impoverishment;¶ • in the “semi-periphery,” to borrow Wallerstein’s category, it was connected with the collapse of the dictatorial structure called “real existing socialism,” which was based on scarcity and corruption, but again kept the polarization of riches and poverty within certain limits.¶ Let me suggest that a common formal feature of all these processes that result in the reproletarianization of the labor-force is the fact that they suppress or mini- mize the forms and possibilities of representation of the subaltern within the state apparatus itself, or, if you prefer, the possibilities of more or less effective counter-power. With this remark I want to emphasize the political aspect of processes which, in the first instance, seem to be mainly “economic.”

#### This debate is about competing methodologies. The question at the end of the debate is whose ethical orientation best catalyzes political organization against Capital. Vote negative to affirm the Communist Hypothesis as a prerequisite to political or personal calculations, which ensure that discussions in debate continue to operate from within a broader framework of capitalistic competition

Badiou 2009 (Alain, Prof. @ European Graduate … ,*The Meaning of Sarkozy*, pgs. 97-103 bb)

I would like to situate the Sarkozy episode, which is not an impressive page in French history, in a broader horizon. Let us picture a kind of Hegelian fresco of recent world history - by which I do not, like our journalists, mean the triad Mitterrand-Chirac-Sarkozy, but rather the development of the politics of working-class and popular emancipation over nearly two centuries.¶Since the French Revolution and its gradually universal echo, since the most radically egalitarian developments of that revolution, the decrees of Robespierre's Committee of Public Safety on the 'maximum' and Babeuf's theoriza­ tions, we know (when I say 'we', I mean humanity in the abstract, and the knowledge in question is universally available on the paths of emancipation) that communum u the right hypothuu. Indeed, there is no other, or at least I am not aware of one. All those who abandon this hypothesis immediately resign themselves to the market economy, to parliamentary democracy - the form of state suited to capitalism - and to the inevitable and 'natural' character of the most monstrous inequalities.¶What do we mean by 'communism'? As Marx argued in the 1844ManUJcriptJ, communism is an idea regarding the destiny of the human species. This use of the word must be completely distinguished from the meaning of the adjective 'communist' that is so worn-out today, in such expressions as 'communist parties', 'communist states' or 'communist world' - never mind that 'communist state' is an oxymoron, to which the obscure coinage 'socialist state' has wisely been preferred. Even if, as we shall see, these uses of the word belong to a time when the hypothesis was still coming-to-be.¶In its generic sense, 'communist' means first of all, in a negative sense - as we can read in its canonical text The CommunutManijeJto - that the logic of classes, ofthefunda­ mental subordination of people who actually work for a dominant class, can be overcome. This arrangement, which has been that of history ever since antiquity, is not ipevitable. Consequently, the oligarchic power of those who possess wealth and organize its circulation, crystallized in the might of states, is not inescapable. The communist hypothesis is that a different collective organization is practicable, one that will eliminate the inequality ofwealth and even the division of labour: every individual will be a 'multi-purpose worker', and in particular people will circulate between manual and intellectual work, as well as between town and country. The private appropriation of monstrous fortunes and their transmission by inheritance will disappear. The existence of a coercive state separate from civil society, with its military and police, will no longer seem a self-evident necessity. There will be, Marx tells us - and he saw this point as his major contribution - after a brief sequence of 'proletarian dictatorship' charged with destroying the remains of the old world, a long sequence of reorganization on the basis of a 'free association' of producers and creators, which will make possible a 'with­ ering away' of the state.¶'Communism' as such only denotes this very general set of intellectual representations. This set is the horizon of any initiative, however local and limited in time it may be, that breaks with the order of established opinions - the necessity of inequalities and the state instrument for protect­ ing these - and composes a fragment of a politics of emancipation. In other words, communism is what Kant called an 'Idea', with a regulatory function, rather than a programme. It is absurd to characterize communist principles in the sense I have defined them here as utopian, as is so often done. They are intellectual patterns, always actualized in a different fashion, that serve to produce lines of demarcation between different forms of politics. By and large, a particular political sequence is either compatible with these principles or opposed to them, in which case it is reactionary. 'Communism', in this sense, is a heuristic hypothesis that is very frequently used in political argument,¶even if the word itself does not appear. If it is still true, as Sartre said, that 'every anti-communist is a swine', it is because any political sequence that, in its principles or lack of them, stands in formal contradiction with the communist hypothesis in its generic sense, has to be judged as opposed¶ to the emancipation of the whole of humanity, and thus to the properly human destiny of humanity. Whoever does not illuminate the coming-to-be of humanity with the communist hypothesis - whatever words they use, as such words matter little - reduces humanity, as far as its collective becoming is concerned, to animality. As we know, the contemporary - that is, the capitalist name of this animality - is 'competition'. The war dictated by self-interest, and nothing more.¶As a pure Idea of equality, the communist hypothesis has no doubt existed in a practical state since the beginnings of the existence of the state. As soon as mass action opposes state coercion in the name of egalitarian justice, we have the appearance of rudiments or fragments of the communist hypothesis. This is why, in a pamphlet titled De l'uJeologie, which I wrote in collaboration with the late lamented Fran<;oisBalmes and was published in 1976, we proposed to identifY 'communist invariants'.2 Popular revolts, such as that of the slaves led by Spartacus, or that of the German peasants led by Thomas Munzer, are examples of this practical existence of communist invariants.¶ However, in the explicit form that it was given by certain thinkers and activists of the French Revolution, the commu­ nist hypothesis inaugurates political modernity. It was this that laid low the mental structures of the ancien regime, yet without being tied to those 'democratic' political forms that the bourgeoisie would make the instrument for its own pursuit of power. This point is essential: from the beginning, the communist hypothesis in no way coincided with the 'democratic' hypothesis that would lead to present-day parliamentarism. It subsumes a different history and different events. What seems important and creative when illuminated by the communist hypothesis is different in kind from what bourgeois-democratic historiography selects. That is indeed why Marx, giving materialist foundations to the first effective great sequence of the modern politics of emancipation, both took over the word 'communism' and distanced himself from any kind of democratic 'politicism' by maintaining, after the lesson of the Paris Commune, that the bourgeois state, no matter how democratic, must be destroyed.¶Well, I leave it to you to judge what is important or not, to judge the points whose consequences you choose to assume against the horizon of the communist hypothesis. Once again, it is the right hypothesis, and we can appeal to its principles, whatever the declensions or variations that these undergo in different contexts.¶Sartre said in an interview, which I paraphrase: If the communist hypothesis is not right, if it is not practicable, well, that means that humanity is not a thing in itself, not very different from ants or termites. What did he mean by that? If competition, the 'free market', the sum of little pleasures, and the walls that protect you from the desire of the weak, are the alpha and omega of all collective and private existence, then the human animal is not worth a cent.¶And it is this worthlessness to which Bush with his aggressive conservatism and crusader spirit, Blair the Pious with his militarist rhetoric, and Sarkozy with his 'work, family, country' discipline, want to reduce the existence of the immense majority of living individuals. And the 'Left' is still worse, simply juxtaposing to this vacant violence a vague spirit of charity. To morbid competItIOn, the pasteboard¶ victories of daddy's boys and girls, the ridiculous supermen¶ of unleashed finance, the coked-up heroes of the planetary¶ stock exchange, this Left can only oppose the same actors¶ with a bit of social politeness, a little walnut oil in the wheels,¶crumbs of holy wafer for the disinherited - in other words,¶ borrowing from Nietzsche, the bloodless figure of the 'last man,.¶ To put an end once and for all to May '68 means agreeing that our only choice is between the hereditary nihilism of finance and social piety. It not only means accepting that communism collapsed in the Soviet Union, not only acknowledging that the PartiCommuniste Fran<;ais has been wretchedly defeated, but also and above all it means abandoning the hypothesis that May '68 was a militant invention precisely aware ofthe failure ofstate 'communism'. And thus that May '68, and still more so the five years that followed, inaugurated a new sequence for the genuine communist hypothesis, one that always keeps its distance from the state. Certainly, no one could say where all this might lead, but we knew in any case that what was at stake was the rebirth of this hypothesis.¶If the thing that Sarkozy is the name of succeeds in imposing the necessity of abandoning any idea of a rebirth of this kind, if human society is a collection of individuals pursuing their self-interest, if this is the eternal reality, then it is certain that the philosopher can and must abandon the human animal to its sad destiny.¶ But we shall not let a triumphant Sarkozy dictate the meaning of our existence, or the tasks of philosophy. For what we are witnessing in no way imposes such a renunciation of the communist hypothesis, but simply a consideration of the moment at which we find ourselves in the history of this hypothesis.

#### This round is key – every act of discussion must be understoo0d as a point of metaphoric condensation for Communism. Voting negative means the assuming with full ethical force that the battle is already won.

**BADIOU2010** [ALAIN, The Communist Hypothesis Translated by David Macey and Steve Corcoran 2010 p 252-257

Let's recapitulate as simply as possible. A truth is the political real. History, even as a reservoir of proper names, is a symbolic place. The ideological operation of the Idea of communism is the imaginary projection of the political real into the symbolic fiction of History, including in its guise as a representation of the action of innumerable masses via the One of a proper name. The role of this Idea is to support the individual's incorporation into the discipline of a truth procedure, to authorize the individual, in his or her own eyes, to go beyond the Statist constraints of mere survival by becoming a part of the body-of-truth, or the subjectivizable body. We will now ask: why is it necessary to resort to this ambiguous operation? Why do the event and its consequences also have to be exposed in the guise of a fact - often a violent one that IS accompanied by different versions of the 'cult of personality'? What is the reason for this historical appropriation of emancipatory politics? The simplest reason is that ordinary history, the history of individual lives, is confined within the State. The history of a life, with neither decision nor choice, is in itself a part of the history of the State, whose conventional mediations are the family, work, the homeland, property, religion, customs and so forth. The heroic, but individual, projection of an exception to all the above - as is a truth procedure - also aims at being shared with everyone else; it aims to show itself to be not only an exception but also a possibility that everyone can share from now on. And that is one of the Idea's functions: to project the exception into the ordinary life of individuals, to fill what merely exists with a certain mea'mre of the extraordinary. To convince my own immediate circle - husband or wife, neighbours and friends, colleagues - that the fantastic exception of truths in the making also exists, that we are not doomed to lives programmed by the constraints of the State. Naturally, in the final analysis, only the raw, or militant, experience of the truth procedure will compel one person or another's entry into the bodyoftruth. But to take him or her to the place where this experience is to be found - to make him or her a spectator of, and therefore partly a participant in, what is important for a truth the mediation of the Idea, the sharing of the Idea, are almost always required. The Idea of communism (regardless of what name it might otherwise be given, which hardly matters: no Idea is definable by its name) is what enables a truth procedure to be spoken in the impure language of the State and thereby for the lines of force by virtue of which the State prescribes what is possible and what i s impossible to be shifted for a time. In this view of things, the most ordinary action is to take someone to a real political meeting, far from their home, far from their predetermined existential parameters, in a hostel of workers from Mali, for example, or at the gates of a factory. Once they have come to the place where politics is occurring, they will make a decision about whether to incorporate or withdraw.But in order for them to come to that place, the Idea and for two centuries, or perhaps since Plato, it has been the Idea of communism - must have already shifted them in the order of representations, of History and of the State. The symbol must imaginarily come to the aid of the creative flight from the real. Allegorical facts must ideologize and historicize the fragility of truth. A banal yet crucial discussion with four workers and a student in an ill-lit room must momentarily be enlarged to the dimensions of Communism and thus be both what it is and what it will have been as a moment in the local construction of the True. Through the enlargement of the symbol, it must become visible that 'just ideas' come from this practically invisible practice.The fiveperson meeting in an out-of-the-way suburb must be eternal in the very expression of its precariousness. That is why the real must be exposed in a fictional structure.

#### We must have the courage to reinvent and remain faith to the idea of communism. The world of the status quo is not necessary and should be abolished. This radical starting point is good enough to create possibilities for new politics

**BADIOU2010** [ALAIN, The Communist Hypothesis Translated by David Macey and Steve Corcoran 2010 p 62-67

Having closed that parenthesis, we can say that we are still struggling with the difficult questions raised by May '68. We are the contemporaries of '68 from the point of view of politics, the definition of politics, and the organized future of politics. I therefore use the word 'contemporary' in the strongest possible sense. Of course, the world has changed, and of course categories have changed. The categories 'student th" k ' d " h' you , workers an peasants now mean sometlng different, and the union and party organizations of those days are now in ruins. But we have the same problem, and are the contemporaries of the problem revealed by May '68: the classical figure of the politics of emancipation was ineffective. Those of us who were politically active in the 1 960s and 1970s did not need the collapse of the USSR to teach us that. Countless new things have been experimented with, tried out and tested both in theory and in the practices that are dialectically bound up with it. And it still goes on thanks to the energy of a handful of activists, intellectuals and workers - and no distinction is made between them - who appear to be working in isolation. They are the guardians of the future and they are inventing the future. But it cannot be said that the problem has been resolved: what new forms of political organization are needed to handle political antagonisms? As in science, until such time as the problem has not been resolved, you have all sorts of discoveries stimulated by the search for a solution. Sometimes, and for the same reason, whole new theories see the light of day, but the problem itself is still there. We can define our contemporaneity with May '68 in similar terms. It is another way of talking about our fidelity to May '68. The decisive issue is the need to cling to the historical hypothesis of a world that has been freed from the law of profit and private interest - even while we are, at the level of intellectual representations, still prisoners of the conviction that we cannot do away with it, that this is the way of the world, and that no politics of emancipation is possible. That is what I propose to call the communist hypothesis. It is in fact mainly negative, as it is safer and more important to say that the existing world is not necessary than it is to say, when we have nothing to go on, that a different world is possible. This is a question of modal logic: how, in political terms, can we move from non-necessity to possibility?Because quite simply, if we accept the inevitability of the unbridled capitalist economy and the parliamentary politics that supports it, then we quite simply cannot see the other possibilities that are inherent in the situation in which we find ourselves. Second, we have to try to retain the words of our language, even though we no longer dare to say them out loud. In '68, these were the words that were used by everyone. Now they tell us: 'The world has changed, so you can no longer use those words, and you know that it WIL'S the language of illusions and terror.' 'Oh yes, we can! And we must!' The problem is still there, and that means that we must be able to pronounce those words. It is up to us to criticise them, and to give them a new meaning. We must be able to go on saying 'people', 'workers', 'abolition of private property', and so on, without being considered has-beens, and without considering ourselves as has-beens. We have to discuss these words in our own field, in our own camp. We have to put an end to the linguistic terrorism that delivers us into the hands of our enemies. Giving up on the language issue, and accepting the terror that subjectively forbids us to pronounce words that offend dominant sensibilities, is an intolerable form of oppression. And finally, we have to realize that all politics is organized, and that the most difficult question is probably that of what type of organization we need. We can resolve it through the multifaceted experiments that begin in '68. For the classic party dispositif, and its social supports, the most important 'battles' were in fact electoral battles, and that is a doctrine that has given all it can give. It is worn out and no longer works, despite the great things it was able to achieve or promote between 1900 and 1960. We have to discuss our fidelity to May '68 on two levels. At the ideological and historical level, we should draw up our own balance sheet for the twentieth century, so that we can reformulate the emancipation hypothesis in contemporary terms, now that the socialist states have failed. And we also know that new local experiments and political battles are going on, and that they will provide the backdrop that will create these new forms of organization. This combination of complex ideological and historical work, and theoretical and practical data about new forms of political organization, is the defining feature of our times. I would readily describe this as the era of the reformulation of the communist hypothesis. Then what is the virtue that means most to us? You know that the revolutionaries of 1 792-94 used the word 'virtue'. Saint-Just asked the crucial question: 'What do those who want neither virtue nor terror want?' His answer was that they wanted corruption. And that indeed is what today's world asks of us: to accept the wholesale corruption of minds under the yoke of commodities and money. The main political virtue we need to fight that now is courage. Not only courage when we face the police - though we will certainly find that - but the courage to defend and practice our ideas and principles, to say what we think, what we want, and what we are doing.To put it in a nutshell: we have to be bold enough to have an idea.A great idea.We have to convince ourselves that there is nothing ridiculous or criminal about having a great idea. The world of global and arrogant capitalism in which we live is taking us back to the 1840s and the birth of capitalism. Its imperative, as formulated by Guizot, was: 'Get rich!' We can translate that as 'Live without an idea!' We have to say that we cannot live without an idea. We have to say: 'Have the courage to support the idea, and it can only be the communist idea in its generic sense.' That is why we must remain the contemporaries of May '68. In its own way, it tells us that living without an idea is intolerable. And then a long and terrible resignation set in. Too many people now think that there is no alternative to living for oneself, for one's own interests. Let us have the courage to cut ourselves off from such people. I am a philosopher, so let me tell you something that has been said again and again since Plato's day. It is very simple. I am telling you as a philosopher that we have to live with an idea, and that what deserves to be called a real politics begins with that conviction.

#### Our ethico-political obligation is to assume responsibility for our actions. Capitalism render’s its victims anonymous and ensures that the aff’s personal focus never come to terms with the billions of degraded life choices globally—our epitstemological position is a PREREQUISITE to understanding the full extent of accessibility concerns.

Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, 2004, Conversations With Zizek, p. 14-16

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord­ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subju­gated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties con­cerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of im­plicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibi­tion conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economismwe should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight thatin order to create a uni­versal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its constructionthrough a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is thatthe gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its out­comes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diver­sity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and name­less (viz, the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’. And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is mag­nified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differ­ential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sus­tained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against thisZizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par­ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

### Case

#### Trading autobiographical narrative for the ballot commodifies one’s identity and has limited impact on the culture that one attempt’s to reform – when autobiographical narrative “wins,” it subverts its own most radical intentions by becoming an exemplar of the very culture under indictment

Coughlin 95—associate Professor of Law, Vanderbilt Law School. (Anne, REGULATING THE SELF: AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL PERFORMANCES IN OUTSIDER SCHOLARSHIP, 81 Va. L. Rev. 1229)

Although Williams is quick to detect insensitivity and bigotry in remarks made by strangers, colleagues, and friends, her taste for irony fails her when it comes to reflection on her relationship with her readers and the material benefits that her autobiographical performances have earned for her. n196 Perhaps Williams should be more inclined to thank, rather than reprimand, her editors for behaving as readers of autobiography invariably do. When we examine this literary faux pas - the incongruity between Williams's condemnation of her editors and the professional benefits their publication secured her - we detect yet another contradiction between the outsiders' use of autobiography and their desire to transform culture radically. Lejeune's characterization of autobiography as a "contract" reminds us that autobiography is a lucrative commodity. In our culture, members of the reading public avidly consume personal stories, n197 which surely explains why first-rate law journals and academic presses have been eager to market outsider narratives. No matter how unruly the self that it records, an autobiographical performance transforms that self into a form of "property in a moneyed economy" n198 and into a valuable intellectual [\*1283] asset in an academy that requires its members to publish. n199 Accordingly, we must be skeptical of the assertion that the outsiders' splendid publication record is itself sufficient evidence of the success of their endeavor. n200

Certainly, publication of a best seller may transform its author's life, with the resulting commercial success and academic renown. n201 As one critic of autobiography puts it, "failures do not get published." n202 While writing a successful autobiography may be momentous for the individual author, this success has a limited impact on culture. Indeed, the transformation of outsider authors into "success stories" subverts outsiders' radical intentions by constituting them as exemplary participants within contemporary culture, willing to market even themselves to literary and academic consumers. n203 What good does this transformation do for outsiders who are less fortunate and less articulate than middle-class law professors? n204 Although they style themselves cultural critics, the [\*1284] storytellers generally do not reflect on the meaning of their own commercial success, nor ponder its entanglement with the cultural values they claim to resist. Rather, for the most part, they seem content simply to take advantage of the peculiarly American license, identified by Professor Sacvan Bercovitch, "to have your dissent and make it too." n205

#### Even if their best intention is to resist the liberal subject, autobiography is understood by its consuming audience as the assertion of the classic autonomous subject – this subverts the political potential of performance by rendering one’s experience legible to the terms of liberalism. This recreates the violence of liberalism that is the root of Western conquest

Coughlin 95—associate Professor of Law, Vanderbilt Law School. (Anne, REGULATING THE SELF: AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL PERFORMANCES IN OUTSIDER SCHOLARSHIP, 81 Va. L. Rev. 1229)

The outsider narratives do not reflect on another feature of autobiographical discourse that is perhaps the most significant obstacle to their goal to bring to law an understanding of the human self that will supersede the liberal individual. Contrary to the outsiders' claim that their personalized discourse infuses law with their distinctive experiences and political perspectives, numerous historians and critics of autobiography have insisted that those who participate in autobiographical discourse speak not in a different voice, but in a common voice that reflects their membership in a culture devoted to liberal values. n206 As Sacvan Bercovitch puts it, American cultural ideals, including specifically the mythic connection between the "heroic individual ... [and] the values of free enterprise," are "epitomized in autobiography." n207 In his seminal essay on the subject, Professor Georges Gusdorf makes an observation that seems like a prescient warning to outsiders who would appropriate autobiography as their voice. He remarks that the practice of writing about one's own self reflects a belief in the autonomous individual, which is "peculiar to Western man, a concern that has been of good use in his systematic conquest of the [\*1285] universe and that he has communicated to men of other cultures; but those men will thereby have been annexed by a sort of intellectual colonizing to a mentality that was not their own." n208 Similarly, Albert Stone, a critic of American autobiography, argues that autobiographical performances celebrate the Western ideal of individualism, "which places the self at the center of its world." n209 Stone begins to elucidate the prescriptive character of autobiographical discourse as he notes with wonder "the tenacious social ideal whose persistence is all the more significant when found repeated in personal histories of Afro-Americans, immigrants, penitentiary prisoners, and others whose claims to full individuality have often been denied by our society." n210¶ Precisely because it appeals to readers' fascination with the self-sufficiency, resiliency and uniqueness of the totemic individual privileged by liberal political theory, there is a risk that autobiographical discourse is a fallible, even co-opted, instrument for the social reforms envisioned by the outsiders. By affirming the myths of individual success in our culture, autobiography reproduces the [\*1286] political, economic, social and psychological structures that attend such success. n211 In this light, the outsider autobiographies unwittingly deflect attention from collective social responsibility and thwart the development of collective solutions for the eradication of racist and sexist harms. Although we may suspect in some cases that the author's own sense of self was shaped by a community whose values oppose those of liberal individualism, her decision to register her experience in autobiographical discourse will have a significant effect on the self she reproduces. n212 Her story will solicit the public's attention to the life of one individual, and it will privilege her individual desires and rights above the needs and obligations of a collectivity.¶ Moreover, literary theorists have remarked the tendency of autobiographical discourse to override radical authorial intention. Even where the autobiographer self-consciously determines to resist liberal ideology and represents her life story as the occasion to announce an alternative political theory, "the relentless individualism of the genre subordinates" her political critique. n213 Inevitably, at least within American culture, the personal narrative engrosses the readers' imagination. Fascinated by the travails and triumphs of the developing autobiographical self, readers tend to construe the text's political and social observations only as another aspect of the author's personality.¶ Paradoxically, although autobiography is the product of a culture that cultivates human individuality, the genre seems to make available only a limited number of autobiographical protagonists. n214 Many theorists have noticed that when an author assumes the task of defining her own, unique subjectivity, she invariably reproduces herself as a character with whom culture already is well-acquainted. n215 While a variety of forces coerce the autobiographer [\*1287] to conform to culturally sanctioned human models, n216 the pressures exerted by the literary market surely play a significant role. The autobiographer who desires a material benefit from her performance must adopt a persona that is intelligible, if not enticing, to her audience. n217 As I will illustrate in the sections that follow, the outsider narratives capitalize on, rather than subvert, autobiographical protagonists that serve the values of liberalism.

#### The 1AC’s challenge to detention allows the military-industrial complex to continue unabated by making war more ethical

Cady 10 (Duane L., prof of phil @ hamline university, From Warism to Pacifism: A Moral Continuum, pp. 22-23)

The widespread, unquestioning acceptance of warism and the corresponding reluctance to consider pacifism as a legitimate option make it difficult to propose a genuine consideration of pacifist alternatives. Warism may be held implicitly or explicitly. Held in its implicit form, it does not occur to the warist to challenge the view that war is morally justified; war is taken to be natural and normal. No other way of understanding large-scale human conflict even comes to mind. In this sense warism is like racism, sexism, and homophobia: a prejudicial bias built into conceptions and judgments without the awareness of those assuming it. In its explicit form, warism is openly accepted, articulated, and deliberately chosen as a value judgment on nations in conflict. War may be defended as essential for justice, needed for national security, as “the only thing the enemy understands,” and so on. In both forms warism misguides judgments and institutions by reinforcing the necessity and inevitability of war and precluding alternatives. Whether held implicitly or explicitly, warism obstructs questioning the conceptual framework of the culture. If we assume (without realizing it) that war itself is morally justifiable, our moral considerations of war will be focused on whether a particular war is justified or whether particular acts within a given war are morally acceptable. These are important concerns, but addressing them does not get at the fundamental issue raised by the pacifist: the morality of war as such. In Just and Unjust Wars Michael Walzer explains that “war is always judged twice, first with reference to the reasons states have for fighting, secondly with reference to the means they adopt.”8 The pacifist suggestion is that there is a third judgment of war that must be made prior to the other two: might war, by its very nature, be morally wrong? This issue is considered by Walzer only as an afterthought in an appendix, where it is dismissed as naïve. Perhaps Walzer should not be faulted for this omission, since he defines his task as describing the conventional morality of war and, as has been argued above, conventional morality does take warism for granted. To this extent Walzer is correct. And this is just the point: our warist conceptual frameworks— our warist normative lenses— blind us to the root question. The concern of pacifists is to expose the hidden warist bias and not merely describe cultural values. Pacifists seek to examine cultural values and recommend what they ought to be. This is why the pacifist insists on judging war in itself, a judgment more fundamental than the more limited assessments of the morality of a given war or the morality of specific acts within a particular war.

#### This makes effective ethical responses to the status quo impossible

* Another impact: freeing ourselves from war = more resources for peace

Lawrence 9 (Grant, “Military Industrial "War" Consciousness Responsible for Economic and Social Collapse,” OEN—OpEdNews, March 27)

As a presidential candidate, [Barack Obama](http://obama.senate.gov/) called [Afghanistan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_in_Afghanistan_%282001%E2%80%93present%29) ''the war we must win.'' He was absolutely right. Now it is time to win it... Senators [John McCain](http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0564587/) and Joseph Lieberman [calling](http://www.miamiherald.com/opinion/inbox/story/960269.html) for an expanded war in Afghanistan "How true it is that war can destroy everything of value." Pope Benedict XVI [decrying](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5iuue8kE-e0lYZVFpt4RlbX4M_IEw) the suffering of Africa Where troops have been quartered, brambles and thorns spring up. In the track of great armies there must follow lean years. Lao Tzu on [War](http://www.sacred-texts.com/tao/salt/salt09.htm) As Americans we are raised on the utility of war to conquer every problem. We have a drug problem so we wage war on it. We have a cancer problem so we wage war on it. We have a crime problem so we wage war on it. Poverty cannot be dealt with but it has to be warred against. Terror is another problem that must be warred against. In the [United States](http://maps.google.com/maps?ll=38.8833333333,-77.0166666667&spn=10.0,10.0&q=38.8833333333,-77.0166666667%20%28United%20States%29&t=h), solutions can only be found in terms of wars. In a society that functions to support a massive military industrial war machine and empire, it is important that the terms promoted support the conditioning of its citizens. We are conditioned to see war as the solution to major social ills and major political disagreements. That way when we see so much of our resources devoted to war then we don't question the utility of it. The term "war" excites mind and body and creates a fear mentality that looks at life in terms of attack. In war, there has to be an attack and a must win attitude to carry us to victory. But is this war mentality working for us? In an age when nearly half of our tax money goes to support the war machine and a good deal of the rest is going to support the elite that control the war machine, we can see that our present war mentality is not working. Our values have been so perverted by our war mentality that we see sex as sinful but killing as entertainment. Our society is dripping violence. The violence is fed by poverty, social injustice, the break down of family and community that also arises from economic injustice, and by the managed media. The cycle of violence that exists in our society exists because it is useful to those that control society. It is easier to sell the war machine when your population is conditioned to violence. Our military industrial consciousness may not be working for nearly all of the life of the planet but it does work for the very few that are the master manipulators of our values and our consciousness. Rupert Murdoch, the media monopoly man that runs the "Fair and Balanced" [Fox Network](http://www.fox.com/), Sky Television, and [News Corp](http://www.newscorp.com/) just to name a few, [had](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rupert_Murdoch) all of his 175 newspapers editorialize in favor of the [Iraq war](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq_War). Murdoch snickers when [he says](http://www.newscorpse.com/ncWP/?p=341) "we tried" to manipulate public opinion." The Iraq war was a good war to Murdoch [because,](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2004/07/b122948.html) "The death toll, certainly of Americans there, by the terms of any previous war are quite minute." But, to the media manipulators, the phony politicos, the military industrial elite, a million dead Iraqis are not to be considered. War is big business and it is supported by a war consciousness that allows it to prosper. That is why more war in Afghanistan, the war on Palestinians, and the other wars around the planet in which the [military industrial complex](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military-industrial_complex) builds massive wealth and power will continue. The military industrial war mentality is not only killing, maiming, and destroying but it is also contributing to the present social and economic collapse. As mentioned previously, the massive wealth transfer that occurs when the American people give half of their money to support death and destruction is money that could have gone to support a just society. It is no accident that after years of war and preparing for war, our society is crumbling. Science and technological resources along with economic and natural resources have been squandered in the never-ending pursuit of enemies. All of that energy could have been utilized for the good of humanity, ¶ instead of maintaining the power positions of the very few super wealthy. So the suffering that we give is ultimately the suffering we get. Humans want to believe that they can escape the consciousness that they live in. But that consciousness determines what we experience and how we live. As long as we choose to live in "War" in our minds then we will continue to get "War" in our lives. When humanity chooses to wage peace on the world then there will be a flowering of life. But until then we will be forced to live the life our present war consciousness is creating.
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## Case

### A2 Language

#### Performance is not a mode of resistance – it gives too much power to the audience because the performer is structurally blocked from controlling the (re)presentation of their representations. Appealing to the ballot is a way of turning over one’s identity to the same reproductive economy that underwrites liberalism

Phelan 96—chair of New York University's Department of Performance Studies (Peggy, Unmarked: the politics of performance, ed published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005, 146-9)

146

Performance’s only life is in the present. Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations of representations: once it does so, it becomes something other than performance. To the degree that performance attempts to enter the economy of reproduction it betrays and lessens the promise of its own ontology. Performance’s being, like the ontology of subjectivityproposed here, becomes itself through disappearance. The pressures brought to bear on performance to succumb to thelaws of the reproductive economy are enormous. For only rarely in this culture is the “now” to which performance addresses its deepest questions valued. (This is why the now is supplemented and buttressedby the documenting camera, the video archive.) Performance occursover a time which will not be repeated. It can be performed again, butthis repetition itself marks it as “different.” The document of a performance then is only a spur to memory, an encouragement of memory to become present. The other arts, especially painting and photography, are drawnincreasingly toward performance. The French-born artist Sophie Calle,for example, has photographed the galleries of the Isabella StewartGardner Museum in Boston. Several valuable paintings were stolen fromthe museum in 1990. Calle interviewed various visitors and membersof the muse um staff, asking them to describe the stolen paintings. She then transcribed these texts and placed them next to the photographs of the galleries. Her work suggests that the descriptions and memories of the paintings constitute their continuing “presence,” despite the absence of the paintings themselves. Calle gestures toward a notion of the interactive exchange between the art object and the viewer. While such exchanges are often recorded as the stated goals of museums and galleries, the institutional effect of the gallery often seems to put the masterpiece under house arrest, controlling all conflicting and unprofessional commentary about it. The speech act of memory and description (Austin’s constative utterance) becomes a performative expression when Calle places these commentaries within the 147 representation of the museum. The descriptions fill in, and thus supplement (add to, defer, and displace) the stolen paintings. The factthat these descriptions vary considerably—even at times wildly—onlylends credence to the fact that the interaction between the art objectand the spectator is, essentially, performative—and therefore resistantto the claims of validity and accuracy endemic to the discourse of reproduction. While the art historian of painting must ask if thereproduction is accurate and clear, Calle asks where seeing and memoryforget the object itself and enter the subject’s own set of personalmeanings and associations. Further her work suggests that the forgetting(or stealing) of the object is a fundamental energy of its descriptiverecovering. The description itself does not reproduce the object, it ratherhelps us to restage and restate the effort to remember what is lost. Thedescriptions remind us how loss acquires meaning and generatesrecovery—not only of and for the object, but for the one who remembers.The disappearance of the object is fundamental to performance; itrehearses and repeats the disappearance of the subject who longs alwaysto be remembered. For her contribution to the Dislocations show at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1991, Calle used the same idea but this time she asked curators, guards, and restorers to describe paintings that were on loan from the permanent collection. She also asked them to draw small pictures of their memories of the paintings. She then arranged the texts and pictures according to the exact dimensions of the circulating paintings and placed them on the wall where the actual paintings usually hang. Calle calls her piece Ghosts, and as the visitor discovers Calle’s work spread throughout the museum, it is as if Calle’s own eye is following and tracking the viewer as she makes her way through the museum.1 Moreover, Calle’s work seems to disappear because it is dispersed throughout the “permanent collection”—a collection which circulates despite its “permanence.” Calle’s artistic contribution is a kind of self-concealment in which she offers the words of others about other works of art under her own artistic signature. By making visible her attempt to offer what she does not have, what cannot be seen, Calle subverts the goal of museum display. She exposes what the museum does not have and cannot offer and uses that absence to generate her own work. By placing memories in the place of paintings, Calle asks that the ghosts of memory be seen as equivalent to “the permanent collection” of “great works.” One senses that if she asked the same people over and over about the same paintings, each time they would describe a slightly different painting. In this sense, Calle demonstrates the performative quality of all seeing. 148 I Performance in a strict ontological sense is nonreproductive. It is this quality which makes performance the runt of the litter of contemporary art. Performance clogs the smooth machinery of reproductive representation necessary to the circulation of capital. Perhaps nowhere was the affinity between the ideology of capitalism and art made more manifest than in the debates about the funding policies for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).2 Targeting both photography and performance art, conservative politicians sought to prevent endorsing the “real” bodies implicated and made visible by these art forms. Performance implicates the real through the presence of living bodies. In performance art spectatorship there is an element of consumption: there are no left-overs, the gazing spectator must try to take everything in. Without a copy, live performance plunges into visibility—in a maniacally charged present—and disappears into memory, into the realm of invisibility and the unconscious where it eludes regulation and control. Performance resists the balanced circulations of finance. It saves nothing; it only spends. While photography is vulnerable to charges of counterfeiting and copying, performance art is vulnerable to charges of valuelessness and emptiness. Performance indicates the possibility of revaluing that emptiness; this potential revaluation gives performance art its distinctive oppositional edge.3 To attempt to write about the undocumentable event of performance is to invoke the rules of the written document and thereby alter the event itself. Just as quantum physics discovered that macro-instruments cannot measure microscopic particles without transforming those particles, so too must performance critics realize that the labor to write about performance (and thus to “preserve” it) is also a labor that fundamentally alters the event. It does no good, however, to simply refuse to write about performance because of this inescapable transformation. The challenge raised by the ontological claims of performance for writing is to re-mark again the performative possibilities of writing itself. The act of writing toward disappearance, rather than the act of writing toward preservation, must remember that the after-effect of disappearance is the experience of subjectivity itself. This is the project of Roland Barthes in both Camera Lucida and Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes. It is also his project in Empire of Signs, but in this book he takes the memory of a city in which he no longer is, a city from which he disappears, as the motivation for the search for a disappearing performative writing. The trace left by that script is the meeting-point of a mutual disappearance; shared subjectivity is possible for Barthes because two people can recognize the same Impossible. To live for a love whose goal is to share the Impossible is both a humbling project and an exceedingly ambitious one, for it seeks to find connection only in that which is no longer there. Memory. Sight. Love. It must involve a full seeing of the Other’s absence (the ambitious part), a seeing which also entails the acknowledgment of the Other’s presence (the humbling part). For to acknowledge the Other’s (always partial) presence is to acknowledge one’s own (always partial) absence. In the field of linguistics, the performative speech act shares with the ontology of performance the inability to be reproduced or repeated. “Being an individual and historical act, a performative utterance cannot be repeated. Each reproduction is a new act performed by someone who is qualified. Otherwise, the reproduction of the performative utterance by someone else necessarily transforms it into a constative utterance.”4 149 Writing, an activity which relies on the reproduction of the Same(the three letters cat will repeatedly signify the four-legged furry animalwith whiskers) for the production of meaning, can broach the frame of performance but cannot mimic an art that is nonreproductive. Themimicry of speech and writing, the strange process by which we put words in each other’s mouths and others’ words in our own, relies on a substitutional economy in which equivalencies are assumed and re-established. Performance refuses this system of exchange and resists the circulatory economy fundamental to it. Performance honors the idea that a limited number of people in a specific time/space frame can have an experience of value which leaves no visible trace afterward. Writing about it necessarily cancels the “tracelessness” inaugurated within this performative promise. Performance’s independence from mass reproduction, technologically, economically, and linguistically, is its greatest strength. But buffeted by the encroaching ideologies of capitaland reproduction, it frequently devalues this strength. Writing aboutperformance often, unwittingly, encourages this weakness and falls inbehind the drive of the document/ary. Performance’s challenge to writingis to discover a way for repeated words to become performative utterances, rather than, as Benveniste warned, constative utterances.

#### Nommo fails to theorize disagreement, therefore it cannot understand community creation and addresses disagreement as death of the African American individual

**Lynn Clarke, Vanderbilt Prof of Comm, 2004,** *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 18.4 (2004) 317-325

Addressing the second question first, the problem of holding power accountable to those in whose name it speaks is apparent in certain deployments of *Nommo* as instrumental force. The speech practice of "call and response" is a striking example. In Yancy's invocation of *Nommo* to account for this dynamic "*co-signing* and *co-narrating* of a shared communicative reality," a speaker makes "a verbal point" to an audience charged with responding (293). The conceived, expected response is one of "approval." If not received, the audience will likely be deemed "'dead.'" Knowles-Borishade, who comes closest to thinking the question of *Nommo* and dissent, offers a somewhat different account. In it, responders co-create the caller's "message—the Word" by either sanctioning or rejecting it "spontaneously during the speech," based on "the perceived morality and vision of the Caller" and "the relevance of the message" (Knowles-Borishade 1991, 497-98). According to Knowles-Borishade, call and response aims at "consensus" determined by "the people themselves" (493-94). Through the process of "checks and balances" that constitutes call and response, "levels of perfected social interaction" are promoted. Yet, in Yancy's and Knowles-Borishade's discussions of call and response, an account of disagreement and its potential to hold power accountable does not appear. At most, disagreement is figured as privatized rejection. The grounds of this response remain unknown to the speaker and audience members, among whom reasons for dissent may vary. In the face of silent rejection, the accounts of AAL's call and response are mum on what ought happen next. The dead audience plays no transparent cognitive-practice role. The caller is free to cast his word-spell. The absense of accountability in a sheerly productive word appears more readily in Asante's conception of African communication. In it, the group is thought to take precedence over the individual (Asante 1998, 74). To Asante, this "strong collective mentality" warrants a focus on the aesthetic dimension of speech in "traditional African public discourse." The focus is relatively narrow, prompting a declaration that, "The African speaker means to be a poet; not a lecturer," inducing "compulsive relationships" and invoking the audience's "inner needs" through "the inherent power" of "concrete images" (91). Though reason may matter on this account of *Nommo,* it is tough to see how and why. **[End Page 320]** Indeed, talk of reason appears relatively unimportant in Asante's "traditional" understanding of African public discourse (75, 90-91). Creativity's "highlight" shines in the absence of an explicit role for communicative reason in public speech.[3](http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2735/journals/journal_of_speculative_philosophy/v018/18.4clarkel.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT3#FOOT3) Accountability appears as a non-issue, lurking uncomfortably in the shadow of creative power.

#### Yancy’s nommo cannot create intersubjective relations within the African American community—it only speaks to those who already agree on the terms . That means it fails to broaden African American political discourse because it leaves unaddressed those who disagree.

**Lynn Clarke, Vanderbilt Prof of Comm, 2004,** *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 18.4 (2004) 317-325

Returning to the question of creative power's compass—Yancy's account of *Nommo* raises problems here as well. In the account, recall, the word's generative function funds "an oppositional way of speaking" (Yancy 2004, 289). Among other products, the speech acts of resistance manifest themselves in a black identity and reality based on a presumption of shared interests among African American selves.[4](http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2735/journals/journal_of_speculative_philosophy/v018/18.4clarkel.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT4#FOOT4) At the same time, however, *Nommo*'s creative force is conceptually detached from the word's power to constitute intersubjective relations between selves and others *within* the African American community. Thus, Yancy's concept of *Nommo* only admits a generative power to create identification among blacks who *already* agree to the presence and terms of shared interest. The power of this *Nommo* fails to reach those African Americans who disagree with black majoritarian terms. This relatively minimal compass of power suggests that *Nommo*'s potential to define black community and reality may need to be reconceptualized beyond the presumptions of shared experience and common values to consider *Nommo*'s potential to forge relations between African Americans who are divided on the terms of their present and future.

### Uniqueness

#### I’ll answer the uniqueness debate here – There is NO uniqueness for their strategy – it has already been commodified in the status quo.

Carter 2011

[Niambi, Black Woman's Burden: Commodifying Black Reproduction (review), From: Black Women, Gender & Families , Volume 5, Number 2, Fall 2011]

In Black Woman's Burden: Commodifying Black Reproduction, author Nicole Rousseau argues that black women occupy a unique space in the American sociopolitical landscape. Rousseau's primary aim in the text is to "illustrate the clear links between historical policies and practices that have exploited, restricted, and controlled Black reproduction as well as current assaults on black womanhood that have resulted in coercive policies and programming" (5). Rousseau examines black women's reproductive labor from enslavement to the contemporary period. Employing her theory of historical womanism, Rousseau argues black women have served a vital role as producers and reproducers of the labor force. Thus, black women occupy a distinctive position in the labor force as members of the labor pool and as the source of labor. It is in their capacity as reproducers, Rousseau argues, black women are most economically valued and reviled.Rousseau, in her examination of social rhetoric, demonstrates how black women are marginalized and, yet, are simultaneously targets of exploitative social policy. This social policy has persistently sought to coerce, surveil, and ultimately control black women's reproductive labors. This burden, she persuasively argues, is not exclusive to poor black women. Black women face this situation as a group because the dominant social rhetoric has tended to construct black motherhood as dangerous to the superstructure. Thus, black women, as potential mothers, have been both rendered silent and hypervisible in the racist, sexist, and patriarchal public sphere.

#### Visibility of injury of the black body is self defeating and is used against blackness

Nash 2005

[Jennifer C., From Lavender to Purple: Privacy, Black Women, and Feminist Legal Theory, 11 Cardozo Women's L.J. 303, 323 (2005)

The cultural and social surveillance of the black body has been compounded by the legal hyper-surveillance of the black body. While mandatory arrest/no-drop advocates have argued that non-discretion oriented law enforcement mandates operate to ensure that law enforcement engage with all domestic violence calls the same way, many communities of color simultaneously hear the promise of uniformity and recall the terror of disparate policing, racial profiling, and police brutality as a reality that trumps the promise of uniformity. In her reading of the Rodney King beating, Judith Butler analyzes the ways that a tape depicting King “being brutally beaten, repeatedly, and without visible resistance” could be deployed to argue that King's body was posing a threat to the white officers who brutalized him.[85](https://a.next.westlaw.com/Document/I78267cf04a7c11db99a18fc28eb0d9ae/View/FullText.html?transitionType=UniqueDocItem&contextData=(sc.Default)#co_footnote_F85305057272) Butler argues that the presence of the film in “a racially saturated field of visibility” literally colored objectivity and enabled both jurors and members of the court of public opinion to read the video as being in some way about black deviance and criminality rather than white brutality.[86](https://a.next.westlaw.com/Document/I78267cf04a7c11db99a18fc28eb0d9ae/View/FullText.html?transitionType=UniqueDocItem&contextData=(sc.Default)#co_footnote_F86305057272) Butler argues that it is this “racist organization and disposition of the visible” which taints the potential for objectivity, neutrality, or uniformity.[87](https://a.next.westlaw.com/Document/I78267cf04a7c11db99a18fc28eb0d9ae/View/FullText.html?transitionType=UniqueDocItem&contextData=(sc.Default)#co_footnote_F87305057272) While Butler's analysis is grounded in the ways in which jurors and citizens “read” the tape of a brutalized black body and the hyper-exertion of (white male) state force on that body, her insights can be utilized as a way of analyzing and critiquing the language (and promise) of uniformity. That is, if the visual field is “racially saturated” such that evidence of brutality against King can be spun into evidence of his dangerousness, an objective viewer cannot help but wonder if uniform or neutral law enforcement is possible in a regime where “by virtue of [one's] blackness,” one's body is already coded as imminently dangerous.[88](https://a.next.westlaw.com/Document/I78267cf04a7c11db99a18fc28eb0d9ae/View/FullText.html?transitionType=UniqueDocItem&contextData=(sc.Default)#co_footnote_F88305057272)¶ Mills argues that this “racially saturated field of visibility” affects law enforcement's implementation of ostensibly uniform and neutral policies in the domestic violence context. She notes that while mandatory arrest is often contextualized as a sex equality project, it is also a project that perpetuates racial discrimination because “[m]en of color are likely to be arrested and prosecuted for intimate abuse crimes at disturbingly disproportionate rates when compared with their white counterparts.”[89](https://a.next.westlaw.com/Document/I78267cf04a7c11db99a18fc28eb0d9ae/View/FullText.html?transitionType=UniqueDocItem&contextData=(sc.Default)#co_footnote_F89305057272) Mills asserts that these actual gross disparities in \*324enforcement and policing have implications for communities' perceptions of whether mandatory arrest is a beneficial police intervention. She notes, “[a]s law professor Kimberlé Crenshaw has argued, it is critical to remember that many women of color are reluctant to seek intervention from the police, fearing that their contact with law enforcement will exacerbate the system's assaults on their public and private lives.”[90](https://a.next.westlaw.com/Document/I78267cf04a7c11db99a18fc28eb0d9ae/View/FullText.html?transitionType=UniqueDocItem&contextData=(sc.Default)#co_footnote_F90305057272) The fact that at least some black female subjects envision, and imagine, the state as a threatening, and potentially brutal, agent rather than as a safe and potentially life-affirming institution reveals that the adoption of mandatory arrest might have significantly different results, effectiveness, and consequences for communities of color.

#### Their intersectional approach inevitably gets coopted by capitalism – identity-based coalitions are easier targeted and played off each other

Philips 2002

[Joseph Michael, PhD in from the University of Texas at Austin, “THE FIRE THIS TIME: THE BATTLE OVER RACIAL, REGIONAL AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITIES IN DALLAS, TEXAS, 1860-1990”, http://www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2002/phillipsj022/phillipsj022.pdf]

In Dallas, skin color became the coin of the realm. Men like Ochoa believed that greater political and economic privilege should be granted Mexican Americans because they were "white." Such a contention depends on the notion that the black and white "races" represent distinct entities with innate qualities. Harvard biologist Stephen Jay Gould argues that race has no real scientific meaning. There is more genetic variation — deviations in skin pigment, hair texture, inherited disorders, etc. — within the arbitrary racial boxes used to divide humanity than between each category. Since miscegenation has proved as certain in human history as death, war and taxes, and since the purity of each group is a fiction, the definitions of these supposedly distinct categories change each time a child is born.10 As sociologist Howard Winant points out, " . . . in the United States, hybridity is universal: most blacks have ‘white blood,’ and many millions of whites have ‘black blood.’ . . . colonial rule, enslavement, and migration have dubious merits, but they are all effective 'race mixers.'"11 Regardless of how arbitrarily these classifications are defined, placement in a racial category held real-life consequences.12 "Becoming white meant gaining access to a whole set of public and private privileges that materially and permanently guaranteed basic subsistence needs and, therefore, survival," wrote Cheryl I. Harris in a 1993 essay in the Harvard Law Review. "Becoming white increased the possibility of controlling critical aspects of one’s life rather than being the object of others’ domination."13 To be classified as "non-white" in cities like Dallas, on the other hand, was to be assigned low-wage jobs and to have few opportunities for economic advancement. For instance, segregation survived at Dallas schools, lunch counters and department stores until the 1960s. At the opening of that decade, non-whites in Dallas County annually earned about one-fourth the yearly wages of whites. Non-white males suffered twice the unemployment rate as the general population and were far more likely to end up in prison.14 Economic disparities along racial lines survived the dismantling of Jim Crow. Material motives abounded for seeking inclusion within whiteness. If such racial lines had proved unmovable, living conditions might have proved so desperate as to spark violent resistance by people of color. Races, however, are social conventions whose terms change. The definition of racial identities such as white, black, and brown vary over time and by location. Millions of Mexican Americans, for instance, magically ceased to be white in 1930 by virtue of the U.S. Census Bureau which in its population statistics separated those of Hispanic descent from the white population and placed them in a separate "Mexican" category.15 Such legal definitions had little to do with the reality of racial categories and more to do with preventing the transfer of wealth from a white master class to a population of color through inheritance by mixed-race children. Racial categories were created not simply by law, but by custom, as seen in the de facto segregation of Mexican Americans who were never specifically targeted by Texas’ Jim Crow laws. In Dallas, the flexibility of such categories lent the idea of race special power. The opportunity to become white often left potential collaborators, the city’s black and brown populations, at loggerheads. Historian David R. Roediger utilized whiteness to explain why the politically oppressed in America allow themselves to be divided along racial and ethnic lines when their common interest would seemingly lie in challenging the power and privileges of a narrow white ruling bloc.16 Racial lines could be redrawn at will. Dominant racial thought in nineteenth century America, Roediger noted, excluded many immigrant groups, such as the Irish, from the definition of whiteness. Roediger suggests that as labor radicalism began to rise, these groups struck a bargain with the traditional "native" white elites. The immigrant groups would be granted membership within the white race provided they surrendered their ethnic identities, accepted white supremacy and disavowed political radicalism. Many members of these ethnic groups openly embraced racism as a means of attaining higher social status than blacks. Yet, immigrant groups paid the wages of whiteness by alienating themselves from possible allies in their struggle for greater political and economic power. Roediger provides a convincing description of racial politics in the United States, but his model remains too static. Once the Irish achieve whiteness in his account, the change in status assumes an air of permanence. If a group never faced racial demotion, the urgency to cling to white supremacist notions would diminish over time. Neil Foley, in The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture, significantly modified Roediger’s model by demonstrating that poor white sharecroppers in 19th and 20th century Texas faced the loss of their racial status. Wealthy cotton growers, eager to promote Mexican and black sharecroppers as cheaper pools of labor and concerned over signs of incipient radicalism among white farm workers, promoted the notion that "white trash" descended from inferior racial stock. It is the implied threat of such racial demotion that gives whiteness such power as a ruling ideology.17 In Dallas, whiteness represented a merger of physical characteristics and political beliefs. It was based on the premise that Europeans alone were the creators of civilization and the suspicion that other racial groups might be not be only less than white but also less than human. Europeans and their descendents were seen as solely possessing a gift for technology and only they could manage a free republic. In the hands of racial inferiors, republics inevitably degenerated into anarchy. Blackness, in the minds of many Dallasites, equaled savagery, license and irresponsibility. Most Dallasites fell between the extremes of whiteness and blackness. For those so marginalized, such as Mexican Americans and Jews, social acceptability depended on moving closer to the white ideal. In Dallas, to win acceptance as white required not just a European ancestry and a relatively pale skin. Race was also attitude. Whiteness rested on a steadfast belief in racial differences, support for capitalism, faith in rule by the wealthy, certitude that competition and inequality arose from nature, and rejection of an activist government that redistributed political or economic power. Whiteness was most clearly defined by what it was not: it was not black, communal, or socialist.
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### O/V

#### The methodology should not energize debate but rather should render debate useless. Do not protect debate from its slow death, hasten it by voting negative – inclusion into the perfect liberal structures doesn’t change them

Forte 2009 [“useless anthropology: strategies for dealing with the militarization fo the academy”, <http://zeroanthropology.net/2009/05/22/%E2%80%9Cuseless-anthropology%E2%80%9D-strategies-for-dealing-with-the-militarization-of-the-academy/> ]

One does not need to seek employment with the Pentagon, take part in counterinsurgency, or work for the Human Terrain System in order to provide useful, even if involuntary, support for the national security, intelligence and military goals of the U.S., or any NATO state for that matter. In fact, one does not even need to be an American anthropologist in order to provide the U.S. military and intelligence with the information they seek.One needs to simply produce useful anthropology and not be mindful of the consequences of how it can be used by unintended audiences, now or in the future, to support agendas of which one may have limited awareness and even less desire to support. With this and much more in mind, my ambition is to seek the creation of a useless anthropology, and while some would say I was always on the right track for achieving that, I think more of us need to share a goal of producing useless research, to make worthless contributions, and by useless I mean useless to power, to empire, to domination, to regimes of scrutiny and inspection of the periphery. And not just useless, but even toxic and repulsive to the scientists of conquest– an anthropology of both withdrawal and resistance, free of false dilemmas that work to support business as usual, willing to set fire to the crops we planted if it stops them from being harvested by the tyrant, liberating ourselves from being our own best hostages. The idea is to refuse further engagement with the international traffic in information and knowledge that supports the workings of empire, capital, and the state. In this presentation I seek to make three main points. First, to indicate some of the ways that all of us can be even unwillingly useful in supporting U.S. military and intelligence interests. Second, to reflect on the meaning of useful anthropology. Third, to point the way to possible alternatives, that could entail unthinking anthropology as we know it. With reference to the first point, [Gerald Sider](http://anthronow.com/innocentanthro.pdf) made the point that at this moment in history “there is no such thing as an innocent anthropology” (p. 43). We know now that the U.S. military and intelligence are looking for ways of incorporating scholars in producing a global surveillance net. One way is to bring social scientists on counterinsurgency and pacification missions. Another is to have them conduct analysis of stolen Iraqi documents (see [here](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2008/10/31/minerva-research-initiative-violates-international-law-and-iraqi-sovereignty/) and [here](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2008/07/26/minerva-project-and-looted-iraqi-documents/)), or to conduct fieldwork in areas of emerging or potential threat and describe the radicalization process and ways of counteracting it, as part of the Pentagon’s [Minerva Research Initiative](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2008/06/18/minerva-project-now-official-and-ready-to-begin/), managed in partnership with the [National Science Foundation](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2008/08/01/latest-minerva-and-national-science-foundation-news/). Another is to comb through [open access](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2008/08/18/imperializing-open-access-and-militarizing-open-source-whats-yours-is-ours-whats-ours-is-ours/) electronic resources. And yet another is just to [get everything for free](http://rethinkingacademicconferences.blogspot.com/2008/08/academics-beware-traveling-through-us.html), by scanning, copying, seizing any or all electronic devices or written records from researchers as they enter the United States whether returning home to the U.S., or just traveling through, U.S. Border Patrol and Customs agents can: scan and hold laptops indefinitely; they can make electronic copies of hard drives, flash drives, cellphones, iPods, pagers, beepers, video and audio tapes; and, they can seize papers, documents, books, pamphlets, or even litter. This is also true of Canada and the [UK](http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/technology/2008/02/09/us_border_agents_can_search_your_laptop_or_phone.html). Open access publishing, and publishing in electronic formats that are thus amenable to automated harvesting, is a critically important way that ethnographic data can be used by the national security state without the willing participation of researchers. “Intelligence does not have to be secret to be valuable!” says the [website](http://www.universityofmilitaryintelligence.us/mi_library/opensource.asp) of the University of Military Intelligence, regarding open access resources, which takes us to Intelink-U, part of the U.S. Army’s [Foreign Military Studies Office](http://fmso.leavenworth.army.mil/wbil/osisinfo.htm), emerging from the Open Source Information System which serves the US intelligence community with open source intelligence. Among Intelink-U’s subscriptions is the University of New Mexico’s Latin America Database, as well as EbscoHost Databases. The Foreign Military Studies office is also in the process of creating the [World Basic Information Library](http://fmso.leavenworth.army.mil/wbil/wbil.htm) (WBIL), which promotes the concept of “[distance drilling](http://fmso.leavenworth.army.mil/wbil/distance.htm)” telling us that: “About 85% of requirements in the intelligence business can be met with open source, unclassified sources, and can be exploited by qualified military reservists working by telecommuting. The WBIL has remotely located reservists from all four branches of the service doing ‘virtual’ collection and production utilizing their home Personal Computers.” Also, the [Information Operations Advisory Task Force](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2009/04/24/counterinsurgency-for-the-masses-educating-americans-for-campaigns-of-national-interest/) states that it has a “requirement to provide US Forces [in] Afghanistan…with the capability to collect, analyze, and disseminate open source (i.e. sociological or anthropological) information.” With reference to the second point of this presentation, the bases for a useful anthropology, let us note that useful, objective, neutral, and scientific, are once again the buzzwords for an anthropology aligned with power, in the service of the national security state, while rhetorically attempting to move the militarization of the academy beyond the sphere of “politics”. Criticism is political; support is scientific. If you oppose military objectives, you are biased; if you provide practical knowledge, you are objective, and objective is good, just like machines are good. On the other hand, military interest in anthropology is to a significant extent the perhaps unintended outcome of anthropology’s success in marketing itself. The compulsion in this discipline, from the time before its institutionalization in universities, has been to market itself to power as a useful science, with valuable contributions to make, later boasting of the vital importance of ethnography as anthropology’s unique contribution, so much so that [anthropology and ethnography](http://www.scribd.com/doc/7504716/INGOLD-Anthropology-is-Not-Ethnography) are wrongly equated. We wanted the attention of elites, and now we’ve got it. The military is interested in both culture and ethnography. In an article in [National Defense Magazine](http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2008/September/Pages/MarineCorps%E2%80%99Strategy.aspx), we are told that “A deeper understanding of culture has become an official part of Marine Corps strategy.” Meanwhile, General William “KIP” Ward, Commander, United States Africa Command, [said this](http://www.africom.mil/getArticle.asp?art=1659) about the Pentagon’s work in Africa: *“A lot of activity goes on in the continent through our non-government organizations. Academia is involved. When I was in previous assignments, someone came to me and would talk about, well, ‘Ward, you need to get a cultural anthropologist on your team.’ I said, what! A cultural what? Anthropologist? To do what? Get out of here. Or, ‘Ward, you need to have someone to help you understand the human dimension. You need some human terrain analysis.’ I said, ‘what? Get out of here.’ But it’s important, and where do those skills, talents reside — academia.”* But for more academics to be more useful, they need to get over certain twinges of moral compunction. In the minds of the state and military some of us have already reverted to being a tool of imperialism, assuming we were ever anything else. Not serving imperialism is routinely called “retreating from the world” by some. Montgomery McFate, the anthropology PhD who has been the most prominent spokesperson for the Human Terrain System, [wrote](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/milreview/mcfate.pdf) in a military journal that, *“Over the past 30 years, as a result of anthropologists’ individual career choices and the tendency toward reflexive self-criticism contained within the discipline itself, the discipline has become hermetically sealed within its Ivory Tower….anthropologists still prefer to study the ‘exotic and useless,’ in the words of A.L. Kroeber….The retreat to the Ivory Tower is also a product of the deep isolationist tendencies within the discipline.” (p. 28)* She doesn’t stop there, unfortunately, she notes that, *“frequently backed up by self-reflexive neo-Marxism, anthropology began a brutal process of self-flagellation, to a degree almost unimaginable to anyone outside the discipline….The turn toward postmodernism within anthropology exacerbated the tendency toward self-flagellation….(also) This movement away from descriptive ethnography has produced some of the worst writing imaginable.” (p. 28)* In this regard, she merely echoes some of the conservative and often overwrought backlash within the discipline over this trend that it imagined to be postmodern, whatever that is, apparently being self-critical is evil. With reference to the third and final point of this presentation, looking for alternatives and options to cooptation, for less useful anthropologies, I was inspired by Sider’s ideas about how a partisan anthropology, done “to help the victims of currently intensifying inequalities,” might begin, and it would begin in “the design of fieldwork and in the context of understanding struggle” (p. 44). He advocates against interviews, against asking questions of so-called informants, and against any form of recording data. Asking questions, he notes, is a seemingly simple act that opens our work to use by those who seek to dominate and control the people we study (p. 45). There are other ways we can work, he says, less open, but not impervious, to subsequent manipulation. Other options include choosing research projects that, in the eyes of the national security state, are entirely useless, and to write up the results in very esoteric language, with ample self-criticism. Another option is do to more “research at home” either collaborating with persons who are not the subject of either a moral panic or some hyperbolic national security hysteria, or, producing critiques of the way elites exercise power and enforce inequalities and injustices. Another option is [open source ethnography](http://www.openanthropology.org/jumbieethnography.html) done online, to collaborate with the producers of online information of ethnographic value, remixing it so that it becomes problematic to military examination. Not publishing in open access formats is another option, especially once the work is not funded by a public agency, the argument that “the public has a right to the research it funded” vanishes into irrelevance. We can also imagine experimenting with forms of research communication that defy easy understanding and conventional requirements of the military planner’s database, such as fictionalized ethnographies; ethnographic poetry; [open source cinema](http://www.opensourcecinema.org/) (see [here](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Source_Cinema) also); [theatrical coproductions](http://openanthropology.wordpress.com/2007/10/15/from-apter-1999-fabians-dialogical-performative-ethnographic-experiment/), and so forth.What we cannot do, however, and pretend to be innocent about it, is simply to leave here today and continue to conduct business as usual.

### Nommo

#### Code-switching needs to be situated inside broader processes of economic domination – the alternative is a precondition to dissolving code-switching

Gal ’88 (Susan, Mae & Sidney G. Metzl Distinguished Service Professor of Anthropology, of Linguistics, and of Social Sciences @ U. of Chicago, “The political economy of code choice” Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives, pp. 246-248)

However, in contrast to the earlier concern with cross-cultural difference, and perhaps under the influence of generative linguistics, most current comparative studies that include codeswitching have seen it as one instance of universal interactional or social-psychological processes (e.g. Bell 1984; Brown and Levinson 1978; Giles and Smith 1979; Gumperz 1982; Scotton 1983). These studies differ in detail, but they agree that the alternations between linguistic varieties - pronouns of address, dialects, linguistic variables, or seperate languages - all have the same underlying logic in conversation. One influential version of this argument states that the alternative forms index overarching social oppositions (we/they, power/solidarity), making the choice of one form over the other in a specific context an interpretable act that invites conversational inferences (Gumperz 1982) These inferences are very much like Gricean implicatures, but usually center around the speakers' relationships, (ethnic) identities or conversational intentions. Similarly, other comparisons have aimed to show that in all speech communities the linguistic forms perceived to distinguish social groups of different statuses are the ones used for stylistic effect in conversation (Irvine 1985). These broadly pragmatic studies have been enormously important, revealing interactional principles of impressive generality. ¶ In light of the universalist trend, however, many of the papers in this collection constitute something of a departure. They highlight contrasts in codeswitching practices, implicitly or explicitly demanding an explanation for the notable differences between communities as well as the similarities. For instance, it has long been known that some bilingual populations allow very intimate mixing of linguistic systems within utterances or even clauses, while in others strict separation or compartmentalization of codes is required. Codeswitching within a single turn of talk is a common, even characteristic activity of some bilingual populations, while it is rare or non-existent elsewhere. Some communities or sub-groups, often in the grip of purist linguistic ideologies, monitor their codeswitching, indirectly alluding to a perceived switch before it occurs or in subsequent talk. Others are unaware of their codeswitches, sometimes even denying they occur2. The language authorized by the state is often used as a symbol of power and prestige within the bilingual group, but this is by no means always the case. Codeswitching is often limited to conversations within a minority group, but there are also reports of its use between groups, even when one of the interlocutors may be monolingual.¶ ¶ To reach an understanding of these differences, we need a comparative analysis that interprets codeswitching practices not only as conversational tools that maintain or change ethnic group boundaries and personal relationships but also as symbolic creations concerned with the construction of "self" and "other" within a broader political economic and historical context. This suggests that the study of how codes are deployed in conversation is not only a sociolinguistic problem. Because codeswitching usually involves the use of a state-supported and powerfully legitimated language in opposition to a stigmatized minority language that has ocnsiderably less institutional support, it can also provide fresh evidence of what neo-Marxist culture theory (e.g. WIlliams 1973) identifies as "consciousness": how speakers respond symbolically to relations of domination between groups within the state, and how they understand their historic position and identity within a world capitalist system structured around dependency and unequal development.

### Links

#### Their understanding of Power – is a link – the Cross-x of the 1AC articulates power as fluid concept, that is problematic because it allows capitalism to deterritorialize and reinforce itself

Kevin Cryderman, “Jane and Louisa: The Tapestry Of Critical Paradigms: Hutcheon, Lyotard, Said, Dirlik, And Brodber,” 2000, http://65.107.211.206/post/caribbean/brodber/kcry1.html,

In "Borderlands Radicalism," Dirlik is critical of the trends of postmodernism and postcolonialism in regard to borders, subjectivity, and history. Dirlik claims that postmodernism and postcolonialism tend to simply reinforce the reign of late capitalism: Post-modernism, articulating the condition of the globe in the age of flexible production, has done great theoretical service by challenging the tyrannical unilinearity of inherited conceptions of history and society. The political price paid for this achievement, however, has been to abolish the subject in history, which destroys the possibility of political action, or to attach action to one of another diffuse subject positions, which ends up in narcissistic preoccupations with self of one kind of another. (89) Dirlik claims that the 'happy pluralism' of postcolonialism -- such as its emphasis on flux, borderlands and liminal space -- does not so much oppose elite unified narratives of nations and cultures as it does reinforce them. Dirlik also links this trend of "fluid subject positions" (98) in postmodernism to postcolonialism and Global Capitalism: "in the age of flexible production, we all live in the borderlands. Capital, deterritorialized and decentered, establishes borderlands where it can move freely, away from the control of states and societies but in collusion with states against societies" (Dirlik 87). Moreover, the problem "presented by postcolonial discourse" is "a problem of liberating discourse that divorces itself from the material conditions of life, in this case Global Capitalism as the foundational principle of contemporary society globally" (99). Dirlik also links the intellectual class as a product of global capitalism which, according to Dirlik, "has jumbled up notions of space and time" (100). Indeed, both postmodernist and post-colonialist literature involve the fragmentation and rebellion against modernist ideologies that impose essentializing identity, linear time schemes, and totalizing narratives.

#### Slavery is existed as long as conquest – proven by history of Roman empire – capitalism is the root cause of expansion. Slavery is also a question of production – racism was just a byproduct of needing to justify infinite expansion at all costs.

Kovel, 2002 [Joel Kovel**,** Alger Hiss Prof. At Bard, 2002 The Enemy of Nature, Zed Books, p. 123-125]

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 [hu]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.’0 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.

### Debate Space

#### We address the root cause of attendance – economics cut against trending enrollment of black students – the aff does not address the key factor in participation

Robert Longley 9/6/2013 “College Enrollment Declines After Steady Growth”, <http://usgovinfo.about.com/b/2013/09/06/college-enrollment-declines-after-steady-growth.htm>

After six years of substantial and steady growth, U.S. college enrollment has fallen by nearly half a million students in less than a year, according to new report from the U.S. Census Bureau.¶ Statistics from the Census Bureau's School Enrollment: 2012, showed that college enrollment in fall 2012 plunged by 467,000 students compared to fall 2011. The decline, which includes both graduate and undergraduate students, reversed a trend that saw college enrollment soar by 3.2 million students between 2006 and 2011.¶ The report provides an annual look at the characteristics of students enrolled in all levels of schools from nursery to graduate school. Data includes enrollment by age, sex, race, Hispanic origin and country in which the students were born.¶ Also See: Federal Student Aid Primer¶ The greatest decline came among older students, age 25 and older. Their enrollment fell by 419,000, while the enrollment of younger students declined by 48,000.¶ Hispanic Enrollment Increased¶ While college enrollment among white students fell by 1.1 million and black students by 108,000, enrollment of Hispanic college students rose to 3.4 million, up 447,000 between 2011 and 2012. Overall, Hispanics made up almost 22% of all students enrolled in all levels of education from preschool to graduate school in 2012, an increase of nearly 16% since 2002.¶ "This increase in the number of Hispanics enrolled in college can be attributed to the combination of an increase in the adult Hispanic population and their climbing likelihood of being enrolled," said Census Bureau statistician Julie Siebens in a press release.¶ More Diversity on Campus¶ The Census report also reveals the growing diversity among U.S. college students. While the percentage of non-Hispanic white college students fell from 67% to 58% between 2006 and 2012, the percentage of Hispanic students rose from 11% to 17% over the same period and the percentage of black students rose from 14% to 15%.¶ In addition, the percentage of foreign-born students enrolled in preschool through college increased to almost 30% in 2012, up from 28.4% in 2002.¶ The statistics also showed a reduction in the popularity of private schools. The number of students enrolled in private elementary, middle and high schools fell from 4.8 million in 2005, to 4.2 million in 2012.¶ Is it the Rising Cost of College?¶ While the Census Bureau offered no reasons for the declining enrollment in U.S. colleges, it seems only logical that the ever-increasing cost of going to college has played a role.

### Whiteness

#### The Alternative is not a movement with a leader that is divorced from culture but a method that embraces utopia in all its forms under the IDEA of communism – their articulation of privilege is another link – it prevents a focus on the larger structures of capital

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. *Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.”* Pg.176

Specific modes of knowledge and technique begin to appear fundamen­tally violent and illegitimate in relation to a different mode of sovereignty. Consequently, the primary responsibility of the specific intellectual, the self-reflexive inquiry into the modes of power/knowledge that have formed one, i.e., “unlearning privilege,” is nothing but a transfer of alle­giance to new modes of marketized sovereignty emerging around knowl­edge production. The counterpublics, meanwhile, and their border-cross­ing diplomats are simply negotiating points, playing one form of marketized sovereignty off against another. Such conditions complicate politics, of course—no one gets to choose which mode of marketized sov­ereignty they come into direct confrontation with—but this doesn’t liqui­date the universalizing political principles. The very fragmentation of the “common” is at stake in the multiplication of sovereign forms, since the legitimacy of any sovereignty is in the space it provides for theory, ac­countability, and power to be articulated before an outside. To put it dif­ferently, how wide a scope does a given mode of sovereignty provide for each to be “outside of the outside of the other,” on a global scale? In this way, we can also account for the hierarchy arranging different modes of sovereignty, in terms of where the antagonism between privatized modes of sovereignty and transnational modes of accountability are most con­centrated.