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#### Deleuze, Foucault, and other theories of difference reject the coherence and static nature of any concept. This fractured resistance is no different than the rampant individualism that has allowed capitalism to expand rapidly-only members of the upper class benefit from such resistance, as they are already in a position of privilege.

Zavarzadeh in 95 [Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, post-ality: Marxism and postmodernism, post-ality the (dis)simulations of cybercapitalism

Similarly Daniel Bell, who draws upon the traditional sociological protocols and research programs, opposes "totality" as vociferously, in his positivist idiom, as Derrida, Lyotard and postmarxists. Moreover, the pop theorists of cybercapitalism, Alvin Toffler and Heidi Toffler, have reproduced and widely disseminated the theo¬ries of differance in such books as the Future Shock, The third Wave, Powershift, Creating a New Civilization, and through their popular pedagogy of congeniality and anecdotes—especially influencing the corporate elite, their petit bourgeois allies and the Republican Party apparatchiks (whose main function has historically been to build an alliance between the ruling class and petit bourgeoisie by suturing their conflicting economic interests through stabilizing cultural values). In other words, differance not only underlies the postmarxist notion of "radical democ¬racy" put forth by Laclau and Mouffe in their adaptation of Derridean deconstruction (and popularized in the knowledge industry by Stanley Aronowitz), but it is also the founding concept of the new aggressive cult of the individual and entrepre-neurship that marks both the new "wave" (to use Toffler's metaphor for historical change) conservativism of the 1990's and the rejection of representative democ¬racy by the Tofflers, who would like to replace it with a more or less direct self-representational electronic democracy. The Tofflers' notion that representational democracy is the residue of the Enlightenment and cannot serve the "Third Wave" civil society (Powershift 235-369) is rooted in the same philosophical/ideological theories of the sign that has led such ludic- theories as Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault (in their own rhizomatic versions of difference) to denounce the possibility of any representation and instead advocate self-representation. No one, ac¬cording to this end-of-representation theory, can speak for the other (Foucault, Language, Counter-Memory 206)--each must speak for him or herself. This post-al representation is the informing principle of both the Foucault-Laclau¬ Mouffe notion of radical democracy and the Tofflers' idea of direct democracy based on the electronic plebiscite. Deleuze and Guattari's rhizomatic democracy of differance is the same as the Tofflers' electronic activism (Powers/rift 356-358): both are "rooted" in a post-majoritarian hegemonic democracy of pulsations and lines of flights and "traces" of individual energies. Electronic activism provides the ideological effects needed by cybercapitalism because it substitutes direct, experiential, affective democracy for a rational critique-al democracy: it is politics without concepts. The rejection of critique (shared by the left postmodernists such as Fredric Jameson and right-wing Third Wavists like Newt Gingrich) serves the purpose of this post-al plebiscitary democ¬racy of direct "reactions," Far from being a "radical" and avant-garde view that definitely marks the "outdatedness" of collectivity, the "war on totality," is the dominant ideology of cybercapitalism in its war against the working class the collective subject of labor and revolution; the builder of democratic centralism. The anti-totality differance, in short, which grounds the political theories of Derrida, Lyotard, Laclau, Mouffe . , . Toftlers, is the theory of decentralization, privatization and devolution of any collectivity that attempts to provide for the common "needs"- putting in its place the self-articulating "desires" of those whose needs have already been met through class exploitation. There is, thus, a direct connec¬tion between the notion of hegemonic coalition and electronic plebiscitary de¬mocracy; between Ernesto Laclau and Newt Gingrich in their attempts to render the economic interests of an old ruling class as the radically new interests of an emerging cyber civil society.

#### This sustains Everyday suffering is dictated by continued structures of power that puts minorities into a continuous cycle of violence. The result is sadistic violence occurring right now— structural violence, climate change, biodiversity loss, genocide, and even economic collapse. This capitalistic crisis is not like others in history- ITS HAPPENING RIGHT NOW.

Robinson 16 — William I. Robinson, Professor of Sociology, Global Studies and Latin American Studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara, PhD in Sociology, 2016 (“Sadistic Capitalism: Six Urgent Matters for Humanity in Global Crisis,” Truth-Out, April 12th, Available Online at <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/35596-sadistic-capitalism-six-urgent-matters-for-humanity-in-global-crisis>)//RM

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

#### The alternative is to affirm the form of the party—against the subjective atomization of contemporary politics, only a vertical form of organization aimed at transformation of constituted structures of power can actualize change

Dean and Mertz ‘16 (Jodi and Chuck, Donald R. Harter ’39 Professor of Humanities and Social Sciences @ Hobart and William Smith Colleges and Host at This is Hell!, “The JFRP: For a New Communist Party,” aNtiDoTe Zine 1/23/16, https://antidotezine.com/2016/01/23/for-a-new-communist-party/)

CM: Great to have you on the show.¶ Let’s start with Occupy. What, to you, explains the impact that the Tea Party had on Republicans, relative to the impact that Occupy seems to have had on the Democratic Party? All of the sudden there were “Tea Party Republicans.” There weren’t “Occupy Democrats.”¶ JD: That’s a good point. The Tea Party took the Republican Party as its target. They decided that their goal was going to be to influence the political system by getting people elected and basically by trying to take over part of government. That’s why they were able to have good effects. They didn’t regard the mainstream political process as something irrelevant to their concerns. They thought of it as something to seize.¶ The problem with many—but not all—leftists in the US is that they think the political process is so corrupted that we have to completely refuse it, and leave it altogether. The Tea Party decided to act as an organized militant force, and too much of the US left (we saw this in the wake of Occupy) has thought that to be “militant” means to refuse and disperse and become fragmented.¶ CM: So what explains the left turning its back on the collective action of a political party? It would seem like a political party would fit into what the left would historically want: an apparatus that can organize collective action.¶ JD: There are multiple things. First, the fear of success: the left has learned from the excesses of the twentieth century. Where Communist and socialist parties “succeeded,” there was violence and purges and repression. One reason the left has turned its back is because of this historical experience of state socialism. And we have taken that to mean that we should not ever have a state. I think that’s the wrong answer. That we—as the left—made a mistake with some regimes does not have to mean that we can never learn.¶ Another reason that the left has turned its back on the party form has been the important criticism of twentieth century parties that have been too white, too masculine, potentially homophobic; parties that have operated in intensely hierarchical fashion. Those criticisms are real. But rather than saying we can’t have a party form because that’s just what a party does, why not make a party that is not repressive and does not exclude or diminish people on the basis of sex, race, or sexuality?¶ So we’ve got at least two historical problems that have made people very reluctant to use the party. I also think that, whether or not you mark it as 1968 or 1989, the left’s embrace of cultural individualism and the free flow of personal experimentation has made it critical of discipline and critical of collectivity. But I think that’s just a capitalist sellout. Saying everybody should just “do their own thing” is just going in the direction of the dominant culture. That is actually not a left position at all.¶ CM: So does identity politics undermine collectivism? And did that end up leading to fragmentation and a weakening of the left? Because there are a lot of people we’ve had on the show—and one person in particular, Thomas Frank—who say that there is no left in the United States.¶ JD: First I want to say that I disagree with the claim that there is no left. In fact, I think that “the left” is that group that keeps denying its own existence. We’re always saying that we’re the ones who don’t exist. But the right thinks that we exist. That’s what is so fantastic, actually. Did you see the New York Post screaming that Bernie Sanders is really a communist? Great! They’re really still afraid of communists! And it’s people on the left who say, “Oh, no, we’re not here at all!”¶ The left denies its own existence and it denies its own collectivity. Now, is identity politics to blame? Maybe it’s better to say that identity politics has been a symptom of the pressure of capitalism. Capitalism has operated in the US by exacerbating racial differences. That has to be addressed on the left, and the left has been addressing that. But we haven’t been addressing it in a way that recognizes how racism operates to support capitalism. Instead, we’ve made it too much about identity rather than as an element in building collective solidarity.¶ I’m trying to find a way around this to express that identity politics has been important but it’s reached its limits. Identity politics can’t go any further insofar as it denies the impact of capitalism. An identity politics that just rests on itself is nothing but liberalism. Like all of the sudden everything will be better if black people and white people are equally exploited? What if black people and white people say, “No, we don’t want to live in a society based on exploitation?”¶ CM: You were saying that the left denies its own collectivity. Is that only in the US? Is that unique to the US culture of the left?¶ JD: That’s a really important question, and I’m not sure. Traveling in Europe, I see two different things. On the one hand I see a broad left discussion that is, in part, mediated through social media and is pretty generational—people in their twenties and thirties or younger—and that there’s a general feeling about the problem of collectivity, the problem of building something with cohesion, and a temptation to just emphasize multiplicity. You see this everywhere. Everybody worries about this, as far as what I’ve seen.¶ On the other hand, there are countries whose political culture has embraced parties much more, and fights politically through parties. Like Greece, for example—and we’ve seen the ups and downs with Syriza over the last two years. And Spain also. Because they have a parliamentary system where small parties can actually get in the mix and have a political effect—in ways that our two-party system excludes—the European context allows for more enthusiasm for the party as a form for politics.¶ But there’s still a lot of disagreement on the far left about whether or not the party form is useful, and shouldn’t we in fact retreat and have multiple actions and artistic events—you know, the whole alter-globalization framework. That’s still alive in a lot of places. CM: You mentioned the structure of the US electoral system doesn’t allow for a political party to necessarily be the solution for a group like Occupy. Is that one of the reasons that activists dismiss the party structure as something that could help move their agenda forward?¶ JD: We can think about the Black Panther Party as a neat example in the US context: A party which was operating not primarily to win elections but to galvanize social power. That’s an interesting way of thinking about what else parties can do in the US.¶ Or we can think about parties in terms of local elections. Socialist Alternative has been doing really neat work all over the country, organizing around local elections with people running as socialist candidates not within a mainstream party. I think that even as we come up against the limits of a two-party system, we can also begin to think better about local and regional elections.¶ The left really likes that old saw: “Think Globally, Act Locally.” And then it rejects parties—even though political parties are, historically, forms that do that, that actually scale, that operate on multiple levels as organizations.¶ That we have a two-party system makes sense as an excuse why people haven’t used left parties very well in the US, but that doesn’t have to be the case.¶ And one more thing: there is a ton of sectarianism in the far left parties that exist. Many still fight battles that go back to the twenties, thirties, forties, fifties, and haven’t let that go. That has to change. We don’t need that kind of sectarian purity right now.¶ CM: You ask the question, “How do we move from the inert mass to organized activists?” You mention how you were at Occupy Wall Street; you write about being there on 15 October 2011 as the massive crowd filled New York’s Times Square. And you mention this one young speaker, and he addresses the crowd; they’re deciding if they should move on to Washington Square Park or not, because they need to go somewhere where there are better facilities. You then quote the speaker saying, “We can take this park. We can take this park tonight. We can also take this park another night. Not everyone may be ready tonight. Each person has to make their own autonomous decision. No one can decide for you. You have to decide for yourself. Everyone is an autonomous individual.”¶ Did that kind of individualism kill Occupy Wall Street from the start?¶ JD: Yeah, I think so. A lot of times I blame the rhetorics of consensus and horizontalism, but both of those are rooted in an individualism that says politics must begin with each individual, their interests, their experience, their positions, and so on. As collectivity forms—which is not easy when everyone’s beginning from their individual position—what starts to happen is that people start looking for how their exact experiences and interests are not being recognized.¶ I think that the left has given in too much to this assumption that politics begins with an individual. That’s a liberal assumption. Leftists, historically, begin with the assumption that politics begins in groups. And for the left in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the operative group is class. Class is what determines where our political interests come from.¶ I try to do everything I can in the book to dismantle the assumption that politics, particularly left politics, should begin with the individual. Instead I want people thinking about how the individual is a fiction, and a really oppressive fiction at that. And one that’s actually, conveniently, falling apart.¶ CM: You write about Occupy Wall Street having been an opening but having had no continuing momentum. You mention that the party could add that needed momentum. That’s one of the things that parties can do. The structure of the party can continue momentum and keep the opening alive.¶ When you say that a party could be a solution for a movement like Occupy, you don’t mean the Democratic Party, do you?¶ JD: I’ve got a lot of layers on this question. My first answer is that no, I really mean the Communist Party. My friends call this “Jodi’s Fantasy Revolutionary Party” as a joke, because the kind of Communist Party I take as my model may not be real, or may have only existed for a year and a half in Brooklyn in the thirties. And I don’t mean the real-existing Communist Party in the US now, which still exists and basically endorses Democrats.¶ My idea is to think in terms of how we can imagine the Communist Party again as a force—what it could be like if all of our left activist groups and small sectarian parties decided to come together in a new radical left party.¶ So no, I don’t envision the Democratic Party as being that. That’s not at all what I have in mind. I’m thinking of a radical left party to which elections are incidental. Elections might be means for organizing, but the goal isn’t just being elected. The goal is overthrowing capitalism. The goal is being able to build a communist society as capitalism crumbles.¶ Second, it could be the case—as a matter of tactics on the ground in particular contexts—that working for a Democratic candidate might be useful. It could be the case that trying to take over a local Democratic committee in order to get communist/socialist/radical left candidates elected could also be useful. But I don’t see the goal as taking over the Democratic Party. That’s way too limited a goal, and it’s a goal that presupposes the continuation of the system we have, rather than its overthrow.¶ CM: But how difficult would it be for a Communist Party to emerge free of its past associations with the Soviet Union? Can we even use the word “communist” or is it impossibly taboo?¶ JD: We have to recognize that the right is still scared of communism. That means the term is still powerful. That means it still has the ability to instill fear in its enemies. I think that’s an argument for keeping the word “communism.”¶ It’s also amazing that close to half of Iowa participants in the caucuses say that they are socialist. Four or five years ago, people were saying socialism is dead in the US. No one could even say the word. So I actually think holding on to the word “communism” is useful not only because our enemies are worried about communism, but also because it helps make the socialists seem really, really mainstream, and that’s good. We don’t want socialism to seem like something that only happens in Sweden. We want it to seem like that’s what America should have at a bare minimum.¶ One last thing about the history of communism: every political ideology that has infused a state form has done awful things. For the most part, if people like the ideology, they either let the awful things slide, or they use the ideology to criticize the awful things that the state does. We can do the same thing with communism. It’s helpful to recognize that the countries we understand to have been ruled by Communist Parties were never really communist—they didn’t even claim to have achieved communism themselves. We can say that state socialism made these mistakes, and in so doing was betraying communist ideals.¶ I don’t think we need to abandon these terms or come up with new ones. I think we need to use the power that they have. And people recognize this, which is what makes it exciting.¶ CM: You write, “Some contemporary crowd observers claim the crowd for democracy. They see in the amassing of thousands a democratic insistence, a demand to be heard and included. In the context of communicative capitalism, however, the crowd exceeds democracy.¶ “In the 21st century, dominant nation-states exercise power as democracies. They bomb and invade as democracies, ‘for democracy’s sake.’ International political bodies legitimize themselves as democratic, as do the contradictory and tangled media practices of communicative capitalism. When crowds amass in opposition, they pose themselves against democratic practices, systems, and bodies. To claim the crowd for democracy fails to register this change in the political setting of the crowd.”¶ So are crowds today, the protesters today, opposed to democracy? Or are they opposed to the current state of, let’s say, representative democracy?¶ JD: Let’s think about our basic environment. By “our,” now, I mean basically English-speaking people who use the internet and are listening to the radio and live in societies like the United States. In our environment, what we hear is that we live in democracy. We hear this all the time. We hear that the network media makes democratic exchange possible, that a free press is democracy, that we’ve got elections and that’s democracy.¶ When crowds amass in this setting, if they are just at a football game, it’s not a political statement. Even at a march (fully permitted) that’s registering opposition to the invasion of Iraq, for example, or concern about the climate—all of those things are within the general environment of “democracy,” and they don’t oppose the system. They don’t register as opposition to the system. They’re just saying that we want our view on this or that issue to count.¶ But the way that crowds have been amassing over the last four or five years—Occupy Wall Street is one example, but the Red Square debt movement in Canada is another; some of the more militant strikes of nurses and teachers are too—has been to say, “Look, the process that we have that’s been called democratic? It is not. We want to change that.”¶ It’s not that we are anti-democratic. It’s that democracy is too limiting a term to register our opposition. We want something more. We want actual equality. Democracy is too limiting. The reason it’s too limiting is we live in a context that understands itself as “democratic.” So democracy as a political claim, in my language, can’t “register the gap that the crowd is inscribing.” It can’t register real division or opposition. Democracy is just more of what we have.¶ CM: We are so dependent. We use social media so much, we use Facebook so much, we use so many of these avenues of what you call communicative capitalism so much. How can we oppose or reject this system without hurting ourselves and our ability to communicate our message to each other? Can we just go on strike? Can we become the owners of the means of communicative production?¶ JD: One of the ways that Marxism historically has understood the political problems faced by workers is our total entrapment and embeddedness in the capitalist system. What makes a strike so courageous is that workers are shooting themselves in the foot. They’re not earning their wage for a time, as a way to put pressure on the capitalist owner of the workplace.¶ What does that mean under communicative capitalism? Does it mean that we have to shoot ourselves in the foot by completely extracting ourselves from all of the instruments of communication? Or does it mean that we change our attitude towards communication? Or does it mean that we develop our own means of communication?¶ There’s a whole range here. I’m not a Luddite. I don’t think the way we’re going to bring down capitalism is by quitting Facebook. I think that’s a little bit absurd. I think what makes more sense is to think of how we could use the tools we have to bring down the master’s house. We can consolidate our message together. We can get a better sense of how many we are. We can develop common modes of thinking. We can distribute organizing materials for the revolutionary party.¶ I don’t think that an extractive approach to our situation in communicative media is the right one. I think it’s got to be more tactical. How do we use the tools we have, and how do we find ways to seize the means of communication? This would mean the collectivization of Google, Facebook, Amazon, and using those apparatuses. But that would probably have to be day two of the revolution.¶ CM: Jodi, I’ve got one last question for you, and it’s the Question from Hell, the question we might hate to ask, you might hate to answer, or our audience is going to hate the response.¶ How much did the narrative that Occupy created, of the 99% and the 1%, undermine a of collectivity? Because it doesn’t include everyone…¶ JD: Division is crucial. Collectivity is never everyone. What this narrative did was produce the divided collectivity that we need. It’s great to undermine the ~~stupid~~ myth of American unity, “The country has to pull together” and all that crap. It’s fantastic that Occupy Wall Street asserted collectivity through division. This is class conflict. This says there is not a unified society. Collectivity is the collectivity of us against them. It produced the proper collectivity: an antagonistic one.

#### Capitalism has infiltrated the educational plane and controls the way we have developed. It constitutes a tool for upholding neoliberal hegemony and will co-opt any emancipatory struggles. It is important to resolve through a transformation of the pedagogical plane through a praxis of pedagogical decolonization. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best methodology to resist capitalism.

Robinson 16 (Global Capitalism and the Restructuring of Education: The Transnational Capitalist Class' Quest to Suppress Critical Thinking Author(s): William I. Robinson Source: Social Justice , 2016, Vol. 43, No. 3 (145) (2016), pp. 1-24 Published by: Social Justice/Global Options Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26405720)

IN RECENT DECADES WORLD CAPITALISM HAS BEEN UNDERGOING A process of globalization, or profound restructuring and expansion. What type of human capital does the emerging global capitalist system require in order for it to function (which is to say, in order for capital accumulation to overcome the technical and political impediments to its continuous expansion)? For one, it needs a cadre of organic intellectuals who are to do the overall thinking and strategizing for the system, as well as a small army of technocrats and administrators who are to resolve problems of system maintenance and development. At the same time, this system needs a very large army, indeed, of people who will supply nothing but their labor, and who are not disposed or equipped to think critically and reflexively about their existence or that of a system sustained on great inequalities and ever more repressive and ubiquitous social control. Finally, it needs a mass of humanity as surplus labor—let us say a few billion people or so—who can serve as a reserve supply of manual and other forms of low-skilled and flexible labor in agriculture, industry, and services; who can be carefully controlled at all times; and who can be discarded when no longer needed. What kind of an educational system would be able to deliver such a mass of humanity endowed with, or lacking in, the sets of skills, knowledge, and mental faculties needed to meet these requirements? Certainly, it would need a core of elite centers of education where the organic intellectuals who administer the system and engage in its ongoing design would study and train. Below it would be a tier of educational institutions producing every sort of vocational and technocratic referred to as "symbolic analysts" ers—that is, people trained in as engineers, computer programmers, change for their services and comfortable lifestyles. Then "precariatized" and thrown basic numeracy and literacy and whose potential for critical threat to the capitalist order. This tier in the educational system would be quite restricted in its pedagogical dual function of supplying the necessary to produce servile critical thinking that could punitive social control. In that the transnational elite The Trifurcation of Humanity The 1 Percent, the 20 Percent, On the eve of the 2015 annual Switzerland, an event attended business, political, and cultural at that, one must be invited), port on global inequality, aptly More" (Oxfam 2015b). The report observed that the wealthiest 1 percent of humanity owned 48 percent in 2009, and that under more than 50 percent of the global wealth by 2016. The obscenity of such concentrations when seen in the context the world's richest 80 billionaires increased from $1.3 trillion of $600 billion in just four The wealth of these 80 billionaires by the bottom half of the world's half of humanity saw its wealth period. In other words, the of billions of dollars from the poorest half of humanity to the richest 80 people on the planet. If such inequality was already "simply staggering," in the words of the report (Oxfam 2015a), it is noteworthy that this polarization of wealth between the bottom half of humanity and the richest 80 people on earth—all but seven of whom are men—actually accelerated since the 2008 financial collapse, so it would seem that the crisis has made the rich many times richer and the poor many times poorer. It is similarly worth noting that the world s top billionaires and the one percent are concentrated in the financial and insurance sector (Warren Buffett and Michael Bloomberg lead the way, followed by the likes of George Soros, a Saudi prince, several Russian oligarchs, and a Brazilian and a Colombian businessman). A major portion of these richest are also concentrated in the pharmaceutical and health care sectors, and here Indian and Chinese billionaires lead the way, together with ones from Turkey, Russia, Switzerland, and elsewhere. And such immense concentrations of wealth translate in manifold ways into political influence: according to Oxfam, the financial and pharmaceutical sectors spent in recent years close to one billion dollars lobbying in the United States alone. The Occupy Wall Street movement of2011-2012 brought to worldwide attention the concentration of the world's wealth in the hands of the one percent with its famous rallying cry, "We are the 99 percent!" However, an equally if not more significant division of the world's population with regard to political and sociological analysis is between that better off—if not necessarily outright wealthy—20 percent of humanity whose basic material needs are met, who enjoy the fruits of the global cornucopia, and who are generally blessed with conditions of security and stability, and the bottom 80 percent of the world's population who face escalating poverty, deprivation, insecurity, and precariousness.The Oxfam report noted that the richest 20 percent of humanity owned 94.5 percent of the world's wealth in 2014, whereas the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just 5.5 percent of that wealth. In simplified terms, the world faces a trifurcated structure of the 1 percent, the 20 percent, and the 80 percent. The global elite has taken note of these extreme inequalities, as evidenced by the inordinate attention received by Thomas Piketty's 2014 study, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, and it is concerned that such polarization may undermine growth and lead to instability and even to rebellion. But there is little or no discussion among the one percent about any fundamental redistribution of wealth and power downward; instead, the elite has turned to expanding the mechanisms of ideological and cultural hegemony as well as repression. Both and constructed in and through industries, and political and to be seduced by the promise and entertainment, backed dissatisfaction lead to rebellion. So what type of a worldwide the global ruling class, presumably a trifurcation of humanity? for elites and power relations ing needs with regard to economy of global capitalism and open-ended evolution Global Capitalism as Epochal Capitalism experiences major obstacles emerge to ongoing named "structural" or "restructuring" structured in order to overcome invest profitably dry up, the capital, typically through adjustment programs imposed measures, free-trade agreements, violence (Greece's struggle Fund-private banking complex US wars of intervention construction of prison-industrial Both forms of violence have opportunities for capitalist The structural crises of capitalism, involve social upheavals, political cultural change. The last global financial collapse 1970s. The year 1968 was of Martin Luther King in Black and Chicano liberation anti-war movements, and massacre of students took great campesino, worker, and students upheavals across the country. Further away, 1968 saw the Prague Spring, the uprising of students and workers in Paris, the height of the Cultural Revolution in China, the Tet Offensive in Vietnam (which marked the beginning of the first major defeat for US imperialism), and the spread of anti-colonial and armed liberation movements throughout Africa and Latin America. All this reflected a crisis of hegemony for the system—a crisis in its political and cultural domination. Then came the economic dimension. By 1973 the US government had to abandon the gold standard; the recently formed Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) imposed its oil embargo, which sent shock waves through the world economy; and stagflation (stagnation plus inflation) set in everywhere. This was, in a nutshell, a severe structural crisis of twentieth-century nation-state capitalism. By the early 1970s a pre-revolutionary situation was percolating in many countries and regions. The popular classes were able to resist attempts by the dominant groups to shift the burden of the 1970s crises on to their shoulders. As the crisis intensified, these dominant groups sought ways to liberate themselves from the social democratic, redistributive forms of class compromise of the previous decades. Analytically speaking, capital sought to free itself of any reciprocal responsibility to labor, and capitalist states sought to shed themselves of the social welfare systems that were established in previous decades. Elites in the rich countries also sought ways to integrate emergent Third World elites into the system (see, e.g., Prashad 2008, Robin son 1996) .These dominant groups launched a neoliberal counter-revolution: an attempt to roll back the social welfare state, to resubordinate labor, and to reconstitute their global hegemony through a newfound transnational mobility of capital and a transformation of the inter-state system. The model of "savage" global capitalism that took hold in the late twentieth century involved a new relation between capital and labor based on the deregulation, informalization, deunionization, and flexibilization of labor, as more and more workers swelled the ranks of the "precariat"—a proletariate existing in permanently precarious conditions.4 Free-trade agreements and neoliberal policies have played a key role in the subordination of labor worldwide and in the creation of this global flexible labor market. The new model of global capitalism has also involved a renewed round of extensive and intensive expansion of the system. In the late twentieth century, the former socialist countries and the revolutionary states of the Third World were integrated into the world market. But even more than extensive expansion, the system has undergone intensive expansion involving commodification of spheres exchange value, such as social health, and education, so and of unloading of surplus The capitalist system has and transformation since the Americas. On the heels the reorganization of political class agents and technologies, expansion through imperialist of humanity and of the and historical materialist educational system, are connected economy (that is, in the material existence), and experience the changing nature of therefore, has impressed that comprise society. The mercantile era spanned tenth centuries, and it lowed by an epoch of classical first industrial revolution, ruling class, and the consolidation system as the political form symbolic date of 1789, the Competitive capitalism gave national monopolies and which organized themselves in a new round of imperialist world markets, resources, mass social struggles around around a new social structure accumulation involving a norms, and political structures tion (McDonough et al. But the Fordist-Keynesian II—with its mechanisms the market, and class compromise—in the 1970s. Emergent "going global," giving way to the current epoch of global capitalism. One key distinctive feature of the global epoch of world capitalism is that the system has all but exhausted its possibilities for extensive expansion, as the whole world has been brought into the orbit of capital, so that globalization now involves an intensive expansion that is reaching depths not seen in previous epochs. The life-world itself, to use Habermas's (1985) phrase, becomes colonized by capital, and the educational system is an institution that facilitates the colonization of the life-world. Transnational Capital and the Transnational State Global capitalism involves a rearticulation of social power relations around the world. This new epoch is characterized above all by the rise of fully transnational capital and the integration of every country and region into a new globalized system of production, finances, and services. We have seen a sequence in the rise of the global economy. Production was the first to transnationalize, starting in the late 1970s, as epitomized by the consolidation of the global assembly line (a delocalized process of manufacturing across multiple countries) and the spread of maquiladoras and zonas francas based on the super-exploitation of cheap, often young female, workers located in countries of the Global South or border communities. Next to transnationalize, in the twentieth and early twenty-first century, were national banking and financial systems, following the deregulation of financial markets in most countries around the world and the creation of countless new financial instruments or tradable forms of finance. There is no longer such a thing as a national financial system. Given its fungible nature and its virtually complete digitalization, money moves almost without friction through the financial circuits of the global economy and therefore plays a key integrative function. Transnational finance capital has become the hegemonic fraction of capital on a world scale; it determines the circuits of capital and it has subordinated productive capital—not to mention governments, political systems, social institutions, and households. More recent is the transnationalization of services. At this time, in fact, the major thrust of free-trade negotiations such as the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), the Trans Adantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), and most ominously, the Trade in Services Agreement (TISA), is to remove remaining national regulation and of transnational capital from nation state and the working social consideration; and But transnational capital or TCC, has emerged as capitalist classes began to the process accelerated in the 1970s crisis, capitals from numerous mechanisms that through foreign direct and boards of directors, transnational of outsourcing, subcontracting, establishment of tens of thousands inter-alia, Robinson 2004,2014).the giant global or transnational global economy. The TCC is grounded in emergent rather than national. There the TCC has become the global scale, and at its apex when they are still local found that in order to survive or another into the emergent services. Power in most countries has gravitated away from local and national fractions of the elite transnationally oriented Transnational fractions have taken state power, through the takeover of political platforms, backed transnationally oriented the political control and their heightened material capitalist globalization, integrating of accumulation as well as as the World Trade Organization) neoliberal states have opened corporate plunder of resources, As the TCC and its political and bureaucratic allies have pushed capitalist globalization, national states have adopted similar sets of neoliberal policies and signed free-trade agreements in consort with one another and with the supra and transnational institutions that have designed and facilitated the global capitalist project—among them, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB),the European Union, the United Νations, and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This increasingly dense networks of nation state institutions and trans- and supranational organizations constitute transnational state (TNS) apparatuses. It is through such apparatuses that the TCC attempts to exercise its class power in each country and in the global system as a whole. Such TNS institutions have been at the forefront of the neoliberal restructuring of educational systems, including the corn modification of schooling and the privatization of higher education. The Changing Labor Needs of the Global Economy and the New Precariat In the classic study Schooling in Capitalist America, Bowles and Gintis (1976) showed how the internal organization of schools corresponded to the internal organization of the capitalist workforce in its structures, norms, and values (their "correspondence theory"), and how the school system, with its disciplinary processes, hierarchal relations, and hidden curricula, prepared students for their future role in the capitalist economy. Schools, they showed, played a critical role in the capitalist control of labor and in the reproduction of existing social inequalities [see also Willis's (1981) modern classic], Bowles and Gintis's essential argument on the relationship between education and the capitalist economy and society remains valid today. What did change are the nature of capitalism (specifically, its globalization) and the labor needs of the global economy. Bowles and Gintis argued that there was a contradiction between the needs of accumulation and the needs of social reproduction. The capitalist economy needed a workforce that was highly trained, intelligent, and self-directed. The education required for this workforce also developed people's ability to think, and it brought together millions of young people under conditions that could encourage struggles for social justice. Now, alongside a small and shrinking group of high-skilled and high-paid workers, global capitalism needs a workforce with less autonomy and creative abilities, and one subject to ever more intense mechanisms of social control in the face of a rising tide of superfluous labor and ever more widespread immiseration ideological content of mass but the openly and directly a heightened role. Bowles and Gintis (1976) epochs of competitive and the industrial revolution, from century, required a workforce Keynesian capitalism needed whether in the industrial pockets of the Global South (a development strategy whereby national industries). In addition, developmentalism sought modeled on those of the core so too has the dual process by Harry Braverman (1974) and Monopoly Capital, while cal revolution, especially redundant much skilled and (1995) described, two decades End of Work, and as Aronowitz in The Jobless Future. Just between the 80 and the 20 between unskilled and low-office and service complexes and security forces of the skilled technical and knowledge a final conclusion, it is likely nanotechnology, bio-engineering,and robotic and machine the immediate future, the heighten this tendency towards high-skilled tech and knowledge best, or simply to surplus Global capital therefore needs basic numeracy and literacy educational training for high-handful of global elite universities that educate and groom the TCC, its organic intellectuals, and transnationally oriented managerial and techno cratic elites—Harvard, Yale, Cambridge, Oxford, the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Tokyo University, the Indian Institute of Technology, the Grandes Ecoles in France, and so on. Brezis (2009) estimates that the top 50 universities around the world recruit 33 percent of the transnational politi cal elites and 47 percent of the transnational business elites. Most of these global elite universities are located in the United States, but they turn to new transnational student markets to recruit from around the world. Below the elite universities are higher education institutions intended to train people for a mercantile insertion into the upper rungs of the global labor market. In the 1990s, just as the neoliberal onslaught was in full swing, TNS institutions such as the OECD, the European Union, the United Nations, the World Bank, the IMF, and the WTO began calling for universal primary education, for a shift from public to private secondary education, and for the privatization and commodification of higher education. The World Bank has played the lead role in establishing the transnational elite's policy agenda in this regard. Its landmark 2003 report, Achieving Universal Primary Education by 2015 (Bruns et al. 2003), called for primary education to become universal worldwide by the year 2015, expanding on the call for universal education contained in the United Nations Millennium Development Goals promulgated in 2000 at the United Nations Millennium Summit with much fanfare and with the participation of so-called civil society representatives (see http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/goals/).'Pn.c Millennium Development Goals put forth a set of eight development goals to be achieved by 2015: among them, a reduction by half the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and who suffer from hunger; universal primary education; a reduction by two-thirds of the mortality rate among children under five and by three quarters of the maternal mortality rate; a halt to and reversal of the incidence of major diseases; the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment; and so on. However, the prescription put forth to achieve these lofty goals was based on a more thoroughgoing privatization of health and educational systems; a further freeing up of the market from state regulations; greater trade liberalization and structural adjustment; and the conversion of agricultural lands into private commercial property—in other words, an intensification of the very capitalist development that had generated the social conditions to be eradicated (for discussion, see Amin 2006). The 2003 World Bank report curricular and structural of preparing workers for reform would take place within 2003). It argued that universal sound [read: neo-liberal] ally competitive economies," productivity; it also stressed opportunity should not be confused such as land or capital" (ibid., sector financing of primary important, because privatization tion of privately run schools, and elsewhere.6 At the same time as the World Bank and other TNS institutions called for universal primary education to prepare the labor force of global capitalism, they have pushed the privatization of higher education. In its 1998 report, Higher Education Financing Project, the World Bank called for higher-education programs to be privatized, deregulated, and oriented to the market rather than public ownership or governmental planning and regula tion" (World Bank 1998).7 The report argued for a substantial increase in university tuition fees; full payment for room and board; loans for students based on market interest rates, together with the subcontracting of loan collection to private companies; the expansion of "entrepreneurial training" at universities; the multiplication of programs that offer university research findings to corporate purchases; and a general increase in the number of private institutions, with a progressive decrease in public education. The report's author stated in an addendum that much of what may look like the agenda of the neoliberal economist may also be more opportunistic than ideological. With taxes increasingly avoidable and otherwise difficult to collect and with competing public needs so compelling on all countries, an increasing reliance on tuition, fees and the unleashed entrepreneurship of the faculty may be the only alternative to a totally debilitating austerity. (Johnstone 1998,4) This neoliberalization of higher education converts the university worldwide into the domain of the elite and of that 20 percent of global society who have the resources to finance their education and to train for taking commanding roles in global society. At the same time, it heightens the ideological role that education plays in inculcating dull minds with respect for authority, obedience, and a craving for petty consumption and fantasy—that is, the banal culture of global capitalism and its dehumanizing values. Neoliberal restructuring, and most importantly privatization, opens up educational systems to transnational capital, both as a new space for accumulation and as brain trusts for capital itself. Transnational capital has invaded the university and the educational system in every sense, from converting education into a for-profit activity to commissioning and appropriating research (often publicly funded) while simultaneously generating a major new source of financial speculation through students loans (Soederberg 2015). Neoliberal restructuring has extended around the world what Slaugh ter and Leslie (1999) called "academic capitalism," or the development of functional linkages between higher education and corporate "knowledge capitalism" (Slaughter and Leslie 1999; for further discussion on this point, see also Cantwell and Kauppined 2014).9 In the United States, where Slaughter and Leslie focus their research, the corporate takeover of higher education has involved the bifurcation of the professoriate into a small core of tenured professors and an army of precariatized or contract instructors. Adjunct faculty now teach over 70 percent of all university courses in the United States (Kezar and Maxey 2013). The switch from public funding to tuition-led funding of higher education has contributed to the student debt, which increased over 400 percent from 2000 to 2013, when it reached $1.2 trillion (Denhart 2013). These mechanisms of debt bondage lock out would-be surplus labor from access to public higher education and force the poorest to turn to for-profit private "universities"—which have proliferated, with enrollment increasing 2,017 percent from 2000 to 2014 (compared to 25 percent for public universities and for private nonprofit institutions) (National Center for Educational Statistics 2016). There is a double movement here. Capitalist globalization has involved a shift in the low- and unskilled labor-intensive phases of global production circuits from the North to the South at the same time as work in general has become bifurcated into deskilled and high-skills jobs. Thus the neoliberal program of universal primary education and the privatization and corn modification of secondary and higher education runs parallel to changes in the global division of labor as well as to the transformation of labor and the "end of work" (Rifkin 1995). Global Police State and The extreme inequalities contained through consensual lenge the system faces is the global working class tion in global society include to older forms of North-hierarchies, and what Bill workers worldwide, calls a the 1%" (Fletcher 2015).This mass social control and 2010, Mattelart 2010, Robinson farcical wars on drugs, terrorism, generally); such wars of popular and working classes social and political institutions, has taken up the challenge the social control of youth, repressive discipline and punitive control is an old theme, new systems of mass social depths hitherto unseen. As the school-to-prison (see, inter-alia, Rios 2011), about the militarization extreme disciplinary punishment States have historically been this criminalization and many states, public school and absences. According Justice in June 2013, students handcuffs, held in jail for missing more than 10 days plaint, school grounds are students during "tardy sweeps," absences as unexcused even family emergency or illness supplied schools throughout the United States with military-grade weapons and vehicles, and even grenade launchers (Emett 2014). Schools have spied on students in their home by supplying laptop computers with webcams that are activated by remote control (Masterson 2010, Smith and Bosker 2011). The surveillance state has invaded the public school system—especially in poor, working class, and racially oppressed communities—with CCTV cam eras, security checkpoints, full-time armed guards, and military recruiters. This militarization of schools appears to bring about a convergence of the school systems serving the working class and racially oppressed communities with the criminal justice system, to such an extent that the two systems appear as a single institutional continuum (see,inter-alia,Black2016, Nolan 2011). Gilmore (2007) has shown how the turn to mass incarceration provided the state with a means of caging surplus labor, disproportionately from racially oppressed communities, and supplied capital with a means of unloading surplus and sustaining accumulation. The regime of repression and punishment in the public school system appears as the juvenile corollary to mass incarceration. As broad swaths of the working class become surplus labor, schools in marginalized communities prepare students for prison and social death—to use Gilmore's (2007) term—rather than for a life of labor. Meanwhile, high-stakes standardized testing—itself a lucrative source of corporate accumulation—aims to impose a dull uniformity on curricula, reducing learning to rote memorization, routine, punctuality, and obedience; at the same time, non-conforming teachers and teachers unions are the object of disciplinary measures and attacks. Handwritten essays are not evaluated by experienced educators but by temporary workers hired seasonally at low wages and assigned to grade up to 40 essays an hour (Rich 2015). One for profit test scoring company, Pearson, operates 21 scoring centers around the United States, hiring 14,500 temporary scorers during the scoring season (ibid.). Results are then used to defund and close "non-performing"schools. Teachers receive pre-packaged lesson plans that are scripted to prepare for the tests. High-stakes testing leads to the segregation of learning and the bifurcation of schools into those catering to the well-off and those serving the working class and surplus labor, closely mirroring the new spatial apartheid in urban centers. Punitive standardized testing and the spread of charter schools, admission to which is determined by test performance, facilitates the cooptation of promising (and obedient) students from the working class and racially/ethnically oppressed communities into the would-be ranks of the 20 percent as technocratic and knowledge workers. The role of ideology in the nothing new. As Marx famously observed in The German Ideology The ideas of the ruling are in every epoch the ruling ideas. The class that is the ruling time its ruling intellectual material production at its the means of mental production, ing, the ideas of those who are subject to it. The ruling expression of the dominant material relationships grasped As Argentine scholar Atilio on the role of the World undermining critical thought: It is extremely difficult lectual vice of the nefarious and postmodernism, the servative and conformist repertoire of subtle mechanisms at the very roots the growth not to mention at the level general. (Boron 2008,12) Boron goes on to note that universities predominated no private universities of universities in Latin America of all student enrollments; Colombia, private universities university. At the same time, in the quality of education rising student fees, a decline and contract instructors. a percentage of GNP in most time, public spending on every country in Latin America. As the neoliberal commodification of higher education proceeds, the classic ideal that conceived of education as a process for the cultivation and integral development of the human spirit has been abandoned and replaced by a crude mercantile and utilitarian conception of education as training in order to learn the skills that the market demands and to assure the "employability" of the student. (Boron 2008,36) Higher education has become a service. One of the consequences is "the generalized acceptance now enjoyed by the previously bizarre idea that universities should be considered as profitable institutions that generate income generated by the 'sale of their services'" (ibid., 37). Boron calls for critical and radical thought against the neoliberal ideology diffused through the educational and mass media systems of global capitalism. His call, although aimed at Latin America, is equally appropriate for global society as a whole: An observer who came down from Mars might ask, "why does Latin America need radical thought. "The answer: for a very simply reason; because the situation in Latin America is radically unjust, so absolutely unjust and so much more unjust with each passing year, that if we want to make a contribution to the social life of our countries, to the wellbeing of our peoples, we have no other alternative but to critically rethink our society, to explore "other possible worlds" that allow us to move beyond the crisis and to communicate with the mass of people who make history in a plain, simple, and understandable language. (Ibid., 37) Conclusion: A Revitalized Philosophy of Praxis A global rebellion against the rule of the TCC has spread since the financial collapse of 2008. Everywhere around the world there has been an escalation of popular and grassroots social justice struggles and the rise of new cultures of resistance. At the same time, the crisis has produced a rapid political polarization between a resurgent Left and a neo-fascist Right, the latter often driven by ethnic nationalisms and ready to mobilize the increasing insecurity experienced by downwardly mobile and precariatized working-class com munities into support for far-Right projects, as most recently exemplified by the election of Donald play out will depend, in part, will manage to construct ruling bloc. The prospects the crisis is understood and depends, in significant part, forth by the organic intellectuals the Gramscian sense, as intellectuals the emancipatory struggles Faced with the popular and the 1970s, the organic intellectuals cultural level with strategic order to reconstruct ideological through cooptation the demands formation. Dominant groups such diversity in the institutions violently if necessary, any simply curb its prerogatives. gained representation in the They condemned oppression vocabulary. In Latin America, the dominant groups violently repressed the Indio insurreccionista (the insurrectionary Indian) that demanded control over land and resources and encouraged the Indio permitido, who would be allowed to seek cultural pluralism and political representation but was not to question the capitalist social order and its structure of property and class power (for a discussion, see Robinson 2008). On US university campuses, cultural and identity politics took over. Dominant groups now praised (even championed) an opposition to racism, intended as personal injury and micro-aggressions, that eclipsed any critique of the macro-aggressions of capitalism and the link between racial oppression and class exploitation—what Aviva Chom sky (2016) terms "the politics of the left-wing of neoliberalism." Chomsky points out that university administrators are attempting now to absorb into "the market-oriented system of higher education" a new upsurge of student activism in the United States that has placed climate change, inequality, immigrant rights, and opposition to mass incarceration at the forefront of campus struggles (ibid.). Yet the term "neoliberalism" has become a stand-in for "capitalism." Critique of neo-liberalism as a set of policies (liberaliza tion, privatization, deregulation, etc.) and an accompanying ideology that has facilitated capitalist globalization cannot substitute for a critique of global capitalism. A critical part of the construction of any counter-hegemonic project will take place in schools and university campuses around the world. Through out the Americas, my own focal point of scholar-activism, teachers have led the struggle against neoliberal educational reform, the privatization of education, the defunding and closure of schools, the deunionization of the profession, and the state repression of students. They have stood alongside the remarkable student mobilizations in Mexico, Chile, Brazil, the United States, and elsewhere. There is a need to infuse student struggles and worker uprisings with a radical global political economy theory and analysis that can contribute to the practices of global social justice and emancipatory struggles—that is, to a Gramscian philosophy of praxis.
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#### On the rob-

sure but only thrugh resisting cap can we even resits these strutcures, they claim to challenge dominant epistemologies but all their doing is creating a world with chaos without regarding actual violence in the world

on rolli- poltics are necessary

**Optimism > pessimism**

#### Pascal’s wager either a. Pess is true in which case it doesn’t matter weather we do anything or do nothing because the result is the same or b. pess isn’t true in which case doing nothing as if pess is true leads to massive oppression of minorities. Eit you vote neegeven if theirs a 1% chance optimism is true because the world where we are pessimistic, and optimism is the worst world . If you think there is any chance that visible politics could put strategic resistance at a disadvantage, refusing to sacrifice the tactical ground of the possibility of lurking in the shadows until the moment is ripe to strike is an internal net benefit to voting negative—even if their depiction of reality is correct, you’d be better off grabbing the high ground

**It is inequality that actually explains violence in the world,**

Addiyonalliy compare worlds- weigh a world in which we actively try to decarse material viplence and help minorities through consturting new systems of power vs a world in which we embrace chaos and violence is accelerated—their metjod of chalangeing is retsurcted to a small elite who has the luxuries their method rpesuupposes

#### Affect isn’t a basis for politics- they deck our ability to create a better world

Richard Sherwin 15. New York Law School. “Too Late for Thinking: The Curious Quest for Emancipatory Potential in Meaningless Affect and Some Jurisprudential Implications.” *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 13: 1-13.

In the history of western culture we can point to three historic moments of epistemological de-centering. The Copernican revolution taught humanity that we do not dwell at the center of the universe. The Freudian revolution taught us that the ‘‘I’’ is a lonely island besieged on all sides by a raging sea of irrational, unconscious forces. Then quantum theory taught us that the universe is indeterminate: subject to uncanny chance operations. Affect theory, perhaps as an extension of the Darwinian evolutionary account of selective adaptation, humbles rationalist pretensions further by subordinating mind to material, bio-chemical processes. If thinking is always an after-thought, an after-the-fact construction, then we can never reliably account for how we’ve actually been affected by things and others in the world around us.

How oppressive never to escape the grip of contingent social constructs. How depressing, if endless deconstruction yields only more fragmentation. Surely something must abide, some Higgs Boson-like elementary particle that can withstand deconstruction’s powerful blows. Is there anything real enough to withstand critique? Is there any basis left to hope for emancipation from the destabilizing mutability of human fabrication? In Brian Massumi’s view, there is. As he puts it: “The world always already offers degrees of freedom ready for amplification.”22 This takes us to the heart of the vitalist/ liberation impulse, namely: “escape from crystallized power structures.”23

In Massumi’s writings, affect operates as a cipher – a black box into which he can pack his emancipatory ideal.24 (“‘Affect’ is the word I use for ‘hope.’”25) What Massumi does not and perhaps cannot, or simply does not care to do is formulate a coherent basis for political judgment. While he at some points expresses a preference for “caring” and “belonging,”26 he offers no basis in affect theory for why those forms of behavior are preferable to other perhaps more intense alternatives, such as “anger” and “shock,” which he also embraces.27 But choices must be made. As Martha Nussbaum has noted, a society that cultivates conditions of anger and disgust, for example, is different from one that promotes empathy, dignity, and love.28

Massumi is enamored of the anti-structural,29 the spontaneous emergent process that Deleuze called “pure immanence.” But with affective intensity as his ultimate value30 Massumi remains trapped in a double bind. No critical judgment is forthcoming so long as intensity may be amplified.31 Because of this Massumi cannot coherently critique manifestly oppressive political structures (such as futurism, Nazism, and other intensity-fueled political regimes). How could he if the masses have opted to embrace such regimes for the intensity they provide?

Massumi’s resistance to making judgments is consistent with his theory, which minimizes to the vanishing point the human capacity for choice. For Massumi, the very notions of ‘‘individual will’’ and ‘‘subjective reflection’’ are a fiction. (“There is no individual outside its own trans-individual becoming.”32) Body is always conditioning mind – presumably without our conscious awareness. In the end, “events decide.”33 What could human freedom mean under such conditions?

The upshot is plain: in Massumi’s politics of affect, human freedom loses its capacity to signify. Choices are a fiction, and in any event no apparent normative basis exists for affirming, much less institutionalizing a preferred set of power structures. Affective intensity lacks structure by definition. Indeed, that is its appeal. (“Intensity is a value in itself.”34) But as Anthony Kronman has eloquently argued, without coherent structures, the legal, political, and cultural conditions necessary for the meaningful exercise of freedom (including political judgment) are unlikely to emerge – and if they do, they are unlikely to be sustainable.35 The latter point is borne out by the very political events that Massumi identifies as exemplary of his theory. If the “Arab Spring” and the “Occupy Movement”36 illustrate anything it is the effervescence of political action based on spontaneous intensity. In the absence of adequate political structures, this kind of political action is destined to pass with the next day’s tide.

The emancipatory cri du coeur that can be heard echoing in the work of cultural theorists like Massumi may have landed on “trans-individual” affect as the intensive Higgs Boson wave-particle of political science. Its indeconstructability promises freedom from subjective and cultural contingency – the prison house of “crystallized power structures.” But there is a price to be paid. The radical devaluation of reflective consciousness produces a species of freedom that signifies nothing. Perhaps this is what it is like to embrace a Zeitgeist of “de-humanism.”37

In Massumi’s politics of affect we can discern the impetus for ‘‘vitalist/liberation’’ ideology. As Ben Anderson writes: “There is always already an excess [affect] that power must work to recuperate but is destined and doomed to miss. It is that excess that is central to the creativity of bio-political production and thus the power of naked life.”38 Affect in this sense is “a movement of creative production” that always eludes capture. And this is what conveys a sense of its emancipatory power.39 The intensity of affect liberates us from bondage to contingent cultural entanglement.

Corporeal ontology precedes cultural epistemology. This move away from the centrality of cognition marks the demise not only of identity politics, but of identity itself, perhaps even of psychology.40 Simply stated, affect theorists like Massumi romanticize the unknowable “fluid materiality of excitable networks” as a way of disrupting familiar social and cultural hierarchies.41 In so doing, they elevate raw process over social and cultural regimentation and subjugation. It is the neurobiological equivalent of Rousseau’s primitive origin of society, an updated version of the Romantics’ myth of enchantment. If only questions about freedom and responsibility for shared values, justice included, could be resolved by so simple an expedient as the vitalist/liberation category shift from human agency to ‘‘trans-individual affective process.’’ Much can be learned about the various forms of political violence that affective intensity has assumed over the course of human history. But one needn’t take the historical path to discern trouble for Massumi’s emancipatory project. One can start with neuroscience itself.42

Theorists like Massumi play down (as they must) a variety of obstacles that stand in the way of affective emancipation: from the constraints of evolution to the biological programming of the amygdala itself.43 Indeed, what constitutes ‘‘fearfulness,’’ for example, depends upon programming the amygdala based on a habituated pattern of external stimuli.44

There are other problems as well. For instance, a great deal of uncertainty surrounds the question of how communication occurs among different levels of the mind/body complex. As Steve Pile writes, for theorists like Massumi “affect is defined in opposition to cognition, reflexivity, consciousness and humanness.”45 Feelings, on the other hand, occupy a space between non-cognitive affect and highly socialized emotions. Feelings in this sense are pre-cognitive (“a response to transpersonal affects”).46 Our response to affects personalizes them. Through feelings we associate affects with the subject who experiences them. For their part, emotions reflect a shift from pre-cognitive subjectivity to the cognitive domain of socially constructed experience.47 Emotions, in this sense, are how I interpret what I’m feeling through language and other representational or cultural symbolic practices.

Affect theorists like Massumi insist that my choices and perhaps even my feelings may turn out to have nothing to do with the affect my body has already processed without my knowing it. This view preserves the purity of affective intensity by keeping it free of subjective or social significance. If you are in the ‘‘vitalist/liberation’’ camp of affect theory along with Massumi, affect can never be symbolized, which means it can never be cognized. Affect, in this view, is always beyond consciousness. It’s like the dark matter that makes up the universe: we know it’s there, we just can’t say anything about it.

The problem for ‘‘vitalist/liberation’’ theorists like Massumi is that they want to eat their cake and have it too. Affects for them are ciphers – free-ranging radicals incapable of signifying. Yet, at the same time, many of these same theorists engage in searing critiques of those “in power” who use mass media along with other instrumentalities of affective manipulation for purposes of enhancing social or political control.48 The difficulty is this: If affect is being actively engineered to manipulate people’s behavior – whether in the form of habits of consumption, political judgments, or jury verdicts – it is incumbent upon the theorists to account for how exactly this manipulation is being carried out. As Pile cogently notes, how are the agents of affective manipulation able to “know the unknowable” sufficiently well to control their course and impact in society?49

Thrift’s recourse to metaphors such as “pipes and cables” is hardly sufficient to bear the burden of scientific explanation. Indeed, the nomenclature that has emerged to account for the engineering of affect – ranging from “affect flow between bodies,” “transmissions,” and “contagion”50 – all seem to suffer from the same fundamental lack of explanatory power. If we cannot know what affects are, it stands to reason that we cannot know how to control their flow and impact in society.

#### Deleuze’s strategy of affirming flux gets appropriated by the military industrial complex; it’s empirically proven, this sustains the state and turns case

Weizman 6 (Eyal, architect, writer and Director of Goldsmith’s College Centre for Research Architecture,5-6-06, “The Art of War” http://www.frieze.com/article/art-war)/

The Israeli Defence Forces have been heavily influenced by contemporary philosophy, highlighting the fact that there is considerable overlap among theoretical texts deemed essential by military academies and architectural schools The attack conducted by units of the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) on the city of Nablus in April 2002 was described by its commander, Brigadier-General Aviv Kokhavi, as ‘inverse geometry’, which he explained as ‘the reorganization of the urban syntax by means of a series of micro-tactical actions’.1 During the battle soldiers moved within the city across hundreds of metres of ‘overground tunnels’ carved out through a dense and contiguous urban structure. Although several thousand soldiers and Palestinian guerrillas were manoeuvring simultaneously in the city, they were so ‘saturated’ into the urban fabric that very few would have been visible from the air. Furthermore, they used none of the city’s streets, roads, alleys or courtyards, or any of the external doors, internal stairwells and windows, but moved horizontally through walls and vertically through holes blasted in ceilings and floors. This form of movement, described by the military as ‘infestation’, seeks to redefine inside as outside, and domestic interiors as thoroughfares. The IDF’s strategy of ‘walking through walls’ involves a conception of the city as not just the site but also the very medium of warfare – a flexible, almost liquid medium that is forever contingent and in flux. Contemporary military theorists are now busy re-conceptualizing the urban domain. At stake are the underlying concepts, assumptions and principles that determine military strategies and tactics. The vast intellectual field that geographer Stephen Graham has called an international ‘shadow world’ of military urban research institutes and training centres that have been established to rethink military operations in cities could be understood as somewhat similar to the international matrix of élite architectural academies. However, according to urban theorist Simon Marvin, the military-architectural ‘shadow world’ is currently generating more intense and well-funded urban research programmes than all these university programmes put together, and is certainly aware of the avant-garde urban research conducted in architectural institutions, especially as regards Third World and African cities. There is a considerable overlap among the theoretical texts considered essential by military academies and architectural schools. Indeed, the reading lists of contemporary military institutions include works from around 1968 (with a special emphasis on the writings of Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and Guy Debord), as well as more contemporary writings on urbanism, psychology, cybernetics, post-colonial and post-Structuralist theory. If, as some writers claim, the space for criticality has withered away in late 20th-century capitalist culture, it seems now to have found a place to flourish in the military. I conducted an interview with Kokhavi, commander of the Paratrooper Brigade, who at 42 is considered one of the most promising young officers of the IDF (and was the commander of the operation for the evacuation of settlements in the Gaza Strip).2 Like many career officers, he had taken time out from the military to earn a university degree; although he originally intended to study architecture, he ended up with a degree in philosophy from the Hebrew University. When he explained to me the principle that guided the battle in Nablus, what was interesting for me was not so much the description of the action itself as the way he conceived its articulation. He said: ‘this space that you look at, this room that you look at, is nothing but your interpretation of it. […] The question is how do you interpret the alley? […] We interpreted the alley as a place forbidden to walk through and the door as a place forbidden to pass through, and the window as a place forbidden to look through, because a weapon awaits us in the alley, and a booby trap awaits us behind the doors. This is because the enemy interprets space in a traditional, classical manner, and I do not want to obey this interpretation and fall into his traps. […] I want to surprise him! This is the essence of war. I need to win […] This is why that we opted for the methodology of moving through walls. . . . Like a worm that eats its way forward, emerging at points and then disappearing. […] I said to my troops, “Friends! […] If until now you were used to move along roads and sidewalks, forget it! From now on we all walk through walls!”’2 Kokhavi’s intention in the battle was to enter the city in order to kill members of the Palestinian resistance and then get out. The horrific frankness of these objectives, as recounted to me by Shimon Naveh, Kokhavi’s instructor, is part of a general Israeli policy that seeks to disrupt Palestinian resistance on political as well as military levels through targeted assassinations from both air and ground. If you still believe, as the IDF would like you to, that moving through walls is a relatively gentle form of warfare, the following description of the sequence of events might change your mind. To begin with, soldiers assemble behind the wall and then, using explosives, drills or hammers, they break a hole large enough to pass through. Stun grenades are then sometimes thrown, or a few random shots fired into what is usually a private living-room occupied by unsuspecting civilians. When the soldiers have passed through the wall, the occupants are locked inside one of the rooms, where they are made to remain – sometimes for several days – until the operation is concluded, often without water, toilet, food or medicine. Civilians in Palestine, as in Iraq, have experienced the unexpected penetration of war into the private domain of the home as the most profound form of trauma and humiliation. A Palestinian woman identified only as Aisha, interviewed by a journalist for the Palestine Monitor, described the experience: ‘Imagine it – you’re sitting in your living-room, which you know so well; this is the room where the family watches television together after the evening meal, and suddenly that wall disappears with a deafening roar, the room fills with dust and debris, and through the wall pours one soldier after the other, screaming orders. You have no idea if they’re after you, if they’ve come to take over your home, or if your house just lies on their route to somewhere else. The children are screaming, panicking. Is it possible to even begin to imagine the horror experienced by a five-year-old child as four, six, eight, 12 soldiers, their faces painted black, sub-machine-guns pointed everywhere, antennas protruding from their backpacks, making them look like giant alien bugs, blast their way through that wall?’3 Naveh, a retired Brigadier-General, directs the Operational Theory Research Institute, which trains staff officers from the IDF and other militaries in ‘operational theory’ – defined in military jargon as somewhere between strategy and tactics. He summed up the mission of his institute, which was founded in 1996: ‘We are like the Jesuit Order. We attempt to teach and train soldiers to think. […] We read Christopher Alexander, can you imagine?; we read John Forester, and other architects. We are reading Gregory Bateson; we are reading Clifford Geertz. Not myself, but our soldiers, our generals are reflecting on these kinds of materials. We have established a school and developed a curriculum that trains “operational architects”.’4 In a lecture Naveh showed a diagram resembling a ‘square of opposition’ that plots a set of logical relationships between certain propositions referring to military and guerrilla operations. Labelled with phrases such as ‘Difference and Repetition – The Dialectics of Structuring and Structure’, ‘Formless Rival Entities’, ‘Fractal Manoeuvre’, ‘Velocity vs. Rhythms’, ‘The Wahabi War Machine’, ‘Postmodern Anarchists’ and ‘Nomadic Terrorists’, they often reference the work of Deleuze and Guattari. War machines, according to the philosophers, are polymorphous; diffuse organizations characterized by their capacity for metamorphosis, made up of small groups that split up or merge with one another, depending on contingency and circumstances. (Deleuze and Guattari were aware that the state can willingly transform itself into a war machine. Similarly, in their discussion of ‘smooth space’ it is implied that this conception may lead to domination.)I asked Naveh why Deleuze and Guattari were so popular with the Israeli military. He replied that ‘several of the concepts in A Thousand Plateaux became instrumental for us […] allowing us to explain contemporary situations in a way that we could not have otherwise. It problematized our own paradigms. Most important was the distinction they have pointed out between the concepts of “smooth” and “striated” space [which accordingly reflect] the organizational concepts of the “war machine” and the “state apparatus”. In the IDF we now often use the term “to smooth out space” when we want to refer to operation in a space as if it had no borders. […] Palestinian areas could indeed be thought of as “striated” in the sense that they are enclosed by fences, walls, ditches, roads blocks and so on.’5 When I asked him if moving through walls was part of it, he explained that, ‘In Nablus the IDF understood urban fighting as a spatial problem. [...] Travelling through walls is a simple mechanical solution that connects theory and practice.’6 To understand the IDF’s tactics for moving through Palestinian urban spaces, it is necessary to understand how they interpret the by now familiar principle of ‘swarming’ – a term that has been a buzzword in military theory since the start of the US post cold War doctrine known as the Revolution in Military Affairs. The swarm manoeuvre was in fact adapted, from the Artificial Intelligence principle of swarm intelligence, which assumes that problem-solving capacities are found in the interaction and communication of relatively unsophisticated agents (ants, birds, bees, soldiers) with little or no centralized control. The swarm exemplifies the principle of non-linearity apparent in spatial, organizational and temporal terms. The traditional manoeuvre paradigm, characterized by the simplified geometry of Euclidean order, is transformed, according to the military, into a complex fractal-like geometry. The narrative of the battle plan is replaced by what the military, using a Foucaultian term, calls the ‘toolbox approach’, according to which units receive the tools they need to deal with several given situations and scenarios but cannot predict the order in which these events would actually occur.7 Naveh: ‘Operative and tactical commanders depend on one another and learn the problems through constructing the battle narrative; […] action becomes knowledge, and knowledge becomes action. […] Without a decisive result possible, the main benefit of operation is the very improvement of the system as a system.’8 This may explain the fascination of the military with the spatial and organizational models and modes of operation advanced by theorists such as Deleuze and Guattari. Indeed, as far as the military is concerned, urban warfare is the ultimate Postmodern form of conflict. Belief in a logically structured and single-track battle-plan is lost in the face of the complexity and ambiguity of the urban reality. Civilians become combatants, and combatants become civilians. Identity can be changed as quickly as gender can be feigned: the transformation of women into fighting men can occur at the speed that it takes an undercover ‘Arabized’ Israeli soldier or a camouflaged Palestinian fighter to pull a machine-gun out from under a dress. For a Palestinian fighter caught up in this battle, Israelis seem ‘to be everywhere: behind, on the sides, on the right and on the left. How can you fight that way?’9 Critical theory has become crucial for Nave’s teaching and training. He explained: ‘we employ critical theory primarily in order to critique the military institution itself – its fixed and heavy conceptual foundations. Theory is important for us in order to articulate the gap between the existing paradigm and where we want to go. Without theory we could not make sense of the different events that happen around us and that would otherwise seem disconnected. […] At present the Institute has a tremendous impact on the military; [it has] become a subversive node within it. By training several high-ranking officers we filled the system [IDF] with subversive agents […] who ask questions; […] some of the top brass are not embarrassed to talk about Deleuze or [Bernard] Tschumi.’10 I asked him, ‘Why Tschumi?’ He replied: ‘The idea of disjunction embodied in Tschumi’s book Architecture and Disjunction (1994) became relevant for us […] Tschumi had another approach to epistemology; he wanted to break with single-perspective knowledge and centralized thinking. He saw the world through a variety of different social practices, from a constantly shifting point of view. [Tschumi] created a new grammar; he formed the ideas that compose our thinking.11 I then asked him, why not Derrida and Deconstruction? He answered, ‘Derrida may be a little too opaque for our crowd. We share more with architects; we combine theory and practice. We can read, but we know as well how to build and destroy, and sometimes kill.’12

# Case

Presmupitp- they don’t egenratoe offense on the sttament that the wto shld reduce patent portections, bc in order to that thye double turn, they sya don’t create a sttsau policy bc they say the mdiedlca industry is blodthrirty and then defednd and keep it they reject what the aff has to defend, their performance is a double turn with the resolution, they have no offense that results from resolving any of their impacs- the affirmative is a doubke turn, this is not a call for the aff ballot, if they said we shld affirm it double turns bc it defense a policy action. They don’t calrify what they defend and don’t, theirs nothing tht results in voting aff that reoslves the k, they defdne the re

#### ****~3~****

#### Fiat is bad for policy making, it ignores the actual things that occur in the real work asusmign that utopian futures are ideal where the plan occurs hen reality contains barriers processed resistance that prevents policies fromw being passed, ****they instill the mindset that change is easier than it is, undercutting grassroots pedagogy- you destroy policy making and detsorying any chance of the altnertaive through insittling the mindset tha t change is possible and actualized when in reality it is not****

#### ****~1~ The practice of fiat is is illogicals – nothing do can be methodologically actualized, making it intellectually meaningless and actually a practice of strcutires of power in our wolrd today to persuade us to support and use the state instead of allwijg us to formalte reistsnace stratgeies****

Alt solves case- it’s the best way to resist sturctues of capitalism present in the squo

They’ll never escale capitlins- that’s the entire k, them critwuqing cap trjoygh deluze is what dooms it to fail- it’s a rep v rep debate, which means this is a q about their model of how the wolrd works

Their long card doesn t say its static it just says its wrong bc it “owsn others”, they don’t have wrrwants to their claim