## 1NC T—FW

#### Interpretation: The affirmative should defend a topical plan text under — Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicine.

#### Violation: The affirmative changes the entire system in which medicine operates

#### Standards

#### Predictable limits—The resolution proposes the question the negative is prepared to answer and creates a bounded list of potential affs. This is also vital to rigorous modes of contestation that allow for skill development by navigating the complex field of public policy within a bounded area. De-limiting the topic decimates dialogue – research asymmetry creates a procedural hierarchy which makes dialogical communication impossible – that shuts out ideological flux and reinstates the logic of mastery. Failing to do so creates a colonization of methods and inadequate debates about methodology.

#### Fallibility– unlimited topics make assessing the validity of the 1ac’s truth claims impossible AND cause concessionary ground which creates incentives for avoidance. Our method of refinement via contestation challenges hegemonic structures which I/L turns their method – it’s also key to advocacy skills

#### Reforms are possible and desirable---tangible change outweighs the risk of cooption and is still a better strategy than the aff Omi 13:

Omi, Michael (Berkeley ethnic studies professor). “Resistance is futile?: a response to Feagin and Elias”, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36.6, Taylor and Francis

In Feagin and Elias's account, white racist rule in the USA appears unalterable and permanent. There is little sense that the ‘white racial frame’ evoked by systemic racism theory changes in significant ways over historical time. **They dismiss important rearrangements and reforms as merely ‘a distraction from more ingrained structural oppressions and deep lying inequalities that continue to define US society’** (Feagin and Elias 2012, p. 21). Feagin and Elias use a concept they call ‘surface flexibility’ to argue that white elites frame racial realities in ways that suggest change, but are merely engineered to reinforce the underlying structure of racial oppression. Feagin and Elias say the phrase ‘racial democracy’ is an oxymoron – a word defined in the dictionary as a figure of speech that combines contradictory terms. If they mean the USA is a contradictory and incomplete democracy in respect to race and racism issues, we agree**. If they mean that people of colour have no democratic rights or political power in the USA, we disagree**. The USA is a racially despotic country in many ways, but in our view **it is also in many respects a racial democracy, capable of being influenced towards more or less inclusive and redistributive economic policies, social policies, or for that matter, imperial policies**. What is distinctive about our own epoch in the USA (post-Second World War to the present) with respect to race and racism? Over the past decades there has been a steady drumbeat of efforts to contain and neutralize civil rights, to restrict racial democracy, and to maintain or even increase racial inequality. Racial disparities in different institutional sites – employment, health, education – persist and in many cases have increased. Indeed**, the post-2008 period has seen a dramatic increase in racial inequality. The subprime home mortgage crisis, for example, was a major racial event. Black and brown people were disproportionately affected** by predatory lending practices; many lost their homes as a result; race-based wealth disparities widened tremendously. **It would be easy to conclude, as Feagin and Elias do, that white racial dominance has been continuous and unchanging throughout US history.** But such **a perspective misses the** dramatic twists and turns **in racial politics that have occurred since the Second World War and the civil rights era**. Feagin and Elias claim that we overly inflate the significance of the changes wrought by the civil rights movement, and that we ‘overlook the serious reversals of racial justice and persistence of huge racial inequalities’ (Feagin and Elias 2012, p. 21) that followed in its wake. We do not. In Racial Formation we wrote about ‘racial reaction’ in a chapter of that name, and elsewhere in the book as well. Feagin and Elias devote little attention to our arguments there; perhaps because they are in substantial agreement with us. **While we argue that the right wing was able to ‘rearticulate’ race and racism issues to roll back some of the gains of the civil rights movement, we also believe that there are limits to what the right could achieve in the post-civil rights political landscape**. So we agree that the present prospects for racial justice are demoralizing at best. But we do not think that is the whole story. US racial conditions have changed over the post-Second World War period, in ways that Feagin and Elias tend to downplay or neglect. Some of **the major reforms of the 1960s have proved irreversible; they have set powerful democratic forces in motion. These racial (trans)formations were the results of unprecedented political mobilizations, led by the black movement, but not confined to blacks alone**. Consider the desegregation of the armed forces, as well as key civil rights movement victories of the 1960s: the Voting Rights Act, the Immigration and Naturalization Act (Hart- Celler), as well as important court decisions like Loving v. Virginia that declared anti-miscegenation laws unconstitutional. While we have the greatest respect for the late Derrick Bell, we do not believe that his ‘interest convergence hypothesis’ effectively explains all these developments. How does Lyndon Johnson's famous (and possibly apocryphal) lament upon signing the Civil Rights Act on 2 July 1964 – ‘We have lost the South for a generation’ – count as ‘convergence’? **The US racial regime has been transformed in significant ways. As Antonio Gramsci argues, hegemony proceeds through the incorporation of opposition (Gramsci 1971, p. 182). The civil rights reforms can be seen as a classic example of this process; here the US racial regime – under movement pressure – was exercising its hegemony.** But Gramsci insists that such reforms – which he calls ‘passive revolutions’ – cannot be merely symbolic if they are to be effective: oppositions must win real gains in the process. Once again, we are in the realm of politics, not absolute rule. So yes, **we think there were important if partial victories that shifted the racial state and transformed the significance of race in everyday life**. And yes, we think that **further victories can take place both on the broad terrain of the state and on the more immediate level of social interaction: in daily interaction, in the human psyche and across civil society.**Indeed we have argued that in many ways **the most important accomplishment of the anti-racist movement of the 1960s in the USA was the politicization of the social**. In the USA and indeed around the globe, race-based movements demanded not only the inclusion of racially defined ‘others’ and the democratization of structurally racist societies, but also the recognition and validation by both the state and civil society of racially-defined experience and identity**. These demands broadened and deepened democracy itself. They facilitated not only the democratic gains made in the USA by the black movement and its allies, but also the political advances towards equality, social justice and inclusion accomplished by other ‘new social movements’: second-wave feminism, gay liberation, and the environmentalist and anti-war movements among others.** By no means do we think that the post-war movement upsurcge was an unmitigated success. Far from it: all the new social movements were subject to the same ‘rearticulation’ (Laclau and Mouffe 2001, p. xii) that produced the racial ideology of ‘colourblindness’ and its variants; indeed all these movements confronted their mirror images in the mobilizations that arose from the political right to counter them. Yet even their incorporation and containment, even their confrontations with the various ‘backlash’ phenomena of the past few decades, even the need to develop the highly contradictory ideology of ‘colourblindness’, reveal the transformative character of the ‘politicization of the social’. While it is not possible here to explore so extensive a subject, it is worth noting that **it was the long-delayed eruption of racial subjectivity and self-awareness into the mainstream political arena that set off this transformation, shaping both the democratic and anti-democratic social movements that are evident in US politics today.**

#### TVA –  Defend a plan to take down Capitalism through taking down IPR.

#### Reading the affirmative’s thesis on the neg solves educational benefits of the aff.  The ballot isn't key for the aff, so vote neg if the form of debate is irrelevant.

#### Vote for Procedural Fairness and Education – allowing the aff to arbitrarily manipulate the debate’s content with self-serving interpretations creates a *moral hazard*. Vote neg because debate is a competitive activity which loses meaning without substantive constraints.

## K

**Aff relies on European theoretical tradition of abstraction and despiritualization is the foundation of genocidal exploitation**

**Means 80 (**Russell, an American Oglala Lakota activist, the following speech was given by Russell Means in July 1980, before several thousand people who had assembled from all over the world for the Black Hills International Survival Gathering, in the Black Hills of South Dakota. It is Russell Means’s most famous speech, 1980 “For America to Live, Europe Must Die”)

(You notice I use the term American Indian rather than Native American or Native indigenous people or Amerindian when referring to my people. There has been some controversy about such terms, and frankly, at this point, I find it absurd. Primarily it seems that American Indian is being rejected as European in origin–which is true. But all the above terms are European in origin; the only non-European way is to speak of Lakota–or, more precisely, of Oglala, Brule, etc.–and of the Dineh, the Miccousukee, and all the rest of the several hundred correct tribal names.(There is also some confusion about the word Indian, a mistaken belief that it refers somehow to the country, India. When Columbus washed up on the beach in the Caribbean, he was not looking for a country called India. Europeans were calling that country Hindustan in 1492. Look it up on the old maps. Columbus called the tribal people he met “Indio,” from the Italian in dio, meaning “in God.”)It takes a strong effort on the part of each American Indian not to become Europeanized. The strength for this effort can only come from the traditional ways, the traditional values that our elders retain. It must come from the hoop, the four directions, the relations: it cannot come from the pages of a book or a thousand books. No European can ever teach a Lakota to be Lakota, a Hopi to be Hopi. A master’s degree in “Indian Studies” or in “education” or in anything else cannot make a person into a human being or provide knowledge into traditional ways. It can only make you into a mental European, an outsider. I should be clear about something here, because there seems to be some confusion about it. When I speak of Europeans or mental Europeans, I’m not allowing for false distinctions. **I’m not saying that on the one hand there are the by-products of a few thousand years of genocidal, reactionary, European intellectual development which is bad; and on the other hand there is some new revolutionary intellectual development which is good. I’m referring here to the so-called theories of Marxism and anarchism and “leftism” in general. I don’t believe these theories can[not] be separated from the rest of the of the European intellectual tradition.** It’s really just the same old song.The process began much earlier. **Newton, for example, “revolutionized”** physics and the so-called **natural sciences by reducing the physical universe to a linear math**ematical **equation. Descartes** did the same thing with culture. John **Locke** did it with politics, **and** Adam **Smith** did it with economics. Each one of these “thinkers” **took** a piece of **the spirituality of human existence and converted it into code**, an abstraction. **They picked up where Christianity ended: they “secularized” Christian religion, as the “scholars” like to say–and in doing so they made Europe more able and ready to act as an expansionist culture. Each of these intellectual revolutions served to abstract the European mentality even further, to remove the wonderful complexity and spirituality from the universe and replace it with a logical sequence: one, two, three. Answer**! This is what has come to be termed “efficiency” in the European mind. Whatever is mechanical is perfect; whatever seems to work at the moment–that is, proves the mechanical model to be the right one–is considered correct, even when it is clearly untrue. This is why “truth” changes so fast in the European mind; the answers which result from such a process are only stopgaps, only temporary, and must be continuously discarded in favor of new stopgaps which support the mechanical models and keep them (the models) alive. **Hegel and Marx were heirs to the thinking of Newton, Descartes, Locke and Smith. Hegel finished** the process of **secularizing theology–and that is put in his own terms–he secularized the religious thinking through which Europe understood the universe.** Then **Marx put Hegel**’s philosophy in terms **of “materialism**,” which is to say that Marx despiritualized Hegel’s work altogether. Again, this is in Marx’ own terms. And this is now seen as the future revolutionary potential of Europe. Europeans may see this as revolutionary, but **American Indians see it** simply **as** still more of **that same old European conflict between being and gaining. The intellectual roots of a new Marxist form of European imperialism lie in Marx’–and his followers’–links to the tradition of Newton, Hegel and the others.** Being is a spiritual proposition. Gaining is a material act. Traditionally, American Indians have always attempted to be the best people they could**. Part of that spiritual process was and is to give away wealth, to discard wealth in order not to gain.** Material gain is an indicator of false status among traditional people, while it is “proof that the system works” to Europeans. Clearly, there are two completely opposing views at issue here, and Marxism is very far over to the other side from the American Indian view. But let’s look at a major implication of this; **it is not merely an intellectual debate. The European materialist tradition of despiritualizing the universe is very similar to the mental process which goes into dehumanizing another person. And who seems most expert at dehumanizing other people? And why? Soldiers who have seen a lot of combat learn to do this to the enemy before going back into combat. Murderers do it before going out to commit murder. Nazi SS guards did it to concentration camp inmates. Cops do it. Corporation leaders do it to the workers they send into uranium mines and steel mills. Politicians do it to everyone in sight. And what the process has in common for each group doing the dehumanizing is that it makes it all right to kill and otherwise destroy other people. One of the Christian commandments says, “Thou shalt not kill,” at least not humans, so the trick is to mentally convert the victims into nonhumans.** Then you can proclaim violation of your own commandment as a virtue. **In terms of the despiritualization of the universe, the mental process works so that it becomes virtuous to destroy the planet. Terms like progress and development are used as cover words here, the way victory and freedom are used to justify butchery in the dehumanization process**.

**Settlement is not an event, but a structuring ontological logic of elimination constantly manifest in everyday reiteration of the very modes of spatial inhabitance and subjective modes of being – distinct from racial violences**

**Rifkin 14** (Associate Professor of English & WGS @ UNC-Greensboro (Mark, ‘Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance,’ pp. 7-10)//TN

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associa- tions they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to **shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects** to its implications for **nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being**, illuminating and tracking the **pervasive operation of settlement as a system**. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—**invasion is a structure not an event**” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an **organizing principle of settler-colonial society** rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby **the native repressed continues to structure settler- colonial society**” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func- tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sover- eignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and main- tain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writ- ing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “**At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession** occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is **open to being possessed**,” such that “possession . . . forms part of **the ontological structure of white subjectivity**” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have **often been conflated**,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “**misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism**” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collec- tivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and manage- ment: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as **the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself** ” (xix).

#### Vote neg to reject the 1ac in favor of an ethic of incommensurability that pursues decolonization in every instance. The aff is a compromise with the settler state that leaves indigenous demands for sovereignty off the table. Voting neg exposes the aff’s ontological commitments that uphold the settler state and opens up new possibilities for decolonial world-making

#### Role of the ballot is to vote for the team that best disrupts settler colonialism – the desirability of the Aff should be judged by its effect on non-European peoples. Capitalism is not the root cause, it’s European culture

**Means 80 (**Russell, an American Oglala Lakota activist, the following speech was given by Russell Means in July 1980, before several thousand people who had assembled from all over the world for the Black Hills International Survival Gathering, in the Black Hills of South Dakota. It is Russell Means’s most famous speech, 1980 “For America to Live, Europe Must Die”)

For example, a real-estate speculator may refer to “developing” a parcel of ground by opening a gravel quarry; development here means total, permanent destruction, with the earth itself removed. But European logic has gained a few tons of gravel with which more land can be “developed” through the construction of road beds. Ultimately, the whole universe is open–in the European view–to this sort of insanity. Most important here, perhaps, is the fact that Europeans feel no sense of loss in all this. After all, **their philosophers have despiritualized reality,** so there is no satisfaction (for them) to be gained in simply observing the wonder of a mountain or a lake or a people in being. No, **satisfaction is measured in terms of gaining material. So the mountain becomes gravel, and the lake becomes coolant for a factory, and the people are rounded up for processing through the indoctrination mills Europeans like to call schools.** But each new piece of that “progress” ups the ante out in the real world. Take fuel for the industrial machine as an example. Little more than two centuries ago, nearly everyone used wood–a replenishable, natural item–as fuel for the very human needs of cooking and staying warm. Along came the Industrial Revolution and coal became the dominant fuel, as production became the social imperative for Europe. Pollution began to become a problem in the cities, and the earth was ripped open to provide coal whereas wood had always simply been gathered or harvested at no great expense to the environment. Later, oil became the major fuel, as the technology of production was perfected through a series of scientific “revolutions.” Pollution increased dramatically, and nobody yet knows what the environmental costs of pumping all that oil out of the ground will really be in the long run. Now there’s an “energy crisis,” and uranium is becoming the dominant fuel. **Capitalists,** at least, **can be relied upon to develop** uranium as **fuel only at the rate which they** can **show** a **good profit.** That’s their ethic, and maybe they will buy some time. **Marxists**, on the other hand, **can be relied upon to develop** uranium **fuel as rapidly as possible** simply **because it’s the most “efficient” production fuel available. That’s their ethic, and I fail to see where it’s preferable.** Like I said, Marxism is right smack in the middle of European tradition. It’s the same old song. There’s a rule of thumb which can be applied here. **You cannot judge** the real nature of a **European revolutionary doctrine on** the basis of **the changes it proposes to make within** the **European** power structure and **society. You can only judge it by the effects** it will have **on non-European peoples.** This is **because every revolution in European history has served to reinforce Europe’s tendencies and abilities to export destruction** to other peoples, other cultures and the environment itself. **I defy anyone to point out an example where this is not true**. **So now we, as American Indian people, are asked to believe that a “new” European revolutionary doctrine such as Marxism will reverse the negative effects of European history on us. European power relations are to be adjusted once again, and that’s supposed to make things better for all of us. But what does this really mean?** Right now, today, we who live on the Pine Ridge Reservation are living in what white society has designated a “National Sacrifice Area.” What this means is that we have a lot of uranium deposits here, and white culture (not us) needs this uranium as energy production material. The cheapest, most efficient way for industry to extract and deal with the processing of this uranium is to dump the waste by-products right here at the digging sites. Right here where we live. This waste is radioactive and will make the entire region uninhabitable forever. This is considered by the industry, and by the white society that created this industry, to be an “acceptable” price to pay for energy resource development. Along the way they also plan to drain the water table under this part of South Dakota as part of the industrial process, so the region becomes doubly uninhabitable. The same sort of thing is happening down in the land of the Navajo and Hopi, up in the land of the Northern Cheyenne and Crow, and elsewhere. Thirty percent of the coal in the West and half of the uranium deposits in the United States have been found to lie under reservation land, so there is no way this can be called a minor issue. We are resisting being turned into a National Sacrifice Area. We are resisting being turned into a national sacrifice people. The costs of this industrial process are not acceptable to us. It is genocide to dig uranium here and drain the water table–no more, no less. Now let’s suppose that in our resistance to extermination we begin to seek allies (we have). Let’s suppose further that we were to take revolutionary Marxism at its word: that it intends nothing less than the complete overthrow of the European capitalists order which has presented this threat to our very existence. This would seem to be a natural alliance for American Indian people to enter into. After all, as the Marxists say, it is the capitalists who set us up to be a national sacrifice. This is true as far as it goes. But, as I’ve tried to point out, this “truth” is very deceptive.Revolutionary **Marxism is committed to** even further perpetuation and **perfection of the** very industrial **process** which is **destroying us** all. **It offers** only **to “redistribute” the results–**the money, maybe–**of** this **industrialization** to a wider section of the population. It offers to take wealth from the capitalists and pass it around; **but** in order **to do so, Marxism must maintain the industrial system.** Once again, the power relations within European society will have to be altered, but once again **the effects upon American Indian peoples here and non-Europeans elsewhere will remain the same.** This is much the same as when power was redistributed from the church to private business during the so-called bourgeois revolution. European society changed a bit, at least superficially, but its conduct toward non-Europeans continued as before. You can see what the American Revolution of 1776 did for American Indians. It’s the same old song. **Revolutionary Marxism, like industrial society in other forms, seeks to “rationalize” all people in relation to industry–maximum industry, maximum production. It is a doctrine that despises the American Indian spiritual tradition, our cultures, our lifeways. Marx himself called us “precapitalists” and “primitive.”** Precapitalist simply means that, in his view, we would eventually discover capitalism and become capitalists; we have always been economically retarded in Marxist terms. **The only manner in which American Indian people could participate in a Marxist revolution would be to join the industrial system, to become factory workers, or “proletarians,” as Marx called them. The man was very clear about the fact that his revolution could only occur through the struggle of the proletariat, that the existence of a massive industrial system is a precondition of a successful Marxist society.** I think there’s a problem with language here. Christians, capitalists, Marxists. All of them have been revolutionary in their own minds, but none of them really means revolution. What they really mean is continuation. They do what they do in order that European culture can continue to exist and develop according to its needs. Like germs, **European culture goes through occasional convulsions, even divisions within itself, in order to go on living and growing. This isn’t a revolution we’re talking about, but a means to continue what already exists. An amoeba is still an amoeba after it reproduces. But maybe comparing European culture to an amoeba isn’t really fair to the amoeba. Maybe cancer cells are a more accurate comparison because European culture has historically destroyed everything around it; and it will eventually destroy itself**. **So, in order for us to really join forces with Marxism, we American Indians would have to accept the national sacrifice of our homeland; we would have to commit cultural suicide and become industrialized and Europeanized.**At this point, I’ve got to stop and ask myself whether I’m being too harsh. Marxism has something of a history. Does this history bear out my observations? I look to the process of industrialization in the Soviet Union since 1920 and I see that these Marxists have done **what it took the English Industrial Revolution 300 years** to do; and **the Marxists did it in 60 years.** I see that the territory of **the USSR used to contain a number of tribal peoples and that they have been crushed** to make way **for** the **factories. The Soviets** refer to this as “the National Question,” the question of whether the tribal peoples had the right to exist as peoples; and they decided the **tribal peoples were an acceptable sacrifice to the industrial needs. I look to China and I see the same thing. I look to Vietnam and I see Marxists imposing an industrial order and rooting out the indigenous tribal mountain people.** I hear the leading Soviet scientist saying that when uranium is exhausted, then alternatives will be found. I see the Vietnamese taking over a nuclear power plant abandoned by the U.S. military. Have they dismantled and destroyed it? No, they are using it. **I see China exploding nuclear bombs, developing uranium reactors, and preparing a space program in order to colonize and exploit the planets the same as the Europeans colonized and exploited this hemisphere. It’s the same old song, but maybe with a faster tempo this time.** The statement of the Soviet scientist is very interesting. Does he know what this alternative energy source will be? No, he simply has faith. Science will find a way. I hear revolutionary Marxists saying that the destruction of the environment, pollution, and radiation will all be controlled. And I see them act upon their words. Do they know how these things will be controlled? No, they simply have faith. Science will find a way. Industrialization is fine and necessary. How do they know this? Faith. Science will find a way. Faith of this sort has always been known in Europe as religion. Science has become the new European religion for both capitalists and Marxists; they are truly inseparable; they are part and parcel of the same culture. So, in both theory and practice, Marxism demands that non-European peoples give up their values, their traditions, their cultural existence altogether. We will all be industrialized science addicts in a Marxist society. I do not believe that **capitalism itself is** really **responsible for the situation in which American Indians have been declared a national sacrifice.** No, **it is the European** tradition; European **culture itself is responsible. Marxism is just the latest continuation of this tradition, not a solution to it. To ally with Marxism is to ally with the very same forces that declare us an acceptable cost.** There is another way. There is the traditional Lakota way and the ways of the American Indian peoples. It is the way that knows that humans do not have the right to degrade Mother Earth, that there are forces beyond anything the European mind has conceived, that humans must be in harmony with all relations or the relations will eventually eliminate the disharmony. A lopsided emphasis on humans by humans–the Europeans’ arrogance of acting as though they were beyond the nature of all related things–can only result in a total disharmony and a readjustment which cuts arrogant humans down to size, gives them a taste of that reality beyond their grasp or control and restores the harmony. There is no need for a revolutionary theory to bring this about; it’s beyond human control. The nature peoples of this planet know this and so they do not theorize about it. Theory is an abstract; our knowledge is real. Distilled to its basic terms, European faith–including the new faith in science–equals a belief that man is God. Europe has always sought a Messiah, whether that be the man Jesus Christ or the man Karl Marx or the man Albert Einstein. American Indians know this to be totally absurd. Humans are the weakest of all creatures, so weak that other creatures are willing to give up their flesh that we may live. Humans are able to survive only through the exercise of rationality since they lack the abilities of other creatures to gain food through the use of fang and claw.But rationality is a curse since it can cause humans to forget the natural order of things in ways other creatures do not. A wolf never forgets his or her place in the natural order. American Indians can. Europeans almost always do. We pray our thanks to the deer, our relations, for allowing us their flesh to eat; Europeans simply take the flesh for granted and consider the deer inferior. After all, Europeans consider themselves godlike in their rationalism and science. God is the Supreme Being; all else must be inferior.All European tradition, Marxism included, has conspired to defy the natural order of all things. Mother Earth has been abused, the powers have been abused, and this cannot go on forever. No theory can alter that simple fact. Mother Earth will retaliate, the whole environment will retaliate, and the abusers will be eliminated. Things come full circle, back to where they started. That’s revolution. And that’s a prophecy of my people, of the Hopi people and of other correct peoples.

## Case

### Cede The Political

#### Critique cannot rely simply on withdrawal but must have a praxis to engage the state to succeed – not doing so cedes the political to the right

**Mouffe 9** (CHANTAL MOUFFE, prominent Belgian political theorist, “The Importance of Engaging the State”, 2009 pages 233~237, DOA: 7/14/17)//AK

In both Hardt and Negri, and Virno, there is therefore emphasis upon ‘**critique as withdrawal’**. They all call for the development of a non-state public sphere. They call for self-organisation, experimentation, non-representative and extra-parliamentary politics. They **~~see~~ [think of] forms of traditional representative politics as inherently oppressive. So they do not seek to engage with them, in order to challenge them.** They seek to get rid of them altogether. **This disengagement is**, **for** such influential personalities in **radical politics** today, **the key to every political position** in the world. The Multitude must recognise imperial sovereignty itself as the enemy and discover adequate means of subverting its power. Whereas in the disciplinary era I spoke about earlier, sabotage was the fundamental form of political resistance, these authors claim that, today, it should be desertion. It is indeed through desertion, through the evacuation of the places of power, that they think that battles against Empire might be won. Desertion and exodus are, for these important thinkers, a powerful form of class struggle against imperial postmodernity. According to Hardt and Negri, and Virno, radical politics in the past was dominated by the notion of ‘the people’. This was, according to them, a unity, acting with one will. And this unity is linked to the existence of the state. The Multitude, on the contrary, shuns political unity. It is not representable because it is an active self-organising agent that can never achieve the status of a juridical personage. It can never converge in a general will, because the present globalisation of capital and workers’ struggles will not permit this. It is anti-state and anti-popular. Hardt and Negri claim that the Multitude cannot be conceived any more in terms of a sovereign authority that is representative of the people. They therefore argue that new forms of politics, which are non-representative, are needed. They advocate a **withdrawal from existing institutions**. This is something which **characterises much of radical politics today. The emphasis is not upon challenging the state. Radical politics today** **is often characterised by** a mood, **a sense** and a feeling, **that the state itself is inherently the problem.** Critique as engagement I will now turn to presenting the way I envisage the form of social criticism best suited to radical politics today. I agree with Hardt and Negri that it is important to understand the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. But I consider that the dynamics of this transition is better apprehended within the framework of the approach outlined in the book Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics (Laclau and Mouffe, 2001). What I want to stress is that many factors have contributed to this transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, and that it is necessary to recognise its complex nature. My problem with Hardt and Negri’s view is that, by putting so much emphasis on the workers’ struggles, they tend to see this transition as if it was driven by one single logic: the workers’ resistance to the forces of capitalism in the post-Fordist era. They put too much emphasis upon immaterial labour. In their view, capitalism can only be reactive and they refuse to accept the creative role played both by capital and by labour. To put it another way, they deny the positive role of political struggle. In Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics we use the word ‘hegemony’ to describe the way in which meaning is given to institutions or practices: for example, the way in which a given institution or practice is defined as ‘oppressive to women’, ‘racist’ or ‘environmentally destructive’. We also point out that every hegemonic order is therefore susceptible to being challenged by counter-hegemonic practices – feminist, anti-racist, environmentalist, for example. This is illustrated by the plethora of new social movements which presently exist in radical politics today (Christian, anti-war, counter-globalisation, Muslim, and so on). Clearly not all of these are workers’ struggles. In their various ways they have nevertheless attempted to influence and have influenced a new hegemonic order. This means that when we talk about ‘the political’, we do not lose sight of the ever present possibility of heterogeneity and antagonism within society. There are many different ways of being antagonistic to a dominant order in a heterogeneous society – it need not only refer to the workers’ struggles. I submit that it is necessary to introduce this hegemonic dimension when one envisages the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. This means abandoning the view that a single logic (workers’ struggles) is at work in the evolution of the work process; as well as acknowledging the pro-active role played by capital. In order to do this we can find interesting insights in the work of Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello who, in their book The New Spirit of Capitalism (2005), bring to light the way in which capitalists manage to use the demands for autonomy of the new movements that developed in the 1960s, harnessing them in the development of the post-Fordist networked economy and transforming them into new forms of control. They use the term ‘artistic critique’ to refer to how the strategies of the counter-culture (the search for authenticity, the ideal of selfmanagement and the anti-hierarchical exigency) were used to promote the conditions required by the new mode of capitalist regulation, replacing the disciplinary framework characteristic of the Fordist period. From my point of view, what is interesting in this approach is that it shows how an important dimension of the transition from Fordism to post- Fordism involves rearticulating existing discourses and practices in new ways. It allows us to visualise the transition from Fordism to post- Fordism in terms of a hegemonic intervention. To be sure, Boltanski and Chiapello never use this vocabulary, but their analysis is a clear example of what Gramsci called ‘hegemony through neutralisation’ or ‘passive revolution’. This refers to a situation where demands which challenge the hegemonic order are recuperated by the existing system, which is achieved by satisfying them in a way that neutralises their subversive potential. When we apprehend the transition from Fordism to post- Fordism within such a framework, we can understand it as a hegemonic move by capital to re-establish its leading role and restore its challenged legitimacy. We did not witness a revolution, in Marx’s sense of the term. Rather, there have been many different interventions, challenging dominant hegemonic practices. It is clear that, **once we envisage social reality in terms of ‘hegemonic’** and ‘counter-hegemonic’ **practices, radical politics is not about withdrawing completely** from existing institutions. Rather, **we have no other choice but to engage with hegemonic practices, in order to challenge them.** This is crucial; **otherwise** we will be faced with a chaotic situation. Moreover, if we do not engage with and challenge the existing order, if we instead choose to simply escape the state completely, **we leave the door open for others to take control** of systems of authority and regulation. Indeed there are many historical (and not so historical) examples of this. When the Left shows little interest, **Right-wing and authoritarian groups are only too happy to take over the state.** The strategy of exodus could be seen as the reformulation of the idea of communism, as it was found in Marx. There are many points in common between the two perspectives. To be sure, for Hardt and Negri it is no longer the proletariat, but the Multitude which is the privileged political subject. But in both cases the state is seen as a monolithic apparatus of domination that cannot be transformed. It has to ‘wither away’ in order to leave room for a reconciled society beyond law, power and sovereignty. In reality, as I’ve already noted, others are often perfectly willing to take control. If my approach – supporting new social movements and counterhegemonic practices – has been called ‘post-Marxist’ by many, it is precisely because I have challenged the very possibility of such a reconciled society. To acknowledge the ever present possibility of antagonism to the existing order implies recognising that heterogeneity cannot be eliminated. As far as politics is concerned, this means the need to envisage it in terms of a hegemonic struggle between conflicting hegemonic projects attempting to incarnate the universal and to define the symbolic parameters of social life. A successful hegemony fixes the meaning of institutions and social practices and defines the ‘common sense’ through which a given conception of reality is established. However, such a result is always contingent, precarious and susceptible to being challenged by counter-hegemonic interventions. Politics always takes place in a field criss-crossed by antagonisms. A properly political intervention is always one that engages with a certain aspect of the existing hegemony. It can never be merely oppositional or conceived as desertion, because it aims to challenge the existing order, so that it may reidentify and feel more comfortable with that order. **Another important aspect of a hegemonic politics lies in establishing linkages** between various demands (such as environmentalists, feminists, anti-racist groups), so as **to** transform them into claims that will **challenge the existing structure of power relations. This is a further reason why critique involves engagement, rather than disengagement.** It is clear that the different demands that exist in our societies are often in conflict with each other. This is why they need to be articulated politically, which obviously involves the creation of a collective will, a ‘we’. This, in turn, requires the determination of a ‘them’. This obvious and simple point is missed by the various advocates of the Multitude. For they seem to believe that the Multitude possesses a natural unity which does not need political articulation. Hardt and Negri see ‘the People’ as homogeneous and expressed in a unitary general will, rather than divided by different political conflicts. Counter-hegemonic practices, by contrast, do not eliminate differences. Rather, they are what could be called an ‘ensemble of differences’, all coming together, only at a given moment, against a common adversary. Such as when different groups from many backgrounds come together to protest against a war perpetuated by a state, or when environmentalists, feminists, anti-racists and others come together to challenge dominant models of development and progress. In these cases, the adversary cannot be defined in broad general terms like ‘Empire’, or for that matter ‘Capitalism’. It is instead contingent upon the particular circumstances in question – the specific states, international institutions or governmental practices that are to be challenged. Put another way, the construction of political demands is dependent upon the specific relations of power that need to be targeted and transformed, in order to create the conditions for a new hegemony. This is clearly not an exodus from politics. **It is not ‘critique as withdrawal’, but ‘critique as engagement’.** It is a ‘war of position’ that needs to be launched, often across a range of sites, involving the coming together of a range of interests. This can only be done by establishing links between social movements, political parties and trade unions, for example. The aim is to create a common bond and collective will, engaging with a wide range of sites, and often institutions, with the aim of transforming them. This, in my view, is how we should conceive the nature of radical politics.

### Capitalism

#### Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable

**Matthews 11**

**(Richard Matthews, eco-entrepreneur, eco-investor, sustainable writer, “Is Capitalism Sustainable?”, The Green Market, 5-12-2011, http://thegreenmarket.blogspot.com/2011/05/is-capitalism-sustainable.html)**

Business has created the environmental crisis and now **the** same **capitalist system** that was behind the industrial revolution, **is beginning to play a vital role in solving the problems it created**. Despite the link between environmental practices and profitable, long-term business sustainability, many believe that capitalism itself is unsustainable. The Earth has finite resources, so their argument goes, but capitalism depends on ever expanding consumption. The truth is that dating back to the origins of our species, we have seen our use of resources evolve, from stone, to bronze and then iron. More recently we entered the information age which may prove to be the gateway to a more sustainable use of resources. Although we should do everything we can to preserve finite resources, **human ingenuity** is infinite. In this way we are slowly moving away from finite fossil fuels to infinitely renewable fuels such as wind, wave and solar. **Market** driven **solutions** can be incredibly powerful as they have the power to extend, promote and invest in sustainable innovation. Although new market based mechanisms like regulation, incentives and tradable permits are still a few years off, it is inevitable that the true cost of carbon will be made absolutely clear. As a tenant of the free market business should pay for the costs they incur. Sustainability will continue because it is an unstoppable mega-trend that is destined to keep growing at even faster rates. With the rise of the green consumer, businesses want to cash-in on the steady and growing demand for green goods and services. Various partnerships are emerging to help in the development of sustainable best practices. One such arrangement involves the new partnerships between corporations and environmental organizations.

#### Critique of neoliberalism is politically useless—economic elites don’t identify with the title and dismiss social criticism as ‘economically illiterate.’

Rajesh **VENUGOPAL 15**, Assistant Professor in the Department of International Development at the London School of Economics [“Neoliberalism as concept,” *Economy and Society*, Vol. 44, No. 2, 2015, p. 165-187, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

Beyond conceptual proliferation and incoherence, there is an important third terminological feature of neoliberalism that more clearly distinguishes it from the multitude of other stressed and stretched concepts that dot the social sciences: it dares not speak its own name. While there are many who give out and are given the title of neoliberal, there are none who will embrace this moniker of power and call themselves as such. There is no contemporary body of knowledge that calls itself neoliberalism, no self-described neoliberal theorists that elaborate it, nor policy-makers or practitioners that implement it. There are no primers or advanced textbooks on the subject matter, no pedagogues, courses or students of neoliberalism, no policies or election manifestoes that promise to implement it (although there are many that promise to dismantle it). Pedantic as it may seem, this is a point that warrants repetition if only because there is a considerable body of critical literature that deploys neoliberalism under the **mistaken assumption** that, in doing so, it is being transported into the **front-lines of hand-to-hand combat** with free-market economics. Advocates of market deregulation, private-sector-led growth or any of the various shifting components that might be part of neoliberalism do not describe themselves or their policies as such. Instead, neoliberalism is defined, conceptualized and deployed exclusively by those who stand in evident opposition to it, such that the act of using the word has the twofold effect of identifying oneself as non-neoliberal, and of passing negative moral judgment over it. Consequently, neoliberalism often features, even in sober academic tracts, in the rhetorical toolkit of **caricature and dismissal**, rather than of analysis and deliberation. Boas and Gans-Morse (2009, p. 152) find that the inversion in its usage from positive to negative arose during the Pinochet regime in Chile. Until then, Latin American debates over economic policy in the 1960s and 1970s used the term largely in the positive sense, often with reference to West Germany's Wirtschaftswunder, whereas it became steadily negative in the 1980s. Importantly, neoliberalism, which was always a marginal part of the vocabulary in mainstream academic economics, even before its negative association, has since disappeared almost entirely in that arena in parallel with its growing influence and usage in the rest of the social sciences. As a result, the one-sided usage of neoliberalism extends not just to the way it is used only by self-consciously non-neoliberal critics, but also as a term **used only by non-economists**, and that, too, when referring to economic phenomena and economic forms of reasoning. Indeed, the word neoliberalism is so utterly absent in modern economics that it is impossible to reconcile Ferguson's above definition of it as ‘macro-economic doctrine’ with the corpus of contemporary macro-economic theory at hand. For example, the word neoliberalism does not appear at all in any of the major macro-economic textbooks, including Mankiw's Principles of macroeconomics (2012), Blanchard's Macroeconomics (2012), Obstfeld and Rogoff's Foundations of international macroeconomics (1996), Krugman, Obstfeld and Melitz's International economics or Agénor and Montiel's Development macroeconomics (2008). Neither does it appear at all in a host of other widely read texts in the field, including Debraj Ray's Development economics (1998), Banerjee and Duflo's Poor economics (2011) or Barr's The economics of the welfare state (1993). Even the more unorthodox economists critical of market-based solutions, such as Paul Krugman or Joseph Stiglitz, find no need to use the concept. Neoliberalism is absent entirely from Krugman's End this depression now! and finds mention only once (in a footnote to the preface) in Stiglitz's The price of inequality: The avoidable causes and the invisible costs of inequality (2012). Moreover, neoliberalism has, since 1966, only ever appeared twice in the pages of The American Economic Review, on both occasions as fleeting mentions. It has not appeared at all in The Quarterly Journal of Economics since 1960, nor in Journal of Political Economy since 1956. It has never appeared in Journal of Development Economics at all. In comparison, in 2012, it appeared in 10 papers in The Journal of Development Studies, eight papers in World Development, 17 papers in Development and Change and 10 papers in Journal of International Development. 5 What these strikingly different patterns of usage between economics and non-economics indicate is that, beyond dysfunctionality, neoliberalism signifies and reproduces the **mutual incomprehensibility** and the **deep cognitive divide** between these two domains (Jackson, 2013; Milonakis & Fine, 2013). Ha-Joon Chang notes that ‘critics of neoliberalism are routinely dismissed as **“economically illiterate”**’ (Chang, 2003, pp. 42–43). Indeed, for the rest of the social sciences, economics is an entirely alien discipline that is found to be intellectually vapid on the one hand, but also inscrutable and impenetrable due to the mathematical sophistication of its theory and empirics. Neoliberalism purports to provide a lens through which this mysterious and hostile terrain can be surveyed, simplified, labelled and rendered understandable from a safe distance. Economic theory can thus be vicariously critiqued and dismissed without one having to encounter it, much less understand it. Not unsurprisingly, what emerges as a result is **inadequate** and often bears the character of dispatches from trench warfare, in which sketchy and vague outlines of enemy activity are reported from across a foggy and impassable no-man's land.

#### Capitalism inevitable and alt is utopian-human nature

**Hunter 11** [Mark Hunter is Professor of Humanities at St. Petersburg College. June 21, 2011 To Attack Capitalism Is To Attack Human Nature  <http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2011/06/21/to_attack_capitalism_is_to_attack_human_nature_99087.html>, MM]

McCarraher's denunciation of capitalism is in fact an attack on human nature disguised as political discourse. The "pernicious" traits he attributes to capitalism are, in fact, traits globally present in every political/social order-in many cases far worse in non-capitalistic societies-because they are traits of humanity itself.  His entire argument against capitalism consists of nothing more than an elaborate correlation-proves-causation fallacy (cum hoc ergo propter hoc - "with this, therefore because of this"). He wants us to believe that since capitalism contains greed it causes greed. Furthermore, McCarraher seems content to overlook the fact that capitalism is an organic economic system not created as much as evolving naturally as a consequence of free individuals interacting with other free individuals. Private property and the production of goods may be a part of capitalism, but its most essential virtue is as a guardian of man's freedom.  Criticizing capitalism for its avarice is not unlike condemning representative democracy for its failure to elect the wisest of men - each may occur, but it **is not relevant to their fundamental purpose**. Both capitalism and representative democracy maximize freedom by diffusing power and responsibility across the broadest spectrum of society. Rigid control is antithetical to freedom and it is this that most vexes the liberal intellectual.  What McCarraher is unwilling to come to terms with is that his inherent criticism of capitalism is not so much an indictment of capitalism but rather a revealing supposition he is making about humanity itself. His attack on capitalism masks a general contempt for a free people who in his worldview will inevitably choose a path of greed and avarice unless a coercive political order prevents it. Therefore, any liberal political/economic system proposed to replace capitalism must have at its core a process through which the masses are controlled and coerced to overcome the human attributes so abhorred by the liberal intellectual that he wrongly attributes to capitalism rather than people.  McCarraher presents the reader with a moral crusade cleverly cloaked as political theory. He sees the Deadly Sins ever present in modern capitalism, and like the fourth century ascetic Evagrius Ponticus, McCarraher seems particularly obsessed with man's rapacious gluttony. While capitalism's natural and organic nature is condemned for its "deliberate nurturance of our vilest qualities" he fails to put forth the ramifications of the artificial and **contrived alternative.**  The progressive alternative to capitalism must of necessity resemble Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor because the crux of the matter for both modern liberals and Dostoyevsky is human freedom. The infinite variety that is millions of people making millions of decisions to reflect their own self interest needs to be replaced with a 21st century Ubermensch or new political aristocracy that is able to impose on the masses a sin-free, enlightened order. Redemption comes through man's inability to choose the indulgence of sin, and as such the anointed elite - having removed man's freedom - become the deliverers of man's salvation by taking upon themselves the burden of choice. Mankind, now being absolved of the burden of freedom, can live content without the anxiety of responsibility.  However beautiful the veneer of his lofty rhetoric, this "Wellspring" is in the end enslavement. The only way to deliver mankind from the demon Mammon will be by removing the greatest gift of the gods - freedom. In this Faustian exchange we are guaranteed the Marxist security of bread, authoritarian certainty of order and utopian unity of world government.  Far from new, McCarraher's Wellspring of Radical Hope is one more self-righteous proclamation by a moral prig intent on delivering mankind to elusive Olympian heights. Beyond the rhetoric, one suspects this experiment would end as other such utopian pursuits have concluded in history - hopeless.