## Cap K

#### Identity stems from capitalism; concern over identity is a regression to the past caused by the capitalist destruction of the subject

Berardi 15 [(Franco Berardi, Italian philosopher and activist) “Heroes: Mass Murder and Suicide”, 2015, <http://library.lol/main/17244DAAFC98DB84EADDEAD32B93624C>] ZS

Identity is not naturally ascribed; it is a cultural product: it is the effect of the hypostatization (fixation and naturalization) of the cultural difference, of the psychological, social and linguistic particularity. Identity is continuity and confirmation of the place and of the role of a speaker in the cycle of communication. In order to be understood, one must play one’s role in the game, and this role is surreptitiously identified as a mark of belonging. But identity is continually searching for its roots, and the place from whence the enunciation comes is often mistaken as one of natural origins: primeval and therefore undeniably true. The community, which is a place of communication (a place of exchange of signs conventionally charged of meaning), is mistaken as a natural place of belonging, and transformed into the primeval source of meaning. The temporary and transitional convention that gives meaning to signs is strengthened and transformed into the natural mark or motivated relation between sign and meaning. Identity may be seen as the hardening of the inner map of orientation. Identity is the opposite of style, which is singularity and consciousness of the singularity, a map of orientation flexible and adaptable, retroactively changing. Style never has a normative feature, nor implies any kind of interdiction and punishment. Identity is a limitation (unconsciously realized) upon the possibility of comprehension and interaction. It is a useful limitation, of course, but it is dangerous to mistake it as a condition of authenticity and primeval belonging. It is the condition of mutual aggressiveness, of racism and violence, and fascism. Identity is based on a hypertrophic sense of the root, and it leads to the reclamation of belonging as criterion of truth and of selection. Identity is the perceptual and conceptual device that gives us the possibility of knowledge, but sometimes we mistake this knowledge for a re-cognition. So we are led to believe that which we already know, that we possess a map thanks to our belonging. This can be useful some- times, but it is dangerous to mistake our cultural map for the inner territory of belonging. Without a map, one gets lost, but getting lost is the beginning of the process of knowledge; it is the premise for creating any map. In their book Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Resolution, the psychoanalysts Watzlawick, Weakland and Fisch write that the repeated application of the same solution in drastically different conditions is a neurotic attitude which leads to pathological situations. Observed within the context of the current global dynamic of deterritorialization–re-territorialization, such neuroticism emerges as a constitutive component of today’s world order. On the one hand, globalization and the acceleration of cultural and economic exchanges have increased the need for the flexible adaptation of conceptual and linguistic maps. Yet at the same time, paradoxically, the deterritorialization that globalization entails hugely intensifies the need for an identitarian shelter, the need for the confirmation of belonging. Here lies the identitarian trap which is leading the world towards the proliferation of points of identitarian aggressiveness: the return of concepts such as the homeland, religion and family as aggressive forms of reassurance and self-confirmation. We can also read this dynamic in terms of techno- mutation and ethno-mutation. On the one hand, information technology has provoked the acceleration and intensification of semiotic exchanges, and on the other hand, the displacement of people and massive waves of economic and political migration have provoked an unprecedented change in the ethnic landscape of the territories, with all the concomitant cultural contamination and intermixing. In conditions of competition, these processes tend to excite the need for identitarian belonging, and to give way to identitarian aggressiveness. According to Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, universal history can be viewed as a process of deterritorialization. Deterritorialization is the passage from a space whose code is known to a new space, where that code loses its meaning, so that things become unrecognizable for anyone attempting to use the code that was produced by the previous territory. The history of capitalism is continuously producing effects of deterritorialization. At the outset, capitalism destroyed the old relation between the individual and both the agricultural territory and the family. Subsequently, it jeopardized the national borders and created a global space of exchange and communication. Currently, it is jeopardizing the very relation between money and production, and opening the way to a new form of immaterial semiotization. As capitalism destroys all forms of identification, it frees the individuals from the limitations of identity, but simultaneously it provokes a sense of displacement, a sort of opacity that is attributable to the loss of previous meanings and emotional roots. As a result, capitalism ultimately provokes a need for reterritorialization, and a continual return of the past in the shape of national identities, ethnic identities, sexual identities, and so on.

#### AND Their position focused on individualism and identity politics is a tool used by the modern “left” and the bourgeois to force our submission to the capitalist system and divert our attention from our labor and class

**Tumino 01** [(Stephen Tumino, professor at Pratt Institute), “Orthodox Marxism and the Contemporary”, 2001, <http://redcritique.org/spring2001/orthodox_marxism.htm>] ZS

"Globalization" has sharpened the economic contradictions and devastating inequalities of wage-labor. It has also produced theoretical and political crisis on the left since the postmarxist theories (from feminism, to poststructuralism, to cultural studies) which have produced "left" justifications for capitalism can no longer do so without losing their own political credibility—which is to say becoming useless to capitalism which has funded them and supported them. The "left" has justified monopoly capitalism in its global phase by diverting attention away from relations of labor and capital and instead putting the focus on "human rights," "multiculturalism," localist cultural reforms of various kinds, and by intensifying its reification of the individual and her/his desires and consuming passions. Now, after decades of denying the significance of Marxism to struggles against inequality, the liberal-left is anxious to declare a "return" to Marx and to Marxism (usually as "marxism") in order to prove its own practical relevance to addressing the (class) contradictions of transnational capitalism. Yet it is a very strange "Marxism" that is currently being activated by the liberal-left: On the one hand (for example, in the work of writers from Zizek to Paul Smith and in left journals such as Rethinking Marxism and New Left Review), what is put forward is a (flexodox) "Marxism" emptied of the explanatory force of its red concepts of exploitation, labor, need, production, revolution (and which now even rejects as "capitalocentric" any englobing—that is, systematic and non-dispersionist—analysis of capitalism). On the other hand (as what is often opposed to liberal, hybridizing flexodoxy but in fact forms its "popular" flank), [there] is a vapid leftism, which, while it appropriates the concepts of Orthodox Marxism, accommodates the political needs of the ruling class by valorizing the "spontaneous" "agency" of "the people" as the only mode of "authentic" resistance. "Spontaneity"—which forms the undergirding structure of bourgeois "radicalism" that displaces organized class conscious actions with (fragmentary) "rebellions" against the existing—is of course the means by which the ruling class attempts to discredit Orthodox Marxism's insistence on the formative role and unyielding organizational necessity of the international proletarian vanguard party in the development of united and coherent class struggle praxis across national boundaries. In its analytical evacuation of the concepts of Orthodox Marxism as well as in its valorization of "spontaneity," the "new" flexodoxy thus repeats the opportunistic revisionism long ago critiqued by Lenin as the ("democratic") arm of the bourgeoisie in the world socialist movement that blocks the emergence of struggles for any "total" change. In short, the aim of this left opportunism remains today as yesterday in the substitution of "reforms" (local political and cultural changes which mask the integral and total dynamics of economic exploitation in production) for world-revolution. Finally, the depth of theoretical crisis on the left might be measured by its desperate embracing of Spinoza as an exemplary "materialist"!

#### The impact is that capitalism renders life meaningless because it only cares about profit in order to reproduce itself. Only class consciousness and dialectic analysis can explain the root cause of all other oppression.

Schumacher 13 [(Maarten Schumacher) “The Meaningless of life in Capitalism,” 2013, <https://maartenschumacher.wordpress.com/2013/03/04/the-meaninglessness-of-life-in-capitalism>] ZS

“I’ve talked a few times about the ‘meaninglessness of life’, but what do I mean by that? Though I definitely don’t think that there is some given (by Nature? God? Destiny?) meaning we have to discover in order to live a full and happy life, I don’t think life has to be meaningless either. We have to give life a meaning by choosing, deciding, what our lives should mean and by letting our activity reflect this decision. So what’s the problem, why do I think people suffer from a lack of meaning? Perhaps not surprisingly, the answer is [because of] capitalism. Capitalist production is inherently meaningless, because its only aim is to reproduce itself. In a pre-capitalist production process, you start with producing something other people have a demand for, so you can sell it on the market, and with the money buy a product you have a demand for. In capitalist production the relationship is inverted; the capitalist starts with money (capital), buys a product with it (investment), in order to sell it at a profit. Where the goal of a pre-capitalist production process is to fill a demand, in capitalism, the goal is to make profit. In fact, when a company fails to make bigger and bigger profits, it stagnates and goes bankrupt. This is why our world is flooded by advertisement; we have to constantly be stimulated, seduced, into buying products we don’t really need, otherwise profits cannot not grow further. So how does this vicious cycle of ever-increasing profits which holds the world hostage, so to say, affect us in our everyday lives? The problem is that we have to participate in it if we want someplace to live and something to eat. Even if you are lucky enough to earn money doing something meaningful, you are constantly fighting a losing battle against your boss, because he doesn’t care about that meaningful thing you are doing, he only cares about if it is profitable or not. Every employee will find [themselves] himself hindered in [their] his work by the demand for profits (or by cutbacks if you work in the public sector). The result is frustration and cynical withdrawal. In order to cope with it, we have to invent narratives that make our frustrating activity meaningful; maybe you sacrifice yourself for your children, that they may ha1ve it better than you (which puts a terrible burden on your children), or maybe you imagine your work to be so crucial that you should do it no matter the personal cost (which makes you a kind of tragic hero). Another way to deal with it would be the cynical way: life has no meaning anyway, so you use what you earn to indulge in stupid pleasures. The alternative to these coping mechanisms is depression. The only way out would be of course to change the system, to free ourselves from this pressure to always make more profits, and decide what is really important in life, and let the production process support this decision, instead of being slaves to it. Easier said than done though. But wouldn’t any activity directed at this goal of finding a viable alternative to capitalism be more meaningful than the participation in it?”

#### The alt is intersectional, dialectic class conscious revolt. Only communal resistance with a will towards a common goal will exhaust the capitalist system that works by placating individuals with self expression and celebration of difference

Dean 16 [(Jodi Dean, professor at Hobart and William Smith Colleges) “Crowds and Party,” 2016, <http://library.lol/main/94894B0740A38FE166F5E83819C8C049>] ZS

“In communicative capitalism, individual acts of resistance [and], subversion, cultural production, and opinion expression, no matter how courageous, are easily absorbed into the circulatory content of global personal media networks. Alone, they don’t amplify; they can’t endure. They are easily forgotten as new content rushes into and through our feeds. We indulge in fantasies of the freedom of our expression, our critical edge and wit, disavowing the way such individuated freedom is the form of collective incapacity. Against states and alliances wielded in the service of capital as a class, diverse and separate struggles are so many isolated resistances, refusals to undertake the political work of pulling together in organized, strategic, long-term struggle. The constant churn of demands on our awareness disperses our efforts and attention. What the Left should be doing is coordinating, consolidating, and linking its efforts so that they can amplify each other. We don’t need multiple, different campaigns. We need an organized struggle against capitalism capable of operating along multiple issues in diverse locations. Crowds push back. From the perspective of the party, we see them as the insistent people. Fidelity to the insistence of the egalitarian discharge demands that we build the infrastructure capable of maintaining the gap of their desire. The more powerful the affective infrastructure we create, the more we will feel its force, interiorizing the perspective of the many into the ego-ideal that affirms our practices and activities and pushes us to do more than we think we can. Radical pluralists and participatory democrats sometimes imply that there can be a left politics without judgment, condemnation, exclusion, and discipline. Denying the way that collective power works back on those who generate it, they suggest we can have the benefits of collectivity without its effects. But “working back” is an inextricable dimension of collectivity’s capacity to cut through the self-interest of individual needs and produce enduring bonds of solidarity. Collective activities always have effects in excess of their immediate goals. Rather than fearing these effects, rather than remaining stuck in the fantasy that an individual can change the world, and rather than remaining so gripped by fears of power that we fantasize a politics that can abolish it, we should confront the force of collectivity directly and take responsibility for generating it and using it. The party capable of building an affective infrastructure that can cut through the of capitalist expectation will err. It is not, cannot be, and should not be believed to be infallible. Sometimes it may turn its immense energies on itself. If we can’t bear it, we aren’t the Left, the communists, we need. Anyone who is unwilling to talk about the party should not talk about political transformation.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best engages in acts of comradery. Only collective action can solve for the harms of capitalism and resolve the Left

Dean 16 [(Jodi Dean, professor at Hobart and William Smith Colleges) “Crowds and Party,” 2016, <http://library.lol/main/94894B0740A38FE166F5E83819C8C049>] ZS

“Crowds and Party comes out of this moment of collective de-subjectivation. Occupy Wall Street foundered against a contradiction at its core. The individualism of its democratic, anarchist, and horizontalist ideological currents undermined the collective power the movement was building. Making collective political action dependent on individual choice, the “theology of consensus” fragmented the provisional unity of the crowd back into disempowered singularities.3 The movement’s decline (which began well before Occupiers were evicted) exposes the impasse confronting the Left. The celebration of autonomous individuality prevents us from foregrounding our commonality and organizing ourselves politically. At the same time and together with the global wave of popular unrest, the collective energy of Occupy at its height nevertheless points to an “idea whose time has come.” People are moving together in growing opposition to the policies and practices of states organized in the interest of capital as a class. Crowds are forcing the Left to return again to questions of organization, endurance, and scale. Through what political forms might we advance? For many of us, the party is emerging as the site of an answer. Against the presumption that the individual is the fundamental unit of politics, I focus on the crowd. Across the globe, crowds are pressing their opposition and rupturing the status quo, the actuality of their movement displacing the politics of identity. Bringing together thinkers such as Elias Canetti and Alain Badiou, I highlight the “egalitarian discharge” of the crowd event as an intense experience of substantive collectivity. I make fidelity to this event the basis for a new theory of the communist party. Because global movements are themselves pushing us to consider the possibilities in and of the party form, we have to recommence imagining the party of communists.4 Who might we be and become as an international revolutionary party again, in our time? To think clearly about these questions, we need to consider the party form unfettered by the false concreteness of specific parties in the contingency of their histories. Liberals and democrats are not the only political theorists who can reflect on their modes of association in the abstract. Communists must do this as well.”

## Case