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### 1

#### Interp: aff must only get offense off the desirability of the policy implementation of the resolution.

### 2

#### While concentrating on decentering identity, queer theory succeeds in promoting the very goals of global capitalism that work against the formation of communities or provide the means to destroy those that already exist

Kirsch 6 (Max, PhD Florida Atlantic University, “Queer Theory, Late Capitalism and Internalized Homophobia,” Journal of Homosexuality, Harrington Park Press, Vol. 52, No. ½, 2006, pp. 19-45,

Jameson has proposed that the concept of alienation in late capitalism has been replaced with fragmentation (1991, p.14). Fragmentation highlights the it also becomes more abstract: What we must now ask ourselves is whether it is precisely this semi-autonomy of the cultural sphere that has been destroyed by the logic of late capitalism. Yet to argue that culture is today no longer endowed with the relative autonomy is once enjoyed as one level among others in earlier moments of capitalism (let alone in precapitalist societies) is not necessarily to imply its disappearance or extinction. Quite the contrary; we must go on to affirm that the autonomous sphere of culture throughout the social realm, to the point at which everything in our social life–from economic value and state power to practices and to the very structure of the psyche itself–can be said to have become ‘cultural’ in some original and yet untheorized sense. This proposition is, however, substantially quite consistent with the previous diagnosis of a society of the image or simulacrum and a transformation of the “real” into so many pseudoevents. (Jameson, 1991, p. 48) The fragmentation of social life repeats itself in the proposal that sexuality and gender are separate and autonomous from bureaucratic state organization. If, as in Jameson’s terms, differences can be equated, then this should not pose a problem for the mobilization of resistance to inequality. However, as postmodernist and poststructuralist writers assume a position that this equation is impossible and undesirable, then the dominant modes of power will prevail without analysis or opposition. The danger, of course, is that while we concentrate on decentering identity, we succeed in promoting the very goals of global capitalism that work against the formation of communities or provide the means to destroy those that already exist, and with them, any hope for political action. For those who are not included in traditional sources of community building–in particular, kinship based groupings–the building of an “affectional community . . . must be as much a part of our political movement as are campaigns for civil rights” (Weeks, 1985, p. 176). This **building of communities requires identification**. If we cannot recognize traits that form the bases of our relationships with others, how then can communities be built? **The preoccupation** of Lyotard and Foucault, as examples, **with the overwhelming power of “master narratives,” posits a conclusion that emphasizes individual resistance and that ironically, ends up reinforcing the “narrative” itself**.

#### Fluidity is a fetish that queer theory uses to deny its own complicity and embeddedness within norms and discursive regulation.

**Epps 01** – (2001, Brad, “The Fetish of Fluidity,” in *Homosexuality and Psychoanalysis*, p. 413-4)

One such move bears on movement itself, presented, over and again, explicitly or implicitly, as truth-value and as freedom. Queer theory tends to place great stock in movement, especially when it is movement against, beyond, or away from rules and regulations, norms and conventions, borders and limits.3 It is not, in this, alone, for a great deal of critical and theoretical work is similarly moved. It is not alone, yet queer theory, as the general effect of particular pronouncements, presents movement, fluid movement, as the liberational undoing of regulatory disciplinarity. Its own disciplinarity appears, however, to be another matter. For it is my contention that by insistently setting its sights on fluidity, by taking it as that which at once denies and affirms disciplinary power, queer theory performs a little magic of its own. To put it provocatively, even perversely, it makes fluidity a fetish.4

This fluidity is not that of a certain feminist "mechanics," where something feminine is maintained, almost essentially, as part of a physical reality that resists symbolic solidification, to talization , or idealization (sec Irigaray 105- 16). Nor is it the fluidity of a certain AIDS activism, where the ideological underpinnings of a prophylactic imperative are exposed and contested. In both cases, fluidity is understood in reference to, among other corporeal properties, blood, milk, and semen. In both cases, as well, fluidity may function as a fetish, but in ways that arguably heighten rather than diminish identificato ry positions and so-called identity politics. The fluidity of queer theory partakes, perhaps, of both the aforementioned "forms" of fluidity, but it places the accent on the diminishment, or undoing, of identity. This is not to say that queer theory did not have a place in AIDS activism, but that the place it often occupied entailed the "subversive" displacement o f all identities, gay and lesbian included (almost as if identity itself were the disease). The problem is that "queer" itself is hardly free from the drag of identity, that it too is consolidated as an identity, perhaps even as an identity to end all identities, with considerable moral charge-again, even when it impugns morality per se, strives to get beyond it. Further, as we shall see, "queer" becomes a term, if not an identity, to be protected, defended, and preserved, to be fixed, that is, as designating a lack of fixity, a generally free fluidity.

Here fluidity presumably flows beyond established channels, even more newly established channels such as feminism, and washes away essence ent irely. What also goes with this flow is gender, race, age, class, and so on, all restyled as so many moving parts in a generalized performance- though rarely for a general audience-of the "human" and the "livable."5 Along with so many things, the body is itself in trouble, rendered so discursive as to matter little if at all. Or so the story goes. Recent work in queer theory revisits, with varying degrees of anxiety, apology, and aggressiveness, the beleaguered matter of materiality, appealing to the importance of "intimate critique" and foregrounding a dialogic praxis that seems willing to reconsider almost everything but the ideological baggage and national limits of the term queer itsel£.6 judith Butler, from whose work I have been so allusively drawing, is paradigmatic here, a ftgure who casts such a long shadow that any incursion into queer theory, any speculation on it, must cite her.7 The present "work is no exception: It finds itself conditioned, perhaps even constrained, by the authority of a work that precedes and exceeds it.

This is not an idle point. Queer theory, for all its antinonnative acts and pronouncements; for all its self-conscious maneuvers against proper objects and proper subjects; for all its assertions of openness and extraacademic inventiveness; for all its language of transgression, subversion, and radicality, is not free from authoritative gestures, rules, and norms of its own. And if queer theory flows, it stops short, as I have suggested, of flowing beyond itself, washing itself away, letting itself go. There is, after all, a certain amount of power and privilege here, and the maintenance and expansion of the queer, in and as queer theory, are not without benefit, economic and otherwise. This is true, of course, for any number of critical endeavors under capitalism, but with queerness it plays a bit differently. The benefit is, in a sense, an ostensible lack of benefit. I might underscore the ostensible-perhaps ostentatious-nature of this lack, which is, by the way, crucial to the psychoanalytic conception of fetishism, but for the moment I will stress the paradox of power and-in typical chiastic fa shion-the power of paradox.

#### Caps the root cause of all violence and controls the internal link to their k – it’s the worst reification of oppression.

Robinson 18 [William I, professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. 2018. “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State.”<http://revolutionary-socialism.com/en/accumulation-crisis-and-global-police-state/>]

Each major episode of crisis in the world capitalist system has presented the potential for systemic change. Each has involved the breakdown of state legitimacy, escalating class and social struggles, and military conflicts, leading to a restructuring of the system, including new institutional arrangements, class relations, and accumulation activities that eventually result in a restabilization of the system and renewed capitalist expansion. The current crisis shares aspects of earlier system-wide structural crises, such as of the 1880s, the 1930s or the 1970s. But there are six interrelated dimensions to the current crisis that I believe sets it apart from these earlier ones and suggests that a simple restructuring of the system will not lead to its restabilization – that is, our very survival now requires a revolution against global capitalism (Robinson, 2014). These six dimensions, in broad strokes, present a “big picture” context in which a global police state is emerging. First, the system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. We have already passed tipping points in climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and diversity loss. For the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system in such a way that threatens to bring about a sixth mass extinction (see, e.g., Foster et al., 2011; Moore, 2015). These ecological dimensions of global crisis have been brought to the forefront of the global agenda by the worldwide environmental justice movement. Communities around the world have come under escalating repression as they face off against transnational corporate plunder of their environment. While capitalism cannot be held solely responsible for the ecological crisis, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can[t] be resolved within the capitalist system given capital’s implacable impulse to accumulate and its accelerated commodification of nature. Second, the level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented. The richest one percent of humanity in 2016 controlled over half of the world’s wealth and 20 percent controlled 95 percent of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just five percent (Oxfam, 2017). These escalating inequalities fuel capitalism’s chronic problem of overaccumulation: the TCC cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to chronic stagnation in the world economy (see next section). Such extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge of social control to dominant groups. As Trumpism in the United States as well as the rise of far-right and neo-fascist movements in Europe so well illustrate, cooptation also involves the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled towards 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. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend themselves to projects of 21st century fascism. Third, the sheer magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as well as the magnitude and concentrated control over the means of global communication and the production and circulation of symbols, images, and knowledge. Computerized wars, drone warfare, robot soldiers, bunker-buster bombs, a new generation of nuclear weapons, satellite surveillance, cyberwar, spatial control technology, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare, and more generally, of systems of social control and repression. We have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society, a point brought home by Edward Snowden’s revelations in 2013, and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication and symbolic production. If global capitalist crisis leads to a new world war the destruction would simply be unprecedented. Fourth, we are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism, in the sense that there are no longer any new territories of significance to integrate into world capitalism and new spaces to commodify are drying up. The capitalist system is by its nature expansionary. 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. At the same time, the privatization of education, health, utilities, basic services, and public lands is turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital’s control into “spaces of capital,” so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? New spaces have to be violently cracked open and the peoples in these spaces must be repressed by the global police state. Fifth, there is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums” (Davis, 2007) pushed out of the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction, into a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. Crises provide capital with the opportunity to accelerate the process of forcing greater productivity out of fewer workers. The processes by which surplus labor is generated have accelerated under globalization. Spatial reorganization has helped transnational capital to break the territorial-bound power of organized labor and impose new capital–labor relations based on fragmentation, flexibilization, and the cheapening of labor. These developments, combined with a massive new round of primitive accumulation and displacement of hundreds of millions, have given rise to a new global army of superfluous labor that goes well beyond the traditional reserve army of labor that Marx discussed. 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. Dominant groups face the challenge of how to contain both the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity. In addition, surplus humanity cannot consume and so as their ranks expand the problem of overaccumulation becomes exacerbated. Sixth, there is an acute political contradiction in global capitalism: economic globalization takes places within a nation-state system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to substitute for a leading nation-state with enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on transnational capital. In the age of capitalist globalization governments must attract to the national territory transnational corporate investment, which requires providing capital with all the incentives associated with neoliberalism – downward pressure on wages, deregulation, austerity, and so on – that aggravate inequality, impoverishment, and insecurity for working classes. Nation-states face a contradiction between the need to promote transnational capital accumulation in their territories and their need to achieve political legitimacy. As a result, states around the world have been experiencing spiraling crises of legitimacy. This situation generates bewildering and seemingly contradictory politics and also helps explain the resurgence of far-right and neo-fascist forces that espouse rhetoric of nationalism and protectionism even as they promote neo-liberalism.

#### The alternative is to Join the Party – reject their performative politics and focus on building dual power to resist capitalism and materially benefit oppressed peoples.

Escalante 18 [Alyson, philosophy at U of Oregon, 08/24/2018. “Against Electoralism, For Dual Power!” <https://theforgenews.org/2018/08/24/against-electoralism-for-dual-power/>] lm

I am sure that at this point, the opportunists reading this have already begun to type out their typical objection: the world is different than it was in 1917, and the conditions of the United States in no way echo the conditions which enabled the Bolsheviks to achieve revolutionary success. To this tried and true objection, there is one simple answer: you are entirely correct, and that is why we need to abandon electoralism and working within the bourgeois state. What were the conditions which allowed the Bolsheviks to successfully revolt? The conditions were that of Dual Power. Alongside the capitalist state, there existed a whole set of institutions and councils which met the needs of the workers. The soviets, a parallel socialist government made up of individual councils, successfully took over many governmental responsibilities in some parts of Petrograd. In the radical Viborg district, the Bolshevik controlled soviets provided government services like mail, alongside programs that could meet the needs of workers. When a far right coup was attempted against the provisional government, it was troops loyal to the Bolshevik factions within the soviet who repelled the coup plotters, proving concretely to the workers of Petrograd that the socialists could not only provide for their needs, but also for their defense. In short: the Bolsheviks recognized that instead of integrating into the bourgeois state, they could operate outside of it to build dual power. They could establish programs of elected representatives who would serve the workers. They would not bolster the capitalist state in the name of socialism, they would offer an alternative to it. And so, when the time came for revolt, the masses were already to loyal to the Bolsheviks. The only party who had never compromised, who had denounced the unpopular imperialist wars, who had rejected the provisional government entirely, was the party who successfully gained the support of the workers. And so, many of us on the more radical fringes of the socialist movement wonder why it is the the DSA and other socialist opportunists seem to think that we can win by bolstering the capitalist state? We wonder, given this powerful historical precedent, why they devote their energy to getting more Ocasios elected; what good does one more left democrat who will abandon the workers do for us? The answer we receive in return is always the same: we want to win small changes that will make life for the workers easier; we want to protect food stamps and healthcare. And do this, we reply: what makes you think reformism is the only way to do this. When the bourgeois state in California was happy to let black children go to school unfed, the Black Panthers didn’t rally around democratic candidates, they became militant and fed the children themselves. In the 40s and 50s, socialists in New York saw people going without healthcare and instead of rallying behind democratic candidates, they built the IWO to provide healthcare directly. Both these groups took up our pressing revolutionary task: building dual power. Imagine if all those hours the DSA poured into electing Ocasio were instead used to feed the people of New York, to provide them with medical care, to ensure their needs were met. Imagine the masses seeing socialism not as a pipe dream we might achieve through electing more imperialists, but as a concrete movement which is currently meeting their needs? The fact is, we are not nearly ready for revolution. Socialists in the United States have failed to meet the needs of the people, and as long as their only concrete interaction with the masses is handing them a voter registration form, they will continue to fail the people. Our task now is not to elect representatives to advocate for the people; it is much more gruelingly laborious than that. Our task is to serve the people. Our task is to build dual power. The movement to do this is underway. Members of the DSA refoundation caucus have begun to move the left of the DSA in this direct, socialist groups like Philly Socialists have begun to build dual power through GED programs and tenants unions, many branches of the Party For Socialism and Liberation have begun to feed the people and provide for their concrete needs, and Red Guard collectives in Los Angeles have built serve the people programs and taken on a stance of militant resistance to gentrification. The movement is growing, its time is coming, and dual power is achievable within our life time. The opportunists are, in a sense, correct. We are not where we were in 1917, but we can begin to move in that direction and dual power can take us there. In order to achieve dual power we have to recognize that Lenin was right: there will be no socialist gains by working within state institutions designed to crush socialism. Furthermore, we must recognize that the strategies of the electoral opportunists trade off with dual power. Electing candidates drains resources, time, and energy away from actually serving the people. And so, we should commit to undertake the difficult and dangerous task of building dual power. We must reject opportunism, we must name the democratic party as our enemy, we must rally around power directly in the hands of the socialist movement. We do not have a parallel system of soviets in the United States. We can change that. Someday the cry “all power to the soviets” will be heard again. Lets make it happen.
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