===1===

====The identity politics of the 1AC naturalize capitalism - the aff appropriates the argument of the bourgeois class to characterize justice and injustice – a class resentment that retains the holdings of the white middle class as the object of desire, obfuscating a critique of capitalism which constructs these norms====

Brown 95 ~~[Wendy, Professor of Political Science at Berkeley, States of Injury, pp. 59-61~~]

In addition to the formations of identity that may be the complex effects of disciplinary

AND

in the multiculturalist mantra, "race, class, gender, sexuality"?

==== The aff believes that if you buy their case it will spill over into real change, but individual rhetorical choices like the aff are just consumer choices in a cap market. They set back the revolution through their methodology.====

THE RED PHOENIX ’12 (APL, https://theredphoenixapl.org/2012/07/10/on-individualism/, Introduction: A Fetish for the Individual Above All)

People in the United States are taught that all of life’s fortunes and misfortunes are

AND

in collective revolutionary work is making a retreat, falling into capitalism’s trap.

====Cap causes extinction – nuclear war, environmental destruction, and social inequality.====

Brown, 05 (Charles, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, 05/13/2005, http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm) 0:26

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means

AND

at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

====Capitalism is the overarching totality that governs all oppression.====

McLaren et al, 4 (Peter and Valerie Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, University of Windsor, Ontario, University of California, 2004, Educational Philosophy and Theory Vol 36 No 2, "Class Dismissed? Historical Materialism and the politics of ‘difference,’")

The cohesiveness of this position suggests that forms of exploitation and oppression are related internally

AND

educators and theorists must cease displacing class analysis with the politics of difference.

====The alternative is to affirm the form of the party—against the subjective atomization of contemporary politics, only a vertical form of organization aimed at transformation of constituted structures of power can actualize change (50)====

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

CM: Great to have you on the show.¶ Let’s start with Occupy.

AND

us against them. It produced the proper collectivity: an antagonistic one.

==Case==

===framing===

====Extinction matters – we control the root cause of structural issues– if we control the cause of exploitation then we should win on the root cause debate on the k which we indicate that structural issues cause and will be the cause of extinction as contradictions cannot be resolved through the system ====

===Case===

====Cx McLaren to first piece of evidence – capitalism undergirds all forms of oppression not just sexuality – contructs are all socially construted to make it harder to struggle against capitalism as mclaren quotes – focusing on different forms of otherization within capitalism creates politics of differences where people have a harder time of coming together to challenging capitalism through a whole – we see ourselves as an identity versus ====

====Our idea that cap undergirds everything postdates their stuff – policies centered around war, medicine, technology, immigration is undergirded by capitalism – the aff cannot explain why there are educational lapses in different areas like where black poor areas get less education than a wealthier white neighborhood – root cause of oppression did not shift in 1954 through the use of anti-queerness – gender has been a part of society since before calendars were made and have been employed since then – the exploitation of individuals based on hierarchies of class based on societies through use of labor potential ====

====We can describe this condition as cruel optimism, an attachment to a possibility that is ultimately impossible or harmful. Sustaining fantasies of social transformation requires an intimate, proximate affective attachment, which debate conveniently provides to judges in the form of teams, but only at the cost of the detached apathy that explains how easily we pack up and do it all over again next round. ====

\*\*Berlant 11\*\* ~~[Lauren, George M. Pullman Professor, Department of English, University of Chicago, Cruel Optimism, Routledge: Duke University Press, 2011, p. 33-6~~]

When we talk about an object of desire, we are really talking about a

AND

worn out by the promises that they have attached to in this world.

====The 1ac’s focus on spectacles of pain legitimize the sentimental politics which affectively undergird neoliberal governance. ====

\*\*Strick 14\*\* ~~[Simon, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Center for Literary and Cultural Research Berlin, American Dolorologies, 2014, p. 132-6~~]

The concluding argument concerns late modern figurations of the body in pain. Spectacles of

AND

compassionate and revolving primarily around the recognition of bodies in pain.3¶

### 1

**The identity politics of the 1AC naturalize capitalism - the aff appropriates the argument of the bourgeois class to characterize justice and injustice – a class resentment that retains the holdings of the white middle class as the object of desire, obfuscating a critique of capitalism which constructs these norms**

**Brown 95** [Wendy, Professor of Political Science at Berkeley, *States of Injury*, pp. 59-61]

In addition to the formations of identity that may be the complex effects of disciplinary and liberal modalities of power, I want to suggest one other historical strand relevant to the production of politicized identity this one twined more specifically to developments in recent political culture. Although sanguine to varying degrees about the phenomenon they are describing, many on the European and North American Leti: have argued that identity politics emerges from the demise of class politics attendant upon post-Fordism or pursuant to May '68. Without adjudicating the precise relationship between the breakup of class politics and the proliferation of other sites of political identification, I want to re- figure this claim by suggesting that what we have come to call identity politics is partly dependent upon the demise of a critique of capitalism and of bourgeois cultural and economic values. In a reading that links the new identity claims to a certain relegitimation of capitalism**, identity politics concerned with race, sexuality, and gender will appear not as a supplement to class politics,** not as an expansion of left categories of oppression and emancipation, not as an enriching augmentation of progressive formulations of power and persons-all of which they also are-**but as tethered to a formulation of justice that reinscribes a bourgeois** (masculinist) **ideal as its measure**.¶ If it is this ideal that signifies educational and vocational opportunity, upward mobility, relative protection against arbitrary violence, and re- ward in proportion to effort, and if it is this ideal against which many of the exclusions and privations of people of color, gays and lesbians, and women are articulated, then the political purchase of **contemporary** American **identity politics would seem to be achieved in part through a certain renaturalization of capitalism** that can be said to have marked progressive discourse since the 1970s. What this also suggests is that **identity politics may be partly configured by a** peculiarly shaped and peculiarly **disguised form of class resentment**, a resentment that is displaced onto discourses of injustice other than class, but a resentment, like all resentments, **that retains the real or imagined holdings of its reviled subject as objects of desire.** In other words, **the enunciation of politicized identities¶ through race, gender. and sexuality** may **require**-rather than incidentally produce-**a limited identification through class, specifically abjuring a critique of class power and class norms precisely insofar as these identities are established vis-a-vis a bourgeois norm of social acceptance, legal protection, and relative material comfort**. Yet, **when not only economic stratification but other injuries to the human body and psyche enacted by capitalism**-alienation, commodification, exploitation, dis- placement, disintegration of sustaining albeit contradictory social forms such as families and neighborhoods-when these **are discursively normalized and thus depoliticized, other markers of social difference may come to bear an inordinate weight**; indeed, they may bear all the weight of the sufferings produced by capitalism in addition to that attributable to the explicitly politicized marking. **If there is one class that articulates and even politicizes itself in late modern North American life, it is that which gives itself the name of the "middle class."** But the foregoing suggests that this is not a reactive identity the sense, for example, of "white" or "straight" in contemporary political discourse. Rather **it is an articulation by the figure of the class that represents, indeed depends upon, the naturalization rather than the politicization of capitalism, the denial of capitalism's power effects in ordering social life, the representation of the ideal of capitalism to provide the good life for all.** Poised between the rich and poor, feeling itself to be protected from the encroachments of neither, the phantasmic middle class signifies the natural and the good between the decadent or the corrupt on one side, the aberrant or the decaying on the other. It is a conservative identity in the sense that it semiotically recurs to a phantasmic past, an imagined idyllic, unfettered, and uncorrupted historical moment (implicitly located around 1955) when life was good-housing was affordable, men supported families on single incomes, drugs were confined to urban ghettos. But it is not a reactionary identity in the sense of reacting to an insurgent politicized identity from below. Rather, it precisely **embodies the ideal to which nonclass identities refer for proof of their exclusion or injury: homosexuals, who lack the protections of marriage, guarantees of child custody or job security, and freedom from harassment; single women, who arc strained and impoverished by trying to raise children and hold paid jobs simultaneously; and people of color, who are not only disproportionately affected by unemployment, punishing urban housing costs, and inadequate health care programs, but disproportionately subjected to unwarranted harassment, figured as criminals, ignored by cab drivers. The point is not that these privations are trivial but that without recourse to the white masculine middle-class ideal, politicized identities would forfeit** a good deal of **their claims to injury and exclusion, their claims to the political significance of their difference.** If they thus require this ideal for the potency and poignancy of their political claims, we might ask to what extent a critique of capitalism is foreclosed by the current configuration of oppositional politics, and not simply by the "loss of the socialist alternative" or the ostensible "triumph of liberalism" in the global order. In contrast with the Marxist critique of a social whole and Marxist vision of total transformation, to what extent do **identity politics require a standard internal to existing society against which to pitch their claims, a standard that not only preserves capitalism from critique, but sustains the invisibility and inarticulateness of class**-not accidentally, but endemically? Could we have stumbled upon one reason why class is invariably named but rarely theorized or developed in the multiculturalist mantra, "race, class, gender, sexuality"?

**The aff believes that if you buy their case it will spill over into real change, but individual rhetorical choices like the aff are just consumer choices in a cap market. They set back the revolution through their methodology.**

**THE RED PHOENIX ’12** (APL, <https://theredphoenixapl.org/2012/07/10/on-individualism/>, Introduction: A Fetish for the Individual Above All)

**People in the United States are taught that all of life’s fortunes and misfortunes are brought about solely by the actions of the individual.** We are taught that a person, by virtue of living in the United States of America, has every opportunity to work hard and become the next success story. Poverty is the fault of the individual and wealth is the result of an individual’s labor and genius according to this perception, making the individual something of a deity within their own realm. We are taught that those who rule our society and find themselves in the position of master in our political and economic lives deserve to be there, and that those who find themselves in squalor are in their position due to a failure in education, work ethic and character. Considering that we are taught these delusions from our youngest years, **it makes sense that individualism has become central to the false consciousness prevailing in our society.** From the liberal retort to the concept of revolution, to the worst dregs of Objectivist philosophy, one can find many currents which prioritize an individual or individuals over the rest of society, **and use this fetish for the individual to resist revolutionary motion, to defend the exploitation and cruelty of our system for fear of any alternative inconveniencing the individual.** To any argument, any position, any stance or statement of fact, the true individualist need only spew “but what about me?” in an attempt to appeal to the individualism of the person making the argument, or worse, to emotively flail their arms in an effort to resist any and all logic outside of their “principled” position. While the individual is likely to believe that their individualism will protect them from being coerced or co-opted into supporting things that would harm them, this “**independence” is actually an essential ideological construct for their intellectual enslavement.** If the toilers and exploited in a society see themselves as the problem, and are unmotivated to unite for their common benefit, and at the same time see the world around them as “fair” and their exploiters as role models for the ideal individual, what interest does this serve? Is it the individual or is it a class of the very same exploiters who have an interest in undermining any attempt at resisting their hegemony? Definitive Bourgeois Ideological Paradigm Emerges While there have probably been self-obsessed individuals throughout the history of our species, **individualism as a major ideological force has its origins in the ideology of the Age of Enlightenment and the emergence of capitalism.** While in feudalism the main ideological concern was with lineages, bloodlines and aristocratic titles that justified property relations, bourgeois revolutions yielded the need for new cultural means of articulating the reasons for new property relations. The new bourgeoisie were not the aristocrats of old, and required a new justification for their power and hegemony outside of the feudal model. The answer came from the property relations themselves, arguing that individuals with property were entitled to their property. “Liberté, Sûreté, Propriété” (Liberty, Security, Property) was one famous slogan of the French Revolution, and this spirit of the ideological and state protection of private ownership of the means of production continued in America’s political revolution in the 1770’s.Despite beginning with this more advanced ideological justification for property relations, the United States remained incredibly backward in its production and in ideology. The United States operated with two competing economic systems, an industrial capitalist system in the north and a slave system in the south, eventually driving the country into a civil war until the northern states were able to assert their economic and political hegemony over the union. The racial apartheid of the slavery and post-slavery United States, combined with a religious fervor and puritan religion, put the United States behind other industrialized societies in terms of ideology, and much of the operating of society was still justified with religious mysticism and racial hierarchy. In the class struggles that emerged in the 19th and early 20th century, revolutionary and progressive forces were confronted with some of the most reactionary currents in the industrial world, while at the same time struggling with the enlightenment period illusions that bound the minds of the people. A New Opium in an Increasingly Secular, Less Nationalist World In the wake of the Second World War, when nationalism, reaction and imperialism had brought the world into devastation for the second time, the old ideological currents of religious reaction and colonial racism were beginning to lose their edge against the aspirations of American working people for a better world. Racial chauvinism came into contradiction with the appearance of a new generation of black veterans, returning from fighting fascism on the battlefield to finding fascistic and reactionary currents oppressing them in their homes and renewing the calls for civil rights made decades earlier by America’s communists. Women in the workplace necessitated new forms of social relations, while the older forms of capitalist patriarchy began to face resistance. A new post-war generation began to move against the old forms of social control, and the old norms of American society were found to be at a loss for a means of diffusing the powder-keg new imperialist wars and new aspirations for liberation and social justice inspired. To continue their struggle against revolutionary movement, while appeasing the masses of workers who were dissatisfied with their lot in life, the bourgeoisie had to return their rhetoric to the Enlightenment ideals while finding more modern expressions of racism and patriarchy to keep the social order intact. The solution lied in selling individualism as a uniquely American product, as the virtue of a “free” society, as a weapon against any and all oppressive forces – both real and imaginary – and as the chief method of resistance in an age of protest and social movement. Capitalists were able to shuffle their goods into new markets of individualists looking for “alternatives” – alternative lifestyle, alternative ways of dress, alternative musical expressions – and this culture of the “alternative” became a new ideological force against social movement, channeling the energies of disaffected people away from the more dangerous revolutionary forms and into the more comfortable and superficial pretenses of resistance. Whereas before the American bourgeoisie relied on religious, nationalistic and colonialist cultural opiates to quell movements for revolution, the crisis that post World War II imperialist adventures and social backwardness drove the powers that be to modernize anti-communism, to make it “hip” when a new generation was yearning for a new society. As a result, the United States was able to weather the storm and continue to wage the Cold War and strengthen imperialism’s grip until the final collapse of the Soviet Union. Standing as the world’s only “superpower,” the U.S. was able to continue its campaign of butchery in the Middle East, in the former Yugoslavia and elsewhere, confident that the ideology they had set in place would protect them from revolutionary upheaval. The conformity of non-conformism **The great thing about individualism for the bourgeoisie**, as previously mentioned**, is that its manifestations work within the capitalist framework. Individualists wanting to protest society by being “more individual” will find their way into the goods, the art-forms and the ideology the capitalists have for sale, all while maintaining the illusion that they are effectively resisting the forces in society they don’t like. This comfortable, passive pseudo-resistance leads to organizational and practical lethargy,** while at the same time allowing for newer markets and more opportunities to profit for the capitalists. At the same time, individualism is utilized as a justification for nationalism and as a foil for those societies that the United States is competing with. From the straw-man Orwellian socialism, to the exaggeration of societies like Iran and North Korea, the capitalists argue that in the U.S., the individual is “free” and elsewhere they are not. The idea that in such societies every aspect of your life is decided for you, that a “totalitarian” regime controls every aspect of your life, and that in America one is “free to decide their own destiny” is an important ideological lever for justifying imperialist attacks on such societies and repression on any who sympathize with them against imperialism. In a society where “democracy” is a phrase pigeonholed to mean “democracy for the capitalists,” “individualism” is altered from its stated meaning to itself being the privilege of those with power. One’s ability to express their “individuality” is proportional to their spending power, just as one’s “participation in a democracy” is proportional to their access to voting rights, to the candidates and to the wellsprings of campaign donations which speak louder than stated principles. Yet this objective state of affairs will continue to be dismissed by individualists due to the cult of the individual and the notion that the individual, and not a combination of the individual, the society and the class struggle, decide one’s fate. What is the Individual? A denial and dismissal of a political and economic social context wherein individuals are influenced and motivated to action or inaction is at the crux of individualism’s argument. “No matter what the world around you does, you decide on your own actions,” “no one forced you to do this,” etc. These and similar statements are utilized to make every circumstance a person finds themselves in brought about by personal responsibility, or lack of responsibility. Yet, to counter this, an important question to ask is: since I’m so responsible, how come I have no say in where I was born? What educational opportunities I had growing up? What class background my parents had? My biological characteristics and general state of health? How people have perceived and treated me? If I’m supposed to be a “self-made” person, how is that possible when I was not “self made,” but born to parents, taught by others, shaped by individuals and institutions at every phase of my life? The objective reality is that there never was, nor ever will be, a “self-made” man or woman. Every one of us is created by certain conditions within a certain context, shaping our opportunities and outlooks, our experiences and our abilities, our skills and aspirations. Without our context, we would be nothing, and without society, we are nothing but isolated biological organisms barely able to subsist. The way that we know ourselves, the way that we live and grow, is through our interactions with others in the larger social networks in which we participate. What Truly Makes One in 7 Billion. Having established that there is no such thing as a self-made person, and the importance of the larger world we live in as a motivating factor in the positions in which individuals find themselves, it’s important to understand that how we relate to the world is dialectical: just as we are created and influenced by the world, we help to create and influence the world through our own actions. Each day, some 7 billion individuals come together for production, for socialization, for teaching and learning, building and demolishing, conflict and cooperation. This network is all-encompassing, with all human beings in some way being affected by the expenditure of energy by other human beings.Knowing this, one might ask, what does it mean to be “one in 7 billion?” Does it mean we are special, or does it mean that we are insignificant? The answer is not that simple; we are all unique in certain ways, from different sequences of DNA to different sets of experiences and skills, yet we all have commonalities, and in the organization of our societies into classes, common interests within these classes. **When it comes to whether the efforts of an individual can have a greater or lesser impact on the human experience, the way that we measure this is through the individual’s contribution to the movement of society,** to its progress or to its degeneration. How does an individual expend their energies? To help humanity’s transformation, for the end of exploitation and greater social justice? Or does the individual aid the cause of reaction, serve to exploit his fellow person and move to benefit themselves and the exploiting class? It is in this way we must evaluate our own contributions to the greater fabric of human society. Why Should One Person Care? When confronted with this paradigm, the true individualist would reject it as a whole, saying that the individual decides what an individual is worth. “Why should I care about the rest of them? How does that help me?” The idea here is that the individualist, prioritizing individual desires to collective needs, must be “put out” if they are to break their focus from their individual fetish. Yet it must be understood that, as human beings interconnected with other human beings in this social framework, who rely on that framework for survival, we receive a benefit when the conditions of our class are improved. When people like us, who work the same jobs we do, who are in the same social position, benefit as a collective, we will experience these benefits in our everyday lives, and actions we take to achieve benefits for ourselves and our peers eventually reach home. The idea that society is, to the individual, so abstract and removed that they can receive no tangible benefit from working on its behalf is, in a word, ridiculous. Consider the benefit of child labor laws. Would you be where you are today if, instead of spending your youth in a dusty coal mine or working at an assembly line, rather than receiving some manner of education? How about with simple utilities like public sewage? Doesn’t the individual benefit from not living in cities overflowing with human waste? The 8 hour work day, which workers fought and died for, continues to yield a tangible benefit for every worker in the U.S. How does the individual worker not benefit from things like this? Conclusion: To move forward, we must all move forward In order to change our lot in life, first American working people need to realize that we are in the same boat. Rather than succumb to the illusions laid out to us by capitalism, that we as individuals are solely responsible for our destiny and we merely need to work harder to succeed**, we must understand that the problems we face are systemic, and their solutions involve the cooperation and common activity of the working class rising up together to take the reigns of society. To attempt to resist capitalism by simply attempting to “not conform” rather than engaging in collective revolutionary work is making a retreat, falling into capitalism’s trap.**

#### Cap causes extinction – nuclear war, environmental destruction, and social inequality.

**Brown, 05** (Charles, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, 05/13/2005, <http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm>) 0:26

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class. Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or **exacerbates all major social ills of our times**. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. The threat of nuclear war, **which can destroy all humanity, grows** with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to spiral, threatening all life on our planet. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of stagnant real wages, while health and education costs soar. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries. Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work of comparable value. All workers receive lower wages when racism succeeds in dividing and disorganizing them. In every aspect of economic and social life, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian a nd Pacific Islanders, Arabs and Middle Eastern peoples, and other nationally and racially oppressed people experience conditions inferior to that of whites. Racist violence and the poison of racist ideas victimize all people of color no matter which economic class they belong to. The attempts to suppress and undercount the vote of the African American and other racially oppressed people are part of racism in the electoral process. Racism permeates the police, judicial and prison systems, perpetuating unequal sentencing, racial profiling, discriminatory enforcement, and police brutality. The democratic, civil and human rights of all working people are continually under attack. These attacks range from increasingly difficult procedures for union recognition and attempts to prevent full union participation in elections, to the absence of the right to strike for many public workers. They range from undercounting minority communities in the census to making it difficult for working people to run for office because of the domination of corporate campaign funding and the high cost of advertising. These attacks also include growing censorship and domination of the media by the ultra-right; growing restrictions and surveillance of activist social movements and the Left; open denial of basic rights to immigrants; and, violations of the Geneva Conventions up to and including torture for prisoners. These abuses all serve to maintain the grip of the capitalists on government power. They use this power to ensure the economic and political dominance of their class. Women still face a considerable differential in wages for work of equal or comparable value. They also confront barriers to promotion, physical and sexual abuse, continuing unequal workload in home and family life, and **male supremacist** ideology perpetuating unequal and often unsafe conditions. The constant attacks on social welfare programs severely impact single women, single mothers, nationally and racially oppressed women, and all working class women. The reproductive rights of all women are continually under attack ideologically and politically. Violence against women in the home and in society at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

**Capitalism is the overarching totality that governs all oppression.**

**McLaren et al, 4** (Peter and Valerie Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, University of Windsor, Ontario, University of California, 2004, *Educational Philosophy and Theory* Vol 36 No 2, “Class Dismissed? Historical Materialism and the politics of ‘difference,’”)

The cohesiveness of this position suggests that forms of **exploitation and oppression are related internally to the extent that they are located in the same totality**— one which is currently **defined by capitalist class rule. Capitalism is an overarching totality that is**, unfortunately, **becoming increasingly invisible in** post-Marxist **‘discursive’ narratives that valorize ‘difference’ as a primary explanatory construct.¶** For example, E. San Juan (2003) argues that **race relations and race conflict are necessarily structured by the larger totality of the political economy** of a given society, as well as by modifications in the structure of the world economy. He further notes that the capitalist mode of production has articulated ‘race’ with class in a peculiar way. He too is worth a substantial quotation:¶ While the stagnation of rural life imposed a racial or castelike rigidity to the peasantry, the rapid accumulation of wealth through the ever more intensifying exploitation of labor by capital could not so easily ‘racialize’ the wage-workers of a particular nation, given the alienability of labor- power—unless certain physical or cultural characteristics can be utilized to divide the workers or render one group an outcast or pariah removed from the domain of ‘free labor.’ **In the capitalist development of U.S. society, African, Mexican, and Asian bodies**—more precisely, their **labor power** and its reproductive efficacy—**were colonized and racialized**; hence the idea of ‘internal colonialism’ retains explanatory validity. ‘**Race’ is thus constructed out of raw materials furnished by class relations, the history of class conflicts, and the vicissitudes of** colonial/**capitalist expansion** and the building of imperial hegemony. **It is dialectically accented and operationalized** not just to differentiate the price of wage labor within and outside the territory of the metropolitan power, but also **to reproduce relations of domination**–subordination invested with an aura of naturality and fatality. The refunctioning of physical or cultural traits as ideological and political signifiers of class identity reifies social relations. Such ‘racial’ markers enter the field of the alienated labor process, concealing the artificial nature of meanings and norms, and essentializing or naturalizing historical traditions and values which are contingent on mutable circumstances.¶ For San Juan, **racism and nationalism are modalities in which class struggles articulate themselves at strategic points in history**. He argues that **racism arose with the creation and expansion of the capitalist world economy.** He maintains, rightly in our view, that racial or ethnic group solidarity is given ‘meaning and value in terms of their place within the social organization of production and reproduction of the ideological-political order; ideologies of racism as collective social evaluation of solidarities arise to reinforce structural constraints which preserve the exploited and oppressed position of these “racial” solidarities’.¶ It is remarkable, in our opinion, that **so much of contemporary social theory has largely abandoned the problems of labor, capitalist exploitation, and class analysis** at a time when capitalism is becoming more universal, more ruthless and more deadly. The metaphor of a contemporary ‘tower of Babel’ seems appropriate here—academics striking radical poses in the seminar rooms while remaining oblivious to the possibility that **their seemingly radical discursive maneuvers do nothing to further the struggles ‘against oppression and exploitation which continue to be real, material, and not merely “discursive” problems** of the contemporary world’ (Dirlik, 1997, p. 176). Harvey (1998, pp. 29–31) indicts the new academic entrepreneurs, the ‘masters of theory-in-and-for-itself’ whose ‘discourse radicalism’ has deftly side-stepped ‘the enduring conundrums of class struggle’ and who have, against a ‘sobering background of cheapened discourse and opportunistic politics,’ been ‘stripped of their self-advertised radicalism.’ For years, they ‘contested socialism,’ ridiculed Marxists, and promoted ‘their own alternative theories of liberatory politics’ but now they have largely been ‘reduced to the role of supplicants in the most degraded form of pluralist politics imaginable.’ **As they pursue the politics of difference, the ‘class war rages unabated’** and they seem ‘either unwilling or unable to focus on the unprecedented economic carnage occurring around the globe.’¶ Harvey’s searing criticism suggests that post-Marxists have been busy fiddling while Rome burns and his comments echo those made by Marx (1978, p. 149) in his critique of the Young Hegelians who were, ‘in spite of their allegedly “world- shattering” statements, the staunchest conservatives.’ Marx lamented that the Young Hegelians were simply fighting ‘phrases’ and that they failed to acknowledge that in offering only counter-phrases, they were in no way ‘combating the real existing world’ but merely combating the phrases of the world. Taking a cue from Marx and substituting ‘phrases’ with ‘discourses’ or ‘resignifications’ we would contend that the practitioners of difference politics who operate within exaggerated culturalist frameworks that privilege the realm of representation as the primary arena of political struggle question some discourses of power while legitimating others. Moreover, **because they lack a class perspective, their gestures of radicalism are belied by their own class positions**.10 As Ahmad (1997a, p. 104) notes:¶ One may speak of any number of disorientations and even oppressions, but one cultivates all kinds of politeness and indirection about the structure of capitalist class relations in which those oppressions are embedded. To speak of any of that directly and simply is to be ‘vulgar.’ In this climate of Aesopian languages **it is absolutely essential to reiterate that most things are a matter of class.** That kind of statement is ... surprising only in a culture like that of the North American university ... But it is precisely in that kind of culture that people need to hear such obvious truths.¶ Ahmad’s provocative observations imply that substantive analyses of the carnage wrought by ‘globalized’ class exploitation have, for the most part, been marginalized by the kind of radicalism that has been instituted among the academic Left in North America. He further suggests that while various post-Marxists have invited us to join their euphoric celebrations honoring the decentering of capitalism, the abandonment of class politics, and the decline of metanarratives (particularly those of Marxism and socialism), they have failed to see that the most ‘meta of all metanarratives of the past three centuries, the creeping annexation of the globe¶ for the dominance of capital over laboring humanity has met, during those same decades, with stunning success’ (Ahmad, 1997b, p. 364). As such, Ahmad invites us to ask anew, the proverbial question: What, then, must be done? To this question we offer no simple theoretical, pedagogical or political prescriptions. Yet we would argue that **if social change is the aim**, progressive educators and **theorists must cease displacing class analysis with the politics of difference.**

#### The alternative is to affirm the form of the party—against the subjective atomization of contemporary politics, only a vertical form of organization aimed at transformation of constituted structures of power can actualize change (50)

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

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

## Case

### framing

#### Extinction matters – we control the root cause of structural issues– if we control the cause of exploitation then we should win on the root cause debate on the k which we indicate that structural issues cause and will be the cause of extinction as contradictions cannot be resolved through the system

### Case

#### Cx McLaren to first piece of evidence – capitalism undergirds all forms of oppression not just sexuality – contructs are all socially construted to make it harder to struggle against capitalism as mclaren quotes – focusing on different forms of otherization within capitalism creates politics of differences where people have a harder time of coming together to challenging capitalism through a whole – we see ourselves as an identity versus

#### Our idea that cap undergirds everything postdates their stuff – policies centered around war, medicine, technology, immigration is undergirded by capitalism – the aff cannot explain why there are educational lapses in different areas like where black poor areas get less education than a wealthier white neighborhood – root cause of oppression did not shift in 1954 through the use of anti-queerness – gender has been a part of society since before calendars were made and have been employed since then – the exploitation of individuals based on hierarchies of class based on societies through use of labor potential

#### We can describe this condition as cruel optimism, an attachment to a possibility that is ultimately impossible or harmful. Sustaining fantasies of social transformation requires an intimate, proximate affective attachment, which debate conveniently provides to judges in the form of teams, but only at the cost of the detached apathy that explains how easily we pack up and do it all over again next round.

Berlant 11 [Lauren, George M. Pullman Professor, Department of English, University of Chicago, *Cruel Optimism*, Routledge: Duke University Press, 2011, p. 33-6]

When we talk about an object of desire, we are really talking about a cluster of promises we want someone or something to make to us and make possible for us. **This** cluster of promises **could be embedded in a** person**, a thing, an** institution**, a** text, a norm, a bunch of cells, smells, **a good idea -** whatever. To phrase 'the object of desire' as a cluster of promises is to allow us to encounter what's incoherent or enigmatic in our attachments, not as confirmation of our irrationality but as an explanation for our sense of our endurance in the object, insofar as **proximity to the object means proximity to the cluster of things that the object promises**, some of which may be clear to us while others not so much. In other words, all attachments are optimistic**. That does not mean that they** all **feel optimistic**: one might dread, for example, returning to a scene of hunger or longing or the slapstick reiteration of a lover or parent's typical misrecognition. **But the surrender to the return to the scene where the object hovers in its potentialities is the operation of optimism as an affective form**. In optimism, the subject leans toward promises contained within the present moment of the encounter with their object.' **'Cruel optimism' names a relation of attachment to compromised conditions of possibility** whose realisation is discovered either to be impossible, sheer fantasy, or too possible, and toxic. What's cruel about these attachments, and not merely inconvenient or tragic, **is that the subjects who have x in their lives might not well endure the loss of their object or scene of desire, even though** its presence threatens their well-being**, because whatever the content of the** attachment **is, the continuity of the form of it provides something of the continuity of the subject's sense of** what it means to keep on living on and to look forward to being in the world. This phrase points to a condition different than that of melancholia, which is enacted in the subject's desire to temporise an experience of the loss of an object/scene with which she has identified her ego continuity. Cruel optimism is the condition of maintaining an attachment to a problematic object. One more thing: **the cruelty of an optimistic attachment is**, I think, usually **something an analyst observes about someone's** or some group's **attachment** to x, **since usually** that attachment exists without being an event, or even better, seems to lighten the load for someone/some group.^ But **if the cruelty of an attachment is experienced by someone**/some group, even in disavowed fashion, **the fear is that the loss of the object**/scene of promising itself **will defeat the capacity to have any hope about anything**. Often this fear of loss of a scene of optimism as such is unstated and only experienced in a sudden incapacity to manage startling situations, as we will see below. One might point out that all objects/scenes of desire are problematic, in that investments in them and projections onto them are less about them than about what cluster of desires and affects we can manage to keep magnetised to them. I have indeed wondered whether all optimism is cruel, because the experience of loss of the conditions of its reproduction can be so breathtakingly bad, just as the threat of the loss of x in the scope of one's attachment drives can feel like a threat to living on itself. But some scenes of optimism are clearly crueller than others: **where cruel optimism operates, the very vitalising** or animating **potency of an object**/ scene **of desire contributes to the attrition of the very thriving that is supposed to be made possible in the work of attachment in the first place**. This might point to something as banal as a scouring love, but it also opens out to obsessive appetites, working for a living, patriotism, all kinds of things. **One makes affective bargains about the costliness of one's attachments, usually unconscious ones, most of which keep one in proximity to the scene of desire**/attrition. This means that a poetics of attachment always involves some splitting off of the story I can tell about wanting to be near x (as though x has autonomous qualities) from the activity of the emotional habitus I have constructed by having x in my life in order to be able to project out my endurance as proximity to the complex of what x seems to offer and proffer. **To understand cruel optimism**, therefore, **one must embark on** an analysis of rhetorical indirection, as **a way of thinking about the strange temporalities of projection into** an enabling object that is also disabling. I learned how to do this from reading Barbara Johnson's work on apostrophe and free indirect discourse. In her poetics of indirection, each of these rhetorical modes is shaped by the ways a writing subjectivity conjures other ones so that, **in a performance of fantasmatic intersubjectivity, the writer gains superhuman observational authority, enabling a performance of being made possible by the proximity of the object. Because this object is something like what I am describing in the optimism of attachment, I'll describe a bit the shape of my transference with her thought**. In 'Apostrophe, Animation, and Abortion,' which will be my key referent bere, Johnson tracks the political consequences of apostrophe for what has become foetal personhood: a silent, affectively present but physically displaced interlocutor (a lover, a foetus) is animated in speech as distant enough for a conversation but close enough to be imaginable by the speaker in whose head the entire scene is happening.' But **the condition of projected possibility**, of a hearing that cannot take place in the terms of its enunciation ('you' are not here, 'you' are eternally belated to the conversation with you that I am imagining) **creates a** fake present moment of intersubjectivity **in which, nonetheless, a performance of address can take place. The present moment is made possible by the fantasy** of you, **laden with the** x **qualities I can project** onto you, given your convenient absence. Apostrophe therefore appears to be a reaching out to a you, a direct movement from place x to y, but it is actually a turning back**, an animating of a receiver on behalf of the desire to make something happen now that realises something in the speaker**, makes the speaker more or differently possible, because she has admitted, in a sense, the importance of speaking for, as, and to, two: but only under **the** condition, and **illusion**, that the two is really (in) one. Apostrophe **is thus an indirect, unstable, physically impossible but phenomenologically vitalising movement of rhetorical animation that permits subjects to suspend themselves in the optimism of a potential occupation of the same psychic space of others, the objects of desire who make you possible** (by having some promising qualities, but also by not being there).'' Later work, such as on 'Muteness Envy,' elaborates Johnson's description of the gendered rhetorical politics of this projection of voluble intersubjectivity.'^ The paradox remains that **the conditions of the lush submerging of one consciousness into another require a double negation: of the speaker's boundaries**, so s/he can grow bigger in rhetorical proximity to the object of desire; **and of the spoken of, who is** more or less **a** powerful mute **placeholder providing an opportunity for the speaker's imagination**

of her/his/their flourishing. Of course **psychoanalytically speaking** all intersubjectivity is impossible**. It is a** wish, a **desire**, and a demand for an enduring sense of being with and in x, and is related to that big knot **that marks the indeterminate relation between a feeling of recognition and misrecognition** - recognition is the misrecognition you can bear, **a transaction that affirms you** without, again, necessarily feeling good or accurate (it might idealise, **it might affirm your monstrosity**, it might mirror your desire to be nothing enough to live under the radar, it might feel just right, and so on).'' Johnson's work on projection shows that scenes of impossible identity, rhetorically rendered, open up meaning and knowledge by mining the negative - projective, boundary dissolving - spaces of attachment to the object of address who must be absent in order for the desiring subject of intersubjectivity to get some traction, to stabilise her proximity to the object/scene of promise. In free indirect discourse, a cognate kind of suspension, the circulation of this kind of merged and submerged observational subjectivity, has less pernicious outcomes, at least when Johnson reads Zora Neale Hurston's practice of it.' In a narrator's part-merging with a character's consciousness, say, free indirect discourse performs the impossibility of locating an observational intelligence in one or any body, and therefore forces the reader to transact a different, more open relation of unfolding to what she is reading, judging, being, and thinking she understands. In Jobnson's work such a transformative transaction through reading/speaking 'unfolds' the subject in a good way, despite whatever desires they may have not to become significantly different." In short, **Johnson's work on projection is about the optimism of attachment**, and is often itself optimistic about the negations and extensions of personhood that forms of suspended intersubjectivity demand from the reader. What follows is not so buoyant: this is an essay politicising Freud's observation that 'people never willingly abandon a libidinal position, not even, indeed, when a substitute is already beckoning to them'.^ It comes from a longer project about the politics, aesthetics, and projections of political depression. Political depression **persists in affective judgments of the world's intractability** - evidenced in affectlessness, apathy, coolness, cynicism, and so on - **modes of what might be called detachment that are really not detached at all but** constitute ongoing relations of sociality**.'" The politically depressed position is manifested in the problem of** the difficulty of detaching from life-building modalities that can no longer be said to be doing their work, andwhich indeed make obstacles to the desires that animate them; my archive tracks practices of self-interruption, self-suspension, and self-abeyance that indicate people's struggles to change, but not traumatically, the terms of value in which their life-making activity has been cast." **Cruel optimism is**, then, like all phases, a deictic, a phrase that points to a proximate location: as **an analytic lever** it is an incitement to inhabit and **to track the** affective **attachment to what we call 'the good life,'**

which is for so many a bad life that wears out the subjects who nonetheless, and at the same time, find their conditions of possibility within it**.** My assumption is that **the conditions of ordinary life** in the contemporary world even of relative wealth, as in the US, **are conditions of the** attrition or the **wearing out of the subject**, and that the irony - that the labour of reproducing life in the contemporary world is also the activity of being worn out by it - has specific implications for thinking about the ordinariness of suffering, the violence of normativity, and the 'technologies of patience' or lag that enable a concept of the later to suspend questions of the cruelty of the now.'^ **Cruel optimism is** in this sense **a concept pointing toward a mode of lived imminence**, one that grows from a perception about **the reasons people** are not Bartlehy, do not prefer to interfere with varieties of immiseration, but **choose to ride the wave of the system of attachment that they are used to, to syncopate with it, or to be held in a relation of reciprocity, reconciliation, or resignation that does not mean defeat by it**. Or perhaps they move to normative form to get numb with the consensual promise, **and** to **misrecognise that** promise **as an achievement**. This essay traverses three episodes of suspension - from John Ashhery, Charles Johnson, and Ceoff Ryman - of the reproduction of habituated or normative life. These suspensions open up revelations about the promises that had clustered as people's objects of desire, stage moments of exuberance in the impasse near the normal, and provide tools for suggesting why these exuberant attachments keep ticking not like the time bomb they might be but like a white noise machine that provides assurance that what seems like static really is, after all, a rhythm people can enter into while they're dithering, tottering, bargaining, testing, or otherwise being worn out by the promises that they have attached to in this world.

#### The 1ac’s focus on spectacles of pain legitimize the sentimental politics which affectively undergird neoliberal governance.

Strick 14 [Simon, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Center for Literary and Cultural Research Berlin, *American Dolorologies*, 2014, p. 132-6]

The concluding argument concerns late modern figurations of the body in pain. Spectacles of pain have proliferated in many forms in the contemporary American public sphere—if indeed pain hasn't become its primary and all-pervading obsession. Confessional TV shows exchange narratives of personal trauma and hurt for public intelligibility; cinematic spectacles of suffering, from The Passion of the Christ (2004) to torture-porn favorite Hostel (2005), exhibit the body in pain for profit, thrill, and public outrage; news reports narrate national-scale catastrophes through individual testimonials of pain; reality game shows such as Survivor measure their contestants' bodily pain capacities against their resistance to (or aggressiveness in) traumatizing and abusive group dynamics. There is also a proliferation of political discourse disclosing the injuries caused by contemporary forms of governing: public movements raise consciousness for excluded and abjected forms of living, feeling, and aching in Western democracies; critical discourses continue to shed light on the structural violence of regimes of power; the interventions of identitarian movements and groups successfully expand public recognition of social and political injury, changing the scope of intelligibility in the process.¶ These diverse affective phenomena are not always readily distinguishable in neoliberal regimes. Scholars such as Wendy Brown or Sara Ahmed have pointed out the coopting of identitarian politics in contemporary governmental regimes. These critical voices urge "[c]aution . . . against the assumption that 'speaking out' and 'making visible' within so-called radical politics can be separated from the conventions of self-expression in neoliberal forms of governance" (Ahmed and Stacey 2001, 4). Bill Clinton's infamous tagline "I feel your pain" or Barack Obama's ongoing focus on a "politics of empathy"1 are only the presidential cases in point for an ongoing politics of pain that links recognition of suffering to democratic progress. Academic debates have matched this capitalization on pain and compassion as necessary ingredients to the development of politics, ethics, or community making, such as in Rosi Braidotti's call for the unification of feminist, gay, lesbian, and transgender identity politics under the label of a "community of the suffering."2 The various diagnoses of America as "wound culture" (Seltzer 1998) or "trauma culture" (Kaplan 2005), in this view, describe a highly disparate, tension-laden, and ambivalent field of affective discourse, rather than a unified or unifying fixation on pain in contemporary Western societies.¶ Lauren Berlant has argued that these politics of affect dictate the continuous envelopment of the political in sentimental rhetoric. Sentimentalism holds up the promise that subjectivity is granted in the recognition of pain and that democracy is realized as the participation in an ideal of common suffering and compassion. Sentimental discourses "locate the human in a universal capacity to suffer and romantic conventions of individual historical acts of compassion and transcendence. [They] imagine a nonhierarchical social world that is . . . 'at heart' democratic because good intentions and love flourish in it" (2008, 6). Sentimental rhetoric produces a public sphere assembled around pain bonded by feeling with what is unspeakable: a commonality of passionate and compassionate bodily subjects, or a "fantasy of generality through emotional likeness in the domain of pain" (Berlant 2008, 6).¶ These arguments suggest a fundamental link between the sentimental evocation of pain and the discourses imagined as "at heart democratic." Indeed, the emancipatory project of democracy relies on articulations of pain, the recognition of those suffering, and a unified politics as remedy of this suffering. This is certainly true for American culture and its foundational ideas of promise and exceptionalism. The cultural sites I have pointed to participate in this evocation of a public sphere, where oppressive hurtings and social injuries are "counted in" toward a better politics of integration, understanding, and recognition. The sentimental linkage of emancipation through the circulation of pain and compassion as politics indicates a larger genealogy that dominates American culture and that this book has tried to elucidate. This genealogy was traced back to America's emancipatory foundation as a nation freed from colonial injury, and informed by a national history of successful incorporations of marginalized subjects into the national project (suffrage, abolitionism). American dolorologies has related this discourse to an apparatus of cultural technologies such as compassion, testimony to oppression, and articulations of affect and pain, and the materializations of race and gender they covertly enact. My analysis concurs with Berlant's observation that the various claims to pain as identity disarticulate their marginalizing effects in a rhetoric of universalization:¶ In the liberal tradition of the United States [testimony of pain] is not simply a mode of particularizing and puncturing self-description by minorities, but a rhetoric of universality located, not in abstract categories, but in what was thought to be, simultaneously, particular and universal experience. Indeed, it would not be exaggerating to say that sentimentality has long been a popular rhetorical means by which pain is advanced, in the United States, as the true core of personhood and citizenship. (2000, 34)¶ This connection of pain, nation, and subjectivity has, on the one hand, led to the public sphere becoming more and more a site of intimate "affect" exchange. This transformation is visible in the proliferation of mediatized forms of confession, testimony, and other articulations of traumatized selfhood, such as reality TV or the culture of therapeutic discourse. These governmental forms of achieving public subjectivity through speaking pain imitate and appropriate the critical formulations of differential experience from identitarian movements, at times becoming indistinguishable from them: "We can also see a . . . collusion between liberal, capitalist forms of mass entertainment and individualist therapies, and the feminist importance of the personal" (Ahmed 2000, 12). The achievement of public visibility through the articulation of trauma and pain is furthermore supplemented by mainstream political discourse becoming compassionate and revolving primarily around the recognition of bodies in pain.3¶

### Counteradvocacy

#### Counter advocacy: People ought to take control of medicine and its intellectual property rights away from member states of the WTO without referencing “hands”

#### Hands is ableist.

Tran 19 (“Disability Justice in the Work place” by Dr. Kim Tran. Ready set go. [https://www.thereadyset.co/blog/disability-justice-in-the-workplace April feb 26](https://www.thereadyset.co/blog/disability-justice-in-the-workplace%20April%20feb%2026), 2019

Are you going to the all-hands?”

“Let’s talk about it during the standing meeting.”

“It’s easy, I’ll walk you through it.”

“That’s an insane timeline.”

We often use language and ideas that center the body and mind and makes assumptions about how we move and think. Even Nike, hoping to inspire the masses, tells us to “dream crazier.” These common turns of phrase sometimes use imagery that is close to the actual practice of an activity, but more likely, deviates far from it. Instead of accuracy, many workplace metaphors are employed as an attempt to convey meaning to something that is difficult to explain; in other words, they’re a linguistic shortcut.

Language scholars Murray Knowles and Rosamund Moon describe metaphors like these as an aide that helps people communicate by tying an abstract concept to a concrete idea; making it easier to understand. Yet, while we strive for a shared terminology to make communication easier, these same phrases frequently rely on negative ideas about the people who make up our offices and teams. When we say things like:

That’s such a lame idea.

or

The presentation was tone deaf.

We’re making vast and problematic assumptions about bodies, what they can do and what we want them to do. Workplace metaphors like these often rely on ableist ideas.

The Center for Disability Rights defines ableism as, “A set of beliefs or practices that devalue and discriminate against people with physical, intellectual, or psychiatric disabilities and often rests on the assumption that disabled people need to be ‘fixed’ in one form or the other.” Ableism is pervasive, subtle and ubiquitous; it’s everywhere.