## Notes: Cap vs. K Affs

The easiest way to win the cap argument is to go straight for the root cause arguments. If you can win that capitalism is the root cause of the aff harms, and that the affirmative attempts to solve fail, then if you solve for their root cause, then you solve for their impacts and the external capitalism impacts. Have fun.

## Overview

The kritik turns and outweighs the case

**Extend Farmer 11; The affirmative is rooted in a system of neoliberal interests that creates inequality, which structures society in a way that leads to extinction. This is because capitalist society leaves us in a system of continued militarization and creating WMD’s. Capitalist society also strengthens the boundaries of social inequality, leading to invisible wars within people that live in poverty, leading to mass misery, starvation, oppression, lack of human rights, and degrading the environment –That’s Szentes 8**

**That is why our alternative is crucial- to reject the Aff’s capitalist model of development**

**Attacking the imperialist system is possible, but we cannot do the affirmative plan, for it further entrenches us in a flawed system of capitalism that justifies all of these harms- that’s Wise, 9**

## Cap vs. Native Aff Notes:

-The oppression that the affirmative speaks against originated from capitalism- The imperialistic drive for economic domination through capitalism justified plunder, conquest, and slavery.

-You need to win that the root cause of the oppression/racism is because of cap- this is key.

Ex. The native American genocide was from capitalism because the natives were simply seen as a resource for work, for labor, and a barrier for true economic domination.

-Integration of the natives into our economic system fails

-Integrating the natives into our healthcare system and building them roads cannot solve for oppression, we just bring them into the system of capitalism. If we win that capitalism is the root cause of the affirmative harms, then it is a reason why the aff must be rejected

-In the case of the Natives affirmative, the affirmative simply uses racism to justify corporate colonialism- spreading the USFG and corporations into the native American reservations.

-Look at the solvency evidence. They use treaties as a reason why the federal government is key. Treaties are rooted in market logic - the treaties are supposedly binding

-They cannot solve for racism beause they do not address the root cause- the problems will just happen again. Giving an impact overview for capitalism gives external impacts to the aff acting as a net benefit.

## **AT: Perm- General Discrimination**

Capitalism and ending discrimination are contradictory- Link proves the perm fails

Freeman, 98 Alan Freeman (Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Principal Economist at Greater London Authority, Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Senior Lecturer at University of Greenwich, Analyst at Economist Intelligence Unit, Alan Freeman is an economist who works for GLA Economics, the Mayor of London's Economic Analysis Unit) 1998 “The Material Roots of Western Racism” http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2216/1/MPRA\_paper\_2216.pdf

Ignoring this, Leiman sets up a series of classic counterpositions. Racism, he explains, ¶ is endemic to capitalism. He needs this to deliver a chestnut: black reform struggles ¶ help the capitalists. ¶ My basic theory in this study is that ending discrimination while maintaining ¶ capitalism is ultimately contradictory and that terminating both depends on ¶ achieving interracial working-class solidarity. Therefore all reformist activity ¶ (including the acquisition of political posts) that works within the existing ¶ political party system only acts to reinforce and legitimate the exploitative and ¶ racist capitalist mode of production and distribution. ¶ The superficiality of this ninety-year old argument is revealed by the fact that the one¶ permissible reform is the fight for higher wages. The trade unions, which most ¶ certainly 'work within the existing party political system' (in the US the bourgeois ¶ party system), which clearly 'reinforce and legitimate the exploitative and racist ¶ capitalist mode of production' and which never cease the 'reformist' pursuit of political posts, are ring-fenced against this criticism because the wage struggle is holy. Such arguments are always used to reinforce the commonsense racism of workers who perceive any struggle for the rights they already have as a frivolous diversion from ¶ getting more money.

## **Links- Sexism**

Sexism emerges from a system of capitalism- Capitalism is a prerequisite to solving case

Rose, 86 Sonya O. Rose (¶ 1984-1986 Co-Director, Women's Studies Program, Colby College¶ 1982-1985 Associate Dean of the College, Colby College¶ 1981-1982 Associate Dean of Faculty, Colby College¶ ¶ 1980-1981 Acting Dean of Faculty, Colby College¶ 1978-1980 Assistant Dean of Faculty, Colby College¶ 1977-1987 Assistant Professor of Sociology, Colby College¶ 1977-1978 Consultant on a VA Funded Research Project: Health Services Utilization and Preference of Latino Veterans¶ 1976-1977 Visiting Assistant Professor of Psychology, Bowdoin College¶ 1975-1976 Research Associate, Department of Psychiatry, Veterans Administration Hospital, Sepulveda, California¶ ) 1986 “‘Gender at Work’: Sex, Class and Industrial Capitalism” http://hwj.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/1/113.full.pdf

Occupational segregation by gender is a concept which refers to the¶ stratification of the labour force which either places men and women in¶ different jobs, or if they are employed at the same job, locates them in¶ separate work sites or on different machines. It has been found to result in¶ the perpetuation of income differentials between male and female¶ workers.¶ 30¶ Attempts to explain gender segregation in the labour force have¶ often focused purely on the requirements of the labour market itself, and¶ have not taken into account gender ideology and gender relations.¶ 31¶ When¶ the question why women are allocated or restricted to particular jobs or¶ industries is asked, the influences on the behaviour and attitudes of¶ women, male co-workers and employers are not subject to analysis, but are¶ treated as exogenous variables often lumped into a category such as¶ 'tradition'. It is precisely the weight of this tradition and its construction¶ which historical analysis can reveal.¶ 32¶ My research on economic competition between men and women in the factory hosiery industry suggests that¶ job segregation among machine operatives was a direct outcome of gender conflict.¶ 33¶ Nancy Osterud's research on industries in Leicester shows the¶ intricate ways in which the gender division of labour evolved under the¶ putting out system in hosiery and became more rigid as it was transplanted¶ to the boot and shoe industry and to the factory hosiery industry with the¶ advance of capitalism.¶ 34¶ Angela John's research on coal mining shows the¶ complex interplay of technology, tradition, union politics and economic¶ necessity that shaped gender divisions in the coal mining workforce.¶ 35¶ These studies suggest that occupational segregation by gender resulted,¶ in part, from the articulation of traditional gender roles in the newly¶ . emerging industrial workforce. But more important they provide evidence¶ of the active role played by skilled male workers in creating gender¶ segregation as they attempted to preserve their own jobs in the face of¶ transformations of the labour process which threatened their redundancy.¶ 36¶ Even these studies, however, do not address the question of why¶ working men advocated an exclusionist strategy rather than one which¶ would have resulted in a united front against the capitalists. One 'old¶ journeyman tailor' demanded in 1834, 'if women are equal in the state of¶ human existence, what right, would I ask, has any set of mechanics to deny¶ them a right which they, the tailors, are at this moment claiming for¶ themselves. Competition is the great, the only, the .all-prevailing evil.¶ Competition must be destroyed, and associated labour raised upon its¶ ashes; all the rest must end in disappointment'.¶ 37¶ But such voices, rare¶ even in the volatile 1830s, became more distant as the century advanced¶ and it was increasingly argued that women belonged not in the workplace,¶ but in the home. Were men consciously attempting to secure or impose¶ gender privilege by excluding women from their unions and their¶ occupations? Or, were they simply struggling for wage levels which would¶ permit them and their families to resist pauperization? These questions¶ have been at the core of the debates on the issue of the family wage,¶ 38¶ and¶ on the reasons for working men's support of protective legislation for¶ women and children.¶ 39¶ They are equally central to an understanding of the¶ role played by skilled working men in the 'gendering' of the labour force¶ during the transition to industrial capitalism.

Current and feminist approaches to solve fails because they are in a system of capitalism- need true socio-economic change

Braswell, 12 Harold Braswell (Emory University, Graduate Student, Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts) 2012 “Disability: The "Difference" That Global Capital Makes” http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3183/3080

In the sixth and final chapter, "The 'Other' Side of the Dialectic: Toward a Materialist Ethic of Care," Erevelles develops a materialist ethic of care that can provide the basis for reimagining both labor relations and the body politic. She criticizes existing feminist theories that celebrate caretaking relationships without consideration of their power inequalities. At the same time, she also criticizes attempts by liberal feminists to rectify these inequalities through the fiction of "choice" (175). Instead, she proposes a dialectical approach to care that constantly intertwines a consideration of its liberating qualities with its current enmeshment in oppressive social relations. Ultimately, constituting a new body politic that can accommodate a feminist ethic of care requires "nonexploitative relations of production and consumption in transnational capital" (197). In this chapter, Erevelles thus shows how socio-economic change can both further—and be aided by—the goals of feminist, queer, critical race, and disability studies.¶ Its commitment to materialist political change gives Disability and Difference a surprisingly unified structure throughout its treatment of seemingly unrelated subject matter. In fact, this ability to tie together such diverse subjects is central to the book's argument: We cannot consider education policy separate from the war in Afghanistan because both phenomena are united by a transnational economic system. For this reason, I recommend reading the book as a whole, though its chapters could also be read in isolation and easily excerpted for graduate and upper-level undergraduate courses.¶

Trying to solve sexism fails with capitalist logic- Capitalism further entrenches sexism

Rose, 86 Sonya O. Rose (¶ 1984-1986 Co-Director, Women's Studies Program, Colby College¶ 1982-1985 Associate Dean of the College, Colby College¶ 1981-1982 Associate Dean of Faculty, Colby College¶ ¶ 1980-1981 Acting Dean of Faculty, Colby College¶ 1978-1980 Assistant Dean of Faculty, Colby College¶ 1977-1987 Assistant Professor of Sociology, Colby College¶ 1977-1978 Consultant on a VA Funded Research Project: Health Services Utilization and Preference of Latino Veterans¶ 1976-1977 Visiting Assistant Professor of Psychology, Bowdoin College¶ 1975-1976 Research Associate, Department of Psychiatry, Veterans Administration Hospital, Sepulveda, California¶ ) 1986 “‘Gender at Work’: Sex, Class and Industrial Capitalism” http://hwj.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/1/113.full.pdf

Any discussion of gender and economic transition must begin with the¶ recognition of the immense complexity of the changes involved. The¶ transition to modern industrial organization took place at varying times in¶ different industries. Separate processes within the same industry followed¶ different time schedules. This unevenness of capitalist development is¶ clearly reflected in the lace industry. Lace was made in steam powered¶ factories from the 1850s, but lace finishing remained a hand industry and¶ was done primarily on an outwork basis, usually in the worker's home, well¶ into the twentieth century.¶ 7¶ Sweated labour and sweated trades remained a¶ feature of the modern industrial landscape in Britain at least until after the First World War and was characteristic of a variety of industries including¶ clothing, nail and chain making, box making, match making as well as lace¶ finishing. Historical analyses continue to recognize and highlight variations¶ in the development of industrial capitalism and the resulting impact on¶ gender relations and the sexual division of labour.¶ It is within these broad background assumptions that historians have¶ begun to specify how gender both shaped and was shaped by the¶ development of industrial capitalism. Sally Alexander's study, 'Women's¶ Work in Nineteenth-century London: a Study of the Years 1820-1850',¶ 8¶ is¶ the starting point of this review. Issues raised by this important analysis of¶ women's wage earning activity have continued to be explored in more¶ recent feminist scholarship. Alexander documented the extent and variety¶ of women's work under the particular conditions of capitalist development¶ in London. Her analysis brought to light the transformation of industries¶ by labour-intensive methods rather than by the introduction of machinery¶ and its impact on women's employment.¶ The vast troops of casual workers, operating in small workshops or as¶ outworkers in their own homes, were part and parcel of the seasonality of¶ many industries and the swings in demand for goods which accompanied¶ the movement of trade cycles. There was an almost unlimited supply of¶ women who could be given work when there was a demand for¶ manufactured goods, and who would be left idle when it was not in the¶ employer's interest to hire them. They formed an elastic labour force¶ because gender ideology portrayed them as primarily concerned with¶ domestic responsibilities and as dependents who could be paid low wages.¶ This construction was seemingly impervious to the reality of the economic¶ circumstances of single and widowed women, and wives whose husbands¶ were ill, alcoholic, or themselves casual labourers who earned low wages at¶ irregular and seasonal employment.¶ 9¶ In many of the traditionally skilled¶ male trades, and in factory-organized manufacturing in London, employers¶ attempted to transform the labour process in order to substitute the¶ cheaper labour of women for the more expensive labour of men.¶ Another commonplace assumption about the effect of industrial¶ capitalism on women's work is that once women married, they dropped out¶ of the labour force. Feminist research in the last decade has suggested that¶ this is an overstatement.¶ 10¶ There is evidence from a range of industries,¶ especially textile manufacturing, that many women remained in employment throughout much of their life cycle. Parliamentary hearings on¶ sweated labour at the end of the nineteenth century and on homework in¶ the first decade of the twentieth, as well as evidence garnered from the¶ Children's Employment Commission hearings in the 1840s and in the¶ 1860s, suggest the importance of such work for married, widowed and¶ elderly women.¶ Using various forms of quantifiable data, American historians have¶ illuminated the varying conditions under which married women and¶ children contributed wages to the household economy. They have shown¶ that husband's occupation, ethnicity and the types of opportunities for paid¶ employment affected when and where married women and their children¶ earned wages as America industrialized." There has been little use made of quantitative methods to examine the connections between women's¶ work, the family life cycle and household organization in the British case.¶ Many historians have shied away from census data because of some very¶ serious shortcomings in the extent to which women's occupations are¶ reflected in enumerator's records. Homework and casual employment in¶ general are underreported in censuses. British historians who have used¶ quantitative methods have focused, for the most part, on household¶ composition, family formation and demographic history and have only¶ recently begun to include women's wage earning as a topic for analysis.¶ 12¶ An example of the fruitfulness of using evidence gleaned from censuses,¶ especially when part of a research strategy which includes more traditional¶ archival material, is to be found in Nancy Grey Osterud's work, 'Gender¶ Divisions and the Organization of Work in the Leicester Hosiery¶ Industry'.¶ 13¶ Using evidence drawn from enumerators' books from the 1851¶ and 1871 censuses of Leicester, Osterud uncovered three distinct patterns¶ of married women's employment in the city. Few middle-class women¶ worked for pay after they married. The wives of skilled artisans and¶ tradesmen, such as carpenters, iron-workers, and tailors, tended to leave¶ the labour force when they had children. However, wives of framework¶ knitters and shoe workers remained at work when their children were¶ young, and withdrew from the labour force only when their children¶ entered it.¶ 14¶ Forty per cent of the wives of hosiery workers in 1851 were¶ employed, compared to 20% of the wives of workers in other industries. In¶ 1871, 30% of hosiery and shoe worker's wives were employed compared¶ with between 15% and 20% of the wives of workers in other industries.¶ Osterud's data allowed her to estimate that 60% of wives were homeworkers in 1851, and 50% worked at home in 1871.¶ 15¶ In addition, her analysis of the organization of work in the hosiery and¶ boot and shoe industries revealed that the gender division of labour¶ characteristic of the domestic hosiery industry in Leicester at mid-century¶ was extended into the manufacture of boots and shoes.¶ 16¶ In the domestic¶ hosiery trade women seamed stockings in their homes. With changes in the¶ processes of production prior to factory production, an increasing number¶ of men went out to work in workshops while women continued to seam¶ workshop-produced stockings at home. The shoe industry which developed¶ in Leicester after the middle of the century was organized similarly.¶ Women stitched 'uppers' in their homes and men made the rest of the shoe¶ in workshops and warehouses. The division of labour by gender in one¶ industry was a model for the development of the division of labour by¶ gender for another. Women working at home used a needle to join knitted¶ fabric or leather. Osterud's findings suggest, first, that there were important connections¶ between household economic arrangements and the structure of work¶ opportunities for household members; gender and marital status did not as¶ such determine when women did waged work. Secondly, Osterud's work is¶ important because it raises questions about traditions concerning gender¶ and work in communities and in households whose heads were employed¶ in occupations characterized by different occupational cultures and levels¶ of earnings. Osterud's evidence on differential employment patterns of wives suggests the possibility that traditions regarding the employment of¶ wives and mothers and the economic status of knitter and shoeworker¶ households generated the particular characteristics of the labour force¶ which made labour intensive outwork profitable for capitalists in the new¶ boot and shoe industry. Wives of framework knitters in 1871 were only¶ slightly more likely to seam stockings than they were to stitch shoes. As¶ Osterud commented, 'the footwear industry could have been organized¶ differently, for power machines for stitching leather were available long¶ before either men's or women's work was drawn into factories.'¶ 17¶ This¶ study, then, suggests the possibility that traditions within households as¶ well as within earlier industries influenced the transformation of production processes of newly capitalized industries.¶ The studies by Sally Alexander and Nancy Grey Osterud are examples¶ of a growing body of literature that has clarified the complexities and¶ variations in women's employment in the transition to industrial capitalism.¶ These complexities and variations are joined by a common thread. They all¶ resulted in women's subordinate role in capitalist production. Why? The¶ one common characteristic of women's employment was its price. Women¶ were workers who could be paid low wages because of an ideology which¶ portrayed them as supplementary wage earners dependent on men for¶ subsistence. The work of Alice Clark and Ivy Pinchbeck¶ 19¶ has made it¶ clear that women, excluded from most apprenticeships since the sixteenth¶ century, had already been designated as a low waged labour force prior to¶ industrial transformation. But the specific ways in which this cheap labour¶ force was utilized in the transition to industrial capitalism varied. What was¶ uniform and unchanging during the transition was the price of women's¶ work. They represented cheap labour. Women's low wages in combination¶ with the ideology supporting and reinforcing their pay rates had a profound¶ impact on gender relations in the course of the industrial revolution.

## Links- Ableism

Trying to solve for ableism falls into the imperialist drive behind our global economy

Braswell, 12 Harold Braswell (Emory University, Graduate Student, Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts) 2012 “Disability: The "Difference" That Global Capital Makes” http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3183/3080

Does disability studies romanticize disability? Maybe so, one is inclined to think after reading Nirmala Erevelles' brilliant new book. In Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic, Erevelles—an associate professor of Social Foundations of Education and Instructional Leadership at the University of Alabama—argues that prominent disability studies scholars theorize disability as an essentially transgressive category that exists outside of the socio-historical world. By fetishizing disability as a marker of transgressive difference, these scholars ignore the world economic system that creates, devalues, and even obliterates disability en masse. Thus, the romanticization of disability within disability studies makes it impossible for the field to identify—much less overturn—the ableism inherent in the global economy.¶ Much of Disability and Difference is a critique of disability studies scholarship that might, generally, be described as "poststructuralist." In Erevelles' view (and also my own), such poststructuralist thought about disability can entail a number of features, including the following:¶ a turn toward linguistic analyses that deny the existence of any material reality outside of language¶ a fetishization of the "local" to such an extent that any attempt to understand global dynamics puts one at risk of being labeled "essentialist"¶ a simultaneous and seemingly contradictory tendency to view disability as an ahistorical category to which all humans inevitably will have access¶ as mentioned above, the romanticization of "disability" as category that inherently upsets dominant forms of social organization.¶¶ In contrast to these poststructuralist analytics, Erevelles argues for a "materialist" conception of disability that focuses on "the actual social and economic conditions that impact (disabled) people's lives, and that are concurrently mediated by the politics of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and nation" (26). And yet, even as Erevelles emphasizes the importance of class for disability, she also argues that disability should have a privileged role in class analysis. For Erevelles, disability is "the ideological linchpin utilized to (re)constitute social difference along the axes of race, gender, and sexuality in a dialectical relationship to the economic/social relations produced within the historical context of transnational capitalism" (6, italics in text). In other words, "disability" is not simply another identity category. It provides a key to the constitution of all identity categories in transnational capitalism. Through a consideration of disability's relationship to these axes of identity and, ultimately, the existing capitalist modes of production, Erevelles attempts to enable the "transformative body politic" of the book's subtitle.¶

Capitalism causes the discrimination against those with disabilities- Breaking down cap is a prerequisite to solving case

Braswell, 12 Harold Braswell (Emory University, Graduate Student, Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts) 2012 “Disability: The "Difference" That Global Capital Makes” http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3183/3080

In Chapter 1, "Disability as 'Becoming': Notes on the Political Economy of the Flesh," Erevelles lays the foundation for what she terms "materialist disability studies" through an analysis of African American literary critic Hortense Spillers' essay "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book." In that essay, Spillers analyzes the role that the violence of the Middle Passage played in the formation of African American identity. Erevelles inserts disability into this narrative, pointing out that the slaves of the Middle Passage were rendered disabled through violence. And yet, in this context in which disability is a marker of racialized violence, Erevelles asks a question that she borrows from the work of Robert McRuer: "What might it mean to welcome the disability to come, to desire it?" (Erevelles 27, citing McRuer 207).¶ Thinking about this question in the context of the Middle Passage is, to say the least, a sobering experience. Erevelles argues that desiring disability must entail a concrete shift in the relations of production that make disability utterly undesirable. To describe how these relations of production both utilize and denigrate disability, Erevelles turns—in a moment of understated poignancy—to the work of her late husband, Robert Young. Drawing on Young's theorization of "race as a commodity fetish," Erevelles argues that the very category of "disability" operates as a commodity fetish that occludes the violence of the socio-economic system. The only way to rid ourselves of this violence is by changing the economic relations of production.¶

## Links- Social Exclusion

Attempts to solve for social exclusion is rooted in a system of capitalism- justifies the flawed capitalist mindset

Pateman, 2k John Pateman (Activist- founding member of The Network- tackling social exclusion in libraries, museums, archives and galleries. He was a founding member of the Quality Leaders Programme for Black Library Workers. He was a founder of Information for Social Change and is part of its editorial collective; he was also the founder of the Cuban Libraries Solidarity Group. He is International Officer for the Lincolnshire branch of UNISON and he is secretary of the Lincolnshire Cuba Solidarity Campaign. He is a Fellow of CILIP and of the Institute of Public Sector Management. He has been an active member of the Branch & Mobile Libraries Group, the International Group, the Diversity Group and LINK: a network for North-South library development)¶ 2000 ¶ “Public Libraries and Social Class” http://eprints.rclis.org/handle/10760/6284#.UBrN2LRAaDc

Levitas (1996) argues that the causes of poverty and inequality are not a feature of the government's social exclusion framework which does not recognise that social divisions are endemic to capitalism : "Social exclusion completely erases from view the inequality between those owning the bulk of productive property and the working population, as well as obscuring the inequalities among workers." Social exclusion policies are framed within the parameters of the capitalist system. This system is based on the majority of people selling their labour, and so great onus is placed on paid employment : if people have jobs then they can be integrated into society. The level of pay they receive and their integration into the social system as well as the economic system are secondary issues. As Levitas (1996) has noted, "civil society has been collapsed into the market" The integral features of a capitalist economy - such as racism, poverty and inequality have been obscured by the focus of social exclusion on the socially excluded rather than on the capitalist system. Levitas (1996) concludes by saying that "society is...more than a market" and that social exclusion "focuses attention on exclusions from labour market positions, while ignoring other processes of, for example, racial exclusion. The term social inclusion presumes that inclusion is beneficial but even if women, ethnic minorities and disabled people achieve equal opportunities within the labour market, it will still be the case that what integration means is participation in a capitalist economy driven by profit and based upon exploitation" Byrne (1997) takes this one step further when he says that the solution to social exclusion "must involve a challenge to capitalism ... efforts at tangential modification cannot work. It is system change or status quo" The status quo is based on paternalistic, short-term approaches to exclusion. It is based on an assumption that the "powers that be" (middle class) know best and that the aim is to improve the material situation of working class people, without fundamentally changing the balance of wealth and power (so that everyone continues to maintain their "place in society").

## AT: Root Cause

Capitalism is the root cause of ableism and racism- Must break down the system first

Braswell, 12 Harold Braswell (Emory University, Graduate Student, Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts) 2012 “Disability: The "Difference" That Global Capital Makes” http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3183/3080

In Chapter 3, "'Unspeakable' Offenses: Disability Studies at the Intersections of Multiple Differences," co-authored with Andrea Minear, Erevelles uses her materialist account of disability studies to deepen current theories of intersectionality. Combining disability studies with critical race theory, she analyzes two narratives that highlight the mutually enforcing nature of racism and ableism: The first is Susan Burch and Hannah Joyner's Unspeakable: The Life of Junius Wilson, which recounts the story of Junius Wilson, a deaf, African American man who was castrated and held in a state mental hospital for 76 years after being falsely accused of attempted rape. The second narrative—based on Erevelles and Minear's own qualitative research—is the story of "Cassie" (a pseudonym), a young African-American girl whose educational progress and very status as a student were gravely threatened by the racism and ableism in the local special-education bureaucracy. Through these narratives, Erevelles and Minear show the intertwined nature of racism and ableism in contemporary capitalism.¶ Chapter 4, "Embodied Antimonies: Feminist Disability Studies Meets Third World Feminism," brings together disability studies and third world feminism to understand how imperialism simultaneously creates and undermines disability in non-Western contexts. First, Erevelles analyzes the role of disability in the US invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, contrasting the fetishization of disabled "cyborg" soldiers in US media and disability studies with the lack of attention shown to the Iraqi and Afghani civilians rendered disabled through these wars (137). She then examines how the World Bank, through its economic rubric of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs), retroactively renders these disabled persons liabilities to the state. Economic imperialism thus creates and devalues disability in a brutal sequence that Erevelles labels the "new eugenics" (141).¶¶ In Chapter 5, "(Im)material Citizens: Cognitive Disability, Race, and the Politics of Citizenship," Erevelles examines how liberal theories of citizenship exclude the intellectually disabled from participation in the body politic. These theories are predicated on "formal justice," the abstract granting of equal access to members of marginalized groups. Drawing on critical race theory, Erevelles argues that the abstract nature of this formal justice naturalizes the socio-economic factors that exclude people of color and persons with disabilities from political participation (154). At the same time, the autonomous individual at the heart of liberal political theory is predicated on the exclusion of persons with mental disabilities who cannot maintain the façade of rational independence (163). As a result, persons with disabilities and people of color (including members of both groups) are systematically denied recognition within a political system based on ableist norms of productive labor. Rectifying this exclusion entails redefining citizenship rights as "positive rights" and rethinking labor outside of economic value. Doing so places persons with mental disabilities at the center of a new conception of citizenship.¶

The argument is reverse causal- Social exclusion is rooted in capitalism, must solve root cause prior to achieve the affirmative goals

Pateman, 2k John Pateman (Activist- founding member of The Network- tackling social exclusion in libraries, museums, archives and galleries. He was a founding member of the Quality Leaders Programme for Black Library Workers. He was a founder of Information for Social Change and is part of its editorial collective; he was also the founder of the Cuban Libraries Solidarity Group. He is International Officer for the Lincolnshire branch of UNISON and he is secretary of the Lincolnshire Cuba Solidarity Campaign. He is a Fellow of CILIP and of the Institute of Public Sector Management. He has been an active member of the Branch & Mobile Libraries Group, the International Group, the Diversity Group and LINK: a network for North-South library development)¶ 2000 ¶ “Public Libraries and Social Class” http://eprints.rclis.org/handle/10760/6284#.UBrN2LRAaDc

Failure to identify and tackle the root cause of social exclusion has led to a range of¶ "solutions" which are inappropriate and ineffective. According to many policy makers,¶ including the European Commission (1994), the cause of social exclusion is not the¶ fundamental nature of capitalism (which never gets discussed) but "contemporary economic¶ and social conditions", which "tend to exclude some groups from the cycle of opportunities"¶ Social exclusion focusses on the needs of these "special groups" through specific programmes¶ and one-off funding initiatives.¶ An example of this is the government's plan to use "part of the 400m extra Lottery money¶ from the New Opportunities Fund (NOF) to back projects which will give the socially¶ disadvantaged equal access to the new University for Industry and the National Grid for¶ Learning" (Howarth, 1998).¶ This approach is flawed for two main reasons. First, if 60% of the population are working¶ class then at least 60% of resources should be spent on their needs. In other words, the¶ majority of mainstream funding should be targetted at the working class, including that¶ section which is socially excluded. In practice, most core funding is directed at the middle¶ class, while the socially excluded are left to rely on special funding. To take the above¶ example, this would require mainstream funding of the University for Industry and the¶ National Grid for Learning to make sure that these initiatives were available to all working¶ class communities.¶ Most anti poverty strategies within local authorities have only limited budgets allocated to¶ them. These budgets are generally only agreed on an annual basis, with no guarantee of the¶ maintenance of current levels of support into¶ the future. As the Local Government Management Board (1995) have noted, "strategic¶ planning of anti poverty activity into the long term future is constrained by this context - and¶ this is likely to remain the case unless the relationship is reversed : that is, the broader process¶ of budget allocation can be brought itself within the anti-poverty strategy, so that all resource¶ commitments can be re-assessed against long term strategic commitments of the latter kind"¶ The second problem with NOF type projects is that they are top down and paternalistic. They¶ involve unequal partnerships between the community and agencies such as local authorities¶ who lead the agenda and control the resources and power. These arrangements can actually¶ hinder community development, as demonstrated by Mayo (1997) in her study of partnerships¶ for regeneration and community development : "partnerships can be disempowering for¶ communities and especially for the most disadvantaged and socially excluded groups within¶ communities."¶ Programmes funded by the Lottery and other schemes can create the situation where local¶ areas are forced to compete against each other for limited resources and comply with an¶ externally imposed agenda which is based on market led approaches. These programmes are¶ often not understood by the socially excluded and do not deliver what they require. Mayo¶ (1997) gives a graphic example from a City Challenge programme : "As one local person¶ commented : "So you get these things through the door 'We offer people the chance to do a¶ CV' - what the fuck is a CV?...and how is it going to get me a job ?"¶ Mayo (1997) suggests that these communities would be better off "putting their time and¶ energies into collective efforts to address the underlying causes of their problems and to press¶ for alternative strategies for community renewal, developed democratically on the basis of¶ equal opportunities from the bottom up"¶ Another consequence of the introduction of schemes like City Challenge is that they have¶ obliged local government to think in terms of targeting programmes and resources, and to¶ engage in competitive bidding for those resources. As LMGB (1995) have noted, "while it¶ might be argued that this has given a sharper focus to local programmes, it may at the same¶ time run counter to strategic approaches to anti poverty work at a local level...(and)...involves¶ local authorities in the (frequently) unproductive use of considerable resources"

Racism originates from capitalism- used to maintain class hegemony

Freeman, 98 Alan Freeman (Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Principal Economist at Greater London Authority, Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Senior Lecturer at University of Greenwich, Analyst at Economist Intelligence Unit, Alan Freeman is an economist who works for GLA Economics, the Mayor of London's Economic Analysis Unit) 1998 “The Material Roots of Western Racism” http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2216/1/MPRA\_paper\_2216.pdf

Only blissful ignorance can lead to the complete blindness with which working class solidarity is treated. Leiman's lengthy discussion boils down to a single phrase: 'the fundamental community of interest between the black and white working classes'. Chapter 6 on Black-White Unity is a lament about the strange fact that it does not happen, aimed mainly at the black communities. The issue he should have addressed is: how can solidarity be rebuilt between the poor of the world and a section of the working class which slams the door in their faces and ¶ then launches a pogrom against the few unfortunates who got in under the bar? One small privileged section of the working class scabs on the world-wide struggle against its own capitalists, is rewarded for scabbing, and projects these world social relations into its innards. Racism is the fetishised expression of the imperialist division of the world. The hierarchy in the metropolis more or less faithfully reproduces the hierarchy ¶ of oppression in the world, with the most recent arrivals from the poorest countries at ¶ the bottom and the oldest arrivals from the richest countries at the top. Leiman tries to locate the roots of racism in slavery, a searing indictment of the ¶ American Dream which even traditional marxists cannot ignore. But if slavery is the ¶ cause of racism then in Europe it is an aberration and in Japan incomprehensible. ¶ Slavery is the most extreme expression of colonial servitude. It accounts for the specific form of racism in the US but not racism in general. This produces a dialogue characteristic of traditional Marxism: whether as ¶ Shulman[1989] accurately puts it 'racism is something which the capitalists do to the ¶ working class'. Leiman shares the nonmaterialist view that racism is a capitalist ¶ conspiracy: their 'political interest in maintaining class hegemony requires dividing ¶ the working class'. Marx held that ideology is the reproduction in thought of existing¶ material relations. Racism is present in the consciousness of the metropolitan working ¶ class because it is present in their relations to the rest of the world. This happens ¶ independently of the capitalists, just as commodity fetishism happens independent of ¶ propaganda. ¶

Capitalists use racism to maintain the imperialist domination of majority over minority

Freeman, 98 Alan Freeman (Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Principal Economist at Greater London Authority, Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Senior Lecturer at University of Greenwich, Analyst at Economist Intelligence Unit, Alan Freeman is an economist who works for GLA Economics, the Mayor of London's Economic Analysis Unit) 1998 “The Material Roots of Western Racism” http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2216/1/MPRA\_paper\_2216.pdf

Leiman to his credit dislikes the grosser consequences of his own argument. He warns ¶ against 'economic determinism' and stresses the importance of 'consciousness' and of a ¶ 'balance' between 'class' and 'race' which is the sort of obeisance generally made in the ¶ presence of awkward little facts, like racism has existed since the Middle Ages and ¶ sexism since the dawn of prehistory,¶ 8¶ or ninety-nine percent of racists are workers. ¶ The tragedy is that materialism, as distinct from economism, does explain far more ¶ about racism than individual consciousness. Traditional Marxism, which reduces ¶ material conditions to material income, opens the door to nonmaterialist accounts ¶ from people rightly incensed at what is portrayed as marxist, who then retreat into ¶ mystical, metaphysical or downright reactionary explanations. ¶ The problem is not to counterpose 'material' to 'conscious' determinations but to ¶ identify the correct material conditions. Mountains will melt before racism can be ¶ understood in terms of the wage struggle. Racism, a political phenomenon, is a ¶ material means of maintaining world imperialist domination. It is the only way this ¶ domination can be maintained. The false appearance that capitalism governs by ¶ consent is a fetishisation of national boundaries, a product of artificial conditions ¶ sustained in the metropolis by the superexploitation of the rest of the world. ¶ Capitalism remains the world dictatorship of the minority over the majority by the ¶ open and violent denial of political rights to the majority, starting with the right to live ¶ where you choose. This is world apartheid. Its ideological expression, racism, is the ¶ inhuman doctrine that the majority of the human race is not in fact human and ¶ therefore has no rights. This is an international culture of repression and any attempt ¶ to understand it within a single nation, above all the most powerful in the world, is ¶ doomed to failure. Leiman's well-meaning book illustrates this fact, albeit negatively, ¶ in laboratory-pure form.

## Zizek- Root Cause

**Capitalism is the root cause of their struggles - their problems will constantly pop back up under an ethic of capitalism**

Zizek 99 — Prof Phil/Sociology/Psych @ Univ. of Ljubljana and professional diva (Slavoj, The Ticklish Subject pg 343-344)

The big news of today's post-political age of the 'end of ideology' is thus the radical 'depoliticization of the sphere of the economy: the way the economy functions (the need to cut social welfare, etc.) is accepted as a simple insight into the objective state of things. However, as long as this fundamental depoliticization of the economic sphere is accepted, all the talk about active citizenship, about public discussion leading to responsible collective decisions, and so on, will remain limited to the 'cultural' issues of religious, sexual, ethnic and other way-of-life differences, without actually encroaching upon the level at which long-term decisions that affect us all are made. In short, the only way effectively to bring about a society in which risky long-term decisions would ensue from public debate involving all concerned is some kind of radical limitation of Capital's freedom, the subordination of the process of production to social control - the radical repoliticization of the economy'. That is to say: if the problem with today's post-politics ('administration of social affairs') is that it increasingly undermines the possibility of a proper political act, this undermining is directly due to the depoliticization of economics, to the common acceptance of Capital and market mechanisms as neutral tools/ procedures to be exploited. We can now see why today's post-politics cannot attain the properly political dimension of universality: because it silently precludes the sphere of economy from politicization. The domain of global capitalist market relations is the Other Scene of the so-called repoliticization of civil society advocated by the partisans of 'identity politics' and other postmodern forms of politicization: all the talk about new forms of politics bursting out all over, focused on particular issues (gay rights, ecology, ethnic minorities ... ), all this incessant activity of fluid, shifting identities, of building multiple ad hoc coalitions, and so on, has something inauthentic about it, and ultimately resembles the obsessional neurotic who talks all the time and is otherwise frantically active precisely in order to ensure that something - what really matters - will not be disturbed, that it will remain immobilized.35 So, instead of celebrating the new freedoms and responsibilities brought about by the 'second modernity', it is much more crucial to focus on what remains the same in this global fluidity and reflexivity, on what serves as the very motor of this fluidity: the inexorable logic of Capital. The spectral presence of Capital is the figure of the big Other which not only remains operative when all the traditional embodiments of the symbolic big Other disintegrate, but even directly causes this disintegration: far from being confronted with the abyss of their freedom - that is, laden with the burden of responsibility that cannot be alleviated by the helping hand of Tradition or Nature - today's subject is perhaps more than ever caught in an inexorable compulsion that effectively runs his life.

## Alt: Neoliberalism

Rejection of neoliberalism is key to rid ourselves of the flawed mindset of capitalism

Hart, 02 Gillian Hart (Professor at UC Berkeley; Chair of Undergraduate Major in Development Studies

PhD. Cornell University, 1978) Dec 1, 2002 “Geography and development: development/s beyond neoliberalism? Power, culture, political economy” http://phg.sagepub.com/content/26/6/812.full.pdf

The cover of Foreign Policy (January/February 2001), depicting African children¶ suffering from kwashiorkor, is emblazoned with the headline ‘A case of bad latitude:¶ why geography causes poverty’. Entitled ‘prisoners of geography’, the article by¶ Ricardo Hausmann is part of a veritable growth industry that has sprung up in the¶ Kennedy School of Government at Harvard purporting to explain why income levels¶ and standards of living not only failed to converge across regions and countries in the¶ era of neoliberalism, but in fact diverged sharply (Sachs, 2000; 2001; Sachs et al., 2001;¶ Sachs and Warner, 2001). Equipped with multiple regression analysis, the initiative is¶ spearheaded by Jeffrey Sachs, a critic of the IMF’s role in the Asian financial meltdown¶ but enthusiastic advocate of shock therapy in Russia and architect of structural¶ adjustment programs in the 1980s.¶ This recent foray by economists into geographical territory is distinctively different¶ from an earlier venture by Paul Krugman (1995), who dipped his toe in geographical¶ waters and found them too messy. Krugman’s focus, however, was on increasing¶ returns to scale. Risking, no doubt, the derision of their colleagues for venturing into the¶ sludge, members of the Sachs expedition have gone off in search of the reasons why,¶ despite ‘good [neoliberal] policies’, some regions appear ‘simply incapable of faster¶ growth’ (Sachs, 1997: 22). They have returned bearing the following trophies: high costs¶ of access to markets by landlocked countries, low productivity of tropical agriculture,¶ and diseases endemic in tropical regions.¶ Unlike their late-Victorian counterparts (or Robert Kaplan’s The coming anarchy¶ (2000)), these present-day environmental determinists do not invoke cultural/racial¶ inferiority. On the contrary, they are engaged in a ‘geography versus culture’ battle with¶ none other than Samuel Huntington on the other side of Harvard Yard. In Culture¶ matters: how values shape human progress (Harrison and Huntington, 2000), Huntington¶ and his acolytes proclaim ‘culture’ (defined ‘in purely subjective terms as the values,¶ attitudes, beliefs, orientations, and underlying assumptions prevalent among people in¶ a society’) as a key ‘variable’ determining ‘the extent to which and the ways in which¶ societies achieve or fail to achieve progress in economic development and political¶ democratization’ (Harrison and Huntington, 2000: xv). In other words, it is bad attitude¶ rather than bad latitude that prevents the laggards from taking advantage of markets.¶ Essentialist notions of nature and culture, in short, are being conjured up to explain the¶ failures of naturalized markets.¶ A second, quite different approach calls for a revival of development economics,¶ likening its demise in the face of neoliberal orthodoxy ‘to the loss of knowledge due to¶ clerical influence during the Middle Ages’ (Weisbrot, 2001: 1). A recent expression of¶ this tendency is a conference on ‘The need to rethink development economics’ organized by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development in¶ September 2001 (www.unrisd.org/engindex/research/rethink.htm). Most prominent¶ among those charting ‘An agenda for a new development economics’ is Nobel laureate¶ Joseph Stiglitz (2001a), sacked from his position as chief economist at the World Bank¶ for his critique of free market ideology (Wade, 2001).¶ At the core of this agenda is the so-called ‘new institutional economics’ (NIE) framed¶ in terms of informational asymmetries and other market ‘imperfections’ that legitimate¶ state intervention in the economy (Cameron, 2000). The NIE in its Stiglitzian form¶ actually grew out of efforts to explain the re-emergence of sharecropping and other¶ supposedly ‘precapitalist’ institutions in the context of rapid commodification of Indian¶ agriculture. As I argued some time ago, the choice-theoretic models that underpin the¶ NIE are inconsistent on their own terms because they implicitly invoke quite crude¶ notions of power, while simultaneously rejecting ‘extra-economic coercion’ (Hart, 1986;¶ see also Bardhan, 1989). More recently, Fine et al. (2001) have underscored the methodological¶ individualism and reductionism of the ‘post-Washington consensus’.¶ Jayasuriya and Rosser (2001: 398) make the astute observation that the new institutionalism¶ is closely akin to the ordo-liberal school that emerged in Germany toward the end¶ of the Weimar Republic calling for orderly regulation of markets – but that the ordoliberals¶ were far clearer about the political ramifications of this sort of regulatory state¶ than their NIE counterparts. It was also the ordo-liberals who helped inspire Foucault’s¶ concept of governmentality (Lemke, 2001).¶ Feminists have gone furthest in trying to find and probe effective oppositional spaces¶ within mainstream economics, exemplified in the journal Feminist Economics and a¶ special issue of World Development (vol. 28, no. 7, July 2000) on ‘Growth, trade, finance,¶ and gender inequality’. In the most radical contribution to the conference on rethinking¶ development economics, Diane Elson (2001) not only insists on rethinking the economy¶ in terms of social reproduction and the gendered character of unpaid care (see also¶ Folbre, 2001), but she also calls for a new synthesis of ‘economic’ and ‘social’ policy¶ grounded in universal state-based entitlements that are available to all members of a¶ society; and for democratizing the process of macro-economic policy-making. Elson¶ recognizes that such efforts to promote ‘voice’ can easily be undermined by finance¶ capital’s exercising an ‘exit’ option – a further reason, she argues, for controls on international¶ capital movements (see also Eatwell and Taylor, 2000). Yet neither she nor other¶ feminist economists attend to questions of spatiality, and the power-laden practices¶ through which space and scale are produced and redefined.¶ Before exploring possible convergences with recent themes in critical human¶ geography, I want to turn to influential notions of ‘embeddedness’ that underpin the¶ ubiquitous ‘social capital’, and purport to explain the multiple capitalisms and postsocialist¶ transitions that have become particularly dramatic in the era of neoliberalism.¶ They also overlap with recent efforts to think in terms of ‘alternative modernities’.

## Universal 1st

**Their politics reinforce capitalism - movements become specialized markets to remedy guilt while nothing actually changes**

Dean 5 —Prof PoliSci @ William Smith College, PhD PoliSci @ Columbia (Jodi, “Zizek Against democracy,” ebsco)

Unlike most critical thinkers identified with the Left, Zizek rejects the current emphasis on multicultural tolerance. He has three primary reasons for rejecting multiculturalism as it is currently understood in cultural studies and democratic theory. First, agreeing with Wendy Brown, he argues that multiculturalism today rests on an acceptance of global capital. Insofar as Capital’s deterritorializations create the conditions for the proliferation of multiple, fluid, political subjectivities, new social movements and identity politics rely on a political terrain established by global capital. Multiculturalism thus ultimately accepts and depends on the depoliticization of the economy: “the way the economy functions (the need to cut social welfare, etc.) is accepted as a simple insight into the objective state of things.” We might think here of feminist struggles over the right to an abortion, political work toward marriage benefits for same sex couples, and energies in behalf of movies and television networks that target black audiences. In efforts such as these, political energy focuses on culture and leaves the economy as a kind of unquestioned, taken-for-granted basis of the way things are. This is not to say that identity politics are trivial. On the contrary, Zizek fully acknowledges the way these new forms of political subjectivization “thoroughly reshaped our entire political and cultural landscape.” Rather, the problem is that capital has adapted to these new political forms, incorporating previously transgressive urges and turning culture itself into its central component. Zizek’s argument would be stronger were he to think of new social movements as vanishing mediators. Identity politics opened up new spaces and opportunities for capitalist intensification. As new social movements transformed the lifeworld into something to be questioned and changed, they disrupted fixed identities and created opportunities for experimentation. The market entered as provider of these opportunities. We might think here of gay media. As Joshua Gamson argues, while gay portal sites initially promised to offer safe and friendly spaces for gay community building, they now function primarily “to deliver a market share to corporations.” In this gay media, “community needs are conflated with consumption desires, and community equated with market.” My point, then, is that social victories paved the way for market incursions into and the commodification of ever more aspects of experience. And once cultural politics morphed into capitalist culture, identity politics lost its radical edge. For example, the Republican Right in the U.S. regularly accuses the Left of playing the race card whenever there is opposition to a non-Anglo political appointee. A second argument Zizek employs against multiculturalism concerns the way that multicultural tolerance is part of the same matrix as racist violence. On the one hand, multicultural “respect” for the other is way of asserting the superiority of the multiculturalist. The multiculturalist adopts an emptied out, disembodied perspective toward an embodied, ethnic other. The ethnic other makes the “universal” position of the multiculturalist possible. Not only does this attitude disavow the particularity of the multiculturalist’s own position, but it also repeats the key gesture of global corporate capital: the big corporations will eat up, colonize, exploit, and commodify anything. They aren’t biased. They are empty machines following the logic of Capital. On the other hand, tolerance towards the other “passes imperceptibly into a destructive hatred of all (“fundamentalist”) Others who do not fit into our idea of tolerance—in short, against all actual Others.” The idea is that the liberal democrat, or multiculturalist, is against hatred and harassment. Tolerance, then, is tolerance for another who also doesn’t hate or harass, that is, tolerance for an other who is not really so other at all. To this extent, the multicultural position blurs into a kind of racism such that respect is premised on agreement and identity. The other with deep fundamental beliefs, who is invested in a set of unquestionable convictions, whose enjoyment is utterly incomprehensible to me, is not the other of multiculturalism. For Zizek, then, today’s tolerant liberal multiculturalism is “an experience of the Other deprived of its Otherness (the idealized Other who dances fascinating dances and has an ecologically sound holistic approach to reality, while practices like wife-beating remain out of sight . . .).” Just as in Eastern Europe after the fall of communism, so today’s reflexive multicultural tolerance has as its opposite, and thus remains caught in the matrix of, a hard kernel of fundamentalism, of irrational, excessive, enjoyment. The concrete realization of rational inclusion and tolerance coincides with contingent, irrational, violence.

**Capitalism will constantly annihilate particular struggles. Capitalism executes a divide-and-conquer strategy - only broad-based action solves**

Dean 5 — Prof PoliSci @ William Smith College, PhD PoliSci @ Columbia (Jodi, “Zizek Against democracy,” ebsco)

To summarize: Zizek argues that the democratic form runs up against a stain or non-universalizable kernel. Using Lacan, he understands this kernel as a stain of enjoyment, of an irreducible attachment to an intense pleasure-pain. The empty place of democracy is never fully empty. It comes up against points of non-universalizability—founding violence, ethnic particularity, the national Thing. Indeed, insofar as democracy has been a project of the Nation, its very starting point, its position of enunciation, requires this non-universalizable kernel. To the extent that liberal democracy tries to eliminate this stain, tries to exclude ethic fundamentalism and nationalist attachment, it necessarily fails. And, under conditions of late capitalism, the problem is even worse. Like liberal democracy, Capital wants to eliminate particular attachments. Liberal-democratic attacks on ethnic fundamentalism, then, serve capitalist ends at they attack some of the few remaining sites of opposition to capitalism. Nationalist, ethnic, racist violence thus persists today at the intersection of two modes of failed universalization—democracy and capitalism. The question is whether a new political universality is possible.

## AT: Universal Can’t Solve Particular

**Their criticism of universal politics is only possible within the space opened by an ethics of universalism**

**Zizek 2k** — (Slavoj, Contingency, Hegemony, Universality p104)

So when we criticize the hidden bias and exclusion of universality, we should never forget that we are already doing so within the terrain opened up by universality: the proper critique of ‘false universality’ does not call it into question from the standpoint of pre-universal particularism, it mobilizes the tension inherent to universality itself, the tension between the open negativity, the disruptive power, of what Kierkegaard would have called ‘universality-in-becoming’, in the fixed form of established universality. Or – we have, on the one hand, the ‘dead’, ‘abstract’ universality of an ideological notion with fixed inclusion / exclusions and, on the other, ‘living’, ‘concrete’ universality as the permanent process of questioning and renegotiation of its own ‘official’ content. Universality becomes ‘actual’ precisely and only be rendering thematic the exclusions on which it is grounded, by continuously questioning, renegotiating, displacing them, that is, by assuming the gap between its own form and content, by conceiving itself as unaccomplished in its very notion. This is what Butler’s notion of the politically salient use of ‘performative contradiction’ is driving at: if the ruling ideology performatively ‘cheats’ by undermining – in its actual discursive practice and the set of exclusions on which this practice relies – its own officially asserted universality, progressive politics, should precisely openly practice performative contradiction, asserting on behalf of the given universality the very content of this universality (in its hegemonic form) excludes.

The universality of the harms must be broken down prior to solving the individual ones

**Zizek 2k** — (Slavoj, Contingency, Hegemony, Universality p104)

The theoretical task is not only to unmask the particular content of inclusions / exclusions involved in the game, but to account of enigmatic emergence of the space of universality itself. Furthermore – and more precisely – the real task is to explore the fundamental shifts in the very logic of the way universality works in the socio-symbolic space: premodern, modern and today’s ‘post-modern’ notion and ideological practice of universality do not, for example, differ only with regard to the particular contents that are included / excluded in universal notions – somehow, on a more radical level, the very underlying notion of universality functions in a different way in each of the epochs. ‘Universality’ as such does not mean the same thing since the establishment of bourgeois market society in which individuals participate in the social order not on behalf of their particular place within the global social edifice but immediately, as ‘abstract’ human beings.

**We do not erase particularity – our ethic embraces the particular as the gap which defines the universal**

**Zizek 2k** — (Slavoj, Contingency, Hegemony, Universality p104)

Against these assertions, I am tempted to claim that, on the contrary, the concept of universality emerges as the consequence of the fact that each particular culture is precisely never and for a priori reasons simple particular, but is always – already in itself ‘crossed the linguistic borders it claims’. In short, while Butler emphasizes that there is no universality without translation, I am tempted to claim that, today, it is crucial to emphasize the *opposite* aspect: there is no particularity without translation*.* This also means that the alternative ‘either the direct imposition of Western human rights as universal or the patient work of translation’ is ultimately a false one: the work translation has always-already begun, linguistic borders are always-already crossed – that is to say, every assertion of particular identity always-already involves a disavowed reference to universality. Or, to put it in Laclau’s terms: prior to being the neutral link or common thread between a serious of particular entities, the “universal” is the name of a gap that forever prevents the particular itself from achieving its (self-)identity.

## AT: Particular Solves Universal

**Even if they attempt to reframe power - absent the alternative, capitalism will corrupt particular struggles**

Zizek 97 [“Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism.”, Senior Researcher, Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana]

What these leftist advocates of populism fail to perceive is that today’s populism, far from presenting a threat to global capitalism, remains its inherent product. Paradoxically, today’s true conservatives are rather the leftist ‘critical theorists’ who reject liberal multiculturalism as well as fundamentalist populism, those who clearly perceive the complicity between global capitalism and ethnic fundamentalism. They point towards the third domain which belongs neither to global market-society nor to the new forms of ethnic fundamentalism: the domain of the political, the public space of civil society, of active responsible citizenship—the fight for human rights, ecology and so forth. However, the problem is that this very form of political space is more and more threatened by the onslaught of globalization; consequently, one cannot simply return to it or revitalize it. To avoid a misunderstanding: our point is not the old ‘economic essentialist’ one according to which, in the case of England today, the Labour victory really did not change anything—and as such is even more dangerous than continuing Tory rule, since it gave rise to the misleading impression that there was a change. There are a lot of things the Labour government can achieve; it can contribute a lot to the passage from traditional English parochial jingoism to a more ‘enlightened’ liberal democracy with a much stronger element of social solidarity (from health care to education), to the respect for human rights (in its diverse forms, from women’s rights to the rights of ethnic groups); one should use the Labour victory as an incentive to revitalize the diverse forms of the struggle for égaliberté. (With the Socialist electoral victory in France, the situation is even more ambiguous, since Jospin’s programme does contain some elements of a direct confrontation with the logic of capital.) Even when the change is not substantial but a mere semblance of a new beginning, the very fact that a situation is perceived by the majority of the population as a ‘new beginning’ opens up the space for important ideological and political rearticulations—as we have already seen, the fundamental lesson of the dialectic of ideology is that appearances do matter. Nonetheless, the post-Nation-State logic of capital remains the Real which lurks in the background, while all three main leftist reactions to the process of globalization—liberal multiculturalism; the attempt to embrace populism by way of discerning, beneath its fundamentalist appearance, the resistance against ‘instrumental reason’; the attempt to keep open the space of the political—seem inappropriate. Although the last approach is based on the correct insight about the complicity between multiculturalism and fundamentalism, it avoids the crucial question: how are we to reinvent political space in today’s conditions of globalization? The politicization of the series of particular struggles which leaves intact the global process of capital is clearly not sufficient. What this means is that one should reject the opposition which, within the frame of late capitalist liberal democracy, imposes itself as the main axis of ideological struggle: the tension between ‘open’ post-ideological universalist liberal tolerance and the particularist ‘new fundamentalisms’. Against the liberal centre which presents itself as neutral and post-ideological, relying on the rule of the Law, one should reassert the old leftist motif of the necessity to suspend the neutral space of Law.

## Cards in Progress:

There is no good way to tag this that I can think of. If you want to tag it yourself, go ahead

Freeman, 98 Alan Freeman (Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Principal Economist at Greater London Authority, Visiting Research Fellow at University of Manitoba, Senior Lecturer at University of Greenwich, Analyst at Economist Intelligence Unit, Alan Freeman is an economist who works for GLA Economics, the Mayor of London's Economic Analysis Unit) 1998 “The Material Roots of Western Racism” http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2216/1/MPRA\_paper\_2216.pdf

Political rights damage capitalism because it necessarily denies them to the great ¶ majority of humans. It is preposterous and insulting to dismiss the profound and ¶ heroic struggle of southern black people with the words (p323) 'they only changed the ¶ status of the blacks from one of unequal exploitation to one of equal exploitation.' If ¶ black people throughout the world had only the same rights and income as a poor ¶ American, capitalism would cease to exist. If it were not for the civil rights struggle ¶ today's American left would not exist to pass such patronizing judgements upon it. ¶ Because this economistic claptrap is nowhere to be found in Marx, traditional ¶ Marxism performs a service. It mutates Marx's categories so that racism can be ¶ dressed up as Marxism: ¶ Marxists [which? who? where?] emphasize that economic factors are decisive ¶ in determining the general shape of any given societal formation and that the ¶ class struggle between the propertied and nonpropertied class is the key to an ¶ understanding of the 'laws of motion' of all class-divided struggle. ¶ What Marx.[1977 p20] actually said is: ¶ The guiding principle of my studies can be summarised as follows. In the social ¶ production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations ¶ independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given ¶ stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of ¶ these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the ¶ real foundation, on which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. ¶ The mode of production of material life [my emphasis-AF] conditions the ¶ process of social, political and intellectual life.¶ 6¶ In the US and the UK the 'struggle between the propertied and nonpropertied classes' ¶ takes the form of an argument over the share of gross output, that is, a legal trade ¶ union wage struggle. For comparison, German capitalism in its time exterminated 40 ¶ million people, eliminated several races from various parts of the planet and ¶ devastated half of Russia.¶ 7¶ The 'economic' factors shaping this class struggle included ¶ Germany's late claim to a 'place in the sun', its defeat in the war, the Russian ¶ revolution and a historical tradition of anti-semitism in Eastern Europe predating ¶ capitalism by around 700 years. ¶ If the 'struggle between the propertied and nonpropertied classes' covers all this then it ¶ just means 'everything to do with capitalism' and Marx's term is better. But its real ¶ content is clear from the rest of the book which centres single-mindedly on 'income, ¶ occupational structures, unemployment, education and housing', all from the point of ¶ view of income, of access to value distributed in the USA. The ellipsis substitutes the ¶ economic struggle over the distribution of income for the political class struggle. It¶ replaces the famous phrase in the Communist Manifesto "the first step in the ¶ revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, ¶ to win the battle of democracy" by the phrase, "the first step in the revolution by the ¶ working class is to raise wages so high that the capitalists give up". ¶