## \*\*\* Perm/CTP

### Permutation

#### The permutation is a better political strategy—capitalism is popular, it provides stability, and the vague replacement they espouse is incapable of motivating change. Working within the capitalist system by combining critique with pragmatic action is the best way to solve.

Grossberg 92 — Lawrence Grossberg, Morris David Distinguished Professor of Communication Studies and Cultural Studies and Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Program in Cultural Studies at the University of North Carolina, 1992 (“‘You Can't Always Get What You Want’: The Struggle over the Left," *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture*, Published by Routledge, ISBN 0415903300, p. 389-390)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be tempered by the realities of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are not waiting to be led into revolution, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide – rather undemocratically, I might add – to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain “civility” in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is simply too weak in the current context to effectively organize people, and too vague to provide any direction. Instead, the left must think of ways to rearticulate capitalism without either giving up the critique or naively assuming that it can create a capitalism “with a human heart.” Leaving such images to Hollywood, the Left can organize to change specific axiomatics of capitalism in particular local, regional, national and global contexts. For example, there is good evidence that the ways in which contemporary American corporations have chosen to deal with labor are not necessarily the most effective in terms of capital productivity itself. This does not entail simply championing unions as they have existed, but restructuring unions to meet the new demands of a changing labor force, and to work within the new systems of global capitalism. We can recognize and argue that the rich are no longer primarily entrepreneurs being rewarded for taking risks, but managers (CEOs) and financial manipulators, even criminals of various sorts. The expansion of capital as a social utility has given way to its immediate private appropriation, with little reinvestment into capitalism’s future. It therefore seems reasonable to limit the ability to privately appropriate wealth. In this context, we might argue for guaranteed minimum and maximum incomes, linking such arguments to notions of the value of human life. We might propose to limit investors’ abilities to reap short-term profits by any number of means, including linking executives’ salaries to capital gains and investments rather than profits.

### Cede The Political DA

#### Turn—ceding the political:

#### A. Capitalism is inevitable – their alternative caricaturizes the left and cedes the political sphere to the right.

Wilson 1 — John K. Wilson, best-selling progressive author and coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 2001 (*How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives*, Published by NYU Press, ISBN 0814793630, p. 15-16)

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism—they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful.

What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town—the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people.

The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances.

To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an [end page 15] ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

#### B. This turns their impacts – pragmatism is key to progressive success – their infatuation with revolution only worsens their impacts.

Wilson 1 — John K. Wilson, best-selling progressive author and coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 2001 (*How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives*, Published by NYU Press, ISBN 0814793630, p. 121-123)

Progressives need to be pragmatic in order to be powerful. However, pragmatism shouldn't be confused with Clintonian centrism and the abandonment of all substance. Pragmatists have principles, too. The difference between a pragmatic progressive and a foolish one is the willingness to pick the right fights and fight in the right way to accomplish these same goals.

The current failure of progressivism in America is due to the structure of American politics and media, not because of a wrong turn that the movement took somewhere along the way. What the left needs is not a "better" ideology but a tactical adaptation to the obstacles it faces in the contemporary political scene. A pragmatic progressivism does not sacrifice its ideals but simply communicates them better to the larger public.

The words we use shape how people respond to our ideas. It's [end page 121] tempting to offer the standard advice that progressives should present their ideas in the most palatable form. But palatable to whom? The media managers and pedestrian pundits who are the intellectual gatekeepers won't accept these ideas. By the time progressives transform their ideas into the political baby food necessary for inclusion in current debates, it barely seems to be worth the effort.

Leftists need to seize the dominant political rhetoric, even though it may be conservative in its goals, and turn it in a progressive direction. Progressives need to use the antitax ideology to demand tax cuts for the poor. Progressives need to use the antigovernment and antiwelfare ideology to demand the end of corporate welfare. Progressives need to translate every important issue into the language that is permissible in the mainstream. Something will inevitably be lost in the translation. But the political soul underlying these progressive ideas can be preserved and brought to the public's attention.

The left does not need to abandon its progressive views in order to be popular. The left only needs to abandon some of its failed strategies and become as savvy as the conservatives are at manipulating the press and the politicians. The language of progressives needs to become more mainstream, but the ideas must remain radical. In an age of soulless politicians and spineless ideologies, the left has the virtue of integrity. Until progressives become less self-satisfied with the knowledge that they're right and more determined to convince everyone else of this fact, opportunities for political change will not be forthcoming.

Progressives have also been hampered by a revolutionary instinct among some leftist groups. According to some left wingers, incremental progress is worthless—that is, nothing short of a radical change in government will mean anything to them. Indeed, for the most radical left wingers, liberal reforms [end page 122] are a threat to the movement, since they reduce the desire for more extreme changes.

What the revolutionaries fail to realize is that progressive achievements can build on one another. If anything approaching a political revolution actually happens in America, it will be due to a succession of popular, effective, progressive reforms. A popular uprising in the ballot box is possible only if the left can change its political assumptions about smaller, specific issues.

#### The question of revolution versus reform is irrelevant – accumulated progressive policy change is the only path to meaningful revolution.

Wilson 1 — John K. Wilson, best-selling progressive author and coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 2001 (*How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives*, Published by NYU Press, ISBN 0814793630, p. 123)

The left often finds itself stuck in a debate between revolution and reform. To self-described revolutionaries, any attempt to reform the system is a liberal compromise that only delays the creation of a socialist utopia.

The vision of workers casting off their chains and embracing the overthrow of capitalism is pure fantasy. No one actually knows what it means to overthrow capitalism, and it clearly isn't going to happen, anyway.

Reforming American capitalism is not a halfhearted effort at modest change; it is a fundamental attack on the reigning ideology of “free market" capitalism. Progressive reforms, taken seriously, are revolutionary in every important sense.

Reforms such as the New Deal were truly revolutionary for their time, and American capitalism has been saved from its own flaws by these progressive reforms. The problem is that these progressive reforms have not been carried far enough, in part because the revolutionary left has too often failed to support the progressives' reformist agenda. The only leftist revolution in America will come from an accumulation of progressive policies, and so the question of revolution versus reform is irrelevant.

## \*\*\* Impact Defense

### A2: Cap Causes War

#### Capitalism is not the root cause of war.

Dandeker 92 — Christopher Dandeker, Professor of Military Sociology in the Department of War Studies at King's College London, 1992 (“The Causes of War and the History of Modern Sociological Theory,” *Effects of War on Society*, Edited by Giorgio Ausenda, Published by the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress by Boydell & Brewer Ltd, ISBN 0851158684, 1st Edition Published in 1992, 2nd Edition Published in 2002, p. 44-45)

All these arguments presuppose two specious sociological contentions: first that capitalism, as the most historically developed and dynamic form of class exploitation, is the source of modern militarism, and second, that socialism, preferably on a world scale would involve the abolition of war. The deficiencies in these views, and indeed of those associated with the industrial society thesis discussed earlier, can be revealed by drawing on Machiavellian themes which can then be set out more explicitly in the next section.

Despite the fact that industrial capitalism has produced two world wars, as Aron (1954) and more recently Michael Mann (1984) have argued, there is no 'special relationship' between capitalism and militarism—or the tendency to war—only one of historical indifference. All the pre-dispositions of 'capitalist states' to use warfare calculatively as a means of resolving their disputes with other states predate the formation of capitalism as an economic system. Of course, it could be argued that capitalism merely changes the form of militarism. That is to say, pre-capitalist patterns of militarism were still expressions of class relations and modern capitalism has just increased the destructive power of the industrialised means of war available to the state. But this argument will not do. Socialist societies in their use of industrialised power show that the technological potential for war is transferable and can be reproduced under non-capitalist conditions. Furthermore, the military activities of socialist states cannot be explained in terms of a [end page 44] defensive war against capitalism or even an aggressive one, as national and geopolitical power motives are arguably just as significant in the determination of state behaviour. Furthermore, imperial expansion not only predates capitalism but it is also difficult to reduce the causes of wars then and now to the interests of dominant economic classes (Mann 1984:25-46).

#### Marxist explanations of war are wrong—*nationalism* is the true driver of conflict.

Dandeker 92 — Christopher Dandeker, Professor of Military Sociology in the Department of War Studies at King's College London, 1992 (“The Causes of War and the History of Modern Sociological Theory,” *Effects of War on Society*, Edited by Giorgio Ausenda, Published by the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress by Boydell & Brewer Ltd, ISBN 0851158684, 1st Edition Published in 1992, 2nd Edition Published in 2002, p. 45-46)

Meanwhile, modern attempts to explain patterns of military expenditure in terms of the imperatives of capital accumulation face major difficulties. The association between economic boom and military spending has been revealed as an empirical association not an inherent connection; indeed the evidence from Germany and Japan indicates that low levels of military spending might well be associated with economic performances superior to those of societies which commit more of their GNP to defence expenditure. Furthermore, the idea that war and the threat of war are weapons of national mythology used by dominant classes to confuse the working class and weaken their natural affinity with international socialism faces the problem that, as in the case of Europe in 1914, national enthusiasms were such that truly remarkable powers would have to be attributed to ruling classes in order to make sense of them while in any case alternative explanations are at hand (Howard 1976:108-15).

The problems of economic determinism in Marxist social theory are compounded by two further difficulties. The first of these concerns its emphasis on endogenous, unfolding models of social change. The tendency is to view state behaviour in terms of the imperatives of internal class relations with warfare being regarded as the externalisation of the contradictory nature of those relations. Marxism finds it difficult to view inter-state relations as characterised by structural interdependencies of a politico-strategic nature. The drift of Marxism is to regard the state as a class actor not as a geopolitical one. This failing derives not just from the internalist bias of Marxist social theory but also from its failure to provide a satisfactory account of the conditions under which the human species has become differentiated into separate societies and, more specifically, why it is that the modern capitalist economic system has developed in the context of a system of competing nation-states—a political system extending from the core of Europe to the rest of the globe during the course of the twentieth century. As Michael Mann has suggested there is nothing in capitalism as an economic system which presupposes or requires such a political system although there is a strong [end page 45] case in favour of the view that the development and triumph of modern capitalism benefited from the constant power struggle amongst the emergent nation-states of European civilisation (Hall 1986; Mann 1988). In Marxist theory, the rise of nation-states has been interpreted as an early stage in the political expression of the universality of the capitalist market, an expression which will change with the demands of capital accumulation (Semmel 1981: 166-73). A contemporary case in point would be the current shift to European integration in the context of global competition amongst the major capitalist blocs. However, nationalism is not a bourgeois phenomenon created to provide ideological and legal conditions favourable for capitalist economic relations. Nor are modern nationalisms, when suitably 'decoded,' enthusiastic proletarian movements ready to take the stage vacated by their less distinguished Western comrades. Nationalism is a far more significant motor of human history than class—a fact which was recognised by some Marxists in the early twentieth century: Mussolini was one of them (Ashworth and Dandeker 1986:82-7; Dandeker 1985:349-67; Gregor 1974:145-7; Smith 1983:47-50).

The inability of Marxism to provide a satisfactory account of nationalism is part of a broader failure to explain why 'societies' exist at all. That is to say, in relation to the four clusters of modernity distinguished earlier, it is through the conjoining of industrialism, capitalism, bureaucratic surveillance and the state monopolisation of the means of violence that modern societies have emerged. As Anthony Giddens has suggested, societies are actually products of modernity (and not one dimension of modernity, i.e., class relations within capitalism). If by society one means a clearly demarcated and internally well articulated social entity it is only relatively recently that large human populations have lived under such arrangements and these have been the achievements of modern nation-states (Dandeker 1990:51; Giddens 1985:172).

## \*\*\* Alternative Bad

### Omnicide/Violence DA

#### Turn—Omnicide:

#### A. Transitioning away from capitalism would collapse civilization and kill billions.

Rockwell 8 — Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., President of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2008 (“Everything You Love You Owe to Capitalism,” Ludwig von Mises Institute, May 18th, Available Online at http://mises.org/story/2982, Accessed 10-04-2008)

Whatever the specifics of the case in question, socialism always means overriding the free decisions of individuals and replacing that capacity for decision making with an overarching plan by the state. Taken far enough, this mode of thought won't just spell an end to opulent lunches. It will mean the end of what we all know as civilization itself. It would plunge us back to a primitive state of existence, living off hunting and gathering in a world with little art, music, leisure, or charity. Nor is any form of socialism capable of providing for the needs of the world's six billion people, so the population would shrink dramatically and quickly and in a manner that would make every human horror ever known seem mild by comparison. Nor is it possible to divorce socialism from totalitarianism, because if you are serious about ending private ownership of the means of production, you have to be serious about ending freedom and creativity too. You will have to make the whole of society, or what is left of it, into a prison.

In short, the wish for socialism is a wish for unparalleled human evil. If we really understood this, no one would express casual support for it in polite company. It would be like saying, you know, there is really something to be said for malaria and typhoid and dropping atom bombs on millions of innocents.

#### B. History is on our side – alternatives to the free market empirically kill millions.

Carden 4 — Art Carden, Graduate Student in Economics at Washington University in St. Louis, 2004 (“Mistaken Identity,” *The Free Market*, Volume 24, Number 6, June, Available Online at http://www.mises.org/freemarket\_detail.aspx?control=497, Accessed 10-05-2008)

Finally, it is deficient scholarship to merely point out the litany of crimes that the market (supposedly) commits and suggest that it has "failed" in any meaningful way. One must propose a superior alternative. In this case, both theory and history are firmly on the side of the free market. Mises and Hayek demonstrated that rational calculation is impossible without private ownership of the means of production. This isn’t to say that a "socialist economy" is inefficient—it is quite literally an oxymoron. Our experience with radical revolutions and planned economies in the twentieth century is hardly encouraging: in the name of "the people," Che Guevara killed thousands, Hitler millions, Stalin and Mao tens of millions.

It may be fashionable to blame the market economy for all of society’s ills, but this blame is undeserved and many scholars’ faith in alternatives to the market is misplaced. No socialist regime has ever held a free election, and no free market has ever produced a death camp. Popular academic opinions to the contrary, the market works. And we can take that to the bank.

#### The impact is intrinsic to revolutionary politics – genocide, totalitarianism, and mass death are the inevitable outcome of Marxist theory.

Osborne 99 — Lawrence Osborne, Contributor to the *New York Times Magazine* and *The New York Observer*, 1999 (“Misadventures in Marxism,” *Salon.com/CNN.com*, September 1st, Available Online at http://edition.cnn.com/books/news/9909/01/ marx.salon/index.html, Accessed 10-15-2004)

But the left's bamboozling rhetoric, Courtois maintains, is but the least of Marxism's sins. The radical tradition as a whole, he argues, has utterly failed to resolve the paradox of its own terrorism and mass violence, leaving it wide open to its current loss of credibility. Academic Marxism hardly even bothers to ask the question, except to play the usual good-cop, bad-cop routine: humane Lenin, evil Stalin, etc. But the failure of Marxism-Leninism goes deeper than its accidental betrayals. It is the ideology itself, claims the darker of the present volumes, that contributed to the stupefying tally of 100 million violent deaths under the hammer and sickle -- the largest ideology-driven genocide in history. Mass murder, they point out with numbing archival thoroughness, was made the center of the revolutionary state in 1918, not 1931, and by 1920 Lenin had killed more people than 90 years of czarism combined. He was, of course, spectacularly outdone by subsequent "Marxist" dictators who thought history was on their side.

For his chapters on the Bolsheviks, Nicholas Werth of the Institute of Contemporary History draws on newly available sources from the Soviet archives. According to Werth, the very idea of class warfare in the abstract -- such vague, antiseptic categories as "bourgeoisie," "kulaks," "counterrevolutionaries," etc. -- provided the theoretical basis for extermination. Indeed, Marx's notion of the evil "bourgeoisie" -- an amorphously vague entity Berman invokes on almost every page -- is the foundation of the original pseudo-scientific hate theory in which an entire abstract class of people is held responsible for all the ills of the race, according to putatively scientific and discernible laws.

\* Courtois is Stephane Courtois, a historian at the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique in Paris and editor of the Journal Communisme. This article discusses his book “Black Book of Communism.”

#### Don’t discount the lessons of history – their alternative’s resentment of the bourgeoisie puts us all at risk for execution.

Osborne 99 — Lawrence Osborne, Contributor to the *New York Times Magazine* and *The New York Observer*, 1999 (“Misadventures in Marxism,” *Salon.com/CNN.com*, September 1st, Available Online at http://edition.cnn.com/books/news/9909/01/ marx.salon/index.html, Accessed 10-15-2004)

Whether intentional or not, when dealing with this ignorance of the criminal dimensions of Communism, our contemporaries' indifference to their fellow humans can never be forgotten. It is not that these individuals are coldhearted. On the contrary, in certain situations they can draw on vast untapped reserves of brotherhood, friendship, affection, even love.

How could all these well-meaning people continue to harbor utopian delusions about their academic faith? To some extent, it's a matter of geographic accident. Unlike the crimes of the Nazis, communist atrocities mostly took place far from the Western heartland. Nor were they ever filmed or exposed by conquering armies. The Soviet Union ended World War II both as a victor and as a Western ally, and was able to profitably ride the wave of "anti-fascism." To those in the West, in the wake of a devastating world war in which the forces of humanism ultimately triumphed, it was simply beyond imagining that one mode of totalitarian genocide had largely been defeated by another. The likelihood of Steven Spielberg ever making a film about the Cheka killing Cossack girls with sledgehammers is remote indeed. Marxism will never have a Holocaust chained to its ankles because those 65 million corpses in China never made it to the screen. The iconic is indeed, alas, more powerful than the ironic.

In the end, though, the "Black Book's" body counts -- necessary as they are -- are less important than the soul-destroying connections between Marxist idealism and the violence committed in its name. Who are the "bourgeoisie," after all, whom humanitarians like Berman have for a century reviled as "bestial," "vile," "cancerous," "murderous" and "bloodsucking"? Are we not reminded of that other phantom scapegoat of anti-capitalist ravings, the Jew? But Berman, unlike the writers of the "Black Book," cannot tell us who his villains actually are, any more than Stalin could. For that is how revolutionary ideology works. The bourgeoisie, like all internal enemies, is undefined and nameless, sometimes little more than a nebulous synonym for civilization itself. It is described as a bacteria, a plague. But in the end it is merely everyone: Berman, Marx, you and I.

In the world of Baboeuf, we are all candidates for the guillotine.

### Monolithic Marginalization DA

#### Turn—Monolithic Marginalization:

#### A. Their argument pre-supposes the existence of a monolithic, all-encompassing “capitalism” and focuses exclusively on class struggle – this marginalizes everyday struggles against oppression like the plan that are key to true liberation.

Biewener 99 — Carole Biewener, Professor and Director of Gender/Cultural Studies at Simmons College, 1999 (“A Postmodern Encounter: Poststructuralist Feminism and the Decentering of Marxism,” *Socialist Review*, Volume 27, Issue 1/2, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ProQuest Research Library)

Marxism has produced a discourse of Capitalism that ostensibly identifies and defines an object of transformative class politics but that operates more powerfully to discourage and marginalize projects of class transformation. In a sense, marxism has contributed to the socialist absence through the very way in which it has theorized the capitalist presence.33

Capitalism has generally been theorized as a unified, singular, and totalizing entity. While this vision of Capitalism as ubiquitous, penetrating, systemic, and hegemonic has enabled certain kinds of radical left political projects and movements, it has also disabled and marginalized others. Gibson-Graham, along with others in the postmodern materialist tradition, questions the inevitability of such a vision of "Capitalism" and has begun to investigate the political possibilities that are enabled by an alternative notion of capitalist exploitation built upon the thin notion of class discussed above.

One exciting and fertile possibility is that of being able to envision class in a myriad of new sites and in a multitude of forms. Class processes are recognized as occurring not only in capitalist industrial enterprises, but also in households and communities, in recreational facilities and religious institutions. Thus, by theorizing the other-than-capitalist modalities of class processes, social formations are understood as having a multiple class character, rather than simply being "capitalist" or "noncapitalist"; and, the other- than-capitalist class processes are not theorized as being subservient to, or shaped by capitalist class processes in any essential or dominant manner.34 This understanding of class as local, plural, dispersed, and uncentered enables a radical politics in which class processes are always being negotiated, constituted, and contested. It allows a sense of being actively involved in creating or constituting class processes in new ways in our immediate, daily lives. To the extent that we address the performance of surplus labor, our conversations, explorations, positionings, and actions in our households, communities, and workplaces can now be understood as part of an active project of social transformation in a class sense. If "capitalism" is not conceived of as a systemic, totalizing entity, but rather as local, dispersed, partial, and uncentered, then many spaces are opened up for creating and enacting noncapitalist and even communal or communist class processes.

Further, with such a fragmentation and multiplicity of class processes, Leftists do not have to insist that effective class politics is linked to the agency of any one well-defined group, such as "the working class." Struggle over class is not seen, therefore, as the privileged domain of the proletariat. Rather, a variety of class modalities and sites can be used and struggled over to change class relations and many different social actors may be understood as engaging in struggles over class. Collective production and appropriation of surplus labor can be fostered and enacted in a factory or office, in the production of a journal or in a household, without having to have wait for cataclysmic, systemic, all encompassing, revolutionary change.

#### B. This turns their critique – only engagement with the system opens space for effective progressive political action – the alternative shuts down left politics.

Biewener 99 — Carole Biewener, Professor and Director of Gender/Cultural Studies at Simmons College, 1999 (“A Postmodern Encounter: Poststructuralist Feminism and the Decentering of Marxism,” *Socialist Review*, Volume 27, Issue 1/2, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ProQuest Research Library)

By developing such an overdeterminist class knowledge, "reformist" class struggles may then be recognized as having transformative consequences in a gendered, racial, or other- than-class sense and "traditional" class politics may be understood as also gendered and racialized politics. For instance, women's participation in capitalist waged labor has, under some circumstances, enabled them to escape or challenge patriarchal familial relations, contributing to new notions of what it means to be a "woman." Struggles over parental leave, the social provision of child care, and universal health insurance may enable divisions of labor that do not constitute or reinforce patriarchal gender relations to the same extent. Extension of parental leave or family benefits to gay and lesbian couples may reform our sexual and gendered identities in potentially new emancipatory ways. Campaigns for "comparable worth" have aimed to revision the valuation of female-identified skills and occupations relative to male-identified ones, thereby destabilizing and subverting gendered notions of "worth" and "value" in transformative ways. Struggles over deindustrialization in urban areas may serve to revitalize communities of color in ways that challenge racist stereotypes. In all of these instances, what might be considered as reformist from a traditional Marxian class standpoint may be understood as transformative and radical from a decentered class perspective that does not privilege class exploitation nor subordinate relations of domination, oppression, and power that are constituted by other-than-class aspects of social life.

Thus, rather than eviscerating the potentialities of left political activity, the decentering of class enables a multiplication and surplus of potentially transformative left political practices. For, not only are we able to recognize the radical character of transforming other-than-class aspects of social life, we are also able to theorize the class dimensions of struggles over these ostensibly other-than-class issues. Marxists are thus able to highlight the class aspect of social life in new and compelling ways. For instance, Marxists may contribute to struggles over reproductive rights by showing the links between feminist concerns about gender subordination and the rights of women and Marxists' concerns with who does the work of childcare and under what conditions, or with who has access to reproductive technology and medical services and for what reasons. Or, in organizing to stop the spread of HIV, Marxists may highlight the class aspects of this crisis, emphasizing the links between joblessness and drug use or between the lack of economic development and prostitution, while also recognizing how the racialized, gendered, and sexualized aspects of the spread of HIV reinforce and help (re)produce these class aspects. "The challenge for Marxists, then, is to develop the ways in which the loss of class as a universal or hegemonic project provides new areas of strength and vitality within Marxism, and opens new horizons for progressive political action."37

In general, by making "class" in any Marxian sense visible, a project is constructed whose political intentionality is, in part, to "reveal" and problematize exploitative class relations. This is a subversive aspect of most Marxian traditions and this subversive aspect may be established in many different ways: via projects that pose class in hegemonic and universalizing terms, but also via projects that understand class in a local and contextual sense.38 Usually a particular ethical dimension is associated with this project whereby a Marxian class analysis is aimed at creating an understanding in which one of the "rules" of the discourse is that class exploitation is "bad." Thus, in addition to theorizing or "revealing" the character of class relations, there is also often the more-or-less explicit project of eradicating class exploitation and of instituting communal forms of producing, appropriating, and distributing surplus labor. Yet, here we must confront a second major challenge presented by poststructuralist feminism, that of the construction of agency and subjectivity. For, in recognizing the contextuality and openness of subjectivity, along with the partiality and discursive character of knowledge, we face the challenge of emptying "class" of any a priori normative status in order to reconstruct a contextual postmodern class politics and/or ethics that does not have recourse to an extradiscursive "standard" by which to justify its political intentionalities, strategies, and projects.39 In and of itself we cannot, therefore, conclude that class exploitation is "bad." Rather, from a postmodern materialist perspective, political, social, and ethical intentionalities and projects depend upon the particular context within which we are situated. Therefore, we must consider and theorize the constituent aspects of class processes in order to ground a class politics. This perspective, therefore, does not mean that it is impossible to embrace a politics committed to furthering nonexploitative class processes or relations, but that such a politics must be continually constructed and enabled, rather than presumed, imposed, or universalized.

#### Their totalizing critique of capitalism impedes effective resistance—vote affirmative to endorse positive change within the confines of capitalism that affirms compassion, empathy, and love.

Ettlinger 9 — Nancy Ettlinger, Associate Professor of Geography at the Ohio State University, 2009 (“Whose capitalism? Mean discourse and/or actions of the heart,” *Emotion, Space and Society*, Volume 2, Issue 2, December, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ScienceDirect)

Actually existing capitalism can be cruel, ruthless, and destructive, deriving in part from negative emotions such as envy, hate, and indifference to others; but it also can be benevolent, deriving in part from positive emotions such as compassion, empathy, and love. It is this latter, often unrecognized dimension of capitalism-in-practice that has much to offer if we recognize, value, and draw upon it in the construction of efforts to create positive change by revaluing emotions, whether on the basis of policy ([Folbre, 2001] and [Tronto, 2003]) or grassroots organization. Discourse of ‘The State,’ like ‘the economy,’ commonly is devoid of issues of emotions and ethics (Askew, 2009). But what about the compassionate human service workers who often work at the interstices of government departments, local institutions, and communities to fortify conditions of living ([Askew, 2009] and [Larner and Butler, 2007])? That we lack accounts of many other instances of state or quasi-state agents whose behavior may derive as much from positive, relational emotions and ethics as from self-interested calculation may pertain to the relative infancy of research on how actions of the heart, both positive and negative, figure in everyday political economy.

Reductionistic accounts of hegemonic capitalism, and neoliberalism in particular, impede a vision of the future based on a critique of the problems as well as hopeful prospects of lived experience. The critical normative dimension of seeing and accounting for emotions and related practices in capitalist life pertains to redefining capitalism and revaluing emotions ([Askew, 2009], [Easterlow and Smith, 2004], [Ettlinger, 2003], [Ettlinger, 2004], [Ettlinger, 2009], [Folbre, 2001], [McDowell, 2004], Robinson, 2006 Fiona Robinson, Beyond labour rights: the ethics of care and women's work in the global economy, International Feminist Journal of Politics 8 (2006), pp. 321–342. Full Text via CrossRef | View Record in Scopus | Cited By in Scopus (1)[Robinson, 2006], [Sayer, 2007], [Sevenhuijsen, 2003], [Smith, 2005] and [Tronto, 2003]).

If the mean discourse of capitalism represents the status quo, then resistance might fruitfully be defined not in terms of opposition to the state or groups defined as the capitalist class, but rather to ‘the separate spheres doctrine’ (Folbre, 2001) – the idea that actions of the heart lie outside, and in opposition to, capitalism. Whereas oppositional or confrontational accounts of resistance connect with the idea of power as located in persons and positions at the apex of societal hierarchies (with powerlessness residing among the subjugated), resistance as a critique of societal norms connects with the idea of power as diffuse. Back to power, then, which, depending on one's perspective, is understood in terms of the implicit binary of ‘productive’ or ‘destructive’. The view here denies neither the destructive elements of capitalist life nor the problems of power held by a few over the majority (Foucault, 1980c); rather, it highlights the problematizing potential of practices that diverge from societal discourse towards possibilities for transformational change (Foucault, 2007).

#### Capitalism is constantly being constituted by our emotions and actions—their attempt to pin it down to a singular discourse that must be rejected fails to account for the multiple logics that constitute it—the alternative can’t solve.

Ettlinger 9 — Nancy Ettlinger, Associate Professor of Geography at the Ohio State University, 2009 (“Whose capitalism? Mean discourse and/or actions of the heart,” *Emotion, Space and Society*, Volume 2, Issue 2, December, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ScienceDirect)

Returning to the premise that the social, economic, cultural, and political are mutually embedded, ‘the economy’ is therefore sensible as a part of life that is connected inextricably with thoughts and feelings, power relations, and histories of experience. If every actor is engaged in navigating the interplay of economic, social, cultural, and political dynamics, and if each time-space context is unique in some way as a function of the time and space-specific confluence of events, then each act in the economy also will be unique in some way. This view connects with the epistemological principles of ascending analysis, which focuses on practices in the first instance to avoid casting them as deviations or outliers (and ultimately as inconsequential) if they lack consistency with general patterns. The particular configuration of diverse logics varies as each actor's past experience across time and space configures uniquely relative to a particular context (Ettlinger, 2004). Following this logic, the economy is constantly being constituted in myriad ways. Similar to Bruno Latour's (2005) point that ‘the social’ is not given but is a matter of continual assembly, so too ‘the economy’ – capitalism – is continually being assembled at the nexus of multiple logics that derive from social, political, economic, and cultural principles, and from a concatenation of thoughts and feelings or what conventionally is understood in binary terms as rationality and emotion. Accordingly, ‘the economy’ or ‘capitalism’ requires analysis of the range of ways in which it is constituted in daily life. Any singular discourse cannot possibly account for the variety of actions. How, then, has a mode of accounting for behavior based on the logic of a singular discourse developed?

#### This is a disadvantage to the alternative and a net-benefit to the permutation—vote affirmative to tap important resources within capitalism that give voice to the voiceless and contest ruthless calculation.

Ettlinger 9 — Nancy Ettlinger, Associate Professor of Geography at the Ohio State University, 2009 (“Whose capitalism? Mean discourse and/or actions of the heart,” *Emotion, Space and Society*, Volume 2, Issue 2, December, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ScienceDirect)

What requires problematization in accounts of behavior that focus on generalities is the notion of ‘dominance,’ which refers not to ‘majority’ in the numerical sense, but rather to those who hold power over others. It may well be that the capitalist drive to accumulate more and more capital explains the actions of those who control the most capital, but note that although these actors dominate, they nonetheless are in a (numerical) minority. This mode of accounting offers critical insights into problems of uneven power relations and processes of exploitation and oppression, but crucially, it lacks attention to the voices of actors who constitute the (numerical) majority. Are not all those actors who lack capital also part of the capitalist system? Are not all actors (in and outside the paid work force) in some way working and caring citizens who navigate life with a wide range of thoughts and feelings (Robinson, 2006), including but not limited to the logic of homo economicus?

Also lacking from conventional accounting is attention to different types of voices in the dominant, capitalist class – a homogenization that results in an ecological fallacy and re/produces a binary of we/they, good/bad that may overlook opportunities to tap important resources among those in positions of authority (Foucault, 1997).9 If research begins with the assumption that all voices ‘count,’ even those who seem inconsequential to a particular group or to society overall (Foucault, 2000d), then our mode of accounting requires giving voice to those who lack power over others. From this vantage point, ‘the economy’ unfolds in myriad ways, positively and negatively, through a wide range of actions that include ruthless calculation as much as caring practices ([Ahmed, 2004a], [Ahmed, 2004b], [Folbre, 2001] and [Sevenhuijsen, 2003]).

The separation of actions of the heart from the operation of the market is based on an approach to capitalism that focuses on discourse to the exclusion of wide-ranging capitalist practices, and relatedly, on those in power to the exclusion of those who lack power over others. Alternatively, and as argued, we might recognize “the diversity of actually existing markets”, and crucially, their significance as a political resource (Smith, 2005).