#### Look, the whole thesis of Marxist politics is that we need to embrace universal, totalizing perspectives indicates that they can’t solve the residual links because anything short of a wholesale rejection is a sellout. The threshold for a link only has to be infinitesimally small to warrant a TOTAL rejection of the aff’s political method—I’ll do that work now.

#### The 1AC's understanding of progress and power is disastrous - attempts to liberate transgendered individuals make the mistake of basing emancipation in localized, identity-based movements. Local politics, however, are just another manifestation of capitalism - the local is inevitably tied to and manipulated by global structures and swallowed up in the logic of consumption to ensure that the transgendered body would become a new target of markets and capitalist oppression. The aff would be coopted and redeployed to fracture resistance to capital.

Hennessy 2k Rosemary Hennessy, Professor of English and Director of the Center for the Study of Women, Gender, and Sexuality at Rice University, Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism, 2000, pp. 8-9, Questia

Late capitalism’s new economic, political, and cultural structures have also intensified the relationship between global and local situations. Global transnational corporations rely on localities of many sorts as sites for capital accumulation through production, marketing, and knowledgemaking. Global-localism has become both the paradigm of production and an explicit new strategy by which the corporation infiltrates various localities without forfeiting its global aims (Dirlik 34). From corporate headquarters, CEOs orchestrate the incorporation of particular localities into the demands of global capital at the same time that the corporation is domesticated into the local society. Thus it is in the interests of global capitalism to celebrate and enhance awareness of local communities, cultures, and forms of identification. But this cannot be done in a way that makes evident their exploitation, that is, in a way that makes visible the real material relationship between the global and the local (Dirlik 35). Against capitalism’s penetration of local communities, many “local” groups—indigenous people’s movements, ethnic and women’s organizations, lesbian, gay, and transgender rights movements—have presented themselves as potential sites for liberation struggles. Undoubtedly, these struggles have indeed accomplished changes that have enhanced the quality of life for countless people. But the celebration of “the local” as a self-defined space for the affirmation of cultural identity and the formation of political resistance often also play into late capitalism’s opportunistic use of local-izing—not just as an arrangement of production but also as a structure of knowing. The turn to “the local” has also been the characteristic talisman of a postmodern culture and politics that has repudiated the totalizing narratives of modernity. The claims of indigenous and ethnic groups, of women, and of lesbian and gay people have been an important part of postmodern challenges to the adequacy of cultural narratives—among them enlightened humanism and Eurocentric scholarship—that do not address the histories of subaltern peoples. However, insofar as their counter-narratives put forward an alternative that de-links the interests of particular social groups from the larger collective that they are part of, they tend to promote political projects that keep the structures of capitalism invisible.

#### Capital universalizes itself to swallow any possible outside from which the aff could construct a new identity—only the anonymous universality of the proletariat resists the logic of capital. This means only the alternative can solve the case.

Lissovoy ‘8

Noah De Lissovoy, “Dialectic of Emergency/Emergency of the Dialectic,” Capitalism Nature Socialism, vol. 19 iss. 1, pp. 27-40, 2008, 10.1080/10455750701859380

Without a true distinction between inside and outside, there is no inner space of pure truth, no undistorted essence that can be counterposed to a false or inauthentic surface. Instead, alienation can be seen as always already sealed into the very categories and fact of existence within capitalism rather than representing a mere distortion of human being or a subversion of an original wholeness. Thus, Moishe Postone argues that the categories of value and labor themselves are the necessary object of critique in Marxism-i.e., that what has to be critiqued is the totality of capital as ontology rather than simply the maldistribution of social goods or the experience of estrangement, which are its consequences. Postone gives a contemporary twist to the idea that identities do not preserve an inner authenticity against their incorporation by capital but become identities by virtue of this incorporation.29 On this basis, we can understand crisis not as an effect of the distance between a potential authenticity within the economies of self and society and the actual violation of this potential by capitalism, but rather as indicating the tentative intrusion into capital of the obscure forms of a social universe that lies beyond it, and which it cannot comprehend. This is the universe of human autonomy and democratic collectivity, which from the point of view of power can only show up as riot and refusal, or as the fraying and exhaustion of its own categories. This destabilization or interruption is connected to the threat posed by emerging global social movements. These movements are characterized not only by the assertion of rights of citizenship under national (or international) constitutions, nor (simply) by the demand by workers for a fair price for their labor power, but also by a challenge to the discursive framework of global politics. They represent the first flickers of the appearance of a form of life that is inconceivable and imperceptible within the present. The threat that such movements pose to power is that they begin to withdraw social content (actors, territories, forces) from the order of the real as it is organized, and so menace capital with an implosion of the space of its own meaning and possibility. For example, the indigenous movements that have emerged as the central historical force in Bolivia and elsewhere in Latin America represent the appearance of a subject that was not reckoned on, even as antagonist, in capital's imaginary. Capital can only blame itself for this surprise: in its drive to colonize every "periphery" and exploit distant and non-traditional sources of labor power, capital awakens forces and histories that are not reducible to the forms of class contradiction that it has learned to manage. These movements do not primarily threaten the legitimacy of power within the rational economy of communicative action; instead, they threaten the very intelligibility of capital and the universe that it materializes. This threat extends to the forms of identification available to subjects as they become "unmoor[ed]" from "traditional sources of identity" and are instead rearticulated on a global terrain.3

### AT: Perm

#### Marxism requires universalized classist theory—extend Tumino—any risk of a link overwhelms perm solvency by diluting its vision of society with ideological commitments to the status quo.

#### Ideological apologia for particular elements naturalize the system as a whole—social life shouldn’t have to survive by illusion

Cotter ’12 Jennifer Cotter, Assistant Professor of English at William Jewell College, “Bio-politics, Transspecies Love and/as Class Commons-Sense,” Red Critique, Winter/Spring 2012, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/biopoliticstransspeciesismandclasscommonssense.htm

I argue that biopolitics and transspecies posthumanism, in displacing "class" with "life," "production" with "reproduction," "labor" with "love," are affective and ultimately spiritualist understandings of material contradictions that articulate what Marx calls an "inverted world-consciousness." In "A Contribution to a Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right: Introduction," Marx critiques religion for the way in which it articulates an inverted world consciousness because, on the one hand, it is "an expression of and protest against real suffering" and, on the other hand, it provides an "illusory happiness" for "real suffering." By "illusory happiness" Marx means that religion provides an illusory resolution of the material contradictions of exploitation in capitalism that cause the "real suffering" to which religion is both an effect and a response. In this way, rather than providing a material solution to problems of social alienation whose origin are in material relations of production, religion ends up providing a "spiritual aroma" for capitalism that helps to ideologically blur material relations of class and culturally adjust exploited workers to ruling class interests. It is on this basis that Marx argues that "The call [to workers] to abandon illusions about their condition is the call to abandon a condition which requires illusions" (131). Biopolitics and transspecies posthumanism articulate the "spiritual aroma"—the cultural imaginary—of transnational capital now. They do so by putting forward a "common share" in the "immaterial" of a new "global" culture under capitalism in place of transformation of the material relations of production in capitalism and freedom from exploitation. In doing so they serve to naturalize the material relations of exploitation and culturally adjust the contemporary workforces to the needs of capitalism now. In this respect, bio-political and transspecies posthumanist theories of love are a continuation—in a new historical form—of updating the working class into a new morality. George Sampson, in his 1921 book on British national education, English for the English, provides a telling historical example of this practice in his comments on the role of teaching "English" literature and culture to the working-class: "Deny to working-class children any common share in the immaterial, and presently they will grow into the men who demand with menaces a communism of the material" (as qtd in Eagleton 21). To put this another way, the "common share" in the "immaterial" of "culture" for all, was proposed by representatives of ruling class interests, such as Sampson, in order to ideologically smooth over severe material contradictions which were leading British workers to increasingly call into question the basis of ruling class wealth in their own exploitation. More generally, moreover, these comments are symptomatic of the fact that it is in the material interests of capital to provide "immaterial" and "spiritual" resolutions to deflect attention away from the economic and at the same time maintain the cultural cohesion of social bonds that are necessitated by social relations of production founded on exploitation.

#### Our epistemology arguments mean there’s no net benefit to the perm—the flawed knowledge of the 1AC aren’t compatible with the alt’s revolutionary potential

#### Vacillation is a nuclear war DA to the perm

Herod ‘4 James Herod, World-Renowned Anarchist. Fourth Edition, January 2004. “Getting Free: A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it.” http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/index.htm

But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

#### Total enmity is key—the plan’s reformism kills revolutionary politics by giving capitalism a progressive face

Katz 2k Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” Pg. 127-128.

Virno does recognize the danger that a politics predicated upon Exodus, by downgrading the “absolute enmity” implicit in the traditional Marxist assumption that class struggle in its revolutionary form issues in civil war, leads to the assumption that one is “swimming with the current” or is be­ing driven “irresistibly forward” (1996, 203). A politics aimed at the estab­lishment of liberated zones within capitalism under the assumption that the state will wither away without actually being “smashed” leads to the problematic one sees over and over again in postmodern cultural studies: “doing what comes naturally” as radical praxis. To counter this, Virno re­defines the “unlimitedly reactive” “enmity” of the “Multitude” in terms of the “right to resistance” (206): What deserve to be defended at all costs are the works of “friendship.” Vio­lence is not geared to visions of some hypothetical tomorrow, but functions to ensure respect and a continued existence for things that were mapped out yesterday. It does not innovate, but acts to prolong things that are already there: the autonomous expressions of “acting-in-concert” that arise out of general intellect, organisms of non-representative democracy, forms of mu­tual protection and assistance (welfare, in short) that have emerged outside of and against the realm of State Administration. In other words, what we have here is a violence that is conservational (206). The decisiveness of the question of absolute enmity becomes clear if we ask a rather obvious question: What distinguishes autonomous expres­sions from any privatized space (say, Internet chat rooms) that withdraws from the common in the name of friendships, mutual aid, or, for that mat­ter, networks, gated communities, or whatever? In short, nothing can lead more directly to the death of revolutionary politics than the assumption that the days of absolute enmity are over. Autonomous expressions neces­sarily lead to the esoteric and the singular as the paths of least resistance. Therefore (as in all Left-Nietzscheanisms), they take as their main enemy the programmatic and the decidable, transforming liberation into a pri­vate, simulacral affair, regardless of their denunciations of capitalism. I will return to this issue in the next two chapters, but I want to conclude this discussion by stressing that only theory and action that establish spaces that bring the common out into the open—before an outside (theory and judgment) so as to make visible the concentrated political-economic force of the ruling class—can count as a genuinely “new” politics.

#### Fetishizing particularity dooms their project—the age of imperialism forces a choice between comprehensive Marxist history or opportunist myopia—the perm dissolves class solidarity

Lukács ’67 György Lukács, History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, trans. Rodney Livingstone, MIT Press: Cambridge, 1967, p. 29-30

Rosa Luxemburg's major work The Accumulation of Capital takes up the problem at this juncture after decades of vulgarised Marxism. The trivialisation of Marxism and its deflection into a bourgeois 'science' was expressed first, most clearly and frankly in Bernstein's Premises of Socialism. It is anything but an accident that the chapter in this book which begins with an onslaught on the dialectical method in the name of exact 'science' should end by branding Marx as a Blanquist. It is no accident because the moment you abandon the point of view of totality, you must also jettison the starting point and the goal, the assumptions and the requirements of the dialectical method. When this happens revolution will be understood not as part of a process but as an isolated act cut off from the general course of events. If that is so it must inevitably seem as if the revolutionary aspects of Marx are really just a relapse into the primitive period of the workers' movement, i.e. Blanquism. The whole system of Marxism stands and falls with the principle that revolution is the product of a point of view in which the category of totality is dominant. Even in its opportunism Bernstein's criticism is much too opportunistic for all the implications of this position to emerge clearly.2 But even though the opportunists sought above all to eradicate the notion of the dialectical course of history from Marxism, they could not evade its ineluctable consequences. The economic development of the imperialist age had made it progressively more difficult to believe in their pseudo-attacks on the capitalist system and in the 'scientific' analysis of isolated phenomena in the name of the 'objective and exact sciences'. It was not enough to declare a political commitment for or against capitalism. One had to declare ones theoretical commitment also. One had to choose; either to regard the whole history of society from a Marxist point of view, i.e. as a totality, and hence to come to grips with the phenomenon of imperialism in theory and practice. Or else to evade this confrontation by confining oneself to the analysis of isolated aspects in one or other of the special disciplines. The attitude that inspires monographs is the best way to place a screen before the problem the very sight of which strikes terror into the heart of a Social-Democratic movement turned opportunist. By discovering 'exact' descriptions for isolated areas and 'eternally valid laws' for specific cases they have blurred the differences separating imperialism from the preceding age. They found themselves in a capitalist society 'in general'-and its existence seemed to them to correspond to the nature of human reason, and the 'laws of nature' every bit as much as it had seemed to Ricardo and his successors, the bourgeois vulgar economists.

#### It’s already too late, we need to strike out at the enemy even in the times when the enemy can be of use to us. Even if they win a net-benefit you vote negative

Zizek ‘4 Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 2004. Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle, p. 83-84

There is a will to accomplish the ‘leap of faith’ and step outside the global circuit at work here, a will which was expressed in an extreme and terrifying manner in a well-known incident from the Vietnam War: after the US Army occupied a local village, their doctors vaccinated the children on the left arm in order to demonstrate their humanitarian care; when, the day after, the village was retaken by the Vietcong, they cut off the left arms of all the vaccinated children. .. . Although it is difficult to sustain as a literal model to follow, this complete rejection of the enemy precisely in its caring ‘humanitarian’ aspect, no matter what the cost, has to be endorsed in its basic intention. In a similar way, when Sendero Luminoso took over a village, they did not focus on killing the soldiers or policemen stationed there, but more on the UN or US agricultural consultants or health workers trying to help the local peasants after lecturing them for hours, and then forcing them to confess their complicity with imperialism pub­licly, they shot them. Brutal as this procedure was, it was rooted in an acute insight: they, not the police or the army, were the true danger, the enemy at its most perfidious, since they were ‘lying in the guise of truth’ — the more they were ‘innocent’ (they ‘really’ tried to help the peasants), the more they served as a tool of the USA. It is only such a blow against the enemy at [their]his best, at the point where the enemy ‘indeed helps us’, that displays true revolutionary autonomy and ‘sovereignty (to use this term in its Bataillean sense). If one adopts the attitude of ‘let us take from the enemy what is good, and reject or even fight against what is bad’, one is already caught in the liberal trap of ‘humanitarian aid’.

#### If we win that any part of their action is local, micropolitical or focused on identity and culture then the perm is impossible, the act of the aff is to place individuals outside the realm of a Marxist K – the two are diametrically opposed.

Katz 2k Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” Pg. 30.

I therefore bring Marxism into confrontation with postmodern cultural studies as a new and increasingly dominant form of liberalism, one that reworks and restores the classical liberal categories of free subjectivity, ex­perience as the source of truth and legitimacy, the nontotalizability of so­ciety, and politics as dialogue. It reworks and restores them under specifi­cally late-capitalist conditions, in which the public regulation of the reproduction of labor power has placed the possibility for a political form outside of capitalism directly on the logics of socialization and public for­malizations and in which the unprecedentedly rapid and aggressive glob­alization of the commodity form and wage labor have both undermined previous bases for internationalism while making it an immediate neces­sity. It will be noticed that I don’t refer to the “explosion” of culture and its infiltration into economics and politics as a defining feature of late cap­italism (or postmodernism). This is because part of my interest in this book is to open some distance from the notion of culture as a cause—pre­cisely because, as I point out throughout the book, culture generally functions in contemporary Left discourses and in cultural studies in particular as the sign for the very absence of cause.

### 2NC—Impact OV

#### Capitalism is driven to crisis by the contradiction between competing individual interests and finite resources—that’s Foster

#### Results in desperate energy imperialism—rising production costs risk irrational escalation to nuclear conflict

#### Destroys the environment—short term profit trumps long term ecology—causes rampant pollution, species extinction, and climate change

#### Our turns case args are prior to the advantages—extend Tumino—flawed method reproduces social antagonisms and crises nullifying the long-term effects of the plan—prefer theoretical coherency over stop-gap fixes.

#### Gender is the ideological superstructure…Turns their rhetoric arguments.

#### Ethical obligation to reject capital—economic calculus understates its destructive power

Daly ‘4 Glyn Daly, senior lecturer in politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College Northampton, Conversations With Zizek, 2004, pp. 14-16

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord­ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subju­gated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties con­cerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of im­plicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibi­tion conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a uni­versal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its out­comes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diver­sity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and name­less (viz, the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’. And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is mag­nified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differ­ential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sus­tained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par­ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### Material-ideological structures determine their intellectual conclusions—they remain bound to this myth of a liberal subject who can choose their identity and who is fluid and postmodern: This reproduces quick-fixed of the system without any kind of actual change in the material structure of a society. This is why materialism has to come before rhetoric.

Amin ‘4 Samir Amin, director of the Third World Forum in Senegal, 2004, The Liberal Virus, pg. 40-2

Pauperization is inseparable from polarization on the world scale, an inherent result of the expansion of really-existing capi­talism, which is imperialist by nature. Pauperization of the urban popular classes is closely linked to developments of which the peasant societies of the Third World are victims. The subjection of the latter to the requirements of the expansion of capitalist markets maintains new forms of social polarization which exclude a growing proportion of the peasantry from access to the land. These recently poor or landless peasants fuel the migration toward the shantytowns, more than any demographic growth. All these phenomena are going to worsen as long as lib­eral dogmas are not called into question and any corrective poli­cy, in this context, would not be able to stop the trend. Pauperization challenges both economic theory and the strategies for social struggle. Conventional vulgar economic the­ory evades the real questions posed by the expansion of capital­ism. It substitutes the construction of a theory of an imaginary capitalism for the analysis of really-existing capitalism. This imaginary capitalism is conceived as a simple and continual extension of exchange relations (“the market”) while the system actually functions and is reproduced on the basis of capitalist relations of production and exchange (not simple commodity relations). This theory then easily makes the assumption that “the market” by itself is self-regulating and produces a social optimum—an assumption that is supported neither by history nor rational argument. “Poverty” can thus be explained only by causes decreed to be external to economic logic, such as demog­raphy or policy “errors.” Its relationship to the logic of capitalist accumulation is removed from theoretical reflection. Now this liberal virus, which pollutes contemporary social thought and eliminates the capacity to understand the world, let alone to transform it, has profoundly penetrated the whole of the “historical left” formed in the aftermath of the Second World War. The movements engaged at the present time in social struggles for “another world” (a better one) and an alternative globalization will only be able to produce significant social advances if they get rid of this virus in order to begin an authen­tic theoretical debate again. As long as they do not rid them­selves of this virus, even the best intentioned social movements will remain enclosed in the iron grip of an unchallenged concep­tion and, consequently, prisoners of ineffective propositions about “corrective” measures, such as those

#### Their ideology ends in extinction—social problems are depoliticized as we quickly move to try and adjust ourselves without changing the material coordinates of a society: The fact is that capitalism is founded on a system of exclusion and hierarchy which justifies oppression against the other, in this case transgendered bodies, in the first place: The threat of a looming extinction is actualized at the end of capitalism.

Santos ‘3 Boaventura de Sousa Santos, professor of sociology at the School of Economics at the University of Coimbra and Distinguished Legal Scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School and Global Legal Scholar at the University of Warwick, "Collective Suicide?" Bad Subjects, Issue #63, April 2003, accessed 1/28/10 http://bad.eserver.org/issues/2003/63/santos.html

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was under Stalinism, with the Gulag, and under Nazism, with the Holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the Western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality, and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultraconservative in that it aims to reproduce infinitely the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the state and international institutions in their favor. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other.

### Alternative.

#### Vote negative for classist politics—extend Tumino—the ballot affirms communism as a historical necessity. Our historical method is essential for radicalism—universal classism provides a revolutionary program for invigorating class consciousness and identifying a telos for action

#### This is a prior question to specific paths of attack—theory is a prerequisite because we have to understand the system’s weaknesses to resist it and construct suitable alternatives

#### If communism appears dead, we should rescesitate it in an affirmation of universality—orthodox critique decimates the structural support for capitalism

Žižek ‘9 Slavoj Žižek, First as Tragedy, Then as Farce, Verso: London, 2009, p. p. 6-7

What the book offers is not a neutral analysis but an engaged and extremely "partial" one-for truth is partial, accessible only when one takes sides, and is no less universal for this reason. The side taken here is, of course, that of communism. Adorno begins his Three Studies on Hegel with a rebuttal of the traditional question about Hegel exemplified by the title of Benedetto Croce's book What Is Living and What Is Dead in the Philosophy of Hegel? Such a question presupposes, on the part of the author, the adoption of an arrogant position as judge of the past; but when we are dealing with a truly great philosopher the real question to be raised concerns not what this philosopher may still tell us, what he may still mean to us, but rather the opposite, namely, what we are, what our contemporary situation might be, in his eyes, how our epoch would appear to his thought. And the same should apply to communism-instead of asking the obvious question "Is the idea of communism still pertinent today, can it still be used as a tool of analysis and political practise? " one should ask the opposite question: "How does our predicament today look from the perspective of the communist idea?" Therein resides the dialectic of the Old and the New: it is those who propose the constant creation of new terms ("postmodern society:' "risk society:' "informational society:' "postindustrial society:' etc. ) in order to grasp what is going on today who miss the contours of what is actually New. The only way to grasp the true novelty of the New is to analyze the world through the lenses of what was "eternal" in the Old. If communism really is an "eternal" Idea, then it works as a Hegelian "concrete universality": it is eternal not in the sense of a series of abstract-universal features that may be applied everywhere, but in the sense that it has to be re-invented in each new historical situation. In the good old days of Really Existing Socialism, a joke popular among dissidents was used to illustrate the futility of their protests. In the fifteenth century, when Russia was occupied by Mongols, a peasant and his wife were walking along a dusty country road; a Mongol warrior on a horse stopped at their side and told the peasant he would now proceed to rape his wife; he then added: "But since there is a lot of dust on the ground, you must hold my testicles while I rape your wife, so that they will not get dirty!" Once the Mongol had done the deed and ridden away, the peasant started laughing and jumping with joy. His surprised wife asked: "How can you be jumping with joy when I was just brutally raped in your presence?" The farmer answered: "But I got him! His balls are covered with dust!" This sad joke reveals the predicament of the dissidents: they thought they were dealing serious blows to the party nomenklatura, but al they were doing was slightly soiling the nomenklatura's testicles, while the ruling elite carried on raping the people . .. Is today's critical Left not in a similar position? (Among the contemporary names for ever-so-slightly smearing those in power, we could list "deconstruction;' or the "protection of individual freedoms:') In a famous confrontation at the university of Salamanca in 1936, Miguel de Unamuno quipped at the Francoists: "Vencereis, pero no convencereis" ("You will win, but you will not convince")-is this all that today's Left can say to triumphant global capitalism? Is the Left predestined to continue to play the role of those who, on the contrary, convince but nevertheless still lose (and are especially convincing in retroactively explaining the reasons for their own failure)? Our task is to discover how to go a step further. Our Thesis 11 should be: in our societies, critical Leftists have hitherto only succeeded in soiling those in power, whereas the real point is to castrate them .. . But how can we do this? We should learn here from the failures of twentieth century Leftist politics. The task is not to conduct the castration in a direct climactic confrontation, but to undermine those in power with patient ideologico-critical work, so that although they are still in power, one all of a sudden notices that the powers-that-be are afflicted with unnaturally high-pitched voices. Back in the 1960s, Lacan named the irregular short-lived periodical of his school Scilicet-the message was not the word's predominant meaning today ("namely; "to wit;' "that is to say"), but literally "it is permitted to know.' (To know what?-what the Freudian School of Paris thinks about the unconscious . . .) Today, our message should be the same: it is permitted to know and to fully engage in communism, to again act in full fidelity to the communist Idea. Liberal permissiveness is of the order of videlicet-it is permitted to see, but the very fascination with the obscenity we are allowed to observe prevents us from knowing what it is that we see.

### Framework

#### Your decision is not between competing policy options, but historical outlooks—extend Tumino—dialectical materialism is best:

#### Primacy—life is determined by wealth—our experiences are ordered by the economic conditions we are born into. States of conscious are intelligible only through their prior causes—the aff is futile without prior theorization of social totality because it overlooks the systemic necessity of their impacts

#### Universality—totalizing theory is most productive—allows for inclusive coalition-building to resist structures of power—particularisms cause internal dissent which quashes political potency—DA to the perm

#### Ideology—capital imposes epistemic blind-spots which bankrupts their decision-making—causes us to dismiss radicalism and submit to the confines of the status quo—their impacts are propaganda that should be ignored. Only dialectical critique allows for the production of truly objective knowledge. THEIR FOCUS ON IDENTITY IS PART OF THE IDEOLOGICAL SUPERSTRUCTURE THAT CONVINCES US THAT THE MATERIAL CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY IS OKAY THE ONLY PROBLEM LIES IN OTHER PEOPLE’S PERCEPTIONS OF MY IDENTITY. Even if they win that you should default to rhetorical analysis you should still interpret their rhetoric in the context of materialist politics because that’s the only way to make sense of what they are saying—words mean nothing without a material base: No signifier without a signified. Any impact to cap is a disad to their framework.

#### This is comparatively superior to their framework:

#### Economic efficiency is the enabling principle for patriarchy—only Marxism targets the originary coordinates of social inequality necessary to realize feminist concerns. Identity-based critique divides the oppressed into secondary categories which are then subsumed within capitalist hegemony—only the alt generates a unified front against inequality
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Thus, given the economically secured extraction of surplus-labour and the corresponding mode of political decision making under the private capitalist order of social metabolic reproduction, there can be absolutely no room in it for the feminist agenda of substantive equality which would require a radical restructuring of both the constitutive cells and the overall structural framework of the established system. No one in their right mind could even dream about instituting such changes through the political machinery of the capitalist order, in no matter how high an office, without exposing themselves to the danger of being labelled female Don Quixotes. There is no danger of introducing the feminist agenda even by surprise in capitalist systems, since there can be no room at all for it in the strictly circumscribed framework of political decision making destined to the role of facilitating the most efficient economic extraction of surplus-labour. Thus it is by no means accidental that the Indhira Gandhis, Margaret Thatchers and Mrs Bandaranaikes of this world -and the last one despite her original radical left credentials -did not advance in the slightest the cause of women's emancipation; if anything, quite the opposite. The situation is very different in the postcapitalist systems of social metabolic reproduction and political decision making. For, in virtue of their key position in securing the required continuity of surplus-labour extraction, they can initiate wholesale changes in the ongoing reproduction process through direct political intervention. Thus the determination of the political personnel is of a very different order here, in that its potential orientation is in principle much more open than under capitalism. For notwithstanding the mythology of the 'open Society’ (propagandized by authoritarian enemies like Hayek and Popper), under capitalism the objectives and mechanisms of 'market society' remain unreliable taboos, strictly delineating the mandate and the unquestioning orientation of the political personnel who cannot and would not contemplate seriously interfering with the established economic extraction of surplus-labour; not even in its socialdemocratic embodiment. This difference in potential openness in the two systems creates in principle also a space for introducing elements of the feminist agenda, as indeed the shortlived postrevolutionary attempts testify to it in Russia. However, the potential openness cannot be actualized on a lasting basis under the postcapitalist rule of capital, since the hierarchically managed extraction of surplus-labour reasserts itself as the crucial determining characteristic of the social metabolism also under the changed circumstances. Thus the whole question of political mandate must be suitably redefined, nullifying the possibility of both 'representation' (characteristic of the capitalist parliamentary setup, with the totally unquestioning mandate of the representatives towards the established economic mode of surplus-labour extraction and capital accumulation) and 'delegation',