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#### In our constant state of emergency, traditional nation-states cannot maintain control. The current global system is the Empire, which transcends borders to territorialize the collective, or multitude, in every aspect of life for its profit through the merging of economic production and politics. Multinational corporations like IB market their products with a focus on global applicability and manipulate laws for more schools to buy in. The university is also a site for the accumulation of such capital by reorienting intellectual labor and exchange value in the “brain drain”. Page 07
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“Biopower is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it, and rearticulating it” (Hardt and Negri, 2003, p. 3-4). Power from this perspective is able to control the mind and body and since it is able to control entire bodies then it extends to groups of bodies or rather, the society. This relates back to the idea of a control society because every “body” in the society is controlled at the deepest, darkest levels then society, which is composed of the controlled bodies, is able to be controlled. Hardt and Negri continue with the idea of control with: “Biopower thus refers to a situation in which what is directly at stake in power is the production and reproduction of life itself” (2000, p. 24). Once life is controlled from the inside then the reproduction of it is easy to control because the same life will be reproduced with the same type of control as before. All throughout society there is evidence of economics and politics and the ability of these to affect our lives is becoming increasing apparent. “In Empire and its regime of biopower, economic production and political constitution tend increasingly to coincide” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 41). All major political parties around the world address economic issues in their platforms and it is through this constant merging that Empire is able to gain such a strong amount of control over society. Hardt and Negri go to extensive lengths to explain how traditional Marxism by itself is no longer relevant in Empire. Marx’s proletariat was a stationary body of workers who could join together in a union and fight for their rights and justice. In Empire, the proletariat is mobile and much of the labor they produce is immaterial. Marx used a mole to describe how the proletariat could be successful in fighting for their rights. Hardt and Negri suggest that in Empire Marx’s mole needs to transform into a snake if the proletariat is to be successful in their fight (Hardt & Negri, 2000). One of the interesting and possibly confusing parts to understand about Empire is that the proletariat wanted unity of the world’s workers and Empire is a result of that unity. Hardt and Negri explain: “Rather, proletarian internationlism was antinationalist, and hence supranational and global. Workers of the world unite! – not on the basis of national identities but directly through common needs and desires, without regard to borders and boundaries” (2000, p. 49). We must remember that one of the foundations of Empire is there are no boundaries or borders and unity can be viewed on every level. In Empire the proletariat cannot be exempt because it must be exploited. The idea that labor is only associated with that of factory workers is quickly changing. As Hardt and Negri explain: “The central role previously occupied by the labor power of mass factory workers in the production of surplus value is today increasingly filled by intellectual, immaterial, and communicative labor” (2000, p. 29). One of the major changes in many countries today is there are industries that only provide services the workers in these service industries to do not produce an actual product, rather they just provide a service. This is a major change that can be seen in nation-states around the world, if you have a Dell computer in the U.S. and need technical support then you will most likely speak to a technician in a call center in India. The telecommunications industry has played a major part in globalization and also in the creation of Empire. Hardt and Negri explain the importance of this industry with: “Today information and communication have come to play a foundational role in production processes” (2000, p. 289). The impact of the telecommunications industry is easily observed but what must be observed is the created desire and need for these industries and the electronics they produce. The need and desires is what corporations create[d] through marketing. Marketing techniques are used to create the “I’ve got to have that” mentality. However, the marketing tactics that are used are clearly poststructuralist. “Marketing itself is a practice based on differences, and the more differences that are given, the more marketing strategies can be developed” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 152). This difference is clearly seen in target groups that are attacked by marketing companies, while one person of a certain age and gender might not become “hooked” on the campaign, someone that is different will. The marketing industry helps trans-national corporations become more profitable, and every successful corporation has a marketing department or a marketing company on the payroll. The role of corporations is of a great importance in Empire. There are no more local, regional, or national large corporations instead there are trans-national corporations. In order for a corporation to be considered successful it must have a global market and it must have influence over people in different areas of the world. These new corporations have no borders and they also have no allegiance to individual nation-states. One of the most important aspects of these corporations is their ability to market their product. It is through this marketing that people are controlled and kept in place. Labor helps these corporations because of the mobile workforce that is now available, a company can have a factory anywhere and the workers will migrate to this area. However, it is not only the workers that are migrating: “Along with the flight from so- called Third World there are flows of political refugees and transfers of intellectual labor power, in addition to the massive movements of agricultural, manufacturing, and service proletariat” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 213). The migration of intellectuals is easily to observe[d] by simply visiting any large hospital or university. Empire demands not only those who physically toil with their hands to migrate and find better employment [for] but also those who are considered intellectuals.

#### The spatially and temporally indeterminate powers of Empire make fighting against it a prima facie burden. Academia is structured by capitalism; the affirmation of the unjustness of the project endorses the discussion and is the only ethical way to subvert the system - I control uniqueness. Hardt and Negri 2k
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This is when the ontological drama begins, when the curtain goes up on a scene in which the development of Empire becomes its own critique and its process of construction becomes the process of its overturning. This drama is ontological in the sense that here, in these processes, being is produced and reproduced. This drama will have to be clarified and articulated much further as our study proceeds, but we should insist right from the outset that this is not simply another variant of dialectical enlightenment. We are not proposing the umpteenth version of the inevitable passage through purgatory (here in the guise of the new imperial machine) in order to offer a glimmer of hope for radiant futures. We are not repeating the schema of an ideal teleology that justifies any passage in the name of a promised end. On the contrary, our reasoning here is based on two methodological approaches that are intended to be nondialectical and absolutely immanent: the first is critical and decor:- structive, aiming to subvert the hegemonic languages and social structures and thereby reveal an alternative ontological basis that resides in the creative and productive practices of the multitude; the second is constructive and ethico-political, seeking to lead the pro-cesses of the production of subjectivity toward the constitution of an effective social, political alternative, a new constituent power.6 Our critical approach addresses the need for a real ideological and material deconstruction of the imperial order. In the postmod-ern world, the ruling spectacle of Empire is constructed through a variety of self-legitimating discourses and structures. Long ago au-thors as diverse as Lenin, Horkheimer and Adorno, and Debord recognized this spectacle as the destiny of triumphant capitalism. Despite their important differences, such authors offer us real antici-pations of the path of capitalist development.' Our deconstruction of this spectacle cannot be textual alone, but must seek continually to focus its powers on the nature of events and the real determina-tions of the imperial processes in motion today. The critical approach is thus intended to ~~bring to light~~ the contradictions, cycles, and crises of the process because in each of these moments the imagined necessity of the historical development can open toward alternative possibilities. In other words, the deconstruction of the historia rerum gestarum, of the spectral reign of globalized capitalism, reveals the possibility of alternative social organizations. This is perhaps as far as we can go with the method ological scaffolding of a critical and materialist deconstructionism—but this is already an enormous contribution!8 This is where the first methodological approach has to pass the baton to the second, the constructive and ethico-political approach. Here we must delve into the ontological substrate of the concrete alternatives continually pushed forward by the res gestae, the subjec-tive forces acting in the historical context. 'What appears here is not a new rationality but a new scenario of different rational acts—a horizon of activities, resistances, wills, and desires that refuse the hegemonic order, propose lines of flight, and forge alternative con-stitutive itineraries. This real substrate, open to critique, revised by the ethico-political approach, represents the real ontological referent of philosophy, or really the field proper to a philosophy of liberation. This approach breaks methodologically with every philosophy of history insofar as it refuses any deterministic conception of historical development and any "rational" celebration of the result[s]. It demon-strates, on the contrary, how the historical event resides in potential-ity. "It is not the two that recompose in one, but the one that opens into two," according to the beautiful anti-Confucian (and anti-Platonic) formula of the Chinese revolutionaries.' Philosophy is [does] not the owl of Minerva that takes flight after history has been realized in order to celebrate its happy ending; rather, philosophy is subjective proposition, desire, and praxis that are applied to the event.

#### Thus, the standard and role of the ballot is to dismantle the Empire. Prefer additionally—

#### A] Modern-day capitalism separates the consumer from the exploitation necessary for the production of their goods: Natives die from pollution issues mining metals for smartboards, but you don’t care because you’re more concerned with getting a new phone. Any calculus under communicative capital is already epistemologically skewed. Only our method divorces from Western imperialism to explain a variety of “invisible” violence - the coding of different bodies, climate change, *and* why schools are getting defunded. Passavant & Dean 04.
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One task of any reformism is to limit the violence and destruction wrought by the ruling powers and to create effective mechanisms for social protection. But before constructing weapons of self-defense and effective counterpowers, before any call to arms, we need to bring out into daylight the contemporary forms of violence and recognize how people are already struggling against them. When Carl von Clausewitz writes about the fog of war he is trying to cap- ture the uncertainty of military enterprises and the inability of commanders and combatants in the field of battle to gauge clearly the relations of force.7 There is another fog of war, though, an ideological fog that clouds myriad forms of violence, making them all but invisible to external observers, and even sometimes to those who suffer them. Some extreme forms of violence, spectacular acts of brutality,of course, rise high above the fog,and no doubt,we must denounce them. But don’t focus too much on exceptional events. We need to confront all forms of violence: civil wars, imperial wars, race wars, the violence of armies and militias, abuses of the police, rapists and wars on women, attacks on LGBTQ people, terroristic attacks of white supremacy and Islamic fundamentalisms, violence of capitalist finance, incarceration, ecological degradation, and the list goes on.We need to train our vision to see also and, especially, down in the fog, to reveal the daily, systematic and sys- temic, unspectacular forms of violence, what Slavoj Žižek calls the objective violence of the dominant systems of power, which sometimes appears as perpetrator-less crimes.8 Down in the fog is where the real battles must be fought.9 Indignation is a first step toward finding adequate modes of resistance. Art and activism often go hand in hand to reveal and protest violence and war. In the center of Picasso’s Guernica a woman cranes her neck out the window and holds a lamp to illuminate the destruction and suffering. In some respects documentary film has today become the central art form of indignation. Indignation, however, is not merely a victim’s cry, a weapon of the weak. Our hypothesis that power always comes second means that power acts to block the development of free subjectivities: the violence of power is aimed at con- taining and undermining the potential of those who resist and struggle for their own freedom. Indignation is a first expression of strength.10 But indignation is not enough. To disarm the perpetrators we need to forge new weapons.The critique of violence requires, in other words, cre- ating new counterpowers. And even that is not enough. Resistance must contribute to the constitution of new subjectivities, to the project of their liberation.We will take up this argument in chapter 15 but here let us attempt a (admittedly partial and schematic) catalogue of some of the axes of violence seen and unseen that plague our societies, along with some of the emerg- ing struggles against them.11 From the standpoint of these struggles begin to emerge the transversal lines of coalition that we can construct across these different domains and across national boundaries. Building coalitions in an intersectional and international framework is the first step toward creating counterpowers.12 Criminal acts of police brutality against black people in the United States, including Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Freddie Gray, Tamir Rice, Philando Castile, and so many others, have recently taken center stage. But police bru- tality against black men and women in the United States, of course, is not new; what is new are the widespread technologies, such as video cameras in phones, that allow it to be seen and the outcry that has made it the object of mass indignation. And police violence against people of color is not by any means limited to North America. “We have a Ferguson every day,” claims Ignacio Cano, referring to police killings of black men in Brazil’s favelas.13 Certainly the perpetrators of all these deaths should be held to account. But equally important battles are further down in the fog.We need to train our eyes not only and maybe not even primarily on police brutality (as an excep- tional event) or even on the police culture of impunity that makes such acts of brutality possible but also on the normal and daily violence of the police together with the courts and carceral systems.14 Traffic stops, drug arrests, un- equal sentencing, the routine violence of the prison, housing policies, racially divided education systems—these are some of the scenes of racial violence from which we need to clear away the fog. Generating indignation against the silent institutionalized racism is one important aim of contemporary forms of antiracist activism. Black Lives Matter, the BlackOUT Collective, and the Movement for Black Lives are some of the activist organizations in the United States already constructing paths in this direction.15

#### B] Collectivization—follow the line of flight inside the undercommons of the University—even if academia isn’t ultimately perfect, the University is a site of potential to disrupt western knowledge production. We can’t truly step outside of the neoliberal economy of desire, we can harness affective intensities to embrace new modes of constituent power
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We see the 3E as a kind of intensifier of modes of thinking and living dedicated to inventing ways that we can continue to learn together, regardless of our age, background, or learning style. We don’t see it as an opposite to the university; we see it as a parasite. You could put the emphasis on the site: a para-site, a para-institution that maintains relations with the institution of the university but operates by a different logic.

It would be very naive of us to think you could just walk out of capitalism. We’re not that naive. Neoliberalism is our natural environment. We therefore operate with what we call strategic duplicity. This involves recognizing what works in the systems we work against. Which means: We don’t just oppose them head on. We work with them, strategically, while nurturing an alien logic that moves in very different directions. One of the things we know that the university does well is that it attracts really interesting people. The university can facilitate meetings that can change lives. But systemically, it fails. And the systemic failure is getting more and more acute. And so what we imagine is that the Institute, assisted by the 3E Process Seed Bank, will create a new space that might overlap with some of the things the university does well, without being a part of it (or being subsumed by its logic).

MASSUMI.— Going back to the question of value, we want to create an economy around the platform that does not follow any of the usual economic principles. There will be no individual ownership or shares. There will be no units of account, no currency or tokens used internally. The model of activity will not be transactional. Individual interest will not be used as an incentivizer. What there will be is a complex space of relation for people to create intensities of experience together, in emergent excess over what they could have created working separately, or in traditional teams. It’s meant to be self-organizing, with no separate administrative structure or hierarchy, and even no formal decision-making rules. It’s anarchistic in that sense, but through mobilizing a surplus of organizing potential, rather than lacking organization. You could also call it communistic, in the sense that there is no individual value holding. Everything is common.

MANNING.— Undercommon.

MASSUMI.— Yes, undercommonly. The undercommons is Fred Moten and Stefano Harney’s word for emergent collectivity, which is one of our inspirations. We want to foster emergence and process, but at the same time find ways of making it sustainable. That means that the strategic duplicity has to extend to the economy as we currently know it. We have to be parasitical to the capitalist economy, while operating according to a logic that is totally alien to it.

What we’re thinking of is making the collaborative process moving through the platform function according to the radically anti-capitalist principles we were just talking about, centering on the collective production of surplus values of life, and separating that from the dominant economy by a membrane. A membrane creates a separation, but at the same time allows for movements across. It has a certain porosity. The idea is that we would find ways, associated with the affect-o-meter we were describing earlier, to register qualitative shifts in the creative process as it moves over its formative thresholds, and moves back and forth between online operations and offline events. What would be registered is the affective intensity of the production of surplus value of life, its ebbs and flows. The membrane would consist in a translation of those qualitative flows into a numerical expression, which would feed into a cryptocurrency. Basically, we’d be mining crypto with collaborative creative energies—monetizing emergent collectivity. The currency would be “backed” by the confidence we could build in our ability to keep the creative process going and spin it off into other projects, as evidenced by the activities of the Three Ecologies Institute as an experiment in alter-education.

On the side of the membrane facing the monetary economy, we would be producing a recognizable, quantifiable movement of value. But the membrane would shelter the creative process going on inside the platform from being colonized by that logic. We’d try to have the best of both worlds. It would be essential that the currency not be just a speculative vehicle that joins the crowd of coins. Our economic space would have to inhabit an ecology of other economic spaces experimenting with adapting blockchain and post-blockchain autonomous organization to cooperative endeavors. The key, once again, is finding workable solutions to the problem of how to use qualitative analysis to register movements of creative intensity—how to coax numbers into an alliance with qualities of experience. There is a new concept being developed by Nora Bateson that she calls “warm data” that has a similar goal, in relation to basic science, that we’d like to hook into.

MARC.— You want to use blockchain to create a parasitic economy that reappropriates speculative finance to generate profit from collaborative events. You are working within the immaterial level that the movement to occupy public spaces only gestured at, and uses the collaborative spirit common to any movement. Do you consider yourself to be “occupying” the abstract?

MANNING.— If we’re “occupying an abstraction,” we’re doing it in a way that is extraterritorial. All of this is a thought experiment that we want to help sow, but needs to be continued by others, and with others. It will be interesting if it manages to produce process seeds that get away from us and end up going beyond anything that we could have imagined. I’m not sure what Brian would say, but my feeling is that if we’re occupying anything, it’s the imagination. The postcapitalist imagination.

MASSUMI.— Another way of saying it is that we are talking about creating what’s often been called a temporary autonomous zone, but recognizing that we’re all complicit with capital, and not pretending we can just step outside that and go our merry way. If you do that, you only end up carrying unexamined presuppositions with you, and everything breaks down. We want to work from and with that complicity, using strategic duplicity. That doesn’t mean being deceptive. It means working in two registers at once.

We want to create a temporary autonomous zone (TAZ), following anarcho-communist logic, while at the same time being able to articulate it to the existing neoliberal economy, because like it or not, those are the conditions under which we live, and its grip is so tentacular, reaching not only all around us but inside of us, that you have to work hard and with great technique to start loosening the grip. You have to find ways of inhabiting the present, while setting off sparks of futurity that prefigure a postcapitalist world to come. So it’s an occupation in the sense that it’s a cohabitation. The TAZ isn’t a world apart. It’s a pore in the world as it is, in which something else can grow. It’s a relational space that you can enter without the conceit that you’re leaving the existing world. It starts by supplementing, rather than purporting to replace right away. Hopefully that supplementation grows and takes more and more of our cohabitation in, to the point that it can rival the dominant economy.

#### I defend: Resolved: In the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions as a method of constituent power in revolting against the empire. Neg should check in cross-ex, there’s infinite things I violate w bidirectional T. Page 4.
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Standardized testing needs to STOP! When standardized testing is implemented teachers are left teaching to a test because they and their schools are graded according to these scores. Standardized tests have done more damage to education than any other movement. The only things standardized testing has done is make publishing companies richer and single out those who live in poor areas of the U.S. The World Bank also uses standardized testing in order to promote capitalism to poor countries and this must also be stopped. We must concentrate on using, as Deleuze suggests, AND. Our students need to become comfortable with seeing more than one answer for a question. Hopefully they can see numerous possibilities. Educators need to organize and protests against standardized testing and become vocal in their disapproval at the national and international levels.

#### Standardized tests kill the potential for students to cultivate liberation strategies by redirecting the conversation towards the complacency of having a “safe job”. The humanities lose more and more as students are told those aren’t “real industries” and are taught to become beings whose purpose is to only produce value for invisible corporations. Page 4
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I do believe there is a way in which we can begin educating for the multitude and that is to follow the path set forth by Paulo Freire; Critical Pedagogy. The overwhelming majority of education in the world is based on banking education. Bureaucrats at the international, federal, and state levels create a curriculum and expect teachers to follow it closely and the students are expected to sit like mindless lemmings and absorb the knowledge. Paulo Freire described banking education as a process in which the teacher decides everything and controls everything. Today, I do not think we are dealing with the problem of the teacher controlling everything, I believe that it is Empire that is able to control education. By using standardized tests, Empire is able to control[s] the content students are taught. This is not just done in the U.S. but also [and] around the world. The World Bank, with the OECD, us[ing]es standardized tests to measure the education levels in developing countries. As I presented earlier, the World Bank is only interested in education that supports a knowledge economy, which is what trans-national corporations’ desire. Trans-national corporations are able to control education because they promote themselves as the future employers of the students. With this amount of control international institutions can ensur[ing]e that educational systems around the world do not produce students who [do not] will question the power of Empire. By using a form of banking education nomads will never be able to develop. If nomads are not able to form then there is no hope for the multitude to form. Teachers need to develop a deeper understanding of Freire’s problem-posing education. There is no doubt that there are numerous problems in the world that our students are aware of and there are many more that teachers can introduce to students. ~~Viewing~~ [thinking] standards and curriculum as something that students must learn to be knowledgeable of is nothing more than an indoctrination into the prevailing mindset of those controlled by Empire. Freire put forth the idea of education [is] being the most important aspect for the liberation of the peasants in Brazil and we need to follow in his footsteps and liberate our students from the control of Empire. However, most teachers will not deviate from teaching the set curriculum because of fear of loosing their job. I believe there are opportunities for teachers to use problem-posing education and still stay within state, federal, and/or international guidelines. One of the most important aspects of attempting to use Critical Pedagogy is for the students to be in charge of the content they are taught, they must have a voice.

They continue

If given the choice, students would choose to discuss issues that are important to them and they will want to learn about the world they see. The idea of students choosing the content of a lesson is something that can be implemented today in any classroom in the world. Since most teachers are forced to teach towards a date where the students will take standardized tests they are left with several weeks of nothing to do at the end of the year. This small amount of time in the school year is where teachers have the ability to make a concerted effort to change the world. Instead of showing movies and having students do “filler activities” teachers need to let their students have a voice. Students would choose topics they want to more about and are important to them. Continuing to use their content the teacher can help guide a conversation about the topics the students chose and then students can develop a deeper understanding of the world in which they live. Only through a conversation can the teacher and students understand their reality and then find liberation. While this proposal will not change the world and will not form the multitude it does have the ability to begin[s] a conversation about the content that is taught during the year. What parent would not like for their students to come home and talk, with enthusiasm, about what they are learning? What administrator or bureaucrat can condemn students who interested in school? By personally doing this exercise I have been able to add[ed] two Current Issues classes at a school where I was told that students would not want such a class. Who will choose the content of the Current Issues classes? The students, of course.

#### The ac is a manifestation of practical hope absent capitalist understandings of productivity. What is empowering is the constituent’s decision to struggle against the accountability apparatus.

#### The system is insidious and perpetuates itself infinitely. Students’ scores stand for them, allowing for their erasure, and striating teachers into worker relations. De Lissovoy 13
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If the balance is still somewhat more on the side of external rather than internal monitoring in K-12 schools in the USA, nevertheless the proliferation of a similar bureaucracy of surveillance is evident in this context as well. As it polices the space of curriculum, the accountability apparatus ensures not only that learning takes no improper and heterodox forms, but also that the work which it does reproduces the necessity of the apparatus itself – since if schools or students perform well, they prove the effectiveness of the system, and, if they do not, they prove the urgency of the system as a diagnostic tool for those needing remediation. In the context of ideology as enclosure, the impossibility of any alternative is enforced through a kind of campaign of intimidation that forces consent, or at least the audited representation of consent. The field of education is perhaps the best exemplar of this regime. Students and teachers are certainly not faced with the physical harassment that is unleashed when power is materially threatened. However, the symbolic terror of surveillance as assessment has its own kind of force, bind[s]~~ing~~ subjects to circuits of affective and cognitive production that exhaust the possibilities of the imagination. The stigma of ‘low performance’ mobilized by accountability initiatives, however critically interrogated, aims at a real reconstruct[s]~~ion~~ of identity, and represents a real burden to be borne by members of educational communities – most often communities of color (Leonardo, 2007). Reconfiguring hegemony as a process of violation, accountability puts the curriculum in lockdown, forcing the limits of the possible to map precisely onto those of the actual. Pedagogy and Praxis in the Context of Accountability The politics of accountability becomes particularly fraught in the concrete situation of teaching: How should teachers negotiate the suffocating complex of procedures, for the most part organized around the obsession with standardized assessment, which increasingly dictates the process and meaning of teaching? Scholars have shown how these dictates modify the texture of the enacted curriculum (Au, 2007), how they dramatically reorganize the time of teaching (McNeil, 2000) and how they negatively influence its affective possibilities (Ball, 2003). New teachers who have been trained to roll out complex constructivist and critical units find themselves thrown back on their heels as the constraints of the overwhelming drive to climb in accountability rankings shape expectations in schools regarding the priorities and goals of teaching. Even those teachers who have been prepared by critical teacher education curricula for their own war of position within the ideological struggle over standards and social justice are [swept] ~~blindsided~~ by the sheer demands, in terms of the time and space of teaching, made by procedures of assessment and accountability (Picower, 2011). The simplest and least assertive response to this problem is to suggest that teachers ought to surrender for the time being and do no more than fulfill official expectations until the good work of those who are more influential – experts and policy makers – manages to turn the tide and allow for the return of a more authentic form of education. The more common response among progressives, however, is that teachers ought to be creatively subversive in their work – that they should satisfy demands for compliance with the official curriculum while at the same time smuggling in as much of their own uncontaminated and un-test-driven pedagogy as possible. There is evidence that, in fact, teachers are adept at negotiating both the standards and the demands of standardized assessment, allowing them to import a more authentic and critical pedagogy into the margins of instruction (Stillman, 2011). Starting from the same impulse, critical researchers have also proactively proposed their own social-justice-oriented standards frameworks (Andrzejewski, 2005), upon which presumably more progressive objectives and assessments could be developed in order to beat the mainstream standards and testing movement at its own game. However, the analysis I have developed above suggests that this strategy of creative subversiveness often amounts to a form of bad faith. Pulling back from denouncing the proceduralization and instrumentalization of schooling just at the moment in which this commitment begins to carry consequences – the moment of the application of the standards and their corresponding assessments – allows educators to hold to a putatively critical analysis while permitting the system to do its work without interruption. This gesture – in which educators act as if they were in agreement with the official discourse (by submitting to its procedures and rituals) while secretly working to undermine or bypass it in their own teaching – reproduces precisely the contemporary structure of ideology, as Žižek describes it: What they overlook, what they misrecognize, is not the reality but the illusion which is structuring their reality, their real social activity. They know very well how things really are, but still they are doing it as if they did not know. (Žižek, 2008, p. 30) In strategically playing along, the subversive educator accomplishes after all the purposes of the accountability system: the reduc[es]~~tion~~ of the complex process of learning to a simple score or rank. In fact, the ‘subversive’ and strategic element of this collaboration may be the ideologically essential one, since apart from it teachers would be forced to recognize their prostration before the system. These reflections suggest that the emphasis in early and radical expressions of critical pedagogy, particularly in Paulo Freire’s (1997) work, on the necessary link between word and act (the formula for praxis) is still valid. The validity of this formula, which is often dismissed in the present as naively militant, is proven both in the difficulty of concrete challenges to educational policies and structures, as well as in the threat that these structures experience when they are actually faced with such a challenge. Even the peaceful resistance of relatively privileged students, when it is collective, visible and determined, calls forth the full force of the state (as, for instance, in the recent police repression directed against protesting students at the University of California); in the case of organizing efforts by students of color, repressive measures are even more immediate and determined (as in the recent state-sponsored shuttering of high school ethnic studies programs in Arizona). However benign their methods and goals, these initiatives represent a threat to power in the consistency they enact between analysis and practice. My analysis here should make us suspicious of even progressive efforts in teacher education and curriculum that refuse to acknowledge the antagonism which fractures the space of schooling into an occasion of basic political and ethical decision. ‘Social justice’ – a term increasingly adopted as a brand for teacher training programs and colleges of education – often names an empty space that all sides know is precluded in advance, and yet in the name of which educators and academics can avoid concretely confronting the forces that, in fact, structure the social violence they aim to resist. In both enacting and obsessively recording power’s capture of students’ human potential (through test scores, performance reports and achievement matrixes), the system of test-based accountability in education is a crucial ideological formation. It is urgent, therefore, that we investigate its logic completely, including even the role that may be reserved for us, its devoted critics, within its effective operation.

#### Be suspect of their claims- changing tests has always been going on in the backgrounds- from IQ tests that justified social Darwinism to TOEFLs, standardized tests are the incubator of imperialism. Assimilate or be erased. Phillipson 8

**Phillipson 8** --- Robert Phillipson is British, with degrees from the Universities of Cambridge and Leeds, and a doctorate from the University of Amsterdam. Before emigrating to Denmark in 1973 he worked for the British Council in four countries. He taught for many years at the University of Roskilde, Denmark, which has specialised in multi-disciplinary, student-centred learning. He is currently a Research Professor at the Department of English of Copenhagen Business School. (“THE LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM OF NEOLIBERAL EMPIRE”, Robert Phillipson, March 4, 2008) cw//az recut

The Project and its Cheerleaders The neoliberal project for the New American Century that was hatched by the likes of Cheney, Wolfowitz, and Rumsfeld in the late 20th century is quite explicit about its goals (www. newamericancentury.org). These were assessed by D. Armstrong in Harper’s Magazine 305, 2002 (cited in Harvey, 2005, p. 80). The plan is for the United States to rule the world. The overt theme is unilateralism, but it is ultimately a story of domination. It calls for the United States to maintain its military superiority and prevent new rivals from rising up to challenge it on the world stage. It calls for dominion over friends and enemies alike. It says not that the United States must be more powerful, or most powerful, but that it must be absolutely powerful. English has been essential to this mission, the project being explicitly endorsed in an article ‘In praise of cultural imperialism’ in Foreign Policy, by David Rothkopf, Director of the Kissinger Institute (1997, p. 45): **It is in** the **economic** and political **interest** of the United States **to ensure** that if **the world is moving toward** a **common** language, it be English; that if the world is moving toward common **telecommunications**, safety, and quality **standards**, they be American; and that if common values are being developed, they be values with which Americans are comfortable. These are not idle aspirations. English is linking the world. The role of scholars in facilitating this empire in the twentieth century is explored in Neil Smith’s American empire. Roosevelt’s geographer and the prelude to globalization (2003). Geography served a similar function in legitimating and servicing French empire (Said, 1993, p. 205), as did linguistics (Calvet, 1974). Smith’s study traces the shift through territorial, colonial dominance (the invasion of the Philippines in 1898) to the attempt to dominate globally through economic means: ‘The American Empire, which grasped for global power at the beginning, middle, and end of the twentieth century, was built on a strategic recalibration of geography with economics, a new orchestration of world geography in the pursuit of economic accumulation’ (Smith, 2003, pp. xvii–xviii). The narrative thread of the book is the biography of one geographer, Isaiah Bowman, who played a key role in the politics of negotiating the treaties that concluded the First World War and the institutional arrangements (Bretton Woods, U.N., etc.) concluding the Second World War. The book is thus ‘a history of geography, but even more, it is a geography of history’ (op. cit., p. xvii). The study reveals how academia serves to legitimate the thrust for global dominance, in particular the interlocking of the discipline of geography with economics, politics and international affairs. Academia services the ‘global’ needs of the political project: ‘In the 1980s the Defense Mapping Agency alone employed nine thousand people, far outstripping any civilian counterpart, and was the major single employer of geography majors’ (op. cit., p. 3). **Academia perpetuates a system in which** ‘: : : global power **is disproportionately wielded by** a ruling **class** that remains tied to the national interests of the United States’ (op. cit., p. xix). This class **uses English**, probably to the exclusion of all other languages, unlike the captains of industry and finance in continental Europe, who tend to be multilingual. Political discourse is an important constituent of the empire project, with English energetically marketed. Thus after the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, the panaceas marketed for the solution of the post-communist world were ‘liberal democracy, the free market, and above all, the English language’ (British Council Annual Report, 1991–92). The British Council was established in 1935 to promote British interests and English, partly in response to the success of the fascist governments of Italy and Germany in using language teaching and higher education scholarships to promote their national interest. The British Council is a para-statal body that promotes British cultural, educational, and linguistic interests worldwide. ‘English should become the first foreign language throughout Europe, the lingua franca of the changed economic and political circumstances,’ according to Douglas Hurd, British Foreign Secretary in 1991. ‘Britain is a global power with worldwide interests thanks to the Commonwealth, the Atlantic relationship, and the English language,’ according to Malcolm Rifkind, British Foreign Secretary in 1995.4 English is marketed for seemingly altruistic purposes, ‘English skills have been identified as a major factor in the process of reconstruction and transition to democracy’ (British Council recruitment ad., 1993), but self-interest lags never far behind. The English language is promoted in order ‘to exploit the position of English to further British interests’ as one aspect of maintaining and expanding the ‘role of English as the world language into the next century’ (British Council press pack launching ‘English 2000’ in March 1995). English is not merely an instrument for communication, it is a value one identifies with for the social functions the language is seen as serving, its utility in the linguistic market. Its use is spreading worldwide. Thus in continental Europe, English is by far the most widely taught foreign language, and **proficiency** in English **is increasingly required** **in** **key** societal **domains**, such as business and **higher education** (Phillipson, 2006) and in European Union institutions (Phillipson, 2003). In Singapore, English has played a key role in nation-building and is increasingly used not only in commerce and the public sphere but also in the home: the proportion of children starting school who come from English speaking homes has increased from 35% in 1996 to 50% in 2006, the figures varying considerably between the key ethnically defined groups (Pakir, 2008).5 In schools in Karnataka, the heartland of the Indian information technology industry, English is increasingly being adopted as the sole medium of education, but the state is in principle committed to enforcing Kannada-medium education—while 71% of the state government’s ministers send their children to English-medium schools.6 There are proposals to make Chile bilingual in Spanish and English, advocates of adopting English as a second official language in Japan, and so forth. In all these instances, processes are in force that involve implementing greater use of the English language product. The declared goals are primarily economic but also cultural and political, with considerable uncertainty about where the project will lead. The scholarly cheer-leaders of global English are complicit in legitimating this dominance. The tone is set by Kaplan, an influential U.S. language policy scholar, in an article that asks ‘English—the accidental language of science?’ to which he replies: ‘The ascendancy of English is merely the outcome of the coincidence of accidental forces’ (2001, p. 21, see Phillipson, 2002). Kaplan detaches the current role of English from its historical causal determinants, and conflates process and project. In similar vein, Crystal (1999, p. 110), the prolific British linguist, explains that the current dominance of English is due to the language being ‘in the right place at the right time.’ It is baffling that any linguist, writing in a standard, normative form of the language, can claim that ‘The English language has already grown to be independent of any form of social control’ (op. cit., p. 139). His description of both the product and the process serves to legitimate the project in an uncritical way. Some political scientists (of the relatively few who are concerned with language issues) have embraced the project eagerly. van Parijs (2004) sees the move towards English as a global lingua franca as inevitable and desirable, provided certain conditions of fairness are met. He envisages English as the language of a global demos without there being a single ethnos: ‘a forum can be shared thanks to a common language without the culture’ (ibid., p. 118). Both van Parijs and de Swaan (2001) are adherents of rational choice theory, which stresses individual choice but ignores many of the societal factors, including education, that constrain choice. This detaches present-day English from its historical roots, its current role being due to ‘No conspiracy by the Brits, let alone the Americans, but the spontaneous outcome of a huge set of decentralised decisions, mainly by non-anglophones, about which language to learn and which language to use’ (van Parijs 2004, p. 124). Both scholars focus on language as communication and fail to integrate it with issues of identity and power, in effect detaching language from politics. This is a weakness that Gramsci’s work on language hegemony would remedy, so as to ensure that the study of ‘global’ English does not concentrate falsely on purely instrumental functions and draws on a rich tradition in earlier political theory (Ives, 2006, which contains a detailed analysis of the weaknesses of van Parijs’ and de Swaan’s approaches). De Swaan’s book on ‘the global language system’ (2001, reviewed in Phillipson, 2004) has little on globalization or linguistically defined social stratification, linguicism (Skutnabb Kangas, 1988). There is no analysis of the cultural dimensions of North-South relations or global cultural flows, or how English serves to integrate particular communities (states, or professions) and interest groups (finance capital, corporations, media and educational products). His layered language ‘constellation’ is essentially a simple model of triglossia, wrapped in algebraic game theory. Like most work in diglossia, it is loosely anchored in (neo)liberal social theory. One example of how English Language Teaching specialists service empire can be seen in a report in November 1995 in TESOL Matters by Sandra McKay, an ‘Academic Specialist in a United Nations sponsored program to develop the use of Latvian among Latvian residents in all domains of society.’ The efforts were to be directed towards building up Latvian learning among those with Russian as a mother tongue. (Latvian has in fact recovered its pre-1939 role as the sole unifying language for all its citizens, Druviete 1999, and is one of the European Union’s 23 official languages.) But McKay reports that the language to unite the two communities ought to be English. ‘English will provide a natural medium in which Latvians and Russian can work to establish a new independent Latvia’ (McKay 1995, p. 17). She also notes that ‘English is opening Latvia to trade and commerce with the West,’ and names McDonald’s and TV films as showing the way. Corporate consumerism and U.S. lifestyle are thus wedded to the learning of English. It is also important to recall that **TESOL** (the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages) itself **is a significant export** item—**teaching materials, exam**ination**s**, know-how, teachers et al.—for the British and Americans, and a vital dimension of English linguistic neoimperialism. The asymmetrical relationship between ‘natives’ and ‘non-natives’ is confirmed in the naming of the profession. ‘**The naming ‘‘TESOL’’** already **assigns** dichotomous Self-Other subject positions to teacher and learner. It interactionally and officially positions **the Anglo-teacher as Self, and** positions the **learner** in a life trajectory of forever being **Other**—continuing the colonial storyline: : : ’ (Lin and Luke, 2006, p. 67). Language is a central dimension of ideological control, perpetuating the subordination of colonial times into the present: ‘: : : **colonization’s legacy has become invisible** ideological hegemony—domination with consent; that is, the **previously colonized peoples** still **worship** the languages, cultures, music, arts, knowledges, pedagogies, or most aspects of **Western life as** more advanced, progressive and **superior**—as lying closer towards the end point of modernity’ (ibid., p. 69). **Discrimination against immigrants** to the United States, **for whom English is** a **foreign** language, **is integral to public education**, ESOL being construed as deficit and inferior, with all Other languages having low status (Motha, 2006). Some of the key players are disarmingly frank about their global ambitions. The Web site of **E**ducational **T**esting **S**ervices of Princeton, NJ, which is **responsible for the TOEFL** test of English language proficiency, **states: Linguistic imperialism ties a**round **the world. ETS** Global BV now has subsidiaries in Europe and Canada, and it will be **expand**ing in**to other countries** and regions as well. Our subsidiaries offer a **full range of** ETS **products**, services and learning solutions, including English language learning products and services, training and technical assistance, design, development and delivery of large-scale assessments, test design and delivery. Our global mission goes far beyond testing. Our products and services enable opportunity worldwide by **measuring knowledge** and skills, promoting learning and performance, and supporting education and professional development for all people worldwide. **U.S. interests** and services **are** thus **in symbiosis with** the evaluation of **proficiency in English**, with the assessment of linguistic capital. Those wishing for credentials in this linguistic market must invest in the form of ‘global’ English that ETS (and its U.K. equivalent, www.cambridgeesol.org) profitably dispense. They administer what Bourdieu refers to as the sanctions of the (global) linguistic market. We need to trace its origins.

#### And, I don’t contend theory is coherent but if it is:

#### 1] Allow cross applications of case to theoretical issues a. the ROB constrains theoretical education—it doesn’t operate on a different layer if it’s about the ballot b. even if they couldn’t contest case solvency, I can still cross apply our truth claims since they operate independently.

#### 2] Aff gets RVIs— a. reciprocity—neg gets T but the aff doesn’t, creates a 2:1 structural skew that outweighs on magnitude and verifiability b. time skew—the 2ARs too short to prove I’m T and adequately cover substance—effective 2NRs will split their time and make affirming impossible.

#### 3] Reasonability with a bright-line of presence of link and impact turn ground and textually affirming the resolution a. multiple interps the 1NC can read like spec good or spec bad which the aff will always violate so default to substance b. there’s only 4 minutes for the 1AR to generate carded offense, answer standards, and weigh while covering substance—reasonability allows us education.

### Ac

#### In our constant state of emergency, traditional nation-states cannot maintain control. The current global system is the Empire, which transcends borders to territorialize the collective, or multitude, in every aspect of life for its profit through the merging of economic production and politics. Multinational corporations like IB market their products with a focus on global applicability and manipulate laws for more schools to buy in. The university is also a site for the accumulation of such capital by reorienting intellectual labor and exchange value in the “brain drain”. Page 07
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“Biopower is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it, and rearticulating it” (Hardt and Negri, 2003, p. 3-4). Power from this perspective is able to control the mind and body and since it is able to control entire bodies then it extends to groups of bodies or rather, the society. This relates back to the idea of a control society because every “body” in the society is controlled at the deepest, darkest levels then society, which is composed of the controlled bodies, is able to be controlled. Hardt and Negri continue with the idea of control with: “Biopower thus refers to a situation in which what is directly at stake in power is the production and reproduction of life itself” (2000, p. 24). Once life is controlled from the inside then the reproduction of it is easy to control because the same life will be reproduced with the same type of control as before. All throughout society there is evidence of economics and politics and the ability of these to affect our lives is becoming increasing apparent. “In Empire and its regime of biopower, economic production and political constitution tend increasingly to coincide” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 41). All major political parties around the world address economic issues in their platforms and it is through this constant merging that Empire is able to gain such a strong amount of control over society. Hardt and Negri go to extensive lengths to explain how traditional Marxism by itself is no longer relevant in Empire. Marx’s proletariat was a stationary body of workers who could join together in a union and fight for their rights and justice. In Empire, the proletariat is mobile and much of the labor they produce is immaterial. Marx used a mole to describe how the proletariat could be successful in fighting for their rights. Hardt and Negri suggest that in Empire Marx’s mole needs to transform into a snake if the proletariat is to be successful in their fight (Hardt & Negri, 2000). One of the interesting and possibly confusing parts to understand about Empire is that the proletariat wanted unity of the world’s workers and Empire is a result of that unity. Hardt and Negri explain: “Rather, proletarian internationlism was antinationalist, and hence supranational and global. Workers of the world unite! – not on the basis of national identities but directly through common needs and desires, without regard to borders and boundaries” (2000, p. 49). We must remember that one of the foundations of Empire is there are no boundaries or borders and unity can be viewed on every level. In Empire the proletariat cannot be exempt because it must be exploited. The idea that labor is only associated with that of factory workers is quickly changing. As Hardt and Negri explain: “The central role previously occupied by the labor power of mass factory workers in the production of surplus value is today increasingly filled by intellectual, immaterial, and communicative labor” (2000, p. 29). One of the major changes in many countries today is there are industries that only provide services the workers in these service industries to do not produce an actual product, rather they just provide a service. This is a major change that can be seen in nation-states around the world, if you have a Dell computer in the U.S. and need technical support then you will most likely speak to a technician in a call center in India. The telecommunications industry has played a major part in globalization and also in the creation of Empire. Hardt and Negri explain the importance of this industry with: “Today information and communication have come to play a foundational role in production processes” (2000, p. 289). The impact of the telecommunications industry is easily observed but what must be observed is the created desire and need for these industries and the electronics they produce. The need and desires is what corporations create[d] through marketing. Marketing techniques are used to create the “I’ve got to have that” mentality. However, the marketing tactics that are used are clearly poststructuralist. “Marketing itself is a practice based on differences, and the more differences that are given, the more marketing strategies can be developed” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 152). This difference is clearly seen in target groups that are attacked by marketing companies, while one person of a certain age and gender might not become “hooked” on the campaign, someone that is different will. The marketing industry helps trans-national corporations become more profitable, and every successful corporation has a marketing department or a marketing company on the payroll. The role of corporations is of a great importance in Empire. There are no more local, regional, or national large corporations instead there are trans-national corporations. In order for a corporation to be considered successful it must have a global market and it must have influence over people in different areas of the world. These new corporations have no borders and they also have no allegiance to individual nation-states. One of the most important aspects of these corporations is their ability to market their product. It is through this marketing that people are controlled and kept in place. Labor helps these corporations because of the mobile workforce that is now available, a company can have a factory anywhere and the workers will migrate to this area. However, it is not only the workers that are migrating: “Along with the flight from so- called Third World there are flows of political refugees and transfers of intellectual labor power, in addition to the massive movements of agricultural, manufacturing, and service proletariat” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 213). The migration of intellectuals is easily to observe[d] by simply visiting any large hospital or university. Empire demands not only those who physically toil with their hands to migrate and find better employment [for] but also those who are considered intellectuals.

#### Modern-day capitalism separates the consumer from the exploitation necessary for the production of their goods: Natives die from pollution issues mining metals for smartboards, but you don’t care because you’re more concerned with getting a new phone. Any calculus under communicative capital is already epistemologically skewed. Only our method divorces from Western imperialism to explain a variety of “invisible” violence - the coding of different bodies, climate change, *and* why schools are getting defunded. Passavant & Dean 04.

Passavant, Paul A. and Jodi Dean. Empire’s New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri. Routledge, New York and London, 2004. Cw//az

One task of any reformism is to limit the violence and destruction wrought by the ruling powers and to create effective mechanisms for social protection. But before constructing weapons of self-defense and effective counterpowers, before any call to arms, we need to bring out into daylight the contemporary forms of violence and recognize how people are already struggling against them. When Carl von Clausewitz writes about the fog of war he is trying to cap- ture the uncertainty of military enterprises and the inability of commanders and combatants in the field of battle to gauge clearly the relations of force.7 There is another fog of war, though, an ideological fog that clouds myriad forms of violence, making them all but invisible to external observers, and even sometimes to those who suffer them. Some extreme forms of violence, spectacular acts of brutality,of course, rise high above the fog,and no doubt,we must denounce them. But don’t focus too much on exceptional events. We need to confront all forms of violence: civil wars, imperial wars, race wars, the violence of armies and militias, abuses of the police, rapists and wars on women, attacks on LGBTQ people, terroristic attacks of white supremacy and Islamic fundamentalisms, violence of capitalist finance, incarceration, ecological degradation, and the list goes on.We need to train our vision to see also and, especially, down in the fog, to reveal the daily, systematic and sys- temic, unspectacular forms of violence, what Slavoj Žižek calls the objective violence of the dominant systems of power, which sometimes appears as perpetrator-less crimes.8 Down in the fog is where the real battles must be fought.9 Indignation is a first step toward finding adequate modes of resistance. Art and activism often go hand in hand to reveal and protest violence and war. In the center of Picasso’s Guernica a woman cranes her neck out the window and holds a lamp to illuminate the destruction and suffering. In some respects documentary film has today become the central art form of indignation. Indignation, however, is not merely a victim’s cry, a weapon of the weak. Our hypothesis that power always comes second means that power acts to block the development of free subjectivities: the violence of power is aimed at con- taining and undermining the potential of those who resist and struggle for their own freedom. Indignation is a first expression of strength.10 But indignation is not enough. To disarm the perpetrators we need to forge new weapons.The critique of violence requires, in other words, cre- ating new counterpowers. And even that is not enough. Resistance must contribute to the constitution of new subjectivities, to the project of their liberation.We will take up this argument in chapter 15 but here let us attempt a (admittedly partial and schematic) catalogue of some of the axes of violence seen and unseen that plague our societies, along with some of the emerg- ing struggles against them.11 From the standpoint of these struggles begin to emerge the transversal lines of coalition that we can construct across these different domains and across national boundaries. Building coalitions in an intersectional and international framework is the first step toward creating counterpowers.12 Criminal acts of police brutality against black people in the United States, including Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Freddie Gray, Tamir Rice, Philando Castile, and so many others, have recently taken center stage. But police bru- tality against black men and women in the United States, of course, is not new; what is new are the widespread technologies, such as video cameras in phones, that allow it to be seen and the outcry that has made it the object of mass indignation. And police violence against people of color is not by any means limited to North America. “We have a Ferguson every day,” claims Ignacio Cano, referring to police killings of black men in Brazil’s favelas.13 Certainly the perpetrators of all these deaths should be held to account. But equally important battles are further down in the fog.We need to train our eyes not only and maybe not even primarily on police brutality (as an excep- tional event) or even on the police culture of impunity that makes such acts of brutality possible but also on the normal and daily violence of the police together with the courts and carceral systems.14 Traffic stops, drug arrests, un- equal sentencing, the routine violence of the prison, housing policies, racially divided education systems—these are some of the scenes of racial violence from which we need to clear away the fog. Generating indignation against the silent institutionalized racism is one important aim of contemporary forms of antiracist activism. Black Lives Matter, the BlackOUT Collective, and the Movement for Black Lives are some of the activist organizations in the United States already constructing paths in this direction.15

#### I defend: Resolved: In the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions as a method of constituent power in revolting against the empire. Neg should check interps, links, etc. in cross-ex to focus on substance, there’s infinite things I violate w bidirectional T. Page 4 Santa
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Standardized testing needs to STOP! When standardized testing is implemented teachers are left teaching to a test because they and their schools are graded according to these scores. Standardized tests have done more damage to education than any other movement. The only things standardized testing has done is make publishing companies richer and single out those who live in poor areas of the U.S. The World Bank also uses standardized testing in order to promote capitalism to poor countries and this must also be stopped. We must concentrate on using, as Deleuze suggests, AND. Our students need to become comfortable with seeing more than one answer for a question. Hopefully they can see numerous possibilities. Educators need to organize and protests against standardized testing and become vocal in their disapproval at the national and international levels.

#### Standardized tests kill the potential for students to cultivate liberation strategies by redirecting the conversation towards the complacency of having a “safe job”. The humanities lose more and more as students are told those aren’t “real industries” and are taught to become beings whose purpose is to only produce value for invisible corporations. Page 4

Page, Cecil Steven, "Creating Nomads: The Importance of Education in Forming the Multitude" (2007). Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 475. \*bracketed for clarity  
https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/475 cw//az

I do believe there is a way in which we can begin educating for the multitude and that is to follow the path set forth by Paulo Freire; Critical Pedagogy. The overwhelming majority of education in the world is based on banking education. Bureaucrats at the international, federal, and state levels create a curriculum and expect teachers to follow it closely and the students are expected to sit like mindless lemmings and absorb the knowledge. Paulo Freire described banking education as a process in which the teacher decides everything and controls everything. Today, I do not think we are dealing with the problem of the teacher controlling everything, I believe that it is Empire that is able to control education. By using standardized tests, Empire is able to control[s] the content students are taught. This is not just done in the U.S. but also [and] around the world. The World Bank, with the OECD, us[ing]es standardized tests to measure the education levels in developing countries. As I presented earlier, the World Bank is only interested in education that supports a knowledge economy, which is what trans-national corporations’ desire. Trans-national corporations are able to control education because they promote themselves as the future employers of the students. With this amount of control international institutions can ensur[ing]e that educational systems around the world do not produce students who [do not] will question the power of Empire. By using a form of banking education nomads will never be able to develop. If nomads are not able to form then there is no hope for the multitude to form. Teachers need to develop a deeper understanding of Freire’s problem-posing education. There is no doubt that there are numerous problems in the world that our students are aware of and there are many more that teachers can introduce to students. ~~Viewing~~ [thinking] standards and curriculum as something that students must learn to be knowledgeable of is nothing more than an indoctrination into the prevailing mindset of those controlled by Empire. Freire put forth the idea of education [is] being the most important aspect for the liberation of the peasants in Brazil and we need to follow in his footsteps and liberate our students from the control of Empire. However, most teachers will not deviate from teaching the set curriculum because of fear of loosing their job. I believe there are opportunities for teachers to use problem-posing education and still stay within state, federal, and/or international guidelines. One of the most important aspects of attempting to use Critical Pedagogy is for the students to be in charge of the content they are taught, they must have a voice.

They continue

If given the choice, students would choose to discuss issues that are important to them and they will want to learn about the world they see. The idea of students choosing the content of a lesson is something that can be implemented today in any classroom in the world. Since most teachers are forced to teach towards a date where the students will take standardized tests they are left with several weeks of nothing to do at the end of the year. This small amount of time in the school year is where teachers have the ability to make a concerted effort to change the world. Instead of showing movies and having students do “filler activities” teachers need to let their students have a voice. Students would choose topics they want to more about and are important to them. Continuing to use their content the teacher can help guide a conversation about the topics the students chose and then students can develop a deeper understanding of the world in which they live. Only through a conversation can the teacher and students understand their reality and then find liberation. While this proposal will not change the world and will not form the multitude it does have the ability to begin[s] a conversation about the content that is taught during the year. What parent would not like for their students to come home and talk, with enthusiasm, about what they are learning? What administrator or bureaucrat can condemn students who interested in school? By personally doing this exercise I have been able to add[ed] two Current Issues classes at a school where I was told that students would not want such a class. Who will choose the content of the Current Issues classes? The students, of course.

#### Thus, the ac is a manifestation of practical hope absent capitalist understandings of productivity. What is empowering is the constituent’s decision to struggle against the accountability apparatus.

#### The system is insidious and perpetuates itself infinitely. Students’ scores stand for them, allowing for their erasure, and striating teachers into worker relations. De Lissovoy 13

NOAH DE LISSOVOY [Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Texas at Austin, USA] “Pedagogy of the Impossible: neoliberalism and the ideology of accountability.” Policy Futures in Education Volume 11 Number 4 2013 [www.wwwords.co.uk/PFIE](http://www.wwwords.co.uk/PFIE) cw//az

If the balance is still somewhat more on the side of external rather than internal monitoring in K-12 schools in the USA, nevertheless the proliferation of a similar bureaucracy of surveillance is evident in this context as well. As it polices the space of curriculum, the accountability apparatus ensures not only that learning takes no improper and heterodox forms, but also that the work which it does reproduces the necessity of the apparatus itself – since if schools or students perform well, they prove the effectiveness of the system, and, if they do not, they prove the urgency of the system as a diagnostic tool for those needing remediation. In the context of ideology as enclosure, the impossibility of any alternative is enforced through a kind of campaign of intimidation that forces consent, or at least the audited representation of consent. The field of education is perhaps the best exemplar of this regime. Students and teachers are certainly not faced with the physical harassment that is unleashed when power is materially threatened. However, the symbolic terror of surveillance as assessment has its own kind of force, bind[s]~~ing~~ subjects to circuits of affective and cognitive production that exhaust the possibilities of the imagination. The stigma of ‘low performance’ mobilized by accountability initiatives, however critically interrogated, aims at a real reconstruct[s]~~ion~~ of identity, and represents a real burden to be borne by members of educational communities – most often communities of color (Leonardo, 2007). Reconfiguring hegemony as a process of violation, accountability puts the curriculum in lockdown, forcing the limits of the possible to map precisely onto those of the actual. Pedagogy and Praxis in the Context of Accountability The politics of accountability becomes particularly fraught in the concrete situation of teaching: How should teachers negotiate the suffocating complex of procedures, for the most part organized around the obsession with standardized assessment, which increasingly dictates the process and meaning of teaching? Scholars have shown how these dictates modify the texture of the enacted curriculum (Au, 2007), how they dramatically reorganize the time of teaching (McNeil, 2000) and how they negatively influence its affective possibilities (Ball, 2003). New teachers who have been trained to roll out complex constructivist and critical units find themselves thrown back on their heels as the constraints of the overwhelming drive to climb in accountability rankings shape expectations in schools regarding the priorities and goals of teaching. Even those teachers who have been prepared by critical teacher education curricula for their own war of position within the ideological struggle over standards and social justice are [swept] ~~blindsided~~ by the sheer demands, in terms of the time and space of teaching, made by procedures of assessment and accountability (Picower, 2011). The simplest and least assertive response to this problem is to suggest that teachers ought to surrender for the time being and do no more than fulfill official expectations until the good work of those who are more influential – experts and policy makers – manages to turn the tide and allow for the return of a more authentic form of education. The more common response among progressives, however, is that teachers ought to be creatively subversive in their work – that they should satisfy demands for compliance with the official curriculum while at the same time smuggling in as much of their own uncontaminated and un-test-driven pedagogy as possible. There is evidence that, in fact, teachers are adept at negotiating both the standards and the demands of standardized assessment, allowing them to import a more authentic and critical pedagogy into the margins of instruction (Stillman, 2011). Starting from the same impulse, critical researchers have also proactively proposed their own social-justice-oriented standards frameworks (Andrzejewski, 2005), upon which presumably more progressive objectives and assessments could be developed in order to beat the mainstream standards and testing movement at its own game. However, the analysis I have developed above suggests that this strategy of creative subversiveness often amounts to a form of bad faith. Pulling back from denouncing the proceduralization and instrumentalization of schooling just at the moment in which this commitment begins to carry consequences – the moment of the application of the standards and their corresponding assessments – allows educators to hold to a putatively critical analysis while permitting the system to do its work without interruption. This gesture – in which educators act as if they were in agreement with the official discourse (by submitting to its procedures and rituals) while secretly working to undermine or bypass it in their own teaching – reproduces precisely the contemporary structure of ideology, as Žižek describes it: What they overlook, what they misrecognize, is not the reality but the illusion which is structuring their reality, their real social activity. They know very well how things really are, but still they are doing it as if they did not know. (Žižek, 2008, p. 30) In strategically playing along, the subversive educator accomplishes after all the purposes of the accountability system: the reduc[es]~~tion~~ of the complex process of learning to a simple score or rank. In fact, the ‘subversive’ and strategic element of this collaboration may be the ideologically essential one, since apart from it teachers would be forced to recognize their prostration before the system. These reflections suggest that the emphasis in early and radical expressions of critical pedagogy, particularly in Paulo Freire’s (1997) work, on the necessary link between word and act (the formula for praxis) is still valid. The validity of this formula, which is often dismissed in the present as naively militant, is proven both in the difficulty of concrete challenges to educational policies and structures, as well as in the threat that these structures experience when they are actually faced with such a challenge. Even the peaceful resistance of relatively privileged students, when it is collective, visible and determined, calls forth the full force of the state (as, for instance, in the recent police repression directed against protesting students at the University of California); in the case of organizing efforts by students of color, repressive measures are even more immediate and determined (as in the recent state-sponsored shuttering of high school ethnic studies programs in Arizona). However benign their methods and goals, these initiatives represent a threat to power in the consistency they enact between analysis and practice. My analysis here should make us suspicious of even progressive efforts in teacher education and curriculum that refuse to acknowledge the antagonism which fractures the space of schooling into an occasion of basic political and ethical decision. ‘Social justice’ – a term increasingly adopted as a brand for teacher training programs and colleges of education – often names an empty space that all sides know is precluded in advance, and yet in the name of which educators and academics can avoid concretely confronting the forces that, in fact, structure the social violence they aim to resist. In both enacting and obsessively recording power’s capture of students’ human potential (through test scores, performance reports and achievement matrixes), the system of test-based accountability in education is a crucial ideological formation. It is urgent, therefore, that we investigate its logic completely, including even the role that may be reserved for us, its devoted critics, within its effective operation.

#### Be suspect of their claims- changing tests has always been going on in the backgrounds- from IQ tests that justified social Darwinism to TOEFLs, standardized tests are the incubator of imperialism. Assimilate or be erased. Phillipson 8

**Phillipson 8** --- Robert Phillipson is British, with degrees from the Universities of Cambridge and Leeds, and a doctorate from the University of Amsterdam. Before emigrating to Denmark in 1973 he worked for the British Council in four countries. He taught for many years at the University of Roskilde, Denmark, which has specialised in multi-disciplinary, student-centred learning. He is currently a Research Professor at the Department of English of Copenhagen Business School. (“THE LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM OF NEOLIBERAL EMPIRE”, Robert Phillipson, March 4, 2008) cw//az recut

The Project and its Cheerleaders The neoliberal project for the New American Century that was hatched by the likes of Cheney, Wolfowitz, and Rumsfeld in the late 20th century is quite explicit about its goals (www. newamericancentury.org). These were assessed by D. Armstrong in Harper’s Magazine 305, 2002 (cited in Harvey, 2005, p. 80). The plan is for the United States to rule the world. The overt theme is unilateralism, but it is ultimately a story of domination. It calls for the United States to maintain its military superiority and prevent new rivals from rising up to challenge it on the world stage. It calls for dominion over friends and enemies alike. It says not that the United States must be more powerful, or most powerful, but that it must be absolutely powerful. English has been essential to this mission, the project being explicitly endorsed in an article ‘In praise of cultural imperialism’ in Foreign Policy, by David Rothkopf, Director of the Kissinger Institute (1997, p. 45): **It is in** the **economic** and political **interest** of the United States **to ensure** that if **the world is moving toward** a **common** language, it be English; that if the world is moving toward common **telecommunications**, safety, and quality **standards**, they be American; and that if common values are being developed, they be values with which Americans are comfortable. These are not idle aspirations. English is linking the world. The role of scholars in facilitating this empire in the twentieth century is explored in Neil Smith’s American empire. Roosevelt’s geographer and the prelude to globalization (2003). Geography served a similar function in legitimating and servicing French empire (Said, 1993, p. 205), as did linguistics (Calvet, 1974). Smith’s study traces the shift through territorial, colonial dominance (the invasion of the Philippines in 1898) to the attempt to dominate globally through economic means: ‘The American Empire, which grasped for global power at the beginning, middle, and end of the twentieth century, was built on a strategic recalibration of geography with economics, a new orchestration of world geography in the pursuit of economic accumulation’ (Smith, 2003, pp. xvii–xviii). The narrative thread of the book is the biography of one geographer, Isaiah Bowman, who played a key role in the politics of negotiating the treaties that concluded the First World War and the institutional arrangements (Bretton Woods, U.N., etc.) concluding the Second World War. The book is thus ‘a history of geography, but even more, it is a geography of history’ (op. cit., p. xvii). The study reveals how academia serves to legitimate the thrust for global dominance, in particular the interlocking of the discipline of geography with economics, politics and international affairs. Academia services the ‘global’ needs of the political project: ‘In the 1980s the Defense Mapping Agency alone employed nine thousand people, far outstripping any civilian counterpart, and was the major single employer of geography majors’ (op. cit., p. 3). **Academia perpetuates a system in which** ‘: : : global power **is disproportionately wielded by** a ruling **class** that remains tied to the national interests of the United States’ (op. cit., p. xix). This class **uses English**, probably to the exclusion of all other languages, unlike the captains of industry and finance in continental Europe, who tend to be multilingual. Political discourse is an important constituent of the empire project, with English energetically marketed. Thus after the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, the panaceas marketed for the solution of the post-communist world were ‘liberal democracy, the free market, and above all, the English language’ (British Council Annual Report, 1991–92). The British Council was established in 1935 to promote British interests and English, partly in response to the success of the fascist governments of Italy and Germany in using language teaching and higher education scholarships to promote their national interest. The British Council is a para-statal body that promotes British cultural, educational, and linguistic interests worldwide. ‘English should become the first foreign language throughout Europe, the lingua franca of the changed economic and political circumstances,’ according to Douglas Hurd, British Foreign Secretary in 1991. ‘Britain is a global power with worldwide interests thanks to the Commonwealth, the Atlantic relationship, and the English language,’ according to Malcolm Rifkind, British Foreign Secretary in 1995.4 English is marketed for seemingly altruistic purposes, ‘English skills have been identified as a major factor in the process of reconstruction and transition to democracy’ (British Council recruitment ad., 1993), but self-interest lags never far behind. The English language is promoted in order ‘to exploit the position of English to further British interests’ as one aspect of maintaining and expanding the ‘role of English as the world language into the next century’ (British Council press pack launching ‘English 2000’ in March 1995). English is not merely an instrument for communication, it is a value one identifies with for the social functions the language is seen as serving, its utility in the linguistic market. Its use is spreading worldwide. Thus in continental Europe, English is by far the most widely taught foreign language, and **proficiency** in English **is increasingly required** **in** **key** societal **domains**, such as business and **higher education** (Phillipson, 2006) and in European Union institutions (Phillipson, 2003). In Singapore, English has played a key role in nation-building and is increasingly used not only in commerce and the public sphere but also in the home: the proportion of children starting school who come from English speaking homes has increased from 35% in 1996 to 50% in 2006, the figures varying considerably between the key ethnically defined groups (Pakir, 2008).5 In schools in Karnataka, the heartland of the Indian information technology industry, English is increasingly being adopted as the sole medium of education, but the state is in principle committed to enforcing Kannada-medium education—while 71% of the state government’s ministers send their children to English-medium schools.6 There are proposals to make Chile bilingual in Spanish and English, advocates of adopting English as a second official language in Japan, and so forth. In all these instances, processes are in force that involve implementing greater use of the English language product. The declared goals are primarily economic but also cultural and political, with considerable uncertainty about where the project will lead. The scholarly cheer-leaders of global English are complicit in legitimating this dominance. The tone is set by Kaplan, an influential U.S. language policy scholar, in an article that asks ‘English—the accidental language of science?’ to which he replies: ‘The ascendancy of English is merely the outcome of the coincidence of accidental forces’ (2001, p. 21, see Phillipson, 2002). Kaplan detaches the current role of English from its historical causal determinants, and conflates process and project. In similar vein, Crystal (1999, p. 110), the prolific British linguist, explains that the current dominance of English is due to the language being ‘in the right place at the right time.’ It is baffling that any linguist, writing in a standard, normative form of the language, can claim that ‘The English language has already grown to be independent of any form of social control’ (op. cit., p. 139). His description of both the product and the process serves to legitimate the project in an uncritical way. Some political scientists (of the relatively few who are concerned with language issues) have embraced the project eagerly. van Parijs (2004) sees the move towards English as a global lingua franca as inevitable and desirable, provided certain conditions of fairness are met. He envisages English as the language of a global demos without there being a single ethnos: ‘a forum can be shared thanks to a common language without the culture’ (ibid., p. 118). Both van Parijs and de Swaan (2001) are adherents of rational choice theory, which stresses individual choice but ignores many of the societal factors, including education, that constrain choice. This detaches present-day English from its historical roots, its current role being due to ‘No conspiracy by the Brits, let alone the Americans, but the spontaneous outcome of a huge set of decentralised decisions, mainly by non-anglophones, about which language to learn and which language to use’ (van Parijs 2004, p. 124). Both scholars focus on language as communication and fail to integrate it with issues of identity and power, in effect detaching language from politics. This is a weakness that Gramsci’s work on language hegemony would remedy, so as to ensure that the study of ‘global’ English does not concentrate falsely on purely instrumental functions and draws on a rich tradition in earlier political theory (Ives, 2006, which contains a detailed analysis of the weaknesses of van Parijs’ and de Swaan’s approaches). De Swaan’s book on ‘the global language system’ (2001, reviewed in Phillipson, 2004) has little on globalization or linguistically defined social stratification, linguicism (Skutnabb Kangas, 1988). There is no analysis of the cultural dimensions of North-South relations or global cultural flows, or how English serves to integrate particular communities (states, or professions) and interest groups (finance capital, corporations, media and educational products). His layered language ‘constellation’ is essentially a simple model of triglossia, wrapped in algebraic game theory. Like most work in diglossia, it is loosely anchored in (neo)liberal social theory. One example of how English Language Teaching specialists service empire can be seen in a report in November 1995 in TESOL Matters by Sandra McKay, an ‘Academic Specialist in a United Nations sponsored program to develop the use of Latvian among Latvian residents in all domains of society.’ The efforts were to be directed towards building up Latvian learning among those with Russian as a mother tongue. (Latvian has in fact recovered its pre-1939 role as the sole unifying language for all its citizens, Druviete 1999, and is one of the European Union’s 23 official languages.) But McKay reports that the language to unite the two communities ought to be English. ‘English will provide a natural medium in which Latvians and Russian can work to establish a new independent Latvia’ (McKay 1995, p. 17). She also notes that ‘English is opening Latvia to trade and commerce with the West,’ and names McDonald’s and TV films as showing the way. Corporate consumerism and U.S. lifestyle are thus wedded to the learning of English. It is also important to recall that **TESOL** (the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages) itself **is a significant export** item—**teaching materials, exam**ination**s**, know-how, teachers et al.—for the British and Americans, and a vital dimension of English linguistic neoimperialism. The asymmetrical relationship between ‘natives’ and ‘non-natives’ is confirmed in the naming of the profession. ‘**The naming ‘‘TESOL’’** already **assigns** dichotomous Self-Other subject positions to teacher and learner. It interactionally and officially positions **the Anglo-teacher as Self, and** positions the **learner** in a life trajectory of forever being **Other**—continuing the colonial storyline: : : ’ (Lin and Luke, 2006, p. 67). Language is a central dimension of ideological control, perpetuating the subordination of colonial times into the present: ‘: : : **colonization’s legacy has become invisible** ideological hegemony—domination with consent; that is, the **previously colonized peoples** still **worship** the languages, cultures, music, arts, knowledges, pedagogies, or most aspects of **Western life as** more advanced, progressive and **superior**—as lying closer towards the end point of modernity’ (ibid., p. 69). **Discrimination against immigrants** to the United States, **for whom English is** a **foreign** language, **is integral to public education**, ESOL being construed as deficit and inferior, with all Other languages having low status (Motha, 2006). Some of the key players are disarmingly frank about their global ambitions. The Web site of **E**ducational **T**esting **S**ervices of Princeton, NJ, which is **responsible for the TOEFL** test of English language proficiency, **states: Linguistic imperialism ties a**round **the world. ETS** Global BV now has subsidiaries in Europe and Canada, and it will be **expand**ing in**to other countries** and regions as well. Our subsidiaries offer a **full range of** ETS **products**, services and learning solutions, including English language learning products and services, training and technical assistance, design, development and delivery of large-scale assessments, test design and delivery. Our global mission goes far beyond testing. Our products and services enable opportunity worldwide by **measuring knowledge** and skills, promoting learning and performance, and supporting education and professional development for all people worldwide. **U.S. interests** and services **are** thus **in symbiosis with** the evaluation of **proficiency in English**, with the assessment of linguistic capital. Those wishing for credentials in this linguistic market must invest in the form of ‘global’ English that ETS (and its U.K. equivalent, www.cambridgeesol.org) profitably dispense. They administer what Bourdieu refers to as the sanctions of the (global) linguistic market. We need to trace its origins.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the cartographer that foster new connections on the map and don’t settle for foreclosed interpretations. Rose and Braidotti 12

Disability and Social Theory New Developments and Directions. Edited by Dan Goodley, Bill Hughes and Lennard Davis. Chapter 10: Nomadology and Subjectivity: Deleuze, Guattari and Critical Disability Studies. Griet Roets [a postdoctoral researcher affiliated to the FWO and based at the Department of Social Welfare Studies, Ghent University, Belgium. Her doctorate is in educational sciences. Her research interests are critical disability studies, poverty, gender, critical social work, and narrative and ethnographic research.] and Rosi Braidotti[Distinguished Professor in the Humanities and Director of the Centre for the Humanities at Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Her work is strikingly significant in the areas of feminist philosophy, epistemology, post-structuralism and psychoanalysis. Her books include: Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory (Columbia Univ. Press, 1994).]. 2012.

The aim in **nomadic methodology is that of affirmative differences or creative repetitions, which means retelling, reconfiguring, and revisiting a concept, phenomenon, event, or location from different angles** (Braidotti, 2010). **This is not merely a quantitative multiplication of options, but rather a qualitative leap of perspective that can generate a hybrid mixture of interpretations of the phenomenon in question**. This is a situated method of tracking the qualitative, ontological shifts from generative chaos or indeterminate forms to actualised and determined forms, while avoiding the pitfall of essentialism. This method respects the visible and hidden complexities and uncertainties of the real-life world in which we are living. Further, these qualitative shifts call for an intensive form of interdisciplinarity and boundary-crossings among a range of discourses. This nomadic methodology as proposed by Braidotti (2010) seems very relevant for disability studies. In the light of recent research activities (see Roets, 2008), inspired by this nomadic methodology, **we have suggested a research methodology designed to produce and create detailed cartographies of the present in the lives of disabled people and in their becoming in relation with multiple others** (Roets et al., 2009). We explored Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of drawing cartographies of the present as a potentially innovative methodological and analytical approach to disrupt and destabilise the monolithic master narrative typically told about people with ‘intellectual disabilities’. In the main, Deleuze and Guattari stimulate us in a creative experiment with a nomadic and vitalist version of reality and human nature (Braidotti, 2002: 73). ‘Reality’ can be approached and constructed through the interplay of different territories of knowing (Gergen, 1994). **Deleuze and Guattari’s perception of the map is a useful metaphor: The map fosters connections between fields … The map is open and connectable to constant modification. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any kind of mounting, reworked by an individual, group, or social formation. It can be drawn on a wall, conceived of as a work of art, constructed as political action**. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980: 13–14, our italics) Moreover, **a map has multiple entry points and embodies many dimensions and meanings: ‘Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of … [a] map [is that it] has multiple entryways as opposed to the tracing, which always goes back ‘to the same’**. The map has to do with performance’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980: 13–14, our italics). Inspired by Deleuze and Guattari, **Braidotti (2002) proposes the drawing of cartographies of the present as a powerful analytic resource to display the multiple ways in which a culture constructs subject positions** (Parker, 2003; Grosz, 2005). Creating cartographies of the present seizes the opportunity to depict and include a multiplicity of meanings, perspectives and realities. Haraway (1991) points out that there is no single standpoint since every subject is embodied and embedded within sense-making processes and has access to multiple versions of socially created realities. This renewal of conceptual creativity is a project that needs real-life people in positions of discursive subjectivity (Braidotti, 1994), and its methodological requirement is to map and engender diverse accounts of the subjectivity of research subjects. As an illustration, we introduce an experiment with nomadology while doing research in the context of the self-advocacy network in Flanders (Belgium) (see Roets, 2008). **We argue that making cartographies of disability activism in micro-political contexts might enable disability research to question and challenge the essentialist interpretation of impairment, and in particular of ‘intellectual disabilities’. cartographies of the present prioritises both the discovery, in a disabling society, of contextual counter-narratives, and the documentation of lost glimpses of the humanity of disabled people** (see Roets, Goodley and Van Hove, 2007). During our research, we used life story research and ethnography as relevant and complementary research techniques to map the storied and enacted self-advocacy of people with ‘intellectual disabilities’. Life story research is recognised as a useful technique to foreground ‘hidden’ and activist lives and the voices of self-advocates (Booth and Booth, 1996). Doing life story research can explicate cultural, pluralist meanings and create new ones in a dialogue at a deep level of signification where the motive is to philosophise across difference. Such research is inspired by ‘awe, awe at the mystery and complexity of human existence’ (Corker, 2001: 42). **As documented life stories deserve to be contextualised in actions and events and require reflection, we argue that this can be achieved by ethnographic accounts and field notes (Denzin, 1996). Ethnography is defined by Mutua and Swadener (2004: 16) as a form of narrative in which multiple identities and nomadic subjectivities can be explored.** Reflexive and dynamic accounts of researchers might be very useful when they include the storied and enacted versions of the self-advocacy of people with ‘intellectual disabilities’

#### The spatially and temporally indeterminate powers of Empire make fighting against it a prima facie burden. Thousands of academic spaces are structured by capitalism; the affirmation of the unjustness of the project endorses the discussion and is the only ethical way to subvert the system - I control uniqueness. Hardt and Negri 2k

Antonio Negri (Former Professor at University of Paris and University of Padua) and Michael Hardt (Professor at Duke University) “Empire.” Harvard University Press. 2000. \*bracketed for clarity and ableist discourse cw//az || AS

This is when the ontological drama begins, when the curtain goes up on a scene in which the development of Empire becomes its own critique and its process of construction becomes the process of its overturning. This drama is ontological in the sense that here, in these processes, being is produced and reproduced. This drama will have to be clarified and articulated much further as our study proceeds, but we should insist right from the outset that this is not simply another variant of dialectical enlightenment. We are not proposing the umpteenth version of the inevitable passage through purgatory (here in the guise of the new imperial machine) in order to offer a glimmer of hope for radiant futures. We are not repeating the schema of an ideal teleology that justifies any passage in the name of a promised end. On the contrary, our reasoning here is based on two methodological approaches that are intended to be nondialectical and absolutely immanent: the first is critical and decor:- structive, aiming to subvert the hegemonic languages and social structures and thereby reveal an alternative ontological basis that resides in the creative and productive practices of the multitude; the second is constructive and ethico-political, seeking to lead the pro-cesses of the production of subjectivity toward the constitution of an effective social, political alternative, a new constituent power.6 Our critical approach addresses the need for a real ideological and material deconstruction of the imperial order. In the postmod-ern world, the ruling spectacle of Empire is constructed through a variety of self-legitimating discourses and structures. Long ago au-thors as diverse as Lenin, Horkheimer and Adorno, and Debord recognized this spectacle as the destiny of triumphant capitalism. Despite their important differences, such authors offer us real antici-pations of the path of capitalist development.' Our deconstruction of this spectacle cannot be textual alone, but must seek continually to focus its powers on the nature of events and the real determina-tions of the imperial processes in motion today. The critical approach is thus intended to ~~bring to light~~ the contradictions, cycles, and crises of the process because in each of these moments the imagined necessity of the historical development can open toward alternative possibilities. In other words, the deconstruction of the historia rerum gestarum, of the spectral reign of globalized capitalism, reveals the possibility of alternative social organizations. This is perhaps as far as we can go with the method ological scaffolding of a critical and materialist deconstructionism—but this is already an enormous contribution!8 This is where the first methodological approach has to pass the baton to the second, the constructive and ethico-political approach. Here we must delve into the ontological substrate of the concrete alternatives continually pushed forward by the res gestae, the subjec-tive forces acting in the historical context. 'What appears here is not a new rationality but a new scenario of different rational acts—a horizon of activities, resistances, wills, and desires that refuse the hegemonic order, propose lines of flight, and forge alternative con-stitutive itineraries. This real substrate, open to critique, revised by the ethico-political approach, represents the real ontological referent of philosophy, or really the field proper to a philosophy of liberation. This approach breaks methodologically with every philosophy of history insofar as it refuses any deterministic conception of historical development and any "rational" celebration of the result[s]. It demon-strates, on the contrary, how the historical event resides in potential-ity. "It is not the two that recompose in one, but the one that opens into two," according to the beautiful anti-Confucian (and anti-Platonic) formula of the Chinese revolutionaries.' Philosophy is [does] not the owl of Minerva that takes flight after history has been realized in order to celebrate its happy ending; rather, philosophy is subjective proposition, desire, and praxis that are applied to the event.

### Uv

#### Underview:

#### If you have questions about the role of the ballot ask and I’ll clarify- prefer

#### A: There are infinitely many things I can clarify under my ballot- CX is better and doesn’t punish the aff for some random plank in your interp

#### B: Gets better engagement- you know exactly what you can and cannot read

#### C: CX checks is nonunique- you’ll always ask questions because there are always things that can be better clarified so there’s no loss

#### D: I’ll write out specifications if you’re scared of me shifting.

#### Presume aff - U assume statements are false until proven true else you would have no conception of the world – logic o/ws

#### I defend implementation of the resolution and will clarify and accept reasonable neg interps on spec if asked- solves your offense either I

#### A: conceded and you get your ground or

#### B:I don’t and you get better violations/links.

#### Three: I don’t defend theory’s coherent but Aff gets RVI’s if they do

#### A: Key to structural reciprocity- if I don’t have an RVI you can kick out of your shell if I beat it back which always gives you a positive trade off-that makes debating substance impossible because I’m at a disadvantage which is the reason theory is a voter

#### B: Forces only good theory- if you think you’re on the right side of the issue then you’ll always be ready to win the theory debate – that also takes out chilling effect because people will still check abuse. Frontlining isn’t an issue- if you’re right no amount of prep will make me right- I can write 1000 reasons for why defenestrating dogs is good but that doesn’t mean I’m right.

#### C: No substance abuse- you introduced theory in the first place- if you only wanted substance you would’ve debated that layer but you chose not to – independently, even if we go back to substance the quality is no longer good because we wasted time on theory.

### Cw fw

**1- Infinite neg flex- truth testing gives the negative access to infinite outs- they can prove an assumption of the resolution is false or prove the converse which gives them a 1:infinite out to the ballot- key to fairness because we both need equal shots at the ballot.**

**2- Burden of proof- truth testing forces the aff to prove perfection and gives the negative the ability to win the round off a taint- means lopsided debates because a single deficit to the aff would be a reason to negate- also makes the 1AC a moot point because you can’t leverage offense if the negative defends nothing – key to fairness because it equalizes burdens and makes 6 minutes of the 1AC relevant.**

**3- Intuition- when we evaluate truth claims we consider the implications in the real world- we ask if our ethic was internalized if it would be net better- that outweighs- every ethical precept is grounded on some intuitive basis- that humans have the capacity to reason or that some things are normative good- that means we have the strongest internal link to philosophy.**

**4- We do not exclude philosophy- you just have to prove that your standard can weigh offense and allow us to make accurate decisions.**

**5- resolvability**

# 1ar

## Case

### K v K extensions

#### Overview: the thesis of the aff is that biopolitical subjects are affectively connected as the multitude through the system of communicative capital that commodifies the exchange of discourse not content. The Empire, a conglomerate of multinational corporations, uses networks to sell oppression as freedom by being “woke” about spectacles to divert attention from everyday violence — that kills values to life. For example, we disregard the ferguson that’s going on in brazil’s favelas every day. In response, our method is to divide and conquer the Empire everywhere since their networks are all around us and equally vulnerable. Thus, our role of the ballot asks the judge to endorse the best orientation to dismantle the Empire

#### Implications: 1. artificially excluding certain groups is counterproductive to effectiveness of divide and conquer tactics that’s Passavant and Dean. turns the alt and they can’t solve case.

#### 2. Refusal to engage and attempts to outweigh *are* the spectacle of violence that’s complicit in ­­­­\_\_\_\_ that o/ws on scope and probability – . That hijacks your impact work and is a da to the alt which reproduces the squo

#### 3. u create “target groups to sell to” which strips potentiality so multinational corporations can striate “asians” to “must eat rice” and produces microfascism so cap controls the internal link- that’s page 07, the thesis card.

Afropess – private prisons perpetrating gratuitous violence against black flesh are accountable

Queerpess –

Setcol – “check-in” to protest at standing rock, a settler move to innocence that fb profits off of

Weheliye – fb profits off the exchange when id groups against each other

#### On case proper the aff stops economic coercion of teachers to teach the test, that’s de lissovoy 13 – implications:

#### Perm do the aff then the alt: it’s key to develop authentic, anticapitalist conversations in academia like the ones that produced your methodology

#### students aren’t numbers – that’s page 4: presuming your framing is wholly correct is the logic of “objectivity” that causes students to internalize a lower self-worth because of their score. That Justifies epistemic modesty and perm: do the aff as a method of the alt, the case o/ws: their impact presumes value to life post-alt, but communicative cap has invaded so the aff is try or die.

### K v Larp Extensions

#### Overview: the thesis of the aff is that biopolitical subjects are affectively connected as the multitude through the system of communicative capital that commodifies the exchange of discourse not content. The Empire, a conglomerate of multinational corporations, uses networks to sell oppression as freedom by being “woke” about spectacles to divert attention from everyday violence — that kills value to life. For example, we disregard the ferguson that’s going on in brazil’s favelas every day. In response, our method is to divide and conquer the Empire everywhere since their networks are all around us and equally vulnerable. Thus, the role of the ballot is to endorse the best orientation to dismantle the Empire:

#### implications:

#### Ethical calculus of util are inherently skewed towards spectacles like nuclear war – that’s an epistemic disad to their framing and a reason to reject util.

#### Our method is good absent consequences and that was implicated in the ac under page 3 – I don’t defend implementation

#### Extend Page 4: state sovereignty is a puppet for lobbyists. Corporations control the entire way we think through education by promising “safe jobs”. This answers cede the political and proves fiat is illusory, and causes serial policy failure

#### Method outweighs post-fiat advocacy: post fiat advocacies aren’t a goal- our implementation is a means to struggle against striation

#### even if u don’t buy that I still have offense:

#### students’ worth aren’t numbers and there are no “meritocratic” measures to inflict psychological violence on minority bodies, that’s de lissovoy 13. o/ws cyclicality: replication of every day violence is never addressed and capitalism perpetuates their impacts - we control the root cause

#### Reform cps complacently let the Empire to take over as subversive teachers watch education’s demise, making them alienated from their goals - that was de lissovoy 13. Only a full-frontal denial of Empire can expose it.

#### Pics are a measure of cooption like lobbyists nitpick good bills and change it slightly to take credit – that’s an independent voting issue

### Other extensions of offense

#### endorse the ac’s discussion: empire is built on a linguistic narrative of truth – that’s Hardt and Negri 2k. uniqueness goes my way

#### endorse an orientation towards rupturing the international markets on a platform of english English, that’s Phillipson 8

#### endorse a method that stops economic coercion of teachers to teach the test, that’s de lissovoy 13

#### endorse an orientation where students’ worth aren’t numbers. “meritocratic” measure forces psychological violence on minority bodies when they do bad on a biased test, that’s de lissovoy 13

#### endorse a fight against complacency – tests brainwash students into accepting the fog of war, page 4

### Util extensions

#### I’ll concede util, extend permissibility and presumption affirm: every argument presumes statements to be true e.g. we’re not in a brain experiment

#### Util triggers permissibility

#### nothing is good or bad, just permissible: util justifies atrocities like the holocaust if it means preventing 2 holocausts. That’s also an independent voting issue

#### infinite consequences means we’re culpable for infinite problems so there’s no obligation – no matter what I do I’m wrong so presume aff

#### even if I don’t win truth testing, util cannot determine good or bad so affirm since there’s no offense

#### if they win util, it’s j plan counterplan debate. extend passavant and dean 04: capitalism is the worst harm causing climate change, school defunding and more which link turns the da 1. Epistemology is a framing issue: ur calculus doesn’t account for invisible violence like the Fergusons in brazil– independent util trigger and nonuniques the da the aff is try or die. Takes out cap turns and magnitude weighing 2. Scope: affects everyone everyday not just students 3. Cyclicality: the impacts reify themselves because cap is in the structure of society, proves I control the internal link to their impacts prefer 1ar weighing, they could in the nc since all offense was read, but chose to sandbag which kills clash and resolvability we solve, even if you think this might not be true, on the tech level, they conceded the page evi: “education [is] being the most important aspect for the liberation.” Teachers aren’t economically coerced into breeding competitiveness, that’s de lissovoy 13

#### they conceded page 07: standard tests are the building block of cap that’s where students conform to the system by prioritizing objectivity like STEM over liberation – impact turns accessibility to the university args

go to case!

### Trix extensions

#### Extend condo logic – denying assumptions of the topic affirms. Saying Santa isn’t real doesn’t deny that if he were, he would have a red suit. You’ve conceded standardization does not exist since we are constantly reterritorialized under late-stage capitalism and marketed differently. That was De Lissovoy 13 that meritocracies are fake. “standardized” tests thus can’t exist which denies assumptions of the topic. Condo logic o/ws on logic constraints all arguments and probability since the argument was straight conceded – there’s 100% SOL.

### Fw extensions

#### Only affect is morally binding-

## case

### A2: Affect Bad

### A2: antihumanism bad

### A2: becoming is privileged

### A2: Cede the Political

### A2: Cruel opt

### A2: cap turns

### A2: policymaking

# t

## Fairness OV

### the role of the ballot outweighs:

#### Jurisdiction: judges can’t determine norms for all of debate but they can vote in this rd

#### Epistemology: cap changes how we think of the world- your responses are suspect. risk of offense, means you cause exclusion, if you win t I just made it harder for you to get a trophy.

#### Portability: remember mechanics of debate like critical thinking not 1 round

#### at worst, both make normative claims about the real world so its arbitrary to separate them. u indicts our advocacy, but our framing is fair game – proven by the TVA.

### ov: here are independent reasons to vote them down

#### 1. Spectacle DA – their weighing obscures aff’s material impacts to focus on \_\_ and numbs everyday violence in debate, this l/t fairness and limits - we can’t call out violence hidden by cap like the ppl who can’t afford to travel hypercharged by spec shells which say there is injustice bc the negative *deserves* smth

#### 2. Empire DA – they try to make the aff intelligible so communicative cap can control it, which leads to unchecked violence. There’s a reason why unintelligible groups like Anonymous are effective. If they win the abuse on T, it proves the aff method and is offense for us.

#### 3. Static DA –T assumes one correct interp but there’s no stable subject so there can never be consistent practices that was page 03 that creates psychological violence that denies individual identity.

### on fairness proper: calc indicts:

#### 1. irresolvable – unquantifiable with different conceptions so the judge evaluates T differently

#### 2. world is unfair: cap shuts up the multitude with imbalances like coaching which is an internal link to fiarness

#### 3. norm-setting is empirically disproven: ppl read condo pics and split on theory debates

### Procedural:

#### procedurals justify downing me for speaking a second over time, so everyone who finishes their sentence would lose. There’s flexibility

#### Even if I follow time constraints, those allow productive dialogue - if I spoke forever there would never be a debate. theory is problematic since it never gives the multitude ability to engage- reading a hard position does not deny you the ability to make arguments

#### T is not procedural since the judge flows the aff and doesn’t auto down me – it’s different than debating both sides

## On their shell:

### Textuality:

#### Semantics collapses to pragmatics u only care bc it’s fair

#### Voting against imperfect English kills confidence like teachers disciplining students– Outweighs: A) Access prereq to debate’s existence – you hurt vernacular speakers –languages like French lack bare plurals, B) Real world – shutting down discourse scares ppl from speaking out – kills linguistic diversity.

#### "Perfect English" allows Alt-Right to take over mainstream dialogue – Trump won because he weaponized everyday discourse – Outweighs on portability –using imperfect English allows us to engage with proletariat and solve real problems – link turns limits since it proves you kill engagement.

### Testing:

#### 1. u can engage - contest our scholarship w method das since it wasn’t tied to the advocacy

#### 2. Contesting the aff makes it intelligible – we impact turn

#### 3. generics check: kant, logcon, barber, agamben, reps, etc.

### Tva

#### measure of cooption like lobbyists nitpick good bills and change it slightly to take credit – that’s an independent voting issue

#### ppl can o/w

## Counterinterps

#### Counterinterpretation: judges ought to vote for the best cartographer - all impact turns are offense under my counterinterp

#### CI – only read my aff – link turns limits and non-arbitrary net benefit critical education –overcorrect from policy towards an interrogation of Empire – anything else normalizes violence and stops resistance.

### CI ExtraT

#### I meet I spec the method of doing the res which parametricizes it

#### CI: The affirmative can add planks

#### 1. Solves all of their offense – they get links to all of their generics. Since we defend [that aid is bad], they get access to [the homeschool PIC, funding DA, and all other core generics].

#### 2. Critical education –overcorrect from policy towards an interrogation of Empire – anything else normalizes violence and stops resistance.

### CI must spec xyz

#### Cx checks: doublebind it mattered enough for u to give up 5 seconds of cx or not worth it so no real abuse

#### Reject spec shells – they force spec to infinite regress

#### CI: The affirmative does not have to specify \_\_ if I defend as a general principle.

#### limits: u explode number of affs w infinite prerd aff prep focused on 1 while neg is split. Hypercharged since aff cherrpicks best ground.

#### o/w: 1. limits grants the aff infinite preround prep so the eng loses before the get to the win, strat skew is marginal 2. generics check whole res but plan has specific prep to respond to less links, 3. limits abuse is prerd already happened whereas shifting advocacy is contingent 4. cx checks, net benefit of better theory violations if im shifty. o/w doesn't apply to limits and ground the abuse happens b4 rounds

### A2 Limits –

#### functional limits check

#### 1] there isn’t lit or a solvency advocate on every method in their case list

#### 2] even if there are more methods, the US doesn’t give military aid to all of them – only the aff’s definition provides a contextual reading of the resolution

#### 3] limits for the sake of limits decreases real world application

#### 4] Limit uniqueness -- There are 52 countries the EIU defines as authoritarian which should already trigger any limits impact– Their interp requires the neg to have prep for each country plus prep for each type of military aid given to each country -- adding a few more doesn’t change the method of negative prep – it’s just a big topic broski

### A2 Ground –

#### 1] Learning to apply generics to specific affs helps critical thinking—means you’re better able to adapt to a variety of different situations and think on your feet—outweighs on real-world—we often must utilize skills in unfamiliar situations.

#### 2] Most topic authors write about military aid in the context of Israel – our interp is better for ground

#### 3] generics still apply – U.S. as an actor opens up to ptx da, cps, etc.

# K

## Idpol

embrace fracturing even more and understand race as a creative way to emphasize difference. This allows us to acknowledge the different aspects of both race and racism, which doesn’t have one single solution. Embracing fractured ideas of race is a way of becoming minoritarian because it focuses on our differences.

### V setcol

### V afropess

### V queerpess

### V weheliye

### V baudy

#### **The top level clash is that ppl know their ideas circulate and do not care – there’s no terminal impact to the k and the alt will never be applicable– circulation is inevitable. The question becomes how we fight with it?**

Passavant and Dean 04 [Paul A.Passavant and Jodi Dean- “Empire’s New Clothes Reading Hardt and Negri” Routledge. ISBN 0-415-93555-5 [https://www.questia.com/library/108000479/empire-s-new-clothes-reading-hardt-and-negri 2004](https://www.questia.com/library/108000479/empire-s-new-clothes-reading-hardt-and-negri%202004)] cw//az

Thinking about messages in terms of use value and contributions in terms of exchange value sheds light on what would otherwise appear to be an asymmetry in communicative capitalism: the fact that some messages are received, that some discussions extend beyond the context of their circulation. Of course, it is also the case that many commodities are not useless, that people need them. But what makes them commodities is not the need people have for them or, obviously, their use. Rather, it is their economic function, their role in capitalist exchange. Similarly, the fact that messages can retain a relation to understanding in no way negates the centrality of their circulation. Indeed, this link is crucial to the ideological reproduction of communicative capitalism. Some messages, issues, and debates are effective. Some contributions make a difference. But more significant is the system, the communicative network. Even when people know that their specific contributions (their messages, postings, books, articles, films, letters to the editor) simply circulate in a rapidly moving and changing flow of content, in contributing, in participating, they act as if they do not know this. This action manifests ideology as the belief underlying action, the belief that reproduces communicative capitalism.18 Hardt and Negri understand the absorption of media and mediation in the productive machine brought about by communicative capitalism as a merging of the communicative and the biopolitical. And they agree that it comes at the cost of the use value of communicative utterances. In what they see as an imperial totality, "exploitation is the expropriation of cooperation and the nullification of the meanings of linguistic production" (385). The whole system, the machine, functions directly through circulation rather than indirectly through responses to messages. We might say that for them the idea that "we're all connected" means that connections are given rather than produced. Connections no longer need be established or interrogated, they simply are, part of the biopolitical fabric of our lives. At the same time, the very linguistic performances that produce the social world reinforce imperial power, a power that operates through communicative practices.

### V university

#### Academia isn’t a monolith but rather assemblages of values and practices – believing it is makes negative aspects inevitable and makes it impossible to engage in targeted, ethical resistance.

**Heath et al. 13** – (2013, Mary Heath, Associate Professor at Flinders Law School, and Peter Burdon, Associate Professor at the Adelaide Law School, “Academic Resistance to the Neoliberal University,” 23 Legal Educ. Rev. 379, SSRN) cw//az

Academics **who identify** as activists need a clear conception of who or what they are resisting. **Put simply**, not everything that occurs in universities is *neoliberal or* undesirable. **The** university consists of **a** complex assemblage **of structures, values and practices**. **Like other** social institutions**, it has** evolve**d** over time with reference to **the projects of individuals,** politic**al group**s **and other social institutions**. **Sometimes these forces are place-specific and sometimes they are national** (**or** even **international**). Projects can also have lives of their own and are reproduced in unpredictable ways as they come together to constitute a particular institution.86 As **the** outcomes of our efforts **and those of others** become apparent, further **critique and action may be called for**, **and our** strategies and **analyses** of resistance **may** require revision. For these reasons, **we suggest that academic activists conceptualise the university as a set of** practices **that** are historically contingent and capable of transformation. **This perspective is important**, **first**, **because** it brings into view the potential for alternatives to the prevailing state of legal education. In contrast, **the** construction of neolib**eralism** as **‘necessary and** inevitable’ forestalls the possibility of resistance 87 and makes critique appear foolish.88 **Second**, **it means that** resistance can **also** be nuanced and directed at particular structures, **practices or values** rather than at the university or the tertiary system as a whole. **This has obvious implications for the** *prospects of successful action* **and for our sense of agency as activists**.

They continue

The flip side to this conceptualisation is also important. Desirable changes in legal **education** as well as in Australian universities have taken place during the last few decades **as neoliberal practices have also become more and more embedded**. **As academic activists we need to** choose*forms of* resistance that *we believe* are ethical *and meaningful*. We are in no way obliged to oppose every form ofchange. **We might** **instead choose virtuous compliance with changes we think are desirable**,89 or support goals we believe are desirable **while opposing forms of implementation we believe are not**.

### V psychoanalysis

#### **The top lvl clash is that psychoanalysis presumes that we have a desire to reach the lack, the gap between language and ideas, but true understandings do not matter in communicative capitalism. What measures success is if the message circulates**

Passavant and Dean 04[Paul A.Passavant and Jodi Dean- “Empire’s New Clothes Reading Hardt and Negri” Routledge. ISBN 0-415-93555-5 [https://www.questia.com/library/108000479/empire-s-new-clothes-reading-hardt-and-negri 2004](https://www.questia.com/library/108000479/empire-s-new-clothes-reading-hardt-and-negri%202004)] cw//az

Communication in communicative capitalism, then, is not, as Habermas would suggest, action oriented toward reaching understanding.17 In Habermas's model of communicative action, the use value of a message depends on its orientation. In sending a message, a sender intends for it to be received and understood. Any acceptance or rejection of the message depends on this understanding. Understanding is a necessary part of the communicative exchange. In communicative capitalism, however, the use value of a message is less important than its exchange value, its contribution to a larger pool, flow, or circulation of content. A contribution need not be understood; it need only be repeated, reproduced, forwarded. Circulation is the context, the condition for the acceptance or rejection of a contribution. Put somewhat differently, how a contribution circulates determines whether it has been accepted or rejected. And just as the producer, labor, drops out of the picture in commodity exchange, so does the sender (or author) become immaterial to the contribution. The circulation of logos, branded media identities, rumors, catchphrases, even positions and arguments exemplifies this point. The popularity, penetration, and duration of a contribution mark its acceptance or success.

#### psychoanalysis begins with the Real and the family and refuses to look back – schizoanalysis begins with the family and traces through territorialization to what creates the family in the first place. This flaw in psychoanalysis allows the embodiment of the despot and seduction to all authority creating fascism and totalitarianism. This turns case

## Util ov

### Reductionism

### Lexically priority

## other fw

### Social contract theory

## disclosure

## more cards

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for who best methodologically actualizes affect. Affects – or feelings and intensities – structure our world. Selfhood is based on a fragmented relationship to external forces, ensuring a non-sovereign existence. Therefore, the cornerstone of ethics and possibility becomes based in our capacity to open ourselves to both being affected and affecting others, styling these interactions to explore our subjectivity.

Michael Hardt, 2015

Hardt is a professor of Literature and Italian at Duke University, he has written extensively on the work of Deleuze, Spinoza, Berlant, and other philosophers, he has also published a post-Marxist trilogy alongside Antonio Negri including the titles *Empire*, *Commonwealth*, and *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. “The Power to be Affected” International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society Vol. 28, Issue 3, pg 215-222 [TDC]

**Lauren Berlant’s work is filled with explorations of the passions, the many ways in which we** are affected by powers greater than ourselves—in institutional contexts and intimate relations, in sexual encounters and aesthetic experiences, and in political affairs and economic struggles. The object of her journeys through the affects is not simply to register or catalogue—let alone lament—the affective damage caused by living in contemporary society or the ways in which our desires are thwarted. Instead, she **regard**s the **pain**s, pleasures, frustrations, and **longing as** so many **tracks we** can **follow to understand** how people manage in this world to create new intimacies, new bonds, and **new forms of life**.1 Simply getting by and surviving in a dangerous and threatening world, though, is not enough. Berlant revives classical concepts to name her ultimate goals: **we** **should strive for the good life** and seek human flourishing. Orienting the analysis and even the affirmation of the affects toward a project for the good life might well seem an odd combination since the classical tradition teaches us—or, at least, this is what we are usually told—that the passions are the ties that bind us in servitude; only following the dictates of sovereign reason can we truly flourish. In Berlant’s work, instead, the only path toward achieving the good life must be constructed with and **through** the **affects**. To understand the arc of Berlant’s project, I find it helpful to pose it in relation to that of Baruch Spinoza, to which it has strong correspondences. (Berlant may well be a closet Spinozist—even without knowing it.) For Spinoza **being affected by others**, by external forces, **is** not aweakness but **a strength**, a power. As a first approximation, think of the power to be affected as **a gauge of** your **capacity to be** really **in the world**, to register and feel its diverse powers. Once we open up and expand our power to be affected, however, **then** begins the work of **selecting** among the **affects and discover**ing the**means to repeat or prolong those that are beneficial** and prevent the detrimental. That is a path, through the affects, with the affects, toward joy and flourishing. The first step of this process is to take stock realistically and recognize that **we are not sovereign subjects**. Berlant is rightly suspicious of the standard ethical injunctions that assume our individual sovereignty, as well as those that aim at constructing or supporting sovereign political powers. Consider the sovereign individual, in correspondence with Carl Schmitt’s political formula, as the one who decides (2007). Berlant questions both elements of this statement: the one and the decision. Sovereign **decision**, she claims, **resides on** an **illusion of self-control**, “a fantasy misrecognized as an objective state” (2011, p. 97). People are not always engaged in projects of selfextension, she says, and in fact, they seldom have significant control over their decision-**making**. Spinoza expresses the same idea in quantitative terms. The power of all individual or limited subjects to think and act autonomously corresponds proportionally to the relation between their powers and the power of nature as a whole. “The force by which a man perseveres in existing is limited, and infinitely surpassed by the power of external causes” (1985 Ethics IV P3). Only God (or nature as a whole) is self-caused because it has no outside. The fact that the power of the world outside of us so far surpasses our own power means that **we are affected by others much more than we affect the world** or even autonomously affect ourselves, and **thus**, our **capacity for** sovereign **decision-making is minimal** too. The other half of Schmitt’s dictum is equally unfounded: “the one” never decides or acts or is acted on. The **subject is never one. Agency** and causality, Berlant suggests, **should be understood** not in terms of unities but **instead “as dispersed** environmental **mechanisms at the personal as well as** the **institutional level**” (2011, p. 114). Spinoza expresses this too in mathematical and geometrical form. A **body** or an individual, he explains, **is formed when** a great number of **parts agree** with each other **and** thus **communicate** in a **consistent**[ly] way (1985 Ethics II P13 definition). Essential to a body is the relation: the body lives as long as that **relation is maintained**. Instead of thinking in terms of unities, then, we need to think the relation **among multiplicities and** recognize the **consistency of dispersed landscapes**. To identify the locus of decision or acting or being acted upon, we need to look to not the one but the consistent relation among the many. There is no point in lamenting our relative lack of power or unity or ability to rule ourselves autonomously. Spinoza, in fact, ridicules those wise men who, maintaining a fantasy of the sovereign subject, chastise us for being ruled by passions. “Philosophers look upon the passions by which we are assailed as vices, into which men fall by their own fault. So it is their custom to deride, bewail, berate them, or, if their purpose is to appear more zealous than others, to execrate them. They believe that they are thus performing a sacred duty, and that they are attaining the summit of wisdom when they have learnt how to shower extravagant praise on a human nature that nowhere exists and the revile that which exists in actuality. The fact is that they conceive men not as they are, but as they would like them to be. As a result, for the most part it is not ethics they have written, but satire; and they have never worked out a political theory that can have practical application” (2002 Political Treatise, Chapter 1, Introduction, 680). A practical political theory instead must begin where people are, and really existing people are primarily filled, so to speak, by passions. Berlant poses the terrain of the nonsovereign in terms of the “interruptions” or “intermissions” that break the imagined efforts of self- extension of sovereign subjects. (Be careful, though, not to be misled by these terms because, as Berlant makes clear, they are the norm not the exception: we live in the interruption and the intermission the vast majority of the time.) What are we left with, then, if we cannot theorize in terms of the one who decides? Does this realistic standpoint condemn us to powerlessness?2 Neither Spinoza nor Berlant has much interest merely in recounting the disaster of our world and enumerating the damages we suffer. **Recognizing of our relative lack of power is** simply **the** solid **point of departure for theorizing** the **ethics** **and** politics of nonsovereign subjects, a project of **liberation** to increase our power. Here, I find it useful to introduce the concept of the power to be affected because it illuminates most brightly the paths available to nonsovereign subjects to strive for the good life and flourish. Gilles Deleuze, more than any other Spinoza scholar, is the one who individuates the power to be affected as a concept and explores how it constitutes a rich field for an ethical and political project. The touchstone for his interpretation, to which he frequently returns, is Spinoza’s claim that no one has yet determined “what a body can do [quid corpus possit]” and “what is the structure of the body [corporis fabricam]” (1985 Ethics III P2S). For Deleuze, this unknown field exerts an irresistible call: just like Conrad’s Marlowe is drawn to the dark empty space in the middle of his map of Africa, so too Deleuze is compelled by the mystery of what a body can do. And this journey is not merely driven by a desire for knowledge. As Berlant says, “It’s a political problem, of course, the body” (2011, p. 267). Deleuze and Spinoza agree completely. Spinoza’s route, though, which Deleuze follows carefully, is indirect: to investigate what a body can do, we have to look first at how it can be affected because, Deleuze explains, “a body must be defined by the ensemble of relations which compose it, or, what amounts to exactly the same thing, by its power to be affected [pouvoir d’être affecté]” (1978 “L’affect et l’idée”). **You cannot understand the structure of the body if you do not know** all **the** ways in which it can be affected, the nature of **its power to be affected**.3 Deleuze demonstrates two levels, so to speak, of the power to be affected: first, its correspondence to the power to act and, second, the qualities of the affections that compose or fill it, and how they can be transformed. The argument on the first level serves to dignify or elevate the power to be affected. Whereas the sovereign subject is (or imagines itself to be) impervious to and unmoved by external forces, and whereas projects aimed at sovereignty strive to minimize the influence of others, we should conceive being affected by others as a virtue. The most powerful is not the one least affected but, on the contrary, the one affected the most and in the most ways. The more you are affected in many ways, the more alive you are, and to the extent you cease to be affected, to the extent you close off from the world, that much you die.4 Deleuze thus reads in Spinoza a correspondence or equivalence between our power to act and our power to be affected. For all limited subjects, that is, in Spinoza’s terms, for all existing modes, Deleuze claims that “essence is the same as [ne fait qu’un avec] the power of action, and the power of action the same as the power to be affected” (1992, p. 225, translation modified5). Deleuze aims to recognize here not really an identity but an equivalence between the two powers: to affect and to be affected.

#### other thesis card - Global capitalism has created Empire, a new apolitical form of sovereignty without boundaries or barriers. The U.S. *dons the mantle* of Empire and extends its sovereignty through new, deterritorializing channels of control

* Global capitalism erodes the power of nation states --- new world order governed by apolitical sovereignty
* US dons the mantle – imperialist/expansionist constitution sets them up to rule across borders (they are powerful because the do not resemble old European powers)
* Empire is decentered and deterritorializing – US fopo adapts
* Empire seeks to control social life in its entirety in the name of global peace – biopolitical phenomenon

Hardt and Negri 2000 *[Empire*. Michael  Hardt and Antonio  Negri. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000. TDC]

The declining sovereignty of **nation-states** and their increasing **inability to regulate economic** and cultural **exchanges is** in fact one of the primary symptoms of **the** coming of **Empire**. The sovereignty of the nation-state was the cornerstone of the imperialisms that European powers constructed throughout the modern era. By ‘‘Empire,’’ however, we understand something altogether different from ‘‘imperialism.’’ The boundaries defined by the modern system of nation-states were fundamental to European colonialism and eco- nomic expansion the territorial boundaries of the nation delimited the center of power from which rule was exerted overexternal foreign territories through a system of channels and barriers that alternately facilitated and obstructed the flows of production and circulation. Imperialism was really an extension of the sovereignty of the European nation-states beyond their own boundaries. Eventually nearly all the world’s territories could be parceled out and the entire world map could be coded in European colors: red for British territory, blue for French, green for Portuguese, and so forth. Wherever modern sovereignty took root, it constructed a Leviathan that overarched its social domain and imposed hierarchical territorial boundaries both to police the purity of its own identity and to exclude all that was other. The passage to Empire emerges from the twilight of modern sovereignty. In contrast to imperialism, Empire establishes no territorial **center** of **power** **and** does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers.It is a decentered and deterritorializing apparatus of rule **that** progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers. Empire **manages hybrid identities,** flexible hier- archies, and plural exchanges through modulating networks of command. The distinct national colors of the imperialist map of the world have merged and blended in the imperial global rainbow. The transformation of the modern imperialist geography of the globe and the realization of the world market signal a passage within the capitalist mode of production. Most significant, the spatial divisions of the three Worlds(First,Second,andThird)have been scrambled so that we continually find the First World in the Third, the Third in the First, and the Second almost nowhere at all. Capital seems to be faced with a smooth world—or really, a world defined by new and complex regimes of differentiation and homogenization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. The construction of the paths and limits of these new global flows has been accompanied by a transformation of the dominant productive processes themselves, with the result that the **role o**f industrial **factory labor has been reduced** and **priority** give**n** instead **to** communicative, cooperative, and **affective labor**. In the postmodernization of the global economy,the creation of wealth tends ever more toward what we will call biopolitical production, the production of social life itself, in which the economic, the political, and the cultural increasingly overlap and invest one another. Many locate the ultimate authority that rules over the processes of globalization and the new world order in the United States. Proponents praise the United States as the world leader and sole superpower, and detractors denounce it as an imperialist oppressor. Both these views rest on the assumption that **the U**nited **S**tates has simply donned **the mantle of global power** that the European nations have now let fall. If the nineteenth century was a British century, then the twentieth century has been an American century; or really, if modernity was European, then postmodernity is American. The most damning charge critics can level, then, is that the United States is repeating the practices of old European imperialists,while proponents celebrate the United States as a more efficient and more benevolent world leader, getting right what the Europeans got wrong. Our basic hypothesis, however, that a new imperial form of sovereignty has emerged, contradicts both these views. *The United States does not, and indeed no nation-state can today, form the center of an imperialist project.* Imperialism is over. No nation will be world leader in the way modern European nations were. The United States does indeed occupy a privileged position in Empire, but this privilege derives not from its similarities to the old European imperialist powers, but from its differences. These differences can be recognized most clearly by focusing on the properly imperial (not imperialist) foundations of the United States constitution, where by ‘‘constitution’’ we mean both the *formal constitution,* the written document along with its various amend- ments and legal apparatuses, and the *material constitution,* that is, the continuous formation and re-formation of the composition of social forces. Thomas Jefferson, the authors of the *Federalist,* and the other ideological founders of the United States were all inspired by the ancient imperial model; they believed they were creating on the otherside of the Atlantic a new Empire with open, expanding frontiers, where power would be effectively distributed in networks. This imperial idea has survived and matured throughout the history of the United States constitution and has emerged now on a global scale in its fully realized form. We should emphasize that we use ‘‘Empire’’ here not as a metaphor,which would require demonstration of the resemblances betweentoday’sworldorderandtheEmpiresofRome,China, the Americas, and so forth, but rather as a *concept,* which calls primarilyforatheoreticalapproach.2The concept of Empireis characterized fundamentally by a lack of boundaries: Empire’s rule has no limits. First and foremost, then, the concept of Empire posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or really that rules over the entire ‘‘civilized’’ world. No territorial boundaries limit its reign. Second, the concept of Empire presents itself not as a historical regime originating in conquest, but rather as an order that effectively suspends history and thereby fixes the existing state of affairs for eternity. From the perspective of Empire, this is the way things will always be and the way they were always meant to be. In other words, Empire presents its rule not as a transitory moment in the movement of history, but as a regime with no temporal boundaries and in this sense outside of history or at the end of history. Third, the rule of Empire operates on all registers of the social order extending down to the depths of the social world. Empire not only manages a territory and a population but also creates the very world it inhabits. It not only regulates human interactions but also seeks directly to rule over human nature. The object of its rule is social life in its entirety, and thus Empire presents the paradigmatic form of biopower. Finally, although the practice of Empire is continually bathed in blood, the concept of Empire is always dedicated to peace—a perpetual and universal peace out- sideofhistory. The Empire we are faced with wields enormous powers of oppression and destruction, but that fact should not make us nostal- gic in any way for the old forms of domination. The passage to Empire and its processes of globalization offer new possibilities to the forces of liberation. Globalization, of course, is not one thing, and the multiple processes that we recognize as globalization are not unified or univocal. Our political task, we will argue, is not simply to resist these processes but to reorganize them and redirect them toward new ends. The creative forces of the multitude that sustain Empire are also capable of autonomously constructing a counter-Empire, an alternative political organization of global flows and exchanges. **The struggles to contest** and subvert Empire, as well as those to construct a real alternative, **will** thus **take place on the imperial terrain** itself—indeed, such new struggles have already begun to emerge. Through these struggles and many more like them, the multitude will have to **invent** new democratic forms and a **new constituent power** that will one day take us through and **beyond Empire**.

#### Err aff **- their circulation within the archive of debate feeds into communicative capitalism. Even if they are valuable in form, the insertion of their epistemology into this network deems their content irrelevant**, reproducing profit off of exchange
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Communication in communicative capitalism, then, is not, as Habermas would suggest, action oriented toward reaching understanding.17 In Habermas’s model of communicative action, the use value of a message depends on its orientation. In sending a message, a sender intends for it to be received and understood. Any acceptance or rejection of the message depends on this understanding. Understanding is a necessary part of the communicative exchange. In communicative capitalism, however, the use value of a message is less important than its exchange value, its contribution to a larger pool, flow, or circulation of content. A contribution need not be understood; it need only be repeated, reproduced, forwarded. Circulation is the context, the condition for the acceptance or rejection of a contribution. Put somewhat differently, how a contribution circulates determines whether it has been accepted or rejected. And just as the producer, labor, drops out of the picture in commodity exchange, so does the sender (or author) become immaterial to the contribution. The circulation of logos, branded media identities, rumors, catchphrases, even positions and arguments exemplifies this point. The popularity, penetration, and duration of a contribution mark its acceptance or success. Thinking about messages in terms of use value and contributions in terms of exchange value sheds light on what would otherwise appear to be an asymmetry in communicative capitalism: the fact that some messages are received, that some discussions extend beyond the context of their circulation. Of course, it is also the case that many commodities are not useless, that people need them. But what makes them commodities is not the need people have for them or, obviously, their use. Rather, it is their economic function, their role in capitalist exchange. Similarly, the fact that messages can retain a relation to understanding in no way negates the centrality of their circulation. Indeed, this link is crucial to the ideological reproduction of communicative capitalism. Some messages, issues, and debates are effective. Some contributions make a difference. But more significant is the system, the communicative network. Even when people know that their specific contributions (their messages, postings, books, articles, films, letters to the editor) simply circulate in a rapidly moving and changing flow of content, in contributing, in participating, they act as if they do not know this. This action manifests ideology as the belief underlying action, the belief that reproduces communicative capitalism.18

#### The Empire *needs* a constant state of crises for more opportunities to accumulate capitalism and stops the leak before it gets too large: BLM enabled mass media coverage then fizzled out after getting coopted by other agendas. But it is exactly through crises that the multitude can expose the flaws of capitalism and overwhelm it: Anonymous’ exposes allow the constituents to take control of the narrative using the same communicative networks. Similarly, the dependency of multinational organizations on standardized tests to encode society into markets means tests are the first line of attack. Passavant and Dean 04
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The multitude is Hardt’s and Negri’s alternative to Empire. A “new figure of collective biopolitical production,” the multitude is a force that both calls Empire into being and opens up the possibility of political change, of an alternative to imperial rule (30). But how is this change supposed to come about?—especially since it hasn’t. How is the flip from Empire to multitude possible? An obvious response is that this is the wrong question; Hardt and Negri emphasize that Empire is defined by crisis. Crisis is “proper to imperial control.... Cr**isis runs through every moment of the** development and recomposition of the **totality**” (385). Crises arising from the productive resistance and struggle of the multitude and imperial efforts to contain them erupt through out Empire. Central to these crises—for both Empire and multitude—are networked communications. Hardt and Negri write: “Technological development based on the generalization of the communicative relationships of production is a motor of crisis, and productive general intellect is a nest of antagonisms” (386). The struggle over the shape of the network, whether it will be democratically rhizomatic or oligopolistically treelike, exemplifies this presence of conflict, this coexisting of Empire and multitude. Almost like Wittgenstein’s duck-rabbit, Empire and multitude suggest two aspects of the same phenomenon, two ways of seeing the informatization of everyday life and the reconfiguring of communication through capitalism.19 The same conditions that reinforce imperial power, informatization, decentralization, deterritorialization, and spectacle also empower the multitude. Hardt and Negri explain how this works when they describe the loss of the autonomy of the political. As will become clear, this description serves as well as an ontologizarion of the political. We see the loss of the autonomy of the political in the changed relation between the state and capital brought about through communicative capitalism (307).20 For example, just as global financial markets impact domestic currencies and policies in ways independent of national governments and citizenries, so do networked technologies challenge the abilities of states to regulate information flow. Similarly, the very media thriving off and through spectacle reconstitute politics in terms of spectacle. Political successes depend on capacities to get[ting] messages across, to make an impact; accordingly, they often rely on raising money, instilling fear, and producing the fleeting spectacular events that seem to call publics into being. Hardt and Negri argue that these changes in the conditions of political mediation mean the loss of a separate sphere of the political.21 But politics is not lost. In fact, Hardt and Negri imply that now it is everywhere. Faced with the foreclosure of politics, they transform it into its opposite—the inevitable, unavoidable givenness of its presence. They arrive at this ontological point via networked communications, or via the community constituted through immaterial and affective labor in the postmodern information economy. Introducing the imperial constitution as a site of contestation, they write: The general outlines of today’s imperial constitution can be conceived in the form of a rhizomatic and universal communication network in which relations are established to and from all its points or nodes. Such a network seems paradoxically to be at once completely open and completely closed to struggle and intervention. On the one hand, the network formally allows all possible subjects in the web of relations to be present simultaneously, but on the other hand, the network itself is a real and proper non-place. (320) Breaking this down, we find a variation on their claim regarding the struggle over the shape of the global information infrastructure. Rather than posing an alternative between “rhizome” and “tree,” here they treat the rhizomatic structure of contemporary communications as a given. They thereby suggest that the problem of imperial power is more than a problem of corporations; corporate oligopolies present one specific set of controls in a larger, shifting, and complex terrain. And in this terrain, the same attributes are benefits and burdens, assets and hindrances to resistance. What opens the network to resistance and opportunities to communicate closes the network to struggle and intervention. How can one intervene when one—and everyone—is already included? How does one struggle against already present communicative opportunities? And what does struggle even mean in a virtual space? As Noortje Marres observes, “when it comes to the manifestation of social movements, it all depends on the presence of irreducible social actors in the streets.”22 Alternatively, Hardt and Negri suggest that constructing something ontologically new, new modes of human being, a new place in the non-place, is one of the tasks of struggle (217). Perhaps. But making the virtual world a key location of struggle risks conceding the more mundane terrains, practices, and institutions of power to those forces of conservatism and capitalism old-fashioned enough to continue their occupation. It also seems to rely a lot more on the symbolic and immaterial labor of the technologically adept than it does on the affective, caring, and domestic labor of community-building. Be that as it may, for Hardt and Negri, the totality of communication, production, and life renders all of Empire into an “open site of conflict” (404). Resistance and struggle, they urge, are already present. In a way, politics is everywhere, and everything is political.23 Accordingly, language is a fundamental site of struggle. The merger of the communicative and the biopolitical means that destroying “linguistic and communicative regimes of production... in words is as urgent as doing so in deeds” (404). A war of words, over words, is a real war, a real struggle over the means of communication. Hardt and Negri write: “If communication has increasingly become the fabric of production, and if linguistic cooperation has increasingly become the structure of productive corporeality, then the control over linguistic sense and meaning and the networks of communication becomes an ever more central issue for political struggle” (404). All of labor is already involved in this struggle over sense, meaning, knowledge, language, and the networks of communicative production. Presumably, victories in the struggle over language will be retroactively constructed in and through the victorious concepts. Like language, subjectivity is also a site of struggle. As with the communicative networks more broadly, here again the processes of subjectivization characteristic of imperial rule are also those enabling the multitude. And here again Hardt and Negri transform failures of mediation into the immediacy of the political. Their argument draws from what they understand as the passage from disciplinary society to the society of control (329). Disciplinary logics worked primarily within the institutions of civil society to produce subjects. These mediating institutions, for example, the nuclear family, the prison, the school, the union, the local church, and the bowling league, are in crisis (197). The spaces, logics, practices, and norms previously coalescing into these institutions have broken down and apart. Hence, their efficacy is now indeterminate. (In other words, in some instances, the release of an institutional logic from its spatial constraints has given it all the more force; in other instances, the opposite has occurred.) In Hardt’s and Negri’s words, “The indefiniteness of the place of production corresponds to the indeterminancy of the form of the subjectivities produced” (197; emphasis in original). So today, rather than discernible identities rooted in sex or ethnicity, say, and rather than specific social roles such as housewife, worker, prisoner, or company man, there are “hybrid and modulating subjectivities” (331). The fluidity of these subjects supports, on the one hand, the mobility of global capital and imperial control. On the other hand, insofar as these new subjectivities exceed the forms of imperial control, they present alternatives to Empire. The alternatives seem to emerge in three key sites—the gaps and crises spread throughout the society of control, the tension between the economic and the political subject, and the change in what it means to be human that Hardt and Negri designate as an “anthropological exodus.” The first location of alternatives to Empire appears in the crises and failures multiplying throughout the society of control. Biopower in the society of control extends throughout every element of social life. For Hardt and Negri this very extension means that biopower loses “its capacity effectively to mediate different social forces” (25). Instead of disciplining subjects or relying on mediating institutions to channel and manage conflict, order in the society of control is a result of direct interventions (35). Direct interventions are singular and flexible—what we might think of as a political version of just-in-time production. Similarly, whether it is juridical or moral, an aspect of media or military surveillance, such intervention is also unbounded. It can hit anything, any time, any place. But **it can** not **hit** everything, all the time, every place. There is “always a surplus” (60). Events necessarily—as events—erupt. (I think of these as being like so many leaks rupturing a giant dam. As soon as one is fixed, another springs forth.) So, Hardt and Negri argue that imperial control intervenes but does not mediate. Empire reacts to crises not only that its very mode of control cannot prevent but that it actually relies on [crises] to call it into being. Biopower “unifies and envelops within itself every element of social life,” but in so doing, “at that very moment reveals a new context, a new milieu of maximum plurality and uncontainable singularization—a milieu of the event” (25). Hardt and Negri thus conclude that unification entails pluralization. Precisely because Empire encompasses everything, resistance can appear anywhere. **There are more possibilities for resistance than ever before.24**

#### The 1AC is revolutionary sabotage – exploiting cracks of Empire to make way for true resistance. Resistance must start somewhere, the 1AC cultivates radical hope necessary for movement building.

* Justifies state centered policy, i.e. plantext
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Infiltration: a word that may evoke a host of thoughts and fantasies from soldiers operating behind enemy lines, police informants gaining access to criminal organizations, or to scenarios of radicals inserting themselves into corporations or research labs. Whatever the scenario, infiltration can be tactic that anarchists pursue when thinking about operating within current institutional realities, especially if interested in teaching in public schools. Although this claim is entangled within complex relationships of power and privilege, struggle arises wherever domination coalesces, especially within institutional structures and settings (Sharp, Routledge, Philo & Paddison, 2000). Power conjures, “the threadings, knottings and weavings” of social relationships through a intertwining of the social, political, moral, educational, and historical realities of a given society. In this way, power is “crucially and unavoidably spun out across and through the material spaces of the world” (Sharp, et al., 2000, p. 22). This chapter thus looks to situate itself and build radical pedagogy within the threads and knots of contemporary relationships of power; inbetween what Holloway (2010) has called the “cracks” of capitalism, trying to “desperately find . . . faults beneath the surface, or to create cracks by banging the walls” (p. 8). Cracks have emerged through environmental disaster, economic collapse, psychological alienation, a crisis of identity, and decades of war and imperial aggression conducted by the West. It is under these historical conditions that resistance needs to be conceptualized. Creating, finding and exploiting “cracks” within a diffused and networked capitalism demonstrates that dated narratives of revolutionary struggle are no longer viable and there is “no guarantee of a happy ending” (Holloway, 2010, p. 9). Unfortunately, although these narratives may provide comfort amid an onslaught of capitalism, war, death, terror, and alienation, they do not open up, nor allow, alternative possibilities of resistance to form outside the boundaries they construct. In some ways, these may only help to reproduce the current order we find ourselves in. This does not mean that we should resign ourselves to the throngs of nihilistic defeat, as there is indeed potential for radical hope within the cracks of Empire. The multitude, with its potential for infinite possibilities, can build a complex and dispersed resistance through the breaks, tears, and folds of our social order (Deleuze, 1992), and the tactics and pedagogies that we envision as radicals can attempt to capture this spirit. Although the manifestations of these cracks and folds is yet to be seen, I leave the reader to their own radical imaginations in devising ways to subvert a networked and diffused machine (Shukaitis, 2009). Evoking the metaphor of a “machine,” as I describe the multifaceted nature of contemporary capitalism, harkens to Trotter’s (1990) claim that colonialism operated in a very similar way, divorced from individual interactions and operating abstractly through “official” and “unofficial” discourses, forms of knowledge, ways of knowing, the morality of a given era, and the reproduction of knowledge to name a few. The analogy of a machine also challenges that human agency is solely at the center of how social system operate, because machines, “create, distribute, and organize populations and impose regimes of conduct, agency and effectivity” outside of individual actors and agency (Grossberg, 2010, p. 36). Radicals (within and outside the labor movement) had ingenious ways in which to deal with the machines of capitalism, occurring through tactics that spanned strikes, sit-ins, walking out, and subversion to even more direct forms like sabotaging machinery, bringing production to a halt. Sabotage is a tactic that anarchists need to rethink in light of how labor is now dispersed among a wide variety of institutional realities (factories, banks, corporations, and public institutions, for example), as well as the contemporary knowledge and abstract economies. The machines of capitalism that produced goods during the height of the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century provide us a way in which to think of societal machines and tactics that can be adapted for current conditions. How do we as anarchists, who want to teach and work with students, deal with the contradictions of being located within the same institutions that seek to discipline bodies and coerce us? How do we sabotage these machines and build a radical pedagogy from this perspective? Sabotage provides a provocative conceptual framework in which to think about building alternative forms of resistance and aligns with ways in which anarchists have historically conceptualized direct political action. This is even more interesting when we think of how this will emerge through educational practice, as teaching allows us to directly engage ideology, challenging students’ conceptions about the world around them. With this type of important, dare I say political work, why do some anarchists shun the world of public teaching and service? Education is at the “front lines” of the contemporary ideological war conducted by corporate media, official organs of the State, and influential economic institutions. Whether that emerges through corporate textbooks that omit subaltern experiences and worldviews, standardized testing that stress rote memorization, or a curriculum that reproduces Eurocentrism and Western ways of knowing, education is invested in reproducing dominant conceptions of the world. However, sabotage can take myriad forms, and this chapter will build on the conceptual idea of building politics of infiltration. It has been well established that police and other State agents have infiltrated radical political movements, especially with the rise of anarchist praxis over the past two decades (Borrum & Tilby, 2004). Anarchists should think about assuming this same tactic, using the idea of infiltration as a guiding way to think about our praxis within institutional realities and as a way to think about diffused forms of sabotage. Although anarchism is rife with identity and lifestyle politics that detests any signs of “selling out,” this has only proven to further marginalize us in the eyes of the larger society that we must work at convincing how terribly oppressive the current social arrangement is. In the end, our movement is going to have to be broadbased and span multiple identities, social locations, political affiliations, and a renewed sense of politics that seeks to look at how, “the contemporary world has been made to be what it is [and] make visible ways in which it can become something else” (Grossberg, 2010, p. 1). Stoler (2010) discusses the idea of reading and analyzing “against the grain” of archival documents to unearth new interpretations and voices. This chapter urges radicals to think of our social actions along these same lines of thought: against the grain of dominant ideologies that serve to support historically oppressive realities. In this chapter, I will attempt to propose a politics of infiltration through a peculiar anarchist lens that seeks to subvert capitalism and its accompanying institutional realities through a diffused resistance stemming from bodies; bodies immersed in oppressive institutional realities. I dance through theoretical traditions to demonstrate how infiltration can be conceptualized as not only a physical practice (such as our work in classrooms), but also can be a theoretical framework in which to situate our practice, always looking for cracks, weaknesses, and opportunities to sabotage dominant conceptions of the world that demonstrates another world is possible. Although radicals may think of this action as “selling out,” I want to reframe teaching and working within institutions as a potential form of infiltration, inserting other ways of knowing and being into the academy to challenge systemically oppressive realities. Shannon (2009) reminds us that cooptation lurks around every corner and Shukaitis (2009) warns us of the recuperative nature of capitalism. Both of these realities are firmly acknowledged as risks, however, it should not immobilize us into inaction. Nor should this resign us to “ghettoizing” ourselves into intellectual enclaves where conversations are more about nodding our collective heads in agreement rather than challenging our own practices with alternative voices and tactics. Indeed, tensions can be the basis for a critical reflection about what we are actually doing in our practice and engaging a wide variety of techniques and approaches to explore these, such as writing and political organization. Communities of practice, whether in activism or through qualitative research, are an essential feature of building bridges with other like-minded activists and scholars (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Cooptation and recuperation are indeed challenges we will face but should not stop us from doing something, keeping in mind the question that Lorde (2003) had when she struggled with the tools of the master (p. 25). This chapter will hopefully allow the conversation to continue about the role of anarchist theory in building alternative forms of praxis, pedagogy, and direct action, especially within the context of public education and the contradictions that anarchists face within hierarchical and coercive institutions.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for who best methodologically actualizes affect. Affects –feelings and intensities – structure our world. Selfhood is based on a fragmented relationship to external forces, ensuring a non-sovereign existence. Therefore, the cornerstone of ethics and possibility becomes based in our capacity to open ourselves to both being affected and affecting others, styling these interactions to explore our subjectivity.

Michael Hardt, 2015
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Lauren Berlant’s work is filled with explorations of the passions, the many ways in which we are affected by powers greater than ourselves—in institutional contexts and intimate relations, in sexual encounters and aesthetic experiences, and in political affairs and economic struggles. The object of her journeys through the affects is not simply to register or catalogue—let alone lament—the affective damage caused by living in contemporary society or the ways in which our desires are thwarted. Instead, she regards the pains, pleasures, frustrations, and longing as so many tracks we can follow to understand how people manage in this world to create new intimacies, new bonds, and new forms of life.1 Simply getting by and surviving in a dangerous and threatening world, though, is not enough. Berlant revives classical concepts to name her ultimate goals: **we should strive for the good life and seek human flourishing. Orienting** the analysis and even **the affirmation of the affects toward a project for the good life** might well seem an odd combination since the classical tradition teaches us—or, at least, this is what we are usually told—that the passions are the ties that bind us in servitude; only following the dictates of sovereign reason can we truly flourish. In Berlant’s work, instead, **the only path toward achieving the good life must be constructed with and through the affects.** To understand the arc of Berlant’s project, I find it helpful to pose it in relation to that of Baruch Spinoza, to which it has strong correspondences. (Berlant may well be a closet Spinozist—even without knowing it.) **For Spinoza being affected by others, by external forces, is not aweakness but a strength, a power.** As a first approximation, **think of the power to be affected as a gauge of your capacity to be really in the world, to register and feel its diverse powers. Once we open up and expand our power to be affected, however, then begins the work of selecting among the affects and discovering themeans to repeat or prolong those that are beneficial and prevent the detrimental.** That is a path, through the affects, with the affects, toward joy and flourishing. **The first step** of this process **is to take stock** realistically and recognize **that we are not sovereign subjects**. Berlant is rightly suspicious of the standard ethical injunctions that assume our individual sovereignty, as well as those that aim at constructing or supporting sovereign political powers. Consider the sovereign individual, in correspondence with Carl Schmitt’s political formula, as the one who decides (2007). Berlant questions both elements of this statement: the one and the decision. **Sovereign decision, she claims, resides on an illusion of self-control, “a fantasy misrecognized as an objective state” (2011, p. 97). People are not always engaged in projects of selfextension, she says, and in fact, they seldom have significant control over their decision-making.** Spinoza expresses the same idea in quantitative terms. **The power of all individual or limited subjects to think and act autonomously corresponds proportionally to the relation between their powers and the power of nature as a whole.** “The force by which a man perseveres in existing is limited, and infinitely surpassed by the power of external causes” (1985 Ethics IV P3). Only God (or nature as a whole) is self-caused because it has no outside. **The fact that the power of the world outside of us so far surpasses our own power means that we are affected by others much more than we affect the world or even autonomously affect ourselves, and thus, our capacity for sovereign decision-making is minimal too**. The other half of Schmitt’s dictum is equally unfounded: “the one” never decides or acts or is acted on. **The subject is never one. Agency and causality, Berlant suggests, should be understood not in terms of unities but instead “as dispersed environmental mechanisms at the personal as well as the institutional level”** (2011, p. 114). Spinoza expresses this too in mathematical and geometrical form**. A body or an individual, he explains, is formed when a great number of parts agree with each other and thus communicate in a consistent way** (1985 Ethics II P13 definition). Essential to a body is the relation: **the body lives as long as that relation is maintained. Instead of thinking in terms of unities, then, we need to think the relation among multiplicities and recognize the consistency of dispersed landscapes.** To identify the locus of decision or acting or being acted upon, we need to look to not the one but the consistent relation among the many. There is no point in lamenting our relative lack of power or unity or ability to rule ourselves autonomously. Spinoza, in fact, ridicules those wise men who, maintaining a fantasy of the sovereign subject, chastise us for being ruled by passions. “Philosophers look upon the passions by which we are assailed as vices, into which men fall by their own fault. So it is their custom to deride, bewail, berate them, or, if their purpose is to appear more zealous than others, to execrate them. They believe that they are thus performing a sacred duty, and that they are attaining the summit of wisdom when they have learnt how to shower extravagant praise on a human nature that nowhere exists and the revile that which exists in actuality. The fact is that they conceive men not as they are, but as they would like them to be. As a result, for the most part it is not ethics they have written, but satire; and they have never worked out a political theory that can have practical application” (2002 Political Treatise, Chapter 1, Introduction, 680). A practical political theory instead must begin where people are, and really existing people are primarily filled, so to speak, by passions. Berlant poses the terrain of the nonsovereign in terms of the “interruptions” or “intermissions” that break the imagined efforts of self- extension of sovereign subjects. (Be careful, though, not to be misled by these terms because, as Berlant makes clear, they are the norm not the exception: we live in the interruption and the intermission the vast majority of the time.) What are we left with, then, if we cannot theorize in terms of the one who decides? Does this realistic standpoint condemn us to powerlessness?2 Neither Spinoza nor Berlant has much interest merely in recounting the disaster of our world and enumerating the damages we suffer. Recognizing of our relative lack of power is simply the solid point of departure for theorizing the ethics and politics of nonsovereign subjects, a project of liberation to increase our power. Here, I find it useful to introduce the concept of the power to be affected because it illuminates most brightly the paths available to nonsovereign subjects to strive for the good life and flourish. Gilles Deleuze, more than any other Spinoza scholar, is the one who individuates the power to be affected as a concept and explores how it constitutes a rich field for an ethical and political project. The touchstone for his interpretation, to which he frequently returns, is Spinoza’s claim that no one has yet determined “what a body can do [quid corpus possit]” and “what is the structure of the body [corporis fabricam]” (1985 Ethics III P2S). For Deleuze, this unknown field exerts an irresistible call: just like Conrad’s Marlowe is drawn to the dark empty space in the middle of his map of Africa, so too Deleuze is compelled by the mystery of what a body can do. And this journey is not merely driven by a desire for knowledge. As Berlant says, “It’s a political problem, of course, the body” (2011, p. 267). Deleuze and Spinoza agree completely. Spinoza’s route, though, which Deleuze follows carefully, is indirect: to investigate what a body can do, we have to look first at how it can be affected because, Deleuze explains, “a body must be defined by the ensemble of relations which compose it, or, what amounts to exactly the same thing, by its power to be affected [pouvoir d’être affecté]” (1978 “L’affect et l’idée”). You cannot understand the structure of the body if you do not know all the ways in which it can be affected, the nature of its power to be affected.3 Deleuze demonstrates two levels, so to speak, of the power to be affected: first, its correspondence to the power to act and, second, the qualities of the affections that compose or fill it, and how they can be transformed. The argument on the first level serves to dignify or elevate the power to be affected. Whereas the sovereign subject is (or imagines itself to be) impervious to and unmoved by external forces, and whereas projects aimed at sovereignty strive to minimize the influence of others, we should conceive being affected by others as a virtue. The most powerful is not the one least affected but, on the contrary, the one affected the most and in the most ways. The more you are affected in many ways, the more alive you are, and to the extent you cease to be affected, to the extent you close off from the world, that much you die.4 Deleuze thus reads in Spinoza a correspondence or equivalence between our power to act and our power to be affected. For all limited subjects, that is, in Spinoza’s terms, for all existing modes, Deleuze claims that “essence is the same as [ne fait qu’un avec] the power of action, and the power of action the same as the power to be affected” (1992, p. 225, translation modified5). Deleuze aims to recognize here not really an identity but an equivalence between the two powers: to affect and to be affected.
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As Frederick Douglass stated in his autobiography: “Knowledge unfits the child to be a slave”. While one does obtain some liberation with any knowledge they receive, knowledge [is] has come to be a commodity that is sold and marketed around the world. “The most significant material change that underpins neoliberalism in the twenty-first century is the rise in the importance of knowledge as capital” (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 330). n describing the movement towards a knowledge economy Olssen and Peters (2005) relate the explanation given by Joseph E Stiglitz in his work, Globalization and Its Discontents. Stiglitz believes that this movement demands that we rethink economic fundamentals. He suggests that knowledge is different than other commodities because it can be considered a public good. If knowledge is a public good then governments play a vital role in trying to protect intellectual property rights. This economy also allows for more monopolies than we have seen in past times. There is no doubt there are many monopolies in our world today and they continue to develop as countries attempt to control the globe and also control knowledge. Terms such as “knowledge economy” and “knowledge capitalism” are used by the World Bank and the OECD. By linking knowledge with money they attempt to plac[ing]e a price on what is being taught and control what is being taught. “The term knowledge capitalism emerged only recently to described the transition to the so-called knowledge economy, which we characterize in terms of the economics of abundance, the annihilation of distance, the de-territorialization of the state, and, investment in human capital” (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 331). According to David Skyrme Associates (in Olsen & Peters, 2005) the knowledge economy is different from a traditional economy in respect to: economics is changed from that of scarcity to abundance, location is not important, laws and taxes are almost impossible to apply, products enhanced by knowledge can control price, price and value depend upon context, knowledge associated with systems has higher value, and human competencies are a key components. The movement of concentrating on knowledge economy and knowledge capitalism is an effect of Empire. It must be understood that one of the major initiatives of the Right in the U.S. is to implement the use of vouchers in public education. Vouchers are beneficial only to those that already have the funds to send their children to private schools. The average citizen would not benefit under a voucher system because the amount of the voucher would not be enough to pay for the price of private schools. This initiative should be considered in the context of being part of globalization and a movement towards combining knowledge and capitalism. “In the age of knowledge capitalism, we can expect governments in the west to further ease themselves out of the public provision of education as they begin in earnest to privatize the means of knowledge production and experiment with new ways of designing and promoting a permeable interface between knowledge businesses and public education at all levels” (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 339-340). If a voucher system was established then privately owned schools would begin opening all over the U.S. We have already witnessed, in the prison system, what occurs when private companies begin to take over the responsibilities of the government. It is well established that even in our globalized and interdependent world the way in which knowledge and technical skills are distributed is not equal. “Critics point out that the flow of international knowledge and understanding is as unbalanced as the trade figures” (Ziguras, 2005, p. 105). The countries that have the most vibrant economies are the ones in which more money has been spen[d]t on obtaining new knowledge and developing better technical skills. Even though most corporations are only concerned with their bottom-line earnings in order for them to continue to be prosperous they have to be able to hire workers that will meet the demands of the industry. Since the Industrial Revolution the U.S. enjoyed many of the benefits of a capitalist free market system that enabled the business leaders to become rich while the middle and lower classes were further exploited. The U.S. does continue to operate in this tradition with its educational system but due to the amount of interdependency that is apparent in our world today this does not seem fair. If the majority of the products that Americans are consuming are produced in other countries then it is unjust that these countries are not equal in the percentage of schools and institutions of higher learning that are available to their citizens. As I have stated previously, we are continuing to educate our students the way our parents were educated and also we are educating them with the same information and the same goals in mind. The knowledge that our students need[ed] today is vastly different than the knowledge that was exchanged in classrooms ten years ago. Our students are more technical, more connected, and more demanding than students of yesteryear. The knowledge now needed by young children growing up in the postindustrial societies of the twenty-first century differs markedly from times past, when the industrial economy ruled the world. The major function of school is not simply to prepare young children for their unknown and unknowable future as workers, but to enable them to use new technologies to facilitate information production and knowledge creation. (Grieshaber & Yelland, 2005, p. 197) If we do not accept the fact that the current ways the majority of our students are being taught and what they are being taught is incorrect then we will be failing them and seriously damaging the future of our world. The concept of knowledge society changes what many believe to be an educated society. At one time it was assumed that having a one hundred percent literate society meant your country had achieved the educational promise land. With the implementation of computers into every aspect of life the idea of an educated society shifted to include computer competency. Also, instead of having workers it was the goal to have skilled workers. A knowledge society goes further and demands a highly educated highly skilled society. While this can be viewed as just semantics it is much more because this gives the World Bank selling points when judging a nation-states educational systems and society. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is a group of thirty countries that claims to support democratic ideals and a market economy. They work with seventy other countries, NGOs, and citizen movements. “Best known for its publications and its statistics, its work covers economic and social issues from macroeconomics, to trade, education, development, and science and innovation” (OECD, 2006). Since, through surveys by the OECD, the World Bank can show how a country does not perform as well as others they are able to increase the market for their loans. In order to have a highly knowledgeable society countries have to offer intensive and specific training to the citizens. “Much of the available knowledge, particularly that which is highly technical cannot be absorbed without specific and extensive training. Hence the importance of effective training systems” (Tilak, 2002, p. 299). The countries that are most affected by the need for this training do not have the financial stability to offer programs on their own, therefore the Bank is viewed as a savior to their problems. But the Bank is not the savior rather it is the bearer of evil and suffering. The transition of a country to a knowledge society is something, according to many, that cannot be done quickly. If a country is trying to change the ways in which they educate and train their citizens it will take decades to become a reality. There is no quick-fix solution to years of limited access, under funding, and limited resources. If a country wants a truly educated society they need to look at educating their students and not training them because training not require critical thinking skills. The OECD promotes the concept of a knowledge-based economy with the idea that workers will benefit from such a system. “The knowledge-based economy is marked by increasing labour (sic) market demand for more highly skilled workers, who are also enjoying wage premiums” (OECD, 1996, p. 16). The OECD does cite several studies in which they base this statement upon, however, if the economy as a whole is transformed then the price of commodities the citizens’ need and desire also changes. The increase in pay then is not effective because the amount of money being spent has increased. In order for a nation-state to change into a knowledge society they have to rely on the educational system. “Hence, governments in developing countries have an important role in promoting research in the universities, research institutions and other institutions of higher learning” (Tilak, 2002, p. 307). The governments have to consider the changes that are needed in their basic educational system also if they want to change their centers of higher learning. The OECD admits that it is hard to measure knowledge in individuals and the effects they have on the economy. For decades psychiatrists, counselors, and educators have been administering IQ tests in an attempt to measure an individuals’ mental capacity. While it has been proven numerous times these tests are culturally and regionally biased they continue to be widely used. It can also be argued that an IQ test [and] cannot predict the level of achievement an individual may reach in their life. While the OECD has not called for IQ tests to be administered to students and workers they are very interested in trying to measure a society’s knowledge base. “An unknown proportion of knowledge is implicit, uncodified and stored only in the minds of individuals. Terrain such as knowledge stocks and flows, knowledge distribution and the relation between knowledge creation and economic performance is still virtually unmapped” (OECD, 1996, p. 29). The wording of this statement is intriguing because they are attempting to not only measure knowledge but also place a price on it. Since the economic success of a country is the determining factor as to whether a country is developed or not everything has a price. International organizations are interested in measuring and pricing knowledge because through initiatives like these they are able to extend their capitalist agenda around the world. The OECD promotes changing the ways in which economies are measured in relation to the knowledge base of their society. “Economists have traditionally measured the development of human capital in terms of proxies, such as years of education or experience. Such measures do not reflect the quality of education and learning nor the economic returns to investment in education and training” (OECD, 1996, p. 41). Many would agree that the years of education or years of experience do not give a clear picture of the knowledge an individual possesses. This, however, leaves open the debate on how knowledge can be measured. The OECD has taken on this task and are intent on developing a way in which knowledge and its effects on society and economics can be measured. “To fill in some of these measurement gaps, the OECD has recently initiated a project to develop ‘human capital indicators’, aimed particularly at measuring private and social rates of return to investment in education and training” (OECD, 1996, p. 41). The concept that the knowledge of a society can be measure[d] through “human capital indicators” is, to be blunt, [wrong]~~crazy~~. By measuring and comparing the impact of money spent on education and the levels of education attained by society to the economic growth of a society, the OECD believes the “social rate of return” can be assessed. From this point of view a country can spend little on education but if they experience great economic growth then the social rate of return for that country would indicate that government money should not be spent on education. How can a country that spends little on education have a strong overall economy? Imagine if a country has large amounts of natural resources, such as petroleum or natural gas, it would have a strong economy. The other indicator that is measured is private rates of return. “Measuring private rates of return has tended to look at changes in human skills and competencies at the individual or firm level and the impacts on firm performance” (OECD, 1996, p. 42). The OECD found, through their research, that companies who invest in technology and technological training are able to see the greatest increase in returns. With this in mind it can be assumed that if a firm is doing well then the individuals who are employed by the firm must well trained and competent in highly technical jobs. If this is true the employees at Wal-Mart must be well trained and educated, therefore having great knowledge. It is insane to assume that all employees who work at a successful company are highly knowledgeable in regards to overall society. There are many issues that affect the overall performance such as taxes, tariffs, and trade networks. Also, since there are so many successful trans-national corporations it cannot be assumed citizens in one country are well trained and highly knowledgeable. A trans-national corporation may have its headquarters in one country and all of its workers may be in a foreign country. With this in mind, which society would be rated as having highly knowledgeable workers?

They continue

In this same report the authors go further to explain they believe that one of the main problems with improving educational quality is the lack of incentives. Of course, this is also in-line with one of the current movements in the U.S., to award teachers and schools if students scor[ing]~~e~~ high on standardized tests. This is nothing more than paying for grades. As can be expected the researches take the next step and suggest that a form of measurement should be used to identify student achievement. In closing they also suggest that students and parents should be given school choice. Reviewing this study reminds one of No Child Left Behind. It could be argued that since some in the World Bank suggest changes in developing countries educational systems that are a mirror image of NCLB then this is a sign of U.S. imperialism. However, I believe this is not the case and rather it is another sign of Empire. We have to consider that it will be corporations who are asked to set the standards and provide tests and also train the teachers. Therefore it is nothing more than forcing capitalism on unsuspecting countries and schools. The idea of comparing students and educational institutions across the globe is nothing new at least for so-called industrialized nations. In another research paper, by Hanushek and Luque, efficiency and equity in schools is researched. While the authors do look at some of the poorest countries around the world some of the statements they make are quite alarming. “The particular emphasis is the power of resource policies such as improving teacher education or reducing class sizes. These policies have proven ineffective in the United States, but this situation does not necessarily hold elsewhere” (Hanushk and Luque, 2001, p. 23). I am not sure what they based this assertion on but I believe that it has been proven and is generally accepted that if teachers are better educated and classes are smaller then the students have a much better chance of obtaining the knowledge they are being taught. What is alarming about this paper is that it is read by representatives of countries around the world. While the authors do go on to state that reducing class size could have positive effects it is interesting they make the above statement about the U.S. In closing, this report states the importance of the family declines as a student gets older. Once again, I cannot even begin to imagine what studies they are basing this assertion on because familial support is always needed. In “Lifelong Learning in the Global Knowledge Economy”, another World Bank report, the idea of how create an atmosphere of lifelong learning in developing countries is addressed. The report states: Performing in the global economy and functioning in a global society require mastery of technical, interpersonal, and methodological skills. Technical skills include literacy, foreign language, math, science, problem-solving, and analytical skills. Interpersonal skills include teamwork, leadership, and communication skills. Methodological skills include the ability to learn on one’s own, to pursue lifelong learning, and to cope with risk and change. (World Bank, 2003, p. 22) It would be interesting to see how exactly the methodological skills are evaluated and assessed. Of course, through multiple choice tests these institutions can claim to be assessing literacy, language, math and science. If these tests are designed properly they could be considered objective, however, what concerns me is the subjectivity that would be present in evaluation and assessing the interpersonal and methodological skills. The bridging together of knowledge with capitalism and economy began in the twentieth century. The terms “knowledge capitalism” and “knowledge economy” first appeared during this time in reports that were issued by the OECD and World Bank. Since these international organizations have an enormous amount of influence in the world this causes many countries desire ways in which to access knowledge in their economies. “In terms of these reports, education is reconfigured as a massively undervalued form of knowledge capital that will determine the future of work, the organization of knowledge institutions and the shape of society in the years to come” (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 331). The idea of attempting to measure the level and quality of education and its’ affects on the economy has merit because students should be prepared to engage in meaningful employment when they exit schools and/or universities. The problem that develops is the reports issued by the OECD and World Bank become gospel for governments around the world and learning institutions are then changed and instructed to produce workers and not educated citizens. The World Bank is only interested in creating workers for trans-national corporations and creating a desire in the people for goods and more capitalism. The World Bank suggests that ways in which to measure how people are able to interact with one another are still in the beginning stages of development. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is said to be able to measure a student’s social competency and other tests that measure the ability to understand and relate to other cultures are being developed. The World Bank states: “Some private businesses use personality testing, and many companies and organizations are trying to measure interpersonal skills as part of performance evaluations” (World Bank, 2003, p. 22-23). It is alarming that the World Bank wants to follow businesses in their quest to measure how people interact. However, this is what the World Bank does, helps spread capitalism. Interaction and interpersonal skills are important but it is hard to measure competence in this area because true interpersonal interactions are random and spontaneous. Any attempt to measure these would have to be subjective and open to interpretation. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an assessment that is used to measure student performance and the effectiveness of a country’s education system. “PISA is the only international education survey to measure the knowledge and skills of 15-year-old, an age at which students in most countries are nearing the end of their compulsory time in school” (PISA, 2006, ¶ 2). In order for an assessment of this magnitude to be given the OECD contracts out the actual testing to agencies who specialize in assessment and testing. Experts from the fields of reading, mathematics, and science design the surveys and create the tests. “The data collected by PISA shows the successes of some countries’ schools and the challenges being faced in other countries. It allows countries to compare best practices and to further develop their own improvements, ones appropriate for their schools systems” (PISA, 2006, ¶ 20). As is done with the states in the U.S., countries around the world are compared to others, even though they have completely different cultures and societies. The areas that are tested in the PISA are much like those in the United States that are tested every year. “Every PISA survey tests reading, mathematical, and scientific literacy in therms of general competencies, that is, how well students can apply the knowledge and skills they have learned at school to real-life challenges. PISA does not test how well a student has mastered a school’s curriculum” (PISA, 2006, ¶ 22). It is interesting the World Bank is concerned with testing interpersonal communication and cultural skills yet they do not test any area in the filed of social studies. History is the result of interactions and cultural skills being used in everyday life but local histories are not important to international institutions. As the World Bank states: “Competency in math and science is important for participation in the knowledge economy” (World Bank, 2003, p. 25). Math and science are technical and can be easily measured and assessed. Also, these subjects are ones that are usually considered profitable in the future. Since the success of Sputnik the U.S. has concentrated on raising the mathematical and scien[ce]~~tific~~ skills of American students in order to become more dominant in the future. One of the main aspects of a democracy that citizens expect is transparency of the government. The citizens need this in order to ensure their government is being honest in their dealings. The World Bank does not have transparency, people that are affected by its decisions and agreements do not usually know the Bank exist (Stiglitz, 2003). One thing that appears to becoming more prevalent is governments are less transparent, which inevitably leads to corruption and possible totalitarianism. If governments are allowed to become less transparent then international organizations and trans-national corporations will follow. In order for countries that need additional resources to obtain the “help” of organizations such as the IMF, World Bank, and/or WTO they have to agree to the rules and regulations of these organizations. “They are basically forced to give up part of their sovereignty, to let capricious capital markets, including the speculators whose only concerns are short-term rather than the long-term growth of the country and the improvement of living standards, discipline them, telling them what they should and should not do” (Stiglitz, 2003, p. 247). If nation-states are in dire need of medicine, technology, or food the international organizations will assist them. However, the nation- states have to agree to not only open their borders to good intentions but also to capitalism.
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Education has been transformed to align with permanent austerity and debt. Standardized test- ing, charter school and privatization schemes, corporatization, dehistoricizing and depoliticized curricula, the deskilling of teachers, and the col- lapse of carceral logics into public schools have combined to create an educative environment characterized by the production of youth tuned into the punitive logics of indebtedness and pre- cariousness (Giroux 2013; Saltman 2012). Edu- cation in the age of debt and austerity is increasingly being stripped of its mandate to cul- tivate thoughtful democratic subjects with a sense of the importance of ethical and collective obliga- tions and the public or common good. Education has lost its capacity to cultivate subjects with critical and ethical imaginations insofar as its pri- mary aim has been transformed to the production of isolated subjects whose obligations to society are defined solely by their roles as consumers. Indeed, informed largely by the values of the market, education today is quickly losing the capacity to provide young people with the critical skills necessary to resist the structural conditions of neoliberalism and the bonds of perpetual debt.

Instead, education has abandoned its critical and democratic dimensions and become one of the primary apparatuses for disposing young people to a future defined by permanent debt and eco- nomic instability.

If the Foucaultian notion of “‘human capital’ was the logic of neoliberalism in its expansionist periods, austerity is its logic in periods of decline and public disinvestment” (Breu 2014, p. 30). In times of growth, neoliberals bank on educating entrepreneurial subjects, while in times of decline, such as we are experiencing now, they pour mil- lions into educative and cultural apparatus meant to produce a “resilient” mode of subjectivity (Evans and Reid 2013). Resilient young people learn to do their part not by fundamentally resisting larger structures of capital, but rather by learning strategies to deal with unstable and pre- carious financial and social realities. Neoliberal educative efforts bear down with particular inten- sity on young people both in school and through powerful forms of “public pedagogy” outside of school (Giroux 2011, 2013). Neoliberal financial pedagogy teaches youth that resilience is synon- ymous with resistance; that debt and diminished opportunity is inevitable (Evans and Reid 2013). Ultimately, dominant neoliberal power uses edu- cation to teach young people that violent capitalist structures are to be mediated rather than transformed, and, worse still, that the only viable way to do this is through individual rather than collective techniques. Financial and economic resilience, rather than political and social resis- tance, and bare financial literacy, rather than a critical literacy informed by an empowering lan- guage of critical pedagogy, have become the dom- inant educational techniques of the contemporary moment.

Neoliberal regimes of power operate by con- vincing populations that a market society is syn- onymous with democracy and that the fundamental obligations of citizenship are com- mercial. This ideological influence works on young people at multiple points throughout soci- ety: through corporatized curricula in schools, as well as through a larger educational culture steeped in corporate and commercial values. Addressing neoliberalism as an educational project which produces particular forms of sub- jectivity is important for recognizing the degree to which questions about subjectivity, identity, and morality, as well as the limits of political possibil- ity and political imagination, are, in the current moment, also necessarily questions about debt and indebtedness.

Highly commercialized and corporatized forms of life are both cause and effect of a dom- inant mode of education that fails to teach young people to think politically and socially. Taken over by business interests and markets, public educa- tion teaches students about what life dominated by corporations looks and feels like. In urban centers across the country, funding cuts to public educa- tion are matched by “turnaround” and “leader- ship” schemes which result in the stripping of public schools’ capacities to defend themselves from privatization and to generate critical citizens (Saltman 2012). Instead, corporate education has introduced a set of conditions in which subjects are produced to conform to a corporate type of citizenship for an increasingly corporate kind of sovereignty. As Saltman (2012) argues, neoliberal corporate education reformers “champion private sector approaches to reform including, especially, privatization, deregulation, and the importation of terms and assumptions from business, while they imagine public schools as private businesses, dis- tricts as markets, students as consumers and knowledge as a product” (p. 1). Youth indebted- ness is intensified by the assault on unions and teachers, the closure of dozens of public schools in impoverished neighborhoods, the expansion of charters and Educational Management Organiza- tions, and the market-friendly developments of the new Common Core Curriculum. The modus operandi of public education has become indistin- guishable from that of business and corporations, both demand the activity of consumers willing to rely on predatory financial service industries and to go into debt, whether for education, healthcare, or simply to eat. Education, much like market society more generally, has become primarily an indebted space. The result is not only an education saturated in commercial and corporate values, but also a dominant mode of subjectivity dangerously

disposed to the swindle of consumerism and, ulti- mately, the misery of indebtedness.

The increased domination of public education and culture by corporate and commercializing forces is part of a shift towards what Bauman (2005) calls a “society of consumers.” Bauman (2005) uses sociological analysis to argue that as the social state and the production base waned throughout the 1980s and 1990s in the West, a new neoliberal society emerged that resituated consumerism from the periphery directly into the center of a new form of social, political, and economic life. According to Bauman, consumer- ism has radically altered contemporary notions of work, ethics, and time. If work was once the determining factor of a productive economy, or productivity more generally, consumerism now fills that role. Consequently, notions of freedom and what it means to be a citizen in the company of others have been reconceived according to the narrowly circumscribed logic of consumerism.

If, as Bauman argues, there is a morality of consumerism, there is an inverse morality of debt. In fact, consumerism and debt are two inti- mately related vehicles driving the financialized violence at the heart of neoliberalism. So much of neoliberal education is about learning to live in the moment, to take risks, to be bold. Consumerism is about desire, pleasure, and, temporally speaking, the present moment. Debt, on the other hand, is about discipline, self-restraint, and the future. The short-termism that defines all facets of life in the neoliberal conjuncture is responsible for subjects’ incapacity to think clearly and collectively about the long-term consequences of debt and indebted- ness. Neoliberal subjects are well versed in the lingua franca of consumerism, while being excep- tionally poorly versed in the lexical complexity and perpetual obligations of debt and indebted- ness. Indeed, young people learn to not see debt and its consequences by seeing the world through consumerism. Debt is the perpetual blind spot of neoliberal consumerism. And if consumerism has become an alibi for indebtedness, it has also impoverished the political imagination. Neolib- eral education and bankrupt notions of financial literacy have played a key part in this impoverishment.
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One of the main ways in which globalization is accomplished is through the use of the English language. “The English language is a chief instrument of global hegemony” (Imam, 2005, p. 479). For the upcoming Olympic Games in Beijing everyone from waitresses to doctors are required to attend English classes. This is not to say that other languages, such as French, Spanish, and Japanese, are not important. However, in order for trans-national corporations and international organizations to conduct business the people must be able to communicate easily. “The diffusion of English opens up developing country markets”(Imam, 2005, p. 480). If a nation-state wants to become part of the global trade network they must learn the language of international organizations. “The spread of English also facilitates those non- governmental organizations that use programmes (sic) of aid, credit, or business activities through micro-finance to control key social and governmental policies” (Imam, 2005, p. 480). The need for nation-states to educate citizens in the use of English creates a demand. As always where there is demand a supply line will be established. “Likewise the promotion of western education in English creates a market for western publications, and encourages local students to pursue international education, which is three times the cost of local education and generates revenues for the developed nations” (Imam, 2005, p. 480). Since the ability to establish and maintain English education is costly the citizens who are being taught will be forced to pay more. This need to learn a global language causes many of the world’s impoverished to become poorer and more dependent upon international organizations who create a persona of being the saviors. The idea of teaching English in order to help societies become more marketable can be devastating to the culture. If students are taught they need to know English in order to be successful then it would be easy for them to assume that their national language is of no value. “Languages – as the repository for knowledge of ecological and patriarchal critiques as much as technological and multicultural commodities – are what makes it possible for human beings to achieve so much across the generations” (Singh, 2005, p. 130). Every society and culture has a vast amount of knowledge that must not be lost. If we look at the loss of knowledge that occurred due to the assimilation of Native Americans we find [is] evidence of what can occur with demanding people learn English and forgetting their own language. If for no other reason, the problem of language extinction raises key concerns about the death of knowledge that is important to the world’s multilingual knowledge economies. For instance, the extinction of a local language means the death of intimate knowledge of that habit – its land, water, plants, and animals – and therefore a loss to postindustrial technological, ecological, and multicultural ventures of knowledge that could be really useful for learning how to interact[ing] with ecosystems more wisely. (Singh, 2005, p. 130).
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Is there a way to challenge the power of and overcome Empire? Yes, however it is not something that can follow the paths of resistance movements of the past. Hardt and Negri explain the vulnerability of Empire: ... the construction of Empire, and the globalization of economic and cultural relationships, means that the virtual center o Empire can be attacked from any point. The tactical preoccupations of the old revolutionary school are thus completely irretrievable; the only strategy available to the struggles is that of a constituent counterpower that emerges from within empire. (2000, p.59) This counterpower that emerges within Empire is the multitude, which Hardt and Negri explain in detail in their sequel. The movement against Empire must not be a national or local movement but rather an international movement. “We have to accept that challenge and lean to think globally and act globally. Globalization must be met with counter- globalization, Empire with counter-Empire” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 206-207). The movements that need to be formed must be global and these counter movements will be a union of those with different agendas, different nationalities, and different protests. However, they will have one thing in common and that is wanting to challenge the power and influence of Empire. Multitude, also by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, can be viewed as an answer to the problem of Empire. However, it must be stated there is not an easy cut and dry definition of the multitude and this can be attributed to the many aspects that compose Empire. The multitude can be viewed through different lenses such as race, gender, sexuality, social, and economic. “From the socioeconomic perspective, the multitude is the common subject of labor, that is, the real flesh of postmodern production, and at the same time the object from which collective capital tries to make the body of it global development” (Hardt and Negri, 2004, p. 101). In order to fight against Empire we need to form the multitude. “Indeed, as the protests organized against global capital and a global war on terror illustrate, the very communication networks that elude national control and facilitate the control of global capital’s various appendages can also facilitate the self-organization of democratic action at a global level by a new political subject, the multitude” (Passavant, 2004, p. 3-4). Millions around the world use the computer and Internet; however, it must be said that many around the world have never heard of the Internet. One of the problems with organizing in a virtual world is lack of personal contact. Another problem with the use of the Internet is that many people view information from it as being false and many times rightly so. Also, a problem with using the Internet to organize is the ability of governmental agencies to spy on people and groups. Anything that is posted, sent, downloaded, and viewed on a computer can be obtained by anyone around the world if the computer is connected to the Internet. Also, if students and professors are us[e]ing the colleges’ computers then they are basically giving up their rights to privacy. The way we can combat the rule of Empire is to educat[ing]~~e~~ for the multitude. The multitude: “... is a force that both calls Empire into being and opens up the possibility of political change, of an alternative to imperial rule” (Dean, 2004, p. 275). We need educators, from elementary teachers to college professors, to learn about the affects of Empire and also learn how to educate their students to become active in the multitude. It is through the economy that the multitude is attempted to be controlled and defined. As Hardt and Negri (2004) state: Capital wants to make the multitude into [be] an organic unity, just like the state wants to make it into a people. This is where, through the struggles of labor, the real productive biopolitical figure of the multitude begins to emerge[s]. When the flesh of the multitude is imprisoned and transformed into the body of global capital, it finds itself both within and against the processes of capitalistic globalization. (p. 101) There is little doubt the world is controlled by the use of capital and it is through this control that trans-national corporations are able to extend their power across national boundaries. We must remember that the multitude is not a group or people or a mob. In “Globalization and Democracy” Hardt and Negri explain this difference with: “The multitude is not a unity, as in the people, but in contrast to the masses and the mob we can see that it is organized. It is an active, self-organizing agent” (2003, p. 114). The idea of the multitude being self-organizing can be misleading but it must be remembered that a diverse group of protestors is somehow organized and demonstrated the potential power of the multitude.

# Notes

**1st piece of evi:**

use w rotb to rw policymaking skills. end of card talks about how corps line up life thru edu / labor: empire is always in control even when u leave debate.

takes out fairness. empire structures everything problematically

a2 soc contract:

trillions of academic spaces - reading the aff is key

**2nd**

1. perm / t against violence: coalition k2 everything bc empire control all id. one pronged attack bad. artificially excluding certain groups is bad. impact turn alt

2. exceptional violence is problematic bc they gain the attn of media. violence exists everywhere - proves the impact o/ws. verifiability bad. impact turns spec.

**3rd page 4**

this is the best offense bc

1. critical pedagogy - leverage against every rotb. takes friere’s stuff - empire ctrls. even if there are other k affs, there’s so little ab academia. ac is key bc not banking. there are billions of capitalist academic spaces

2. weighing - controlled by corporations - indexed to producing workers. takes out means based ncs bc corps intend to use them and constitutivism.

3. no coalitions bc indiv never get new strats or ? power. empire teaches them to get USEFUL jobs. infinite cycle. ppl forced to learn - so tired to live and need money

**4th de lissovoy 13**

1. take out pics - when students go to school, if there are tests, it creates repressive system bc it psychological condition. teachers are nervous too - evaluated via tests. even 1 tests does this. it’s all ab starting the system of judgement

2.

**5th phillipson 8**

1. take out every cp - test only done to assimilate pop.

2. another constitutivism take out - tests fragment

3. most material - take out setcol

**6th rotb**

**7th hardt 2k**

1. take out cap inev - truths are spread as ideological apparatus so just repeating them gives it power. empire key to topen. from there, we engage in line of flight. your alt is the line of flight. (aff is a line of flight two)

1. Hardt and Negri Reading:

1. Passavant, Paul A. and Jodi Dean. *Empire’s New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*. Routledge, New York and London, 2004.
   1. Passavant - “Postmodern Republicanism”
      1. Introductory explanation of Empire and Multitude **(pp. 2-3)**

while the nation-state’s sovereignty is waning, sovereignty has been rescaled from the level of the nation-state to the level of the global. ppl act in the name of the empire and ppl around the world have the same juridicial logic even though the empire is deterritorialized. imperial world is parasitic on labor power, but the conditions that define it allow for overthrow, just like cap

most academic theory talks ab micropol but the masses suffer from false consciousness and mistake oppression for freedom

* + 1. Introductory explanation of Hardt and Negri’s theory of capitalism (changes in geography, economic production, and affective labor) and the response of ‘postmodern republicanism’ **(pp. 6-9)**

postmodern republicanism describes how the boundaries between public and private no longer make sense. ending boundaries is emancipatory. **geographically**, public spaces disappear. **economically**, post-fordism collapses the distinction btwn home and factory. production is decentralized. information focus makes us wage laborers, but that can also allow us to be a multitude. communicative cap (cap that spreads thru comm) mobile subjects force us to play the domestic and industrial role: we are both mommy and account managers. **change in labor**: production of social being is biopolitical. economic labor produces affect and desire e.g. nurses relieve anxiety or make patients happy as part of the medical care they provide their patients

we are naturally desiring machines. no fixed boundaries btwn human/animal/machine. a new social being requires diff existence. hopeful possibility is key to culture. life is creative. service economy of entertainment industry creates and manipulates bodily mode. this + info = joyful social being abd constitutive. tihs is the multitude. functions on plane of immanence.

* + 1. Introductory explanation of Hardt and Negri’s interpretation of labor and its importance within their system, especially relative to Deleuze’s theory of ontology and immanence **(pp. 10-11).**

labor produces goods used for survival. labor thus produces life. arendt dislike bc no distinguish from natural world. thinks consumer society hasn’t produced anything durable but meets appetites.

H&N: 1. labor, as productive excess, is beyond measure. life isn’t calculable

2. labor k2 multitiude bc it’s the ontological basis for global democracy. labor has become more cooperative.

3. labor is productive of life != lack of value,

deleuze thinks being is multiple multiplicities, an assortment of qualities with others. but also distinct voices like blades of grass. infinite sets of attributes in voices joined through clamor. we all share vital power of life, especially in small children. tho barely individual at this point, they have singularities and can perceive an immanent life of pure power and bliss.

* 1. Dean - “The Networked Empire: Communicative Capitalism and the Hope for Politics”
     1. Introductory explanation of Hardt and Negri’s theory of communication, describing their conceptualization of information, networks, and spectacle **(pp. 268-273).**

info is the paradigm of postmodernity. it transformed industries/labor/exchange. reflexivity is key characteristic, a feedback loop for innovation. computer can make its own instruction and adapt. immaterial services like telemarketing, programming (high paid and low), are abstracted from product of labor. also affective labor creating feelings e.g. entertainment. women’s affective labor is a form of community biopower. the network is the site of production and circulation. communication on advertisement is the means for achieving communication. history of the internet is an ideal rhizome, but corporate broadcast model establishes imperial political conditions. Empire arises out of capital in the informational or communicative mode of development.

3. spectacle: social integration assuming audiences, not participants. solidarity through media network, not traditions. political action difficult, we don’t identify as groups, but rather to the screen. political discourse is a sales pitch, consumable. news shows say the same thing.

* + 1. Expansion upon communication theory, explaining a theory of Empire as producing ‘Communication without Communicability’ **(pp. 273-276)**
       1. This would be useful for responding/interacting with psychoanalysis (especially Lacan), Baudrillard, and semiocapitalism.

communication is cap production, no alt paths. allow us to understand one another force of production divides us. empire entails communication without communicability. force of production instead. Messages are contributions to circulating content—not actions to elicit responses. message is sender to receiver but a circulating data. we don’t care about the message itself; it’s just a mass circulation. commodity is what matters. no one really cares ab what it says, the idea is on circulation. not that we can’t meaningfully communicate but that the economic paradigm has shifted. when we view democracy as a dialogue, the dialogue doesn’t produce an end that cap is based around. not ab an individual conversation but in a social relation. the way the economy profits. cap fractured social relationships; alt needs to embrace the relationships

* + 1. An explanation of the background of how politics operates under Empire and what possibilities for resistance look like within that framework **(pp. 277-281)**
       1. Appears to be useful for a role of the ballot argument about how power/resistance works under Empire, also might have a more general alternative argument.
    2. An explanation of their theory of ‘constituent hope,’ ‘incommunicability,’ ‘the multitude’ and what sort of alternatives political strategies we can develop to resist and overturn the forces of Empire **(pp. 282-284)**
       1. This would very likely be a good place to look for an alternative - it tries to explain and expand upon the strategies that Hardt and Negri provide.

1. Hardt and Negri, Assembly
   1. **p. 258-267** Indignation in the fog of war
      1. Link/Impact card
      2. Talks about how focusing on exception forms of violence obscures the “fog” of Empire and the globalization of violence.
      3. Police brutality, environmental destruction

we need to recognize violence to create effective mechanisms for social protection. ideological fog of war makes certain violence invisible and extreme forms stand out. we need to confront all sorts, not just focusing on exceptional ones. like zizek’s googles.

indignation prereq to resistance but insufficient. art & activism protest violence e.g. picasso’s guernica. we need new weapons e.g. videocameras to check police brutality. we need to check policy brutality but also on daily violence of carceral systems e.g. routine violence f prisons, culture of impunity, etc. generating indignation eg BLM key.

sex viol is spectacular brutality e.g. raping on bus in new delhi but femicide in juarez. women now associate danger w public places despite the fact that most physical and sexual assaults take place in private,”committed by known perpetrators. eclogicaly violence is formless. bp oil spill monopolize global media but unseen industrial disasters posion earth. impacts gradual, difficult to see the slow violence. once visible, no solvency.

capitalist wounds are also hidden, another violent axes, refugee crisis ,

new tech allows for unaccountability and not see those who die in warfare e.g. drones. also recreate logic. drones sometimes succeed in killing targeted enemies but, espe- cially given the wide collateral deaths and damages, they reinforce the will and recruitment of those they intend to defeat—but that failure does not mean they will cease to be employed.

the standpoint of the border, the point of inclusion and exclusion, is the privileged site for bringing into clear view the dynamics of global power.

example of the renewed power of the nation-state on the Right was proclaimed by the United States in its “war on terror” and its occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq

arguments about the “return of the state” and of national sovereignty have been especially prominent in Latin America, where progressive governments came to power as part of political projects to counter the policies of neoliberalism and the rule of global markets. Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia current state eval on social problems but crises go together. can’t help citizens when they spend sm on random things. always track empire from **above** w ir analysis since russia growin. clash of civilizations allows caliphates to estab conservative thought in mid e w imperial power. also track from **below** for pwrs of resistance and revolt. analyze proletariat struggle w other factors e.g. social relations

Jot down notes about these discussion questions:

What is the relationship between Empire and Multitude?

9/11 crystallized previous developments of **Empire**: global sovereignty and legality.

**Multitude**: global biopolitical subject of absolute democracy

multitude is a precondition for the empire. it exists bc govt are scared of the power of the multitude. empire seeks to control multitude, so also a condition for the former’s existennce.

What does communication without communicability mean?

capitalism encourages flow of messages, ? of exchange value not of content. needs to produce more information. how many likes is the value now to use for more speech. applying marxism to the modern world via marx + deleuze.

What are Hardt and Negri’s views of representation? What is one author who would disagree with this view and why would they disagree?

Why is spectacle the glue holding together the Empire?

we aren’t related to each other through traditions but rather spectacles of fear like seeing things on fox news. it’s is a form of empire control bc there are things the empire shows as dangerous so we need to be protected from them. id pol forces focus on other things

What is the relationship between Constituent Power and Multitude?

**baruch spinoza (1600s)** thought heretical at the time bc of atheism,

dvlp rationality consistent with modernism, needs to have pragmatic view of the world like emotions. contemporary view of the subject: completely interspersed w the world around us but can still control lives w rationality.

based on ability to be accepted by the world. monist: everything is made of the same. infinite quality and substance. one unifying feature of reality. empire is a political characterization. ability to explain unifying substance of sociopolitical life.

immanent: advancing continuously rather than transcending.

revitalized in 1950-70s france after wwii. resurge german idealists.

ranciere: “reading capital” not so orthodox marxist, ppl more open to new foundations -> spinoza.

think of marx in spinoza bc natural, interconnected, radically equal way of viewing the world to explain why capitalism is alienating.

marx thinks cap: structure of economics that generate surplus value from alienation / exploitation of labor in response to Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations who thinks freedom is key w motivation.

constant capital - raw material e.g. plastic, medal

variable capital - work necessary to produce a certain end: time effort energy by humans

invisible hand - cap survive bc it needs to via self-interest, the market force. don’t need govt control.

desire to accumulate capital precedes utility

marx dvlp theory on labor / variable capital: theory of labor surplus. only commonality btwn good and service is necessity of human labor. adam smith would justify that the wage received is the amount necessary to continue producing goods.

if i have no ability to benefit from increased cost of production -> alienation: value of work different from value of production. bourgeoise benefit. all conflicts of human history were conflicts of proletariat v bourgeoisie. worker class v capitalist have different agency. owning means of production allows choice that i don’t get under production. in capitalist system, no reprieve from proletariat. capitalist overthrow key to speak to the position of the proletariat. theorize ab govt role in econ. communism: less political but ideological. there’s no work, there’s no system of profit

authors who rely on marx: agamben, zizek: contemporary marxist in some respects, baudrillard

capitalism creates overproduction: once there’s an owner and a worker, the owner wants the worker to produce as much as possible.

hardt and negri interactions: applying marxist thought to global control

affect: relationships btwn subjects. sort of like emotions but not individualistic. affect is relational and social. not just i am sad but btwn me and all of u and how the space shapes interactions. situations where you can feel the affect of rooms: funerals, rollercoasters at disneyworld, awestruck at cathedral

*joyful affect:* new potential, new relations with the world, open up to creativity. first time away from home

*sad affect:* close off potential, not embracing opportunity. not binary like if u do x, it will be sad. staying in your room all day. depression itself isn’t an affective experience. not quantifiable. walk into a classroom and you don’t know anyone, not wanting to talk at a funeral,

multitude: spinoza was in netherlands / dutch rpeublic. royals at top, elected aristocrats. both arbitrarily impose their order in society. spinoza was a friend of the aristocrats. imbalance in powers after 30 years of stability / open communication / direct democracy. william of orange enforces his will. multitude: ppl not part of decision-making that are affected by policies. thinks mass governed by fear, not politically engaged. can be taken advantage of e.g. police abusing ppl into plea bargaining. policing in and of itself harnesses the fear of the multitude e.g. cop car could be around every corner, could be ordered by that. trump uses fear of immigrants taking jobs to get himself elected. doesn’t have to be fear though. e.g. empire allows certain movements so that people’s revolutionary tendencies dissipate.

spinoza asks how can we make sure multitude is given meaning, considering how much power they have? masses are ruled by fear. pick up this lecture: how can we make it democratic rather than to further sovereignty.

“Rather than posing an alternative between “rhizome” and “tree,” here they treat the rhizomatic structure of contemporary communications as a given. “ - empire’s new clothes

- communication is decentralized and there shouldn’t be necessary ordering. should be viewed as such too.

assemblage: a model for understanding our interconnected soup. while rhizome is how we conceive of things, assemblage is more pragmatic. assemblages are type of rhizome. an interconnected space of modeling. fluid arrangement of affective relationships. u shaped tables change the way lab leaders walk around.

interrelate together to how we experience the world. these are ultimately arrangements. easy to think of assemblage as passive description. they’re things that are arranged. brought into being by the joys/sadness we create. if we were to move the change, that would move the assemblage of the camp. u can be purposeful to arrange for example a positive lab environment

territorialization: re-territorialization is giving something order. deterritorialization: breaking down assemblage or opening up to new arrangements. empire will break up the multitude and deterritorialize to be more open to being imposed on. not order or structured but structured across general world. destructure japan to make a global economy. empire does both though.

**cap is globalized** and we can’t use nation states to describe power or how cap functions. doesn’t matter where you are, you buy an iphone from an apple store that looks the same. couple rsns:

1. rise in multinational corporations: buying raw materials one place and selling them in another. exceed corporations as within the state. economy of one country is dependent on another

2. intl institution like imf, world bank, wto

**what capitalism cares ab is also more virtual: informationalization**

cap dc ab production of products

trying to reproduce information to abstract products. feedback loop: when we make info, it’s not just consumed but also used to produce more information. computer uses its own programming to change the way that its operate via data. it’s reflexive not j for different end goals but trying to change the way computers exist. restructure communication so value of content is determined on how many likes u get. did u win versus what did u win on? content of debate is meaningless.

form v content authors like baudrillard rely on communicative cap

in a world of info sharing, where info is commodity, doesn’t matter what information says/means, only matters that it is circulated. no interrogation of what it means cements the current structure.

ex: fake news: profitable to inject into internet even though the content is just wrong

ex: supreme logo. the clothes don’t mean anything, it’s the brand name.

it’s impossible to translate directly into profit but it’s sort of end goal. what do impressions mean? do they actually increase sales?

ex: slacktivism - ppl changed their profile pictures blue but didn’t do anything. ik something is happening in sudan but am not read nearly enough to contribute anything.

march for our lives campaign: it is meaningless that u state school shootings are bad. what comprehensive gun reform has passed?

“war on yemen is an atrocity” is now a meme even though the original content was about thousands of children dying

impact of meaninglessness: desensitization, charity cannibalism.

if all this is true, how do u raise awareness and engage in acts of radicalism? what does it look like?

need to be unpredictable to stop empire’s preemption.

if you don’t do anything, value to life goes away. serial policy failure.

Western governments are intervening international affairs generally for economic incentive. United fruit companies: dole, chiquita, Banana plantation monopolies -> banana republics = unstable countries relying on exporting finite resources, fucked up economies. Taste of tomato + banana has been changed

Empire can’t be tied to particular things anymore bc everything is deterritorialized. Global bourgeosie is the empire e.g. zucc. Empire is sort of a macrostructural take on the invisible hand since it’s developing on its own and resistant to forms of political interaction.

Dng are right in that deterritorializing is powerful and H&N kind of break out of that by saying capitalism does that too so we need to Reterritorialize the masses to create change.

Interconnectedness allows communication networks outside of state ctrl for proletariat democracy. Saudi assume power thru state ctrl. Not a failure of us, or cap getting stronger, but tools for its own destruction. We can use these tools against itself. Opposite of accelerationism. More decentralization would make empire stronger.

Alt examples are like computer hackers, encrypted communication, bitcoin. Arab spring, occupy wall street: be a global roadblock to corporate monopolies and ctrl. We can use empire to resist and create new social relations. J bc military aid is used as a tool of the empire, that doesn’t mean the aff’s approach is true or that we should endorse it.

Agamben/foucault tangent

Biopower ctrls the way ppl live their lives. Ex: go army posters teach u to be a patriot to receive a cultural privilege/authority. Analyzes the way state power has transformed in the modern world. They used to control through fear e.g. deterrence through draw/quartering. Now they have more advancements w prisons, psychiatric wards, etc. to affect our “forms of life”

Govt makes the rules. When there is one who decides, they can change the laws. Gitmo is us leasing cuban land for prison. Bush estab new political category of enemy combatant. U basically have no rights, no civilian courts, indefinite detention at gitmo. Muslims are picked up of accused of terror, subject to waterboarding. The torture is said to have stopped, but unverifiable. Proves state can sanction life.

Deleuze tangent (crosses over from foucault to hardt)

Foucault believes biopower is top down e.g. pschiatric ward. Traditions like religion have deterritorialized now so it’s not applicable. The control society / soc of control is bottom up now, affective ctrl. We police ourselves. Insttitutions are still associated with the state. Ex: govt decide social media, really pol-socioeconomic. We all see the same tasty videos. Cambridge analytica is a personal example of the new ctrl.

Hardt and negri

Anything that is the empire’s control, the multitude can ctrl too. Biopol: way of producing social life. We can shape good forms of living w arab spring. Still biopower since they shape our living, but that can be joyful, not sad.

2n drill

Biopolitics as a system of control begins as static, very institutionalized approaches of sovereign control e.g. the prison system. But as technological advancements come into fruition, governments are no longer constrained to top-down, traditional methods of control, but can decentralize and turn ourselves against ourselves to shape our living. The uncle sam poster has turned into targeted advertising and data manipulation.

for everything the empire can do against us, those are things we can do back as well

constituent power (comes from negri) natural power from organization. V similar to biopol. Reconstructive. **New** forms of power that engage in biopol production of social life like a line of flight e.g. coming up with a new drill. This is what makes the multitude dangerous. Ability to take deterritorialized shit and give order to it. Always is a possibility but comes into being when we construct new arrangement. Not like formal party politics, but organizing smth against the empire.

Direct intervention: power of the multitude w spontaneous eruptions of anger e.g. police violence in chicago. Public transport, carpools allows for easy, organic, mobilization. Even if there’s no clear goal it designates a threat. Empire has hard time handling it. Even if defeated, still has a possibility. Doesn’t do nothing; showing the power of the multitude is part of the global unification

Uncomm doesn’t get circulated based on exchange but on content. When discussing mvmt building, representational politics: a form of resistance that is communicable: interpolated, encoded, and coopted. Easier for empire / state to understand and plan against the state e.g. BPP: disadvantageous to be representational since it’s coopted by the empire, area 51 (fbi patrolling state now). Attempts to include more allow more possibility for communicability and to lose meaning: now it’s a palatable, high grossing film.

How do we take up arms? Incommunicability. Move thru the world in a way that is representative. Affective experiences prove resistance is more than traditional bolitics.

hybridity: concepts don’t mean the same thing that they do in a world pre-cap. Ability to connect across the globe makes identities less apparent but relational to the world. Intermix id that is born = hybridity. Pol mvmt assume binaristic categories: women in stem yay! Embrace a new category of identity that resists that sort of representation instead of uniting gender minorities.

How do u articulate an incommunicable alt?

Empire is a study in governing without governance. Sovereignty without apolitical e.g. ngos appropriation of human rights narrows self-expression. Assuming and acting upon universal ideas is how empire manages to remain in power

Hybridity: selfexpression beyond normal parameters. Affirmation of global identity. Conventions the empire makes are insufficient to challenge empire. Anonymous is an example. V for vendetta movie is proof it still is circulated but it still causes real effects e.g. releasing covert information, endorsing certain candidates at certain times. Alt isn’t just a hacker, but is a good template for refusing rep. our ability to sit here and run through a list is antithetical to the entire point.

Bc this is new u should rationalize this down while emphasizing the contradictions. 1 example + gesture why other alts fail. Explain why alt is correctment of navigating that world.

Invisible committee?

Weather underground / the weatherman: group of college students in the 60s/70s in umich and called the news every day to say they were going to put a bomb in the pentagon. Super random. All college students leave poetic message about dissastisfaction with the squo. We’re on every college campus, every student, etc. some were caught

Dark web

Encryption / different language

Graffiti: dk intent, but indicators of social location depending on where the art is. Banksy got coopted

To articulate a difference codifies which sort of resistance are legit. What is the point of an internet troll? They cast suspicion and doubt in an unrationalizable way. We don’t know what to do w trolls.

Blm is representational and getting coopted

Metoo mvmt was first for women of color who were assaulted -> incorporate universal message of gender oppression, owner was pushed out, accusations of the leaders every day, no one cares. Connect character assassination against ur enemies.