## 1NC

### Off

We’ll begin with a story fromMeinzerin, Kuhn, and Klausmann in 1997

(Marion Meinzerin, professor of history at Cambridge University, Gabriel Kuhn, Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Innsbruck, Ulrike Klausman, freelance journalist, “Woman Pirates and the politics of the Jolly Roger”, Pg 18-22, *azp*)

**Medusa is the Gorgon’s head threatening to emerge from the sea. This terrible monster was once a beautiful woman who was raped in a temple of Athena by the sea god Poseidon.** According to Ovid, **Athena was so enraged that she turned Medusa into an ugly creature, transforming her hair into a thousand snakes**. After that **Medusa was so ugly that any man who caught sight of her would turn to stone**. Very much in keeping with modern»day court procedures in cases of rape, **Athena let the rapist go unpunished**. Why was **Athena** so hostile to women? Actually she **was a very ancient wise goddess, of far older origin than the male Hellenic gods.** But **after the arrival of male gods to the mythology, she was transformed into a being birthed from Zeus’s** head, who had swallowed her mother Metis, the Goddess of Wisdom, who was pregnant with Athena by parthenogenesis. Afterwards, **Athena became the protective goddess of many a hero. One of them was Perseus the Destroyer. He was sent to kill Medusa. Athena gave him a perfectly reﬂective bronze shield, so that he could see Medusa without looking at her**. Thanks to this device, **Perseus was able to behead Medusa, with Athena guiding his hand. He stuck Medusa’s head in a sack and gave it as a gift to Athena, who thereafter carried the snakes on her breastplate so as to strike fear into her enemies**. The symbol of the snake always belonged to Athena, whose mother Metis was called “the wise counsel.” In prehistoric times the snake was a symbol of feminine wisdom, and not just of growth and fertility, as was later assumed. Metis and Medusa represent one and the same power. The name Medusa, a feminine form of medon (ruler), derives from the Sanskrit root medha (wisdom), which is also the root for the Greek metis (good counsel). **The grimace of the grey-skinned snake’s head expresses the fury of those women who still remember**. The Latin word for causing someone to think of something, to remind or to warn, is monere. Etymologically a “monster” is thus the “emblem of the gods in terrifying manifestation.” The monster Medusa reﬂects countless obsessive ideas about sea monsters. In mythological terms, **the Medusa story relates the destruction of female culture**; in psychoanalytic terms it describes the hero’s murder of his mother, and femininity as a psycho-symbolic monstrosity? In the end **Perseus failed to achieve his goal, despite divine** protection and all manner of magical assistance, and although he killed his enemy in her sleep with his hand guided by Athena. **Medusa lives on, the Gorgon’s head has grown back, and its fury has by no means burnt out**. The terror of men before Gorgo, who pulls ships into the depths by their bowsprit in the midst of a tempest, is fully justiﬁed. **Gorgo is the Greek name not only for Medusa—petriﬁed through “ugliness”—but also for the mermaids, who are known to be beautiful and lovely. This may seem like a paradox, but corresponds to the ambivalence with which men view the female**. Aristotle’s hostility to women is far more consistent, and serves to clarify the connection. The relationship between femininity, ﬁsh, mermaids, and sea monsters lies in the attributes “wet” and “cold.” These beings all have a shortage of “heat,” and are thus also lacking in soul and reason. According to Aristotle, a mother only provides the passive material, while the father contributes the active soul endowed with reason. He bears the true species of humans (man). If a mother nonetheless brings a female being to the world, she has circumvented the reasoning species, and once again set loose upon the world a monster lacking in soul. In the legends of seafarers, mermaids also have no souls—but might be able to occasionally acquire one by adopting a respectable way of life among people, and falling in love with a man. Patriarchal **stories of dragon-slaying show two different images of the female: the powerful, threatening mother in the form of the monster, and the desirable, submissive virgin**. In the killing of the dragon, psychoanalysts like C.G. lung and Erich Neumann saw the liberation of **the man from his terrible mother, and the conquest of a new image of the female in the form of the lovely virgin. The man becomes a hero by freeing the virgin from the claws of the mighty monster, in order to subordinate her to himself**. In his book on the origins of consciousness, Erich Neumann writes: “the transformation of the male that occurs in the course of battling the dragon includes a change in his relationship to the female, symbolised in the liberation of the hostage from the power of the dragon; meaning a dissolution of the image of the female from that of the terrible mother.“ Neumann ignores that in antiquity, the life-giving femininity of the Earth and the cosmos was worshipped in the form of the Great Mother. In all her monstrosity she threatens the male need for recognition. That which psychologists understand as the liberation of man from the overwhelming power of mother is actually a desire in the collective male consciousness to subdue nature itself. **The story of** our hero **Perseus goes on to show how pointless these acts of violence actually are. Flying high on the trip home after his “glorious” beheading of Medusa, Perseus encounters a beautiful, naked virgin chained to a cliff. On the horizon a sea monster approaches**. The unhappy girl is the daughter of an Ethiopian queen, who had boasted that she and her daughter were as beautiful as the Nereids. The Nereids promptly lodged a complaint with Poseidon, who sent out a ﬂood of storms and a female sea monster in retribution. An oracle declared that the queen’s daughter had to be chained to the cliffs. **Perseus, a man of action, did not dilly-dally**. After quickly negotiating the dowry with the parents of the princess, **he killed the monster in a bloody battle, and “as prize and cause of all the trouble the virgin strides up, released from her chains**,” according to Ovid. Here **Perseus seems to have won the battle of his life, acquiring a kingdom and a lovely princess.** But closer observation shows that the action has gone subtly awry. **The lovely and passive princess is called Andromeda**: andro-mcda, meaning **the “ruler of men.” The information that her mother is an Ethiopian suggests a likely relationship to the Libyan Medusa**. **Apparently the beautiful virgin and her monstrous mother relate one and the same femininity**. Leviathan poses the biblical counterpart to the Greek myth of Medusa. He is a sea serpent, appearing in the legends of sea travellers as the worst of all sea monsters, crushing ships and swallowing seafarers.

The affirmative’s view of the subject under capital is that of Perseus’s perception of women – the Other is dangerous yet alluring – something to be mapped yet radically unknowable – something to be defeated yet something to be won – a roll of the ballot calling for the liberation of the oppressed is symptomatic of the masculine heroism Perseus is engrained in – the ballot becomes a symbol of the prize of Otherness while ontologically erasing the subaltern – the affirmative’s distancing of themselves from those they invoke is like Perseus’s shield – they view the subaltern through a kaleidoscopic lens while sitting comfortably in this air conditioned simulacra we call the debate round – this knowledge production is not just useless neutrality but rather the lynchpin of the Western intellectual subject – any argument the affirmative makes about how the subaltern would totally be on-board with their project relies on the same logic that reinforces conceptions of the inferior Other – their forcus on voice in the first contention is ironic because a ballot for the affirmative rips out the subaltern’s vocal chords

Spivak 88 (Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Indian literary theorist, philosopher and University Professor at Columbia University, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture,* 1988“Can the Subaltern Speak?,” Online, *azp*)

SOME OF THE most radical criticism coming out of the West today is the result of an interested desire to conserve the subject of the West, or the West as Subject. The theory of pluralized ‘subject-effects’ gives an illusion of undermining subjective sovereignty while often providing a cover for this subject of knowledge. Although the history of Europe as Subject is narrativized by the law, political economy, and ideology of the West, this concealed Subject pretends it has ‘no geo-political determinations.’ The much publicized critique of the sovereign subject thus actually inaugurates a Subject. . . . This S/subject, curiously sewn together into a transparency by denegations, belongs to the exploiters’ side of the international division of labor. It is impossible for contemporary French intellectuals to imagine the kind of Power and Desire that would inhabit the unnamed subject of the Other of Europe. It is not only that everything they read, critical or uncritical, is caught within the debate of the production of that Other, supporting or critiquing the constitution of the Subject as Europe. It is also that, in the constitution of that Other of Europe, great care was taken to obliterate the textual ingredients with which such a subject could cathect, could occupy (invest?) its itinerary — not only by ideological and scientiﬁc production, but also by the institution of the law. . . . In the face of the possibility that the intellectual is complicit in the persistent constitution of Other as the Self’s shadow, a possibility of political practice for the intel- lectual would be to put the economic ‘under erasure,’ to see the economic factor as irreducible as it reinscribes the social text, even as it is erased, however imperfectly, when it claims to be the ﬁnal determinant or the transcendental signiﬁed. The clearest available example of such epistemic violence is the remotely orchestrated, fareflung, and heterogeneous project to constitute the colonial subject as Other. This project is also the asymetrical obliteration of the trace of that Other in its precarious Subjectivity. It is well known that Foucault locates epistemic violence, a complete overhaul of the episteme, in the redeﬁnition of sanity at the end of the European eighteenth century. But what if that particular redeﬁnition was only a part of the narrative of history in Europe as well as in the colonies? What if the two projects of epistemic overhaul worked as dislocated and unacknowledged pans ofa vast two-handed engine? Perhaps it is no more than to ask that the subtext of the palimpsestic narra- tive of imperialism be recognized as ‘subjugated knowledge,’ ‘a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualiﬁed as inadequate to their task or insufﬁ- ciently elaborated: naive knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientiﬁcity‘ (Foucault I980: 82). This is not to describe ‘the way things really were’ or to privilege the narrative of history as imperialism as the best version of history. It is, rather, to offer an account of how an explanation and narrative of reality was established as the normative one. . . . Let us now move to consider the margins (one can just as well say the silent, silenced center) of the circuit marked out by this epistemic violence, men and women among the illiterate peasantry, the tribals, the lowest strata of the urban subproletariat. According to Foucault and Deleuze (in the First World, under the standardization and regimentation of socialized capital, though they do not seem to recognize this) the oppressed, if given the chance (the problem of representation cannot be bypassed here), and on the way to solidarity through alliance politics (a Marxist thematic is at work here) can speak and know their conditions. We must now confront the following question: On the other side of the international division of labor from socialized capital, inside and outside the circuit of the epistemic violence of imperialist law and education supplementing an earlier economic text, can the subaltern speak? . . .

Isn’t it off-putting that the affirmative merely expresses solidarity with the oppressed yet does little to nothing to actually relieve their oppression? – What do you think their endless theories, intellectual movements, and speech acts actually DO to resolve anything? – the answer is absolutely nothing – they aren’t subversive, nor radical, nor even that interesting – their speech act is an intellectual façade designed to avoid having to resolve oppression

Raskin 99 (Marcus Raskin, Professor of Public Policy at George Washington University, 1999, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall)

As I have noted, world social categories and knowledge systems have changed so that they now see the colonized as human beings. The shifting in social categories, often by those who are the radicals and liberals of the privileged groups, created deep divisions between reality and its description. But this has not necessarily resulted in fundamental affirmative change. For those who were consigned to the role of slave, serf and oppressed by imperial Western nations, it may be disconcerting, but pleasantly surprising, that some leading international lawyers and intellectuals stand with those movements that take their strength from the dispossessed, wretched and exploited, whether in war or peace. Even though these idealists are educated in Western and imperial categories of social reality, they have, nonetheless, taken as their task the reconstruction and transformation of international law as it is understood in the United States. The skeptical are permitted their doubts, however. After all, what can those who represent the pain of others, and only indirectly their own, do to ameliorate the pain of misery sanctioned by imperial law? **What do such a band of idealists dare to teach to those who suffer, especially when that suffering is often caused, directly or indirectly, by the choices made by the very class of which these Western intellectuals and lawyers are members?** Why should the oppressed listen to those educated in a language and thought-pattern which, beneath the honeyed words, are the egocentric and ethnocentric doctrines of the [\*524] dominator? Certainly until decolonization, the abstract meaning of the words were employed as signifiers and killers of the culturally oppressed. The language of description and the mode of argument, the very words themselves, were instruments of the colonizer. Their very rules, laws, precedents and citations acted as a steel-belted noose to stifle the cries of the wretched. And yet, these were the very lessons the colonized needed to learn in order to stand up to the colonizer and survive. Not only did they survive, they pressed on to reform nineteenth and early twentieth century imperial law using the UN, and the International Court of Justice. Most importantly, they effected the consciousness of nations. Nevertheless, the wretched must wonder why, behind claims of universality and universal human rights, our actions and thoughts have an often indeterminate or contradictory effect. For Americans, the reason is a complex one. Americans seek identification with the victim in their dreams, but the reality for the American political and legal class is somewhere between carelessness and negligence of the oppressed worker, toleration for the destruction of other people's cultures for purposes of extraction and commodification, exploiter of their lands, and executioner in counter-revolutions which rain bombs of state and financial terror around the world. So even when some in the United States stand with the victim, they must always wonder, "Who are we that come forward with our notions that speak of human affirmation? Who are we to tell the colonized when independence is a drag on themselves and on others as well, possibly leading to war and internecine conflict?" And the wretched can go further and say, "You have recognized our struggle, taken away our language and substituted your words of understanding, but **now what?** How is freedom to be sustained? We, the formerly marginalized, the indigenous and the merely wretched, have come to recognize that what is presented by the West to humanity as conventional knowledge is a betrayal." In truth, **it was a betrayal by intellectuals and all those who dared to suggest that the twentieth century could be a time of liberation and freedom**. **Education and knowledge as mediated through the colonizer's strainer has left humanity in worse shape than at the beginning of the twentieth century**. For some, the god that really failed them was education/knowledge, which, through its institutions, set itself up as the emancipator. This failure, this sense of futility where knowledge is an instrument of domination for the few, demands recognition.

The 1AC is a form of vampirism which allows privileged institutions and individuals to enhance their social position at the expense of those without privilege. The AFF is merely a market exchange in the political economy of debate which covers over the contradictions of commodification.

Leong 2012

/Nancy, Assistant Professor, University of Denver Sturm College of Law, “Racial Capitalism,” Harvard Law Review, <http://www.utexas.edu/law/colloquium/papers-public/2012-2013/09-20-12_Leong%20--%20Racial%20Capitalism.pdf/>

The exchange mechanism Lin posits, in conjunction with Podolny’s account of status-seeking behavior by market participants, reveals the way that the value associated with non-whiteness is transferred. As a result of the legal and social preoccupation with diversity arising from affirmative action doctrine, white people and predominantly white institutions may elevate their status within various markets by affiliating themselves with non-white individuals. We might, for instance, conceive of a status market in “non-racism.” Within this specific market, white individuals and predominantly white institutions tend to have relatively low status. When a white individual or a predominantly white institution engages in an exchange with a non-white person within such a market, we see, in Podolny’s terms, a status leak. The non-white party loses some amount of status, and the white party absorbs some of the status that the non-white party has lost. Put more concretely, the white individual or predominantly white institution has increased status within the “non-racism” market by demonstrating the ability to engage in a relationship with a non-white individual. Meanwhile, the non-white person’s status has diminished within that same market through affiliation with a white individual or a predominantly white institution. Although such exchanges are not fully theorized in the scholarly literature, we do see limited recognition this sort of racial status exchange: Randall Kennedy, for instance, has chronicled the status diminution of non-white people, particularly those in “elite, predominantly white settings,” when other non-whites perceive that they have “sold out” to the expectations of white society.123

The ballot is also a form of self-subalternization, where the judges are encouraged to found a vacuous solidarity with the Affirmative Other by valorizing the material deprivation portrayed in the 1AC – However, their rhetorical strategy amounts to nothing more than a sham renunciation authorized by the same structures of power that produce alterity in the first place, turning the case at a higher level of analysis.

Chow – Andrew W. Mellon Professor of the Humanities @ Brown - 1993

(Rey, *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*, p. 10-11)

The Orientalist has a special sibling whom I will, in order to highlight her significance as a kind of representational agency, call the Maoist. Arif Dirlik, who has written extensively on the history of political movements in twentieth-century China, sums up the interpretation of Mao Zedong commonly found in Western Marxist analyses in terms of a "Third Worldist fantasy"—"a fantasy of Mao as a Chinese reincarnation of Marx who fulfilled the Marxist premise that had been betrayed in the West."16 The Maoist was the phoenix which arose from the ashes of the great disillusionment with Western culture in the 1960s and which found hope in the Chinese Communist Revolution.17 In the 1970s, when it became possible for Westerners to visit China as guided and pampered guests of the Beijing establishment, Maoists came back with reports of Chinese society's absolute, positive difference from Western society and of the Cultural Revolution as "the most important and innovative example of Mao's concern with the pursuit of egalitarian, populist, and communitarian ideals in the course of economic modernization" (Harding, p. 939). At that time, even poverty in China was regarded as "spiritually ennobling, since it meant that [the] Chinese were not possessed by the wasteful and acquisitive consumerism of the United States" (Harding, p. 941). Although the excessive admiration of the 1970s has since been replaced by an oftentimes equally excessive denigration of China, the Maoist is very much alive among us, and her significance goes far beyond the China and East Asian fields. Typically, the Maoist is a cultural critic who lives in a capitalist society hut who is fed up with capitalism—a cultural critic, in other words, who wants a social order opposed to the one that is supporting her own undertaking. The Maoist is thus a supreme example of the way desire works: What she wants is always located in the other, resulting in an identification with and valorization of that which she is not/does not have. Since what is valorized is often the other's deprivation—"having" poverty or "having" nothing—the Maoist's strategy becomes in the main a rhetorical renunciation of the material power that enables her rhetoric.

The subaltern is subsequently reduced to a fungible object, a passive object for the consumption of the debate community – the affirmative absorbs the power of alterity only to toss its carcass back into the dust

Chow 93 (Rey, Andrew W. Mellon, Professor of the Humanities at Brown University, Writing Diaspora: Contemporary Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies, Indiana University Press, pg. 12-13.)

In the “cultural studies” of the American academy in the 1990s. The Maoist is reproducing with prowess. We see this in the way terms such as “oppression,” “victimization,” and “subalternity” are now being used. Contrary to the Orientalist disdain for the contemporary native cultures in the non-West, the Maoist turns the precisely disdained other into the object of his/her study and, in some cases identification. In a mixture of admiration and moralist, the Maoist sometimes turns all people from non-Western cultures into a generalized “subaltern” that is then used to flog an equally generalized “West.” Because the representation of “the other” as such ignores (1) the class and intellectual hierarchies within these other cultures, which are usually as elaborate as those in the West, and (2) the discursive power relations structuring the Maoist’s mode of inquiry and valorization, it produces a way of talking in which notions of lack, subalternity, victimization and so forth are drawn upon indiscriminately, often with the intention of spotlighting the speaker’s own sense of alterity and political righteousness. A comfortably wealthy white American intellectual I know claimed that he was a “third world intellectual” citing as one of his credentials his marriage to a Western European woman of part-Jewish heritage; a professor of English complained about being “victimized” by the structured time at an Ivy League Institution, meaning that she needed to be on time for classes; a graduate student of upper-class background from one of the world’s poorest countries told his American friends that he was of poor peasant stock in order to authenticate his identity as a radical “third worlder representative; male and female academics across the U.S. frequently say they were “raped” when they report experiences of professional frustration and conflict. Whether sincere or delusional, such cases of self-dramatization all take the route of self-sub-alternization, which has increasingly become the assured means to authority and power. What these intellectuals are doing is robbing the terms of oppression of their critical and oppositional import, and thus depriving the oppressed of even the vocabulary of protest and rightful demand. The oppressed, whose voices we seldom hear, are robbed twice - the first time of their economic chances, the second time of their language, which is no longer distinguishable from those who have had our consciousnesses “raised.”

This knowledge production is merely an attempt to map out the coordinates of alterity for the targeting computers of our death machines

Chow, 6 (Rey Chow, Humanities and Modern Culture & Media Studies at Brown University, 2006 The Age of the World Target: Self-Referentiality in War, Theory, and Comparative Work, 40-1)

Often under the modest apparently innocuous agendas of fact gathering and documentation, the “scientific” and “objective” production of knowledge during peacetime about the various special “areas” became the institutional practice that substantiated and elaborated the militaristic conception of the world as target. In other words, despite the claims about the apolitical and disinterested nature of the pursuits of higher learning, activities undertaken under the rubric of area studies, such as language training, historiography, anthropology, economics, political science, and so forth, are fully inscribed in the politics and ideology of war. To that extent, the disciplining, research, and development of so-called academic information are part and parcel of a strategic logic. And yet, if the production of knowledge (with its vocabulary of aims and goals, research, data analysis, experimentation, and verification) in fact shares the same scientific and military premises as war—if, for instance, the ability to translate a difficult language can be regarded as equivalent to the ability to break military codes—is it a surprise that it is doomed to fail in its avowed attempts to “know” the other cultures? Can “knowledge” that is derived from the same kinds of bases as war put an end to the violence of warfare, or is such knowledge not simply warfare’s accomplice, destined to destroy rather than preserve the forms of lives at which it aims its focus? As long as knowledge is produced in this self-referential manner, as a circuit of targeting or getting the other that ultimately consolidates the omnipotence and omnipresence of the sovereign “self”/”eye”—the “I”—that is the United States, the other will have no choice but remain just that—a target whose existence justifies only one thing, its destruction by the bomber. As long as the focus of our study of Asia remains the United States, and as long as this focus is not accompanied by knowledge of what is happening elsewhere at other times as well as the present, such study will ultimately confirm once again the self-referential function of virtual worlding that was unleashed by the dropping of the atomic bombs, with the United States always occupying the position of the bomber, and other cultures always viewed as the military and information target fields. In this manner, events whose historicity does not fall into the epistemically closed orbit of the atomic bomber—such as the Chinese reactions to the war from a primarily anti-Japanese point of view that I alluded to at the beginning of this chapter—will never receive the attention that is due to them. “Knowledge,” however conscientiously gathered and however large in volume, will lead only to further silence and to the silencing of diverse experiences. This is one reason why, as Harootunian remarks, area studies has been, since its inception, haunted by “the absence of a definable object”—and by “the problem of the vanishing object.”

### Off

**Against the affirmative’s paralyzing discursive politics, it is more important than ever to emphasize that transformations in consciousness can never lead to social transformations—only struggling to transform the real material conditions that structure social relations can bring about social change**

**Marx, 1845**

(Karl, The German Ideology, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01b.htm>)

This conception of history depends on our ability to expound the real process of production, starting out from the **material production** of life itself, and to comprehend the form of intercourse connected with this and created by this mode of production (i.e. civil society in its various stages), as the basis of all history; and to show it in its action as State, to explain all the different theoretical products and forms of consciousness, religion, philosophy, ethics, etc. etc. and trace their origins and growth from that basis; by which means, of course, the whole thing can be depicted in its totality (and therefore, too, the reciprocal action of these various sides on one another). It has not, like the idealistic view of history, in every period to look for a category, but remains constantly on the real ground of history; **it does not explain practice from the idea but explains the formation of ideas from material practice;** and accordingly it comes to the conclusion that **all forms and products of consciousness cannot be dissolved by mental criticism**, by resolution into “self-consciousness” or transformation into “apparitions,” “spectres,” “fancies,” etc. but only by the practical overthrow of the actual social relations which gave rise to this idealistic humbug; that not criticism but revolution is the driving force of history, also of religion, of philosophy and all other types of theory. It shows that history does not end by being resolved into “self-consciousness as spirit of the spirit,” but that in it at each stage there is found a material result: a sum of productive forces, an historically created relation of individuals to nature and to one another, which is handed down to each generation from its predecessor; a mass of productive forces, capital funds and conditions, which, on the one hand, is indeed modified by the new generation, but also on the other prescribes for it its conditions of life and gives it a definite development, a special character. It shows that circumstances make men just as much as men make circumstances.

**Unfortunately, Marx’s insight has been all but discarded by the new left, with its emphasis on being postmodern, postcolonial, poststructural, postMarxist, or post-anything. This post-al politics of the contemporary left focuses on discourse and language at the expense of analyzing real material conditions. This post-al logic is complicit with capitalism, especially insofar as it obscures the operation of political economy and the material reality of capitalism**

**Zavarzadeh, Dept English @ Syracuse, 1994**

(Mas’ud, “The Stupidity that Consumption is Just as Productive as Production”, The Alternative

Orange, V 4, Fall/Winter, http://www.etext.org/Politics/AlternativeOrange/4/v4n1\_cpp.html)

The task of this text[1] is to lay bare the structure of assumptions and its relation to the workings of the regime of capital and wage-labor (what I have articulated as “post-al logic"),[2] that unites all these seemingly different texts as they recirculate some of the most reactionary practices that are now masquerading as “progressive” in the postmodern academy. Analyzing the post-al logic of the left is important because it not only **reveals how the ludic left is complicit with capitalism** but, for the more immediate purposes of this text-of-response, it allows us to relate the local discussions in these texts to global problems and to deal, in OR‐2's words, with the “encompassing philosophical issues”[3] that are so violently suppressed by the diversionist uses of “detailism”[4] in these nine texts. Whether they regard themselves to be “new new left," “feminist," “neo-Marxist," or “anarchist," these texts—in slightly different local idioms—do the ideological work of US capitalism by producing theories, pedagogies, arguments, ironies, anecdotes, turns of phrases and jokes that **obscure the laws of motion of capital.** Post-al logic is marked above all by its erasure of “production” as the determining force in organizing human societies and their institutions, and its insistence on “consumption” and “distribution” as the driving force of the social. The argument of the post-al left (briefly) is that “labor," in advanced industrial “democracies," is superseded by “information," and consequently “knowledge” (not class struggle over the rate of surplus labor) has become the driving force of history. The task of the post-al left is to deconstruct the “metaphysics of labor” and consequently to announce the end of socialism and with it the “outdatedness” of the praxis of abolishing private property (that is, congealed alienated labor) in the post-al moment. Instead of abolishing private property, an enlightened radical democracy—which is to supplant socialism (as Laclau, Mouffe, Aronowitz, Butler and others have advised)—should make property holders of each citizen. The post-al left rejects the global objective conditions of production for the local subjective circumstances of consumption, and its master trope is what R-4 so clearly foregrounds: the (shopping) “mall"—the ultimate site of consumption “with all the latest high-tech textwares” deployed to pleasure the “body." In fact, the post-al left has “invented” a whole new interdiscipline called “cultural studies" that provides the new alibi for the regime of profit by shifting social analytics from “production” to “consumption." (On the political economy of "invention" in ludic theory, see Transformation 2 on "The Invention of the Queer.") To prove its “progressiveness," the post-al left devotes most of its energies (see the writings of John Fiske, Constance Penley, Michael Berube, [Henry /Robert] Louis Gates, Jr., Andrew Ross, Susan Willis, Stuart Hall, Fredric Jameson), to demonstrate how “consumption” is in fact an act of production and resistance to capitalism and a practice in which a utopian vision for a society of equality is performed! The shift from “production” to “consumption” manifests itself in post-al left theories through the focus on “superstructural” cultural analysis and **the preoccupation not with the “political economy**” ("base") **but with “representation**"—for instance, of race, sexuality, environment, ethnicity, nationality and identity. This is, for example, one reason for R-2's ridiculing the “base” and “superstructure” analytical model of classical Marxism (Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy) with an anecdote (the privileged mode of “argument” for the post-al left) that the base is really not all that “basic." To adhere to the base/superstructure model for him/her is to be thrown into an “epistemological gulag”. For the post-al left a good society is, therefore, one in which, as R-4 puts it, class antagonism is bracketed and the “surplus value” is distributed more evenly among men and women, whites and persons of color, the lesbian and the straight. It is not a society in which “surplus value"—the exploitative appropriation of the other's labor—is itself eliminated by revolutionary praxis. The post-al left's good society is not one in which private ownership is obsolete and the social division of labor (class) is abolished, rather it is a society in which the fruit of exploitation of the proletariat (surplus labor) is more evenly distributed and a near-equality of consumption is established. This distributionist/consumptionist theory that underwrites the economic interests of the (upper)middle classes is the foundation for all the texts in this exchange and their pedagogies. A good pedagogy, in these texts, therefore is one in which power is distributed evenly in the classroom: a pedagogy that constructs a classroom of consensus not antagonism (thus opposition to “politicizing the classroom” in OR‐1) and in which knowledge (concept) is turned into—through the process that OR‐3 calls “translation"—into “consumable” EXPERIENCES. The more “intense” the experience, as the anecdotes of OR‐3 show, the more successful the pedagogy. In short, it is a pedagogy that removes the student from his/her position in the social relations of production and places her/him in the personal relation of consumption: specifically, EXPERIENCE of/as the consumption of pleasure. The post-al logic obscures the laws of motion of capital by very specific assumptions and moves—many of which are rehearsed in the texts here. I will discuss some of these, mention others in passing, and hint at several more. (I have provided a full account of all these moves in my “Post-ality” in Transformation 1.) I begin by outlining the post-al assumptions that “democracy” is a never-ending, open "dialogue” and “conversation” among multicultural citizens; that the source of social inequities is “power”; that a post-class hegemonic “coalition," as OR‐5 calls it—and not class struggle—is the dynamics of social change; that truth (as R-2 writes) is an “epistemological gulag"—a construct of power—and thus any form of “ideology critique” that raises questions of “falsehood” and “truth” ("false consciousness") does so through a violent exclusion of the “other” truths by, in OR‐5 words, “staking sole legitimate claim” to the truth in question. Given the injunction of the post-al logic against binaries (truth/falsehood), the project of “epistemology” is displaced in the ludic academy by “rhetoric." The question, consequently, becomes not so much what is the “truth” of a practice but whether it “works." (Rhetoric has always served as an alibi for pragmatism.) Therefore, R-4 is not interested in whether my practices are truthful but in what effects they might have: if College Literature publishes my texts would such an act (regardless of the “truth” of my texts) end up “cutting our funding?" he/she asks. A post-al leftist like R-4, in short, “resists” the state only in so far as the state does not cut his/her “funding." Similarly, it is enough for a cynical pragmatist like OR‐5 to conclude that my argument “has little prospect of effectual force” in order to disregard its truthfulness. The post-al dismantling of “epistemology” and the erasure of the question of “truth," it must be pointed out, is undertaken to protect the economic interests of the ruling class. If the “truth question” is made to seem outdated and an example of an orthodox binarism (R-2), any conclusions about the truth of ruling class practices are excluded from the scene of social contestation as a violent logocentric (positivistic) totalization that disregards the “difference” of the ruling class. This is why a defender of the ruling class such as R-2 sees an ideology critique aimed at unveiling false consciousness and the production of class consciousness as a form of “epistemological spanking." It is this structure of assumptions that enables R-4 to answer my question, “What is wrong with being dogmatic?" not in terms of its truth but by reference to its pragmatics (rhetoric): what is “wrong” with dogmatism, she/he says is that it is violent rhetoric ("textual Chernobyl") and thus Stalinist. If I ask what is wrong with Stalinism, again (in terms of the logic of his/her text) I will not get a political or philosophical argument but a tropological description.[5]

Unrestrained capitalism turns the case and makes extinction inevitable

Deutsch, 9

/Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” *Peace Magazine*, http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm/

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that mass extinction "can happen here." A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."¶ BESIDES PROLIFERATION¶ The use of nuclear weapons in wars would appear to be increasingly acceptable. "We have created a situation in the world where we have a very small number of people in control of nuclear arsenals - people whose competence is not necessarily proven, whose rationality is not necessarily at a high level, and whose ethical standards may or may not be acceptable. These people are in charge of making decisions about the use of weapons that could destroy civilization and most life on earth" (p. 245). In their recent collection of papers on nuclear weapons, Falk and Krieger further suggest that the grand military strategy is "largely to project power in order to reap the benefits of profitability for the few. To take control of resources, and to place our military bases strategically around the world in order to have greater degrees of control, sounds like a strategy to benefit corporate interests." They state that the power elite has cleverly manipulated the public by focusing almost exclusive attention on the issue of proliferation, "with corresponding inattention to possession, continuing weapons development, and thinly disguised reliance on threatened use."

**And, capitalism destroys the environment and is the root cause of oppression**

**Latin America Solidarity Coalition, 2003** (“Getting to the Roots: Ecology and Environmental Justice”, http://www.lasolidarity.org/papers/enviro.htm)

The globalization of capital and the interweaving of financial and governmental institutions have opened the flood gates for even greater destruction of ecosystems (ecocide) and the annihilation of traditional peoples, cultures and values (genocide) while waging a war on the poor, woman and workers. In this position paper we believe that those who read this are disillusioned with the current condition of life on earth: global forest destruction, increased mono-culture timber plantations, ozone layer depletion, militarism, consumerism, extinction of species, utter collapse of life support systems, racism, air, water and food pollution, chemical warfare, genetic engineering, sweatshops, sexism, fascism and nationalism, abhorrent corporate multinationalism, industrialism and breakdown of community. All of these are exacerbated by the newest ideology of capitalism: neoliberalism. The neoliberalist ideology legitimates corporate control, proposing a "free" global market, whose sole concern is profit and whose primary hindrances are social desires and environmental conservation. Evident in the socio-ecological consequences are agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Bank (WB), the current proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), and bodies such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). Neoliberalism further fuels an elite to control the earth and all of its inhabitants, leading to desperation, degradation and suffering.

**Reject their assertion that discourse and performance can change material social realities.**

**We must return to Marx, recognizing that the only hope for human survival is a politics which engages in struggles to change material social relations rather than discursive attempts to change assumptions—any attempt to work within the system of capitalism is doomed to failure—our alternative is the only hope for human survival**

**Harman, 97** Editor of the Socialst Worker

(Chris, Economics of the madhouse, Pg 99-100)

‘A reprise in the early 21st century of the conditions in the early part of this century. Such is the danger that confronts the world if we cannot deal with the present crisis concludes Will Hutton in his book The State We’re In. Those conditions included two world wars, the rise of Nazism, the collapse o democracy across most of Europe, the victory of Stalinism, the death camps and the gulag. If they were to be repeated in a few years time there is no doubt it would be on a much more horrific scale that even Hitler could not imagine. We would indeed be facing a future of barbarism, if not the destruction of the whole of humanity. Warnings of such a future are not to be treated lightly. Already the crisis of the 1990’s has begun to unleash the same barbaric forces we saw in the 1930’s. In one country after another political adventurers who support the existing system are making careers for themselves by trying to scapegoat ethnic or religious minorities. In the Russia, the Hitler admirer, racist, and proponent of nuclear war, Zhirinovsky got 24 percent of the vote in the November 1993 poll. In Bombay, another Hitler admirer, Bal Thackercey, runs the state government, threatening to wage war against the Muslim minority. In turkey the government and the military wage a war against the Kurdish fifth of the population, while the fascists try to incite Sunni Muslims to murder Alawi Muslims. In Rwanda the former dictator unleashed a horrific slaughter of Tutsis by Hutus, while in neighboring Burundi there is the threat of slaughter of Hutus by Tutsis. All this horror has its origins in the failure of market capitalism to provide even minimally satisfactory lives for the mass of people. Instead is leaves a fifth of the worlds’ population under nourished and most of the rest doubting whether they will be able to enjoy tomorrow the small comforts that allowed to them today Both the out and out defenders of ruling class power and today’s timid cowed reformists tell us there is no alternative to this system. But if that is true then there is no hope for humanity. Politics becomes merely about having the deckchairs on the titanic while making sure no one disturbs the rich and privileged as they dine at the captain’s table. But there is an alternative. The whole crazy system of alienated labor is a product of what we do. Human beings have the power to seize control of the ways of creating wealth and to subordinate them to our decisions, to our values. We do not have to leave them to the blind caprice of the market to the mad rush of the rival owners of wealth in their race to keep ahead of each other. The new technologies that are available today, far from making out lives worse have the potential to make this control easier. Automated work processes could provide us with more leisure, with more time for creativity and more change to deliberate where the world is going. Computerism could provide us with the unparalleled information about the recourses available to satisfy our needs and how to deploy them effectivly But this alternative cannot come from working within the system, from accepting the insane logic of the market, of competitive accumulation, of working harder in order to force someone else to worker harder or lose their job. The alternative can only come from fighting against the system and the disastrous effect its logic has on the lives of the mass of people.

### Case

The affirmative’s narrative structure perpetuates a politics of forced-presencing that extends the disciplinary logic of the system to the confessional while depoliticizing their speech act, ensuring that dominant relations go unaltered

Brown 96 (Wendy Brown \* Wendy Brown is Professor of Women's Studies and Legal Studies, and is Co-Director of the Center for Cultural Studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz. The University of Chicago Law School Roundtable 1996)

But if the silences in discourses of domination are a site for insurrectionary noise, if they are the corridors we must fill with explosive counter-tales, it is also possible to make a fetish of breaking silence. Even more than a fetish, it is possible that this ostensible tool of emancipation carries its own techniques of subjugation--that it converges with non-emancipatory tendencies in contem- porary culture (for example, the ubiquity of confessional discourse and rampant personalization of political life), that it establishes regulatory norms, coincides with the disciplinary power of confession, in short, feeds the powers we meant to starve. While attempting to avoid a simple reversal of feminist valorizations of breaking silence, it is this dimension of silence and its putative opposite with which this Article is concerned. In the course of this work, I want to make the case for silence not simply as an aesthetic but a political value, a means of preserving certain practices and dimensions of existence from regulatory power, from normative violence, as well as from the scorching rays of public exposure. I also want to suggest a link between, on the one hand, a certain contemporary tendency concerning the lives of public figures--the confession or extraction of every detail of private and personal life (sexual, familial, therapeutic, financial) and, on the other, a certain practice in feminist culture: the compulsive putting into public discourse of heretofore hidden or private experiences--from catalogues of sexual pleasures to litanies of sexual abuses, from chronicles of eating disorders to diaries of homebirths, lesbian mothering, and Gloria Steinam's inner revolution. In linking these two phenomena--the privatization of public life via the mechanism of public exposure of private life on the one hand, and the compulsive/compulsory cataloguing of the details rof women's lives on the other--I want to highlight a modality of regulation and depoliticization specific to our age that is not simply confessional but empties private life into the public domain, and thereby also usurps public space with the relatively trivial, rendering the political personal in a fashion that leaves injurious social, political and economic powers unremarked and untouched. In short, while intended as a practice of freedom (premised on the modernist conceit that the truth shall make us free), these productions of truth not only bear the capacity to chain us to our injurious histories as well as the stations of our small lives but also to instigate the further regulation of those lives, all the while depoliticizing their conditions.

## 2NC

### OV

**Gender oppression stems from the material realities of capitalism**

Scott, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @ U Vermont,2006

(Helen, “Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women’s Literature”, Postcolonial Text, 2.1, http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/article/viewArticle/491/174)

Considered as material coordinates rather than systems of thought, gender and class are inseparable and interdependent: “‘Gender is created not simply outside production but within it … It is not a set of ideas developed separately from the economic structure but a part of it, built into the organization and social relations of work’” (French, quoting Ava Baron, 7). Women’s oppression is not a trans-historical constant but is produced through class structure and serves the needs of capitalism.[9] Women both disproportionately provide the unpaid labor of privatized reproduction — the childcare and other domestic responsibilities that are necessary to service future generations of workers — and form a low paid work force: globally women earn two thirds of the average male wage, and in some countries the gap is far larger.[10] These dynamics are particularly pertinent for discussion of postcolonial countries in the neoliberal period

Scott, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @ U Vermont,2006

(Helen, “Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women’s Literature”, Postcolonial Text, 2.1, http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/article/viewArticle/491/174)

For Gedalof’s study, the material coordinates of oppression are secondary to the “conceptual space where the social and the self meet … within particular discourses of gender, race, national and class identities” (2). Her focus is on “narratives” and “discourses” and she subscribes to a Foucauldian understanding of power as “not just a privilege possessed by a dominant group; it is rather exercised by and through us all, situated as we are in multiple networks of ‘nonegalitarian and mobile relations’” (19). This formulation effectively jettisons the primacy of social structures and class antagonism and instead generalizes power as something omnipresent, equating the expression of a system of ideas with the exercise of social domination.[6] It thus has much in common with the post-Althusserian “rejection of economism and … reprioritization of ideology” and disposal of “Althusser’s rather nebulous but necessary affirmation of the primacy of the material ‘in the last instance’ in favor of a conception of ideology as absolutely autonomous” (Brenner 12-13). The problem with discourse theory is that “once ideology is severed from material reality it no longer has any analytical usefulness, for it becomes impossible to posit a theory of determination — of historical change based on contradiction” (Brenner, paraphrasing Michèle Barrett, 13). Marxists understand class in contrast not as an “identity” but rather as a material relationship to the governing mode of production.[7] In extension, **all forms of oppression — racial, national, gender and sexual — have specific material causes and effects and are shaped by the compulsions of capitalism**.[8] As Deborah Levenson-Estrada maintains in a study of women union activists in 1970s Guatemala: “There is no ‘more important’ or ‘prior’ issue — class or gender — these are inside one another, and the struggle against gender conventions and sexist ideologies is integral to any project of liberation. A critical consciousness about class needs a critical consciousness about gender, and vice versa” (227).

### AT: Perm

New link: any focus on the transformative effects their discourse abstracts language from experience—this is the same logic that abstracts surplus value and enables capitalism.

Scott 6 (Helen, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @ U Vermont, “Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women’s Literature”, Postcolonial Text, 2.1, <http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/article/viewArticle/491/174>)

[P]ostmodernist theory, whether it calls itself post-structuralism, deconstruction or post-Marxism, is constituted by a radical attempt to banish the real human body — the sensate, biocultural, laboring body — from the sphere of language and social life. As a result, I argue, these outlooks reproduce a central feature of commodified society: the abstraction of social products and practices from the laboring bodies that generate them. (1) This elision can be seen in readings of Caribbean literature that constantly move away from material relationships and experiences towards allegorical interpretations emphasizing language and representation.

### AT: Link Turn

Materialism is the only effective strategy for combatting capitalism – prefer our evidence because it’s comparative to the permutation.

Tumino, Pittsburg English Professor, 01(Stephen, Spring 2001, Red Critique, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, <http://redcritique.org/spring2001/printversions/whatisorthodoxmarxismprint.htm>, accessed 7-18)

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups.¶ The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice.¶ Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

### Link

**[intellectual link]Their belief that the intellectual is key to forming ideas creates a dependence of the working class on the intellectual, negating radical social transformation of material conditions of existence**

Zavarzadeh, Dept English @ Syracuse, 1994

(Mas’ud, “The Stupidity that Consumption is Just as Productive as Production”, The Alternative

Orange, V 4, Fall/Winter, http://www.etext.org/Politics/AlternativeOrange/4/v4n1\_cpp.html)

The various tendencies of ludic populism can perhaps best be outlined by examining the emerging figure of the post-al “public intellectual." The “public intellectual” is an invention of the bourgeois academy to solve the material contradictions of capitalism in the cultural imaginary. The “public intellectual” is represented in ludic discourses as a person who democratizes knowledge: he/she ostensibly removes the philosophical opacity, technical obscurity and conceptual density (all assumed to be marks of elitism) from the writings of intellectuals and offers the “results” of knowledge to the “public” in order to “empower” them and turn them into active “agents." In actuality, however, the bourgeois “public intellectual"—in the name of democratizing knowledge—perpetuates the ignorance of the people and deepens their dependence on the knowledge industry. In the name of making knowledge available to all citizens, the “public intellectual” “popularizes” knowledge under the cover of “accessibility” (bite sizing), but in so doing he/she conceals the conditions and practices of production of knowledge and instead offers knowledge as an ahistorical commodity to be consumed with “pleasure"—the success of bite-sizing is in direct relation to the amount of “pleasure” it gives to the reader. In this process the “public intellectual” renders an ideologically necessary service to the ruling class: under the alibi of democratization and anti-elitism, he/she reifies the language of “common sense," which is the congealed false consciousness of the regime of capital and wage-labor. Capitalism needs “common sense” in order to protect its class interests from ideology critique, which aims at producing class consciousness. Thus the “public intellectual” of the ludic knowledge industry is always a dialogical person who is opposed to “critique” (which, as OR‐5 puts it, is the practice of prophets and demagogues; and is considered anti-democratic, or, as R-4 puts it, “elitist"). In bite-sizing knowledge, the “public intellectual” denounces the critique-al relation of the intellectual and culture and instead becomes an “affirmationist”: she/he naturalizes the contradictions of daily life by accepting the laws of “commonsense” and its anti-critique-al, consenting ideology. In fact “affirmation” is the main task of the bourgeois “public intellectual." Moreover, the credibility of the bourgeois “public intellectual” is established through her/his “activism," which is, itself, an “affirmation” of the system by accepting (affirming) its rules and playing inside the system according to the rules of reform. The affirmative activism proposed by R-4, in terms of the work that he/she does “locally” in his/her “community," and the confirmatory “coalition” of OR‐5 are instances of this post-al practice. The complicity of this ludic, localist activism with the counter-revolutionary, experientialist reformism that is protective of capitalism is made clear in R-2's affirmative, New Age-y celebration of “experience” (a celebration shared by OR‐3) for its dismissal of “high theoretical schemes"—which are supposed to “seize and radicalize” the disenfranchised—as a fraud, as calls “from above." R-2's assumption is identical with the dominant ideology: the “disenfranchised” know by the authenticity of their “experience," and they do not need the elitist conceptuality of a vanguard party. The popularity of this ludic activism is owing to its no nonsense, pragmatic (no reciting here of the “right passage," as R-2 puts it) and “honest” stance against a revolutionary praxis guided by a vanguard party—produces a theoretical and historical understanding of social totality and rejects “experience” (the subject) as the “natural” (authentic) ground of social change. The “public intellectual” is a figure invented to combine this deep anti-intellectualism and counter-revolutionary affirmation of the commonsense with reformist localism. The critique of “experience," introduction of the conceptual into the everyday, and development of class consciousness through praxical theory is, of course, the very heart of the revolutionary Marxist project. In What Is To Be Done, Lenin argues that knowledges should not be popularized ("translated"—to use OR‐3's privileged pedagogical technique—into “experience") for the workers: such a practice turns the worker into a passive consumer of knowledge. Workers should, themselves, become producers of knowledge. They intervene in the social “not as workers, but as socialist theoreticians” who are “able to develop” knowledges.

[particularity link]

Springer,12, assistant Professor in the Department of Geography at the University of Victoria (Simon, “Neoliberalising violence: of the exceptional and the exemplary in coalescing moments”, Area 44:2, Royal Geographical Society, 2012, Wiley Online)

The point of our critiques should not be to temper neoliberalism with concessions and niceties, as capitalism of any sort is doomed to fail. The logics of creative destruction, uneven development and unlimited expansion – which stoke the ﬁres of conﬂict and contradict the ﬁnite limitations of the earth – are capitalism’s undoing regardless of the form it takes (Harvey 2007). Hence, what instead needs to be occurring in our scholarship on neoliberalism is a more thorough radicalisation of our agenda, where the purpose becomes to consign neoliberalism and all other forms of capitalism to the waste bin of history, so that the ‘exceptional’ and ‘exemplary’ violence of this maligned chapter of human existence become disturbing abominations from our past, not enduring realities of our present, or conceded inevitabilities of our future. What I mean by exceptional violence is that violence which appears to fall outside of the rule, usually by being so profound in its manifestation. Exceptional violence forces those who bear witness to its implications to recognise its malevolence precisely because of the sheer shock and horror that is unleashed. Consequently, exceptional violence is jarring and elicits a deep emotional response. Yet, exceptional violence is only exceptional in the reaction it provokes and, as the proverb ‘the exception proves the rule’ hints, exceptional violence is not beyond the bounds of the normative, but instead actually always exists in a co-constitutive relationship with exemplary violence, or that violence which forms the rule.

[discourse focus link] And The post-al left’s insistence on discourse as the determining factor in revolution obscures the motion of capital: we are so busy self identifying and theorizing that we ignore the elites seizing power and resources. This approach legitimizes consumption at the root of capitalism as it blathers blindly onwards to “identification across difference.”

Mas'ud Zavarzadeh, Department of English, Syracuse University, editor of Transformation: Marxist Boundary Work in Theory, Economics, Politics and Culture—a biquarterly published by the not-for-profit Maisonneuve Press, College Literature Vol 21 Issue 3, 1994, “The Stupidity That Consumption is Just as Productive as Production: In the Shopping Mall of the Post-Al Left” Questia

The task of this text is to lay bare the structure of assumptions and its relation to the workings of the regime of capital and wagelabor (what I have articulated as "post-al logic"), 1 that unite all these seemingly different texts as they recirculate some of the most reactionary practices that are now masquerading as "progressive" in the postmodern academy. Analyzing the post-al logic of the left 2 is important because it not only reveals how the ludic left is complicit with capitalism but, for the more immediate purposes of this text-of-response, it allows us to relate the local discussions in these texts to global problems and to deal, in OR-2's [ Laird's] words, with the "encompassing philOsophical issues"3 that are so violently suppressed by the diversionist uses of "detailism" 4 in these nine texts. Whether they regard themselves to be new new left," "feminist," "neo-Marxist," or anarchist," these texts--in slightly different local idiom--do the ideological work of U. S. capitalism by producing theories, pedagogies, arguments, ironies, anecdotes, turns of phrases, and jokes that obscure the laws of motion of capital. Post-al logic is marked above all by its erasure of "production" as the determining force in organizing human societies and their institutions, and its insistence on "consumption" and "distribution" as the driving force of the social. 5 The argument of the post-al left (briefly) is that "labor," in advanced industrial "democracies," is superseded by "information," and Consequently "knowl-edge" (not class struggle over the rate of surplus labor) has become the driving force of history. The task of the post-al left is to deconstruct the "metaphysics of labor" and consequently to announce the end of socialism and with it the "outdatedness" of the praxis of abolishing private property (that is, congealed alienated labor) in the post-al moment. Instead of abolishing private property, an enlightened radical democracy--which is to supplant socialism (as Laclau, Mouffe, Aronowitz, Butler, and others have advised)--should make property holders of each citizen. The post-al left rejects the global objective conditions of production for the local subjective circumstances of consumption, and its master trope is what R-4 [ France] so clearly foregrounds: the (shopping) "mall"--the ultimate site of consumption "with *all* latest high-tech textwares" deployed to pleasure the "body." In fact, **the post-al left has "invented" a whole new interdiscipline called "cultural studies" that provides the new alibi for the regime of profit by shifting social analytics from "production" to "consumption.**"

(On the political economy of "invention" in ludic theory, see *Transformation*2 on *"The Invention of the Queer."*) To prove its "progressiveness," the post-al left devotes most of its energies (see the writings of John Fiske, Constance Penley, Michael Bérubé, Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Andrew Ross, Susan Willis, Stuart Hall, Fredric Jameson), to demonstrate how "consumption" is in fact an act of production and resistance to capitalism and a practice in which a utopian vision for a society of equality is performed! **The shift from "production" to "consumption" manifests itself in post-al left theories through the focus on "superstructural" cultural analysis and the preoccupation not with the "political economy**" ("base") **but with "representation**"-**for instance, of race, sexuality, environment, ethnicity, nationality, and identity.** This is, for example, one reason for [ Hill's] ridiculing the "base" and "superstructure" analytical model of classical Marxism ( Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*) with an anecdote (the privileged mode of "argument" for the post-al left) that the base is really not all that "basic." To adhere to the base/superstructure model for [him] is to be thrown into an "epistemological gulag." For the post-al left a good society is, therefore, one in which, as [ France] puts it, class antagonism is bracketed and the "surplus value" is distributed more evenly among men and women, whites and persons of color, the lesbian and the straight. **It is not a society in which "surplus value"--the exploitative appropriation of the other's labor--is itself eliminated by revolutionary praxis**. **The post-al left's good society is not one in which private ownership is obsolete and the social division of labor (class) is abolished. Rather it is a society in which the fruit of exploitation of the proletariat (surplus labor) is more evenly distributed and a near-equality of consumption is established**. This distributionist/consumptionist theory that underwrites the economic interests of the (upper)middle classes is the foundation for all the texts in this exchange and their pedagogies. A good pedagogy in these texts therefore is one in which power is distributed evenly in the classroom: a pedagogy that constructs a classroom of consensus not antagonism (thus opposition to "politicizing the classroom" in OR-1 [ Hogan]) and in which knowledge (concept) is turned--through the process that OR-3 [ McCormick] calls "translation"-into "consumable" EXPERIENCES. The more "intense" the experience, as the anecdotes of McCormick show, the more successful the pedagogy. In short, it is a pedagogy that removes the student from his/her position in the social relations of production and places her/him in the personal relation of consumption: specifically, EXPERIENCE of/as the consumption of pleasure. The post-al logic obscures the laws of motion of capital by very specific assumptions and moves--many of which are rehearsed in the texts here. I will discuss some of these, mention others in passing, and hint at several more. (I have provided a full account of all these moves in my "Post-ality" in *Transformation* 1.) I begin by outlining the post-al assumptions that "democracy" is a never-ending, open "dialogue" and "conversation" among multicultural citizens; that the source of social inequities is "power"; that a post-class hegemonic "coalition," as OR-5 [ Williams] calls it--and not class struggle--is the dynamics of social change; that truth (as R-1 [ Hill] writes) is an "epistemological gulag"-- a construct of power--and thus any form of "ideology critique" that raises questions of "falsehood" and "truth" ("false consciousness") does so through a violent exclusion of the "other" truths by, in [ Williams'] words, "staking sole legitimate claim" to the truth in question. Given the injunction of the post-al logic against binaries (truth/falsehood), the project of "epistemology" is displaced in the ludic academy by "rhetoric." The question, consequently, becomes not so much what is the "truth" of a practice but whether it "works." (Rhetoric has always served as an alibi for pragmatism.) Therefore, [ France] is not interested in whether my practices are truthful but in what effects they might have: if *College Literature* publishes my texts would such an act (regardless of the "truth" of my texts) end up "cutting our funding?" [he] asks. A post-al leftist like [ France], in short, "resists" the state only in so far as the state does not cut [his] "funding." Similarly, it is enough for a cynical pragmatist like [ Williams] to conclude that my argument "has little prospect of effectual force" in order to disregard its truthfulness. The post-al dismantling of "epistemology" and the erasure of the question of "truth," it must be pointed out, is undertaken to protect the economic interests of the ruling class. If the "truth question" is made to seem outdated and an example of an orthodox binarism ([ Hill]), any conclusions about the truth of ruling class practices are excluded from the scene of social contestation as a violent logocentric (positivistic) totalization that disregards the "difference" of the ruling class. This is why a defender of the ruling class such as [ Hill] sees an ideology critique aimed at unveiling false consciousness and the production of class consciousness as a form of "epistemological spanking." It is this structure of assumptions that enables [ France] to answer my question, "What is wrong with being dogmatic?" not in terms of its truth but by reference to its pragmatics (rhetoric): what is "wrong" with dogmatism, [he] says, is that it is violent rhetoric ("textual Chernobyl") and thus Stalinist. If I ask what is wrong with Stalinism, again (in terms of the logic of [his] text) I will not get a political or philosophical argument but a tropological description. 6

### AT: Ableism

Censorship fails—destroys our ability to fight dominant interpretations of words

**Schram, 95** (Sanford F. Schram, professor of social theory and policy at Bryn Mawr College, 1995, words of welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and the Social Science of Poverty)

Euphemisms also encourage self-censorship. The politics of renaming discourages its proponents from being able to respond to inconvenient information inconsistent with the operative euphemism. Yet those who oppose it are free to dominate interpretations of the inconvenient facts. This is bad politics. Rather than suppressing stories about the poor, for instance, it would be much better to promote actively as many intelligent interpretations as possible.

Reappropriating the meaning of oppressive words is the ultimate confrontation to oppressive language

Butler 4(Judith, “Undoing Gender,” Routledge, 2004)

In the same way that the terms of an exclusionary modernity have been appropriated for progressive uses, progressive terms can be appropriated for progressive aims. The terms that we use in the course of political movements which have been appropriated by the Right or for misogynist purposes are not, for that reason, strategically out of bounds. These terms are never finally and fully tethered to a single use. The task of reappropriation is to illustrate the vulnerability of these often compromised terms to an unexpected progressive possibility; such terms belong to no one in particular; they assume a life and a purpose that exceed the uses to which they have been consciously put. They are not to be seen as merely tainted goods, too bound up with the history of oppression, but neither are they to be regarded as having a pure meaning that might be distilled from their various usages in political contexts. The task, it seems, is to compel the terms of modernity to embrace those they have traditionally excluded, where the embrace does not work to domesticate and neutralize the newly avowed term; such terms should remain problematic for the existing notion of the polity, should expose the limits of its claim to universality, and compel a radical rethinking of its parameters. For a term to be made part of a polity that has been conventionally excluded is for it to emerge as a threat to the coherence of the polity, and for the polity to survive that threat without annihilating the term. The term would then open up a different temporality for the polity, establishing for that polity an unknown future, provoking anxiety in those who seek to patrol its conventional boundaries. If there can be a modernity without foundationalism, then it will be one in which the key terms of its operation are not fully secured in advance, one that assumes a futural form for politics that cannot be fully anticipated, a politics of hope and anxiety.
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### AT: Perm

Kappeler 95 (Susanne Kappeler, Associate Prof @ Al-Akhawayn University, The Will to Violence: The Politics of Personal Behavior, 1995, pg. 69-71)

The choice of formulation is political; it is an expression of one’s political attitude. Not only does it reveal how the subject con­stitutes itself — whom it chooses to address and to constitute as the ‘we’ of its discourse, and whom and what it chooses to make an object of speech. It also shows what the subject considers to be the ‘whole’ of the speech or action context and what it chooses to exclude from it. That is, it reveals the subject’s communicative intention. If we lock others into the status of ‘the others’, for example, it is a sign that we do not wish to enter into communication and dialogue with them. Allocating ‘them’ the status of the ‘other’, ‘we’ are speak­ing to ‘ourselves’. As androcentric discourse is speech from men to men and about women, and Eurocentric discourse is speech among Europeans at the ‘centre’ of the world and about those at the ‘pen­phery’, so a white—women—centric discourse is a white women s soliloquy, power speaking to itself. Its addressees are ‘white women —not other white women addressed as communicants in a dialogue, but ‘white women’ as the plural of the white woman subject — we as the plural of myself, talking about ‘them’. It also means that, while we acutely object to being objectified through men’s sexist discourse, considering it to be a form of violence, we do not apparently consider it an act of violence if we ourselves objectify other women — all the less so if those women are absent from the specific speech context. That is to say, we do not consider those we objectify and speak about to be a relevant part of the speech and action context, nor do we consider our act of objectifying them to have any consequences for them worth thinking about. A ‘kind’ interpretation of this discursive behaviour would see it as a result of patriarchal socialization — acquired from dominant discourse as we acquired our ‘mother tongue’ from the speech of our mothers, so that we have unconsciously internalized racism, sexism, classism and scientificness, which now trap and implicate us in our own speech. It is an explanation which, just as Alice Walker criticizes, starts from the assumption of women’s weakness and damagedness, appeal­ing for indulgence on account of diminished responsibility. It is an explanation which also has its respectable model in the ‘high’ theory of semiology, which as Deborah Cameron points out ‘sees experience and indeed the individual herself, as a product and function of an institutionalised system of signs’, where language ‘defines our possi­bilities and limitations, [and] constitutes our subjectivities’.’ As an explanation of limitations and their causes, it is closer to excusing incapability and inadequacy than to positing them as a problem to be overcome. As feminists or Walker’s womanists, however, we will start from the assumption of women’s traditional competence and ability and attribute responsibility to ourselves. For our aim is less to describe these symptoms in the interest of a precise diagnosis and aetiology of our speech impediments, than to analyse the power of discourse and the abuse of this power, in the interest of overcoming them. Nothing prevents us from questioning language use, least of all our own, from asking who we are speaking to when we say ‘we’, who is meant and who is not, and whether what we say applies to this group; when we say ‘women’, from asking ‘all women, or which women?’, and when we describe facts, whether they are as we say, and if we are in a position to judge them. Nothing stops us asking about the acting subjects which have disappeared from passive and adjectival construc­tions representing actions, or from statements concerning perceptions, by whom ‘excluded’, by whom ‘oppressed’, to whom ‘invisible’, and so forth. That is, nothing stops us from attempting to render concrete again what has linguistically been abstracted. For here we can take a first step towards changing political reality, analysing the contexts of action and naming the agents. Only when we recognize the connec­tions and know those responsible for action can we begin to intervene in political reality and to know where to put up resistance. All the more so if the actions concerned are our own which we have thus tried to withdraw from (our) view. If we nevertheless fail to do so, if we continue to treat communic­ative and discursive behaviour as if they were a natural and individual attribute of ourselves like, say, the colour of our hair, it must be political intention. If we are unwilling to question our use of language and to analyse the power relations in our linguistic behaviour, it betrays our willingness to use the relative power of educational and academic privilege and to abuse it in our own interest. To the extent that our language conforms to the structures of dominant discourse —in particular, its abstraction which conceals the substantial connections and relations of reality — it betrays an intention conforming to the meaning and function of that discourse: to legitimate and maintain power and the distribution of power in society.