# ASU Round 6 vs. Louisville GH (Neg)

## 1NC

### 1

#### A: Interpretation: The aff must specify what type of restrictions they remove.

#### B: Violation: The plan merely cites community restrictions on energy production

#### C: Standards

#### Ground- Neg loses all of their specific restrictions ground. They can shift to say that’s not their reprocessing and it makes the aff a moving target and justifies aff condo which kills neg ground because we can never effectively engage the aff.

#### Predictability – there’s no uniform restriction on energy production which makes it impossible to be negative because we cannot predict what the aff will actually defend. Explodes the topic.

#### Voting issue for fairness and education.

### 2

#### The 50 states and all relevant U.S. territories should reduce restrictions on community involvement in energy production just like the debate community should reduce restrictions on knowledge production.

#### CP solves and is real world – empirics prove.

Thormeyer, Power Engineer, ‘12

[Rob, “States Meet to Coordinate Energy and Environmental Policies” http://www.power-eng.com/news/2012/07/12/states-meet-to-coordinate-energy-and-environmental-policies.html]

State and local energy officials, utility commissioners and air regulators met in Washington on July 9 and 10 to coordinate efforts on environmental protection, energy and utility policy. Malcolm Woolf, Director of the Maryland Energy Administration and Chair of the National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO) said: "Despite the gridlock in D.C., State policymakers are finding bipartisan solutions to improve public health, keep the lights on and enhance our economic competitiveness." David Wright, Vice Chair of the South Carolina Public Service Commission and President of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) added: "This meeting demonstrated the need for teamwork between and among state agencies. As utility regulators we are tasked with ensuring reliable electric service at reasonable prices. Our sister agencies at the State level have their own responsibilities. It is critical that we work together as new environmental rules are implemented so we can better serve our energy consumers." Barry Wallerstein, Executive Officer of the South Coast Air Quality Management Administration and Co-President of the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA) stated: "The meeting underscores the importance of utility regulators, air pollution control officials and energy officials working together. We heard some great examples of successful partnerships in States to address challenges. We also heard about current and upcoming EPA air rules that will require us to continue this important collaboration." The meeting brought together representatives from NACAA, NARUC and NASEO, as well as industry, federal government representatives and non-governmental groups. NACAA is composed of State and local air regulators from across the country. NARUC's members are utility commissioners that regulate electricity, natural gas and other utilities at the State level. NASEO's members are the individuals designated as their executive branch energy policy and program advisors within the States that are charged with implementing State energy and economic development programs. This meeting was a continuation of a multi-year effort to ensure that State policymakers are working together in the cross-cutting energy and environmental arenas. Session panels included an overview of the Clean Air Act, an examination of the Utility Mercury Air Toxics Standard, the Greenhouse Gas New Source Performance Standards for Power Plants and the Cross-State Pollution Rule, among other issues. State and local officials from across the country identified innovative approaches, including alternative compliance strategies, energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, as well as other mechanisms to reduce costs and preserve economic development, while improving environmental health. Stu Clark, of the Washington Department of Ecology Air Program, stated: "I would like to see us continue to advance this dialogue, whatever happens in Congress, EPA and the courts on these rules. It can only help the public if State and local officials coordinate these responses, rather than working separately. There are a lot of good examples out there." Charles Gray, NARUC's Executive Director, noted: "This meeting brought together a group of State public servants. We established important relationships and fostered a better understanding on how our respective agencies will move forward. State agencies are leading the way in promoting a clean and reliable energy future."

### 3

#### Comprehensive immigration reform will pass now

Roll Call 2/6 (Jonathan Strong, covers House leadership for Roll Call. He previously served as an investigative reporter for the Daily Caller, http://www.rollcall.com/news/democrats\_see\_hopeful\_signals\_from\_republicans\_on\_immigration-222229-1.html)

LEESBURG, Va. — Top Democrats are walking a fine line in assessing the GOP’s signals on an immigration overhaul, both criticizing what they described as tepid steps forward by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor while praising what Republicans privately say they will be willing to do.¶ At a speech billed as a rebranding of the GOP’s image, the Virginia Republican said he would support citizenship for young people brought to the country illegally as children.¶ But Democratic Caucus Chairman Xavier Becerra called the shift small potatoes.¶ “Been there, done that. We’ve moved on. I think the American people have moved on. It’s great that our Republican colleagues are catching up,” the California lawmaker said at a news conference here, where House Democrats are gathered for a retreat over the next two days.¶ But Becerra, who is part of a secretive bipartisan working group on the topic that includes several conservative Republican lawmakers, did not dismiss signals by the GOP that it is open to moving immigration legislation.¶ He described a House Judiciary Committee hearing Tuesday as encouraging, saying, “I didn’t hear Republicans speaking about how it is impossible and how there should be death placed upon anyone who tries to fix the system comprehensively.”¶ “Perhaps the most encouraging thing for me is the conversations I hear privately outside of the reach of a camera from some of my Republican friends and colleagues who I believe understand that the American people are ready to fix this broken immigration system,” he added.¶ At a closed-door session on immigration moderated by California Democratic Rep. Zoe Lofgren, who is also part of the working group, Lofgren did not update Members on specifics of the bipartisan discussions, Becerra said. Speakers included Angela Kelley from the Center for American Progress and Drew Westen, a professor of psychology and psychiatry at Emory University.

#### Obama’s political capital is key.

Hesson 1/2 (Ted, Immigration Editor at ABC News, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOTq55JIAho)

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year.¶ To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with.¶ 1. Be a Leader¶ During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.¶ 2. Clear Space on the Agenda¶ Political priorities aren't always dictated by the folks in D.C., as the tragic Connecticut school shooting shows us. While immigration had inertia after the election, the fiscal cliff and gun violence have been the most talked about issues around the Capitol in recent weeks. The cliff could recede from view now that Congress has passed a bill, but how quickly the president can resolve the other issues on his agenda could determine whether immigration reform is possible this year. "There's only limited oxygen in the room," Chishti said.

#### Clean energy is unpopular and partisan – hurts Obama’s political capital

LVS, ‘12

[Las Vegas Sun, 11-11-12, “Will Republicans play ball on Obama’s lofty second-term agenda?”, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/nov/11/will-republicans-play-ball-obamas-lofty-second-ter/]

But the phrase “cap-and-trade” makes conservatives see almost as much red as the name Nancy Pelosi. Plus, large swaths of the country — including some longtime Democrats — are beginning to doubt that there’s any real payoff to renewable energy investments. “It’s a lot of hocus-pocus,” said Nick Taylor, 42, a lifelong Las Vegas Democrat and single father of seven who voted for Romney. He used to have a job constructing solar panels with Bombard Electric. “We all made a lot of money doing it, but now the systems don’t work. ... Those are garbage now.” That’s left many lawmakers thinking the status quo may be better than the compromise. “Energy — that just divides the parties so much, and it’s something that the public isn’t really sold on,” Damore said, explaining that despite the arched rhetoric on both sides, the feeling of urgency is still too weak to push the parties to work something out. **“**Clean energy was sold as job creation, and now that doesn’t seem to have happened .. and it's not like the oil and gas industry is going anywhere.”

#### Immigration reform is essential to stop families from being ripped apart and people forced into hiding because of their legal stautus

Huffington Post 2/4 (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/04/dreamers-immigration-reform\_n\_2618360.html)

WASHINGTON -- Bernard Pastor, an undocumented 20-year-old sophomore at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, was detained by immigration agents in 2010. Now he hopes sharing his story can help move the immigration debate forward, and he traveled to Washington on Sunday for a week-long intensive workshop on advocacy.¶ The plan: to teach Dreamers -- young undocumented immigrants who would benefit from the Dream Act -- how to effectively tell their own stories and convince others to support reform.¶ Pastor has some experience with that. He talks to classes sometimes about social justice, and is speaking later this year at a TED conference. His pitch is that immigration opponents need to get to know some of the people affected by their policies.¶ "Before I start speaking I say, I can acknowledge the fact that you, at the end of this speech, will probably still won't support me, and I understand that," he said. "But if you sit down and have a conversation with me, get to know me, I guarantee I can change your mind."¶ Nearly 200 young people, most of them undocumented, are in town for the training, organized by advocacy groups United We Dream and the PICO National Network. They focused Monday on learning to tell their stories, and the stories of their communities, in a way that would cause people to either join the push for immigration reform or reconsider trying to block it.¶ The fight for immigration reform is moving quickly, but advocates say it will require a sustained push. President Barack Obama [laid out his plans last week](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/29/obama-immigration-reform-speech_n_2575572.html) for comprehensive immigration reform that would include a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, increased border security and fixes to the legal immigration system. A bipartisan Senate group, dubbed the "gang of eight," also [released a framework for reform](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/28/senate-immigraton-proposal_n_2568191.html) last week, along largely the same grounds except theirs would tie green cards to border security.¶ The group of Dreamers and allies in the basement ballroom of a temple downtown are aiming for a pathway to citizenship for themselves and their families who are in the country without status. During their week of trainings, they will visit about 100 congressional offices to urge them to vote in support of comprehensive immigration reform and to share their stories. But mostly they are hoping to learn how to be better advocates here, and then take those lessons home to be better activists in their own communities.¶ Jerssay Arredondo, a 21-year-old undocumented immigrant who lives in Phoenix, said it used to be difficult for him to discuss his undocumented status. He moved to the United States from Mexico when he was three years old, and recently applied to stay in the country under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals policy. He said he was embarrassed about being undocumented until 2010, when Arizona's restrictive S.B. 1070 immigration law pulled him into the advocacy movement. Now, he works with the Arizona Dream Coalition to push for reform.¶ He said it's most important to be able to speak to voters who oppose reform, not politicians.¶ "We have so many people on this side, but on the other side these people have so much hate that at times it seems like a waste of time to try to convince them to change their mind because they don't understand," he said. "But in reality, it's those people that have that hate and have that animosity toward us ... those are the ones that are hard to convince, and at the end of the day, that's what's going to matter."¶ The afternoon session on sharing a campaign narrative began with a talk from Carlos Saavedra, a co-founder of United We Dream. He asked the participants to stretch -- by then, they had been at the training for five hours -- and then talked to them about the focus of their effort.¶ "Is this immigration struggle about borders? No. Is this about visas? No. Is this about Marco Rubio? No. Is this about Barack Obama? No," he said. "This is about whether America is still the land of immigrants."¶ Saavedra said the idea is for attendees to figure out the values of their own community and those of the community they want to reach, and then to see where they might align. If they were trying to convince African Americans to join the movement, they might discuss family, he said. If they want to reach out to labor, they could talk about workers' rights.¶ The Dreamers split into groups of about 10 to come up with ways to tell their own stories. They wrote down some of the things they wanted to say, based on set guidelines: using "we" or "us," crafting a narrative, talking about key moments and convincing others to get involved. Then they went around in a circle, getting three minutes to talk -- as other attendees snapped in approval -- and three minutes to listen to criticism.¶ Discussions of the undocumented immigrant experience often tend toward the sad: families being ripped apart by deportation, or people being unable to visit family in their native countries because they wouldn't have the authorization to return to the U.S.¶ When the Dreamers shared their stories, many talked about deportation or detention. Some had been picked up by the police or Immigration and Customs Enforcement, while others had seen their family members detained. They talked about Erika Andiola, an advocacy leader and undocumented immigrant whose mother and brother [were held by ICE overnight](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/11/erika-andiola-undocumented-immigrant_n_2456792.html) last month, then released after an outcry from the activist community.¶ But Saavedra encouraged them to keep a positive tone to their speeches. "Pain alone will not get us to the finish line," he told the group. "Pain will wake you up. Hope will keep you alive."

### 4

#### 1. Embracing “experience” as the basis for epistemology ignores the mediated nature of experience. Experience is just another site for articulating the dominant ideology because it ignores the historical continuity of class domination in favor of a “local” understanding of oppression.

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, “Putting Materialism back into Race Theory”, <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm>)

Bourgeois philosophical assumptions haunt the Afrocentric project and, in the domain of black feminist theory, Patricia Hill Collins provides an instructive example of this intersection. In Black Feminist Thought, Collins posits the "special angle of vision" that black women bring to knowledge production process (21), and this "unique angle" (22) provides the "standpoint" for Afrocentric feminism, a feminism that she equates with humanism (37). Similar to the experiential metaphysics of Black women's standpoint theory, Collins also situates Afrocentric feminist epistemology "in the everyday experiences of African-American women" (207). Consequently, Collins suggests that "concrete experience" constitutes a criterion of meaning (208). However, the experiential, the "real", does not adequate the "truth", as Collins implies. Collins rejects the "Eurocentric Masculinist Knowlege Validation Process" for its positivism but, in turn, she offers empiricism as the grounds for validating experience. Hence, the validity of experiential claims is adjudicated by reference to the experience. Not only is her argument circular, but it also undermines one of her key claims. If race, class, gender, and the accompanying ideological apparatuses are interlocking systems of oppression, as Collins suggest, then the experiential is not the site for the "true" but rather the site for the articulation of dominant ideology. On what basis then, could the experiential provide grounds for an historical understanding of the structures that make experience itself possible as experience? Asante and Collins assume that experience is self-intelligible and in their discourse it functions as the limit text of the real. However, I believe experience is a highly mediated frame of understanding. Though it is true that a person of color experiences oppression, this experience is not self-explanatory and, therefore, it needs to be situated in relation to other social practices. Experience seems local but it is, like all cultural and political practices, interrelated to other practices and experiences. Thus its explanation come from its "outside". Theory, specifically Marxist theory, provides an explanation of this outside by reading the meaning of all experiences as determined by the economic realities of class. While Asante's and Collins' humanism reads the experience of race as a site of "self-presence", the history of race in the United States—from slavery to Jim Crow to Katrina—is written in the fundamental difference of class. In other words, experience does not speak the real, but rather it is the site of contradictions and, hence, in need of conceptual elaboration to break from cultural common sense, a conduit for dominant ideology. It is this outside that has come under attack by black (humanist) scholars through the invocation of the black (transcendental) subject.

#### 2. Energy production drives capitalism – it enables the capitalist cycle of growth and exploitation of the working class

ICC 11 (International Communist Current, “Nuclear energy, capitalism and communism” August 16th, World Revolution no.347, September 2011, http://en.internationalism.org/wr/347/nuclear#\_ftnref30)

The increasing use of energy has been a feature of industrialisation around the world. It expresses not only the increase in scale of production and the impact of rising population, but also the development of productivity with the increase in the quantity of the means of production, including energy, that each worker is able to set in motion. This trend has continued today: between 1973 and 2008 total energy consumption increased by 80%.[18] The revolution in the form and quantity of energy available to humanity underpinned the industrial revolution and opened the door from the realm of want to that of plenty. But this revolution was driven by the development of capitalism whose purpose is not the satisfaction of human needs but the increase of capital based on the appropriation of surplus value produced by an exploited working class. Energy is used to drive the development of productivity but it is also a cost of production. It is part of the constant capital alongside raw materials, machines and factories and, as such, tends to increase in relation to the variable capital that is the source of capitalism’s profits. It is this that dictates capitalism’s attitude to energy. Capitalism has no regard for the use of energy, for the destruction of finite resources, other than as a cost of production. Increased productivity tends to require increased energy, so the capitalists (other than those in the oil industry) are driven to try and reduce the cost of this energy. On the one hand this results in the profligate use of energy for irrational ends, such as transporting similar commodities back and forth across the world and the ceaseless multiplication of commodities that meet no real human need but serve only as a means to extract and realise surplus value. On the other, it leads to the denial of access to energy and to the products of energy for millions of humans who lack the money to be of interest to the capitalists. This is illustrated in Nigeria where Shell pumps out billions of dollars worth of oil while the local people go without or risk their lives by trying to illegally tap the oil from the pipeline. The price is also paid by those working in the energy industries in lives lost and bodies maimed or poisoned and by the environment and all that lives in it, from the polluted, toxic waters of the Thames that characterised 19th century London to the warming of the globe that threatens the future of humanity today.

#### 3. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear

Foster 5 [John Bellamy, Monthly Review, September, Vol. 57, Issue 4, “Naked Imperialism”, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>]

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China,that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

#### 4. Vote negative to adopt the historical material criticism of the 1NC - historical analysis of the material conditions of capital is the only way to break free from is contradictions and social inequalities it causes

Tumino 1 (Steven, teaches at the City University of New York, Spring, What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before)

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

#### 5. Class divisions are the root of all other oppressions

Kovel 2 (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124)

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

#### 6. Historical materialism must come first - it predetermines consciousness and the very possibilities of reflective thinking

**Marx 1859** (Karl, a pretty important dude. “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface” http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm) JM

>edited for gendered language<

In the social production of their existence, [people] inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic – in short, ideological forms in which [people] become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks about himself, so one cannot judge such a period of transformation by its consciousness, but, on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the conflict existing between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

### Case

#### The aff’s Politics of Personal Identity forecloses any possibility real social change. If you are concerned with real bodies in pain and suffering, effective advocacy demands that you move beyond yourself to understand the structures in society that make these impacts inevitable. Vote negative to reject this myopic brand of politics.

**Minow 97** [Martha, Not Only For Myself: Identity, Politics, and the Law, Professor of Law @ Harvard, p. 56-57]

Identity politics tends to locate the problem in the identity group rather than the social relations that produce identity groupings.235 **Personal testimony about oppression risks replacing analysis of social structures that produce and maintain it**.236 **Personal testimony is crucial to articulating and maintaining memories, but incapable of providing either analysis of the past or constructive programs for the future. Cornel West observes: "we confine discussions about race in America to the 'problems' black people pose for whites rather than consider what this way of viewing black people reveals about us as a nation."**237 **Serious discussion of race in America, he argues, "must begin not with the problems of black people but with the flaws in American society—flaws rooted in historic inequalities and longstanding cultural stereotypes."**238 Identity politics is likely to reinforce white people's conception of blacks as "them" rather than bringing home people's mutual dependence and relationships. Identity politics tends to produce not only defensiveness among white men, but also makes it easier for white men to abandon and even blame people of color and women of all sorts for their circumstances. More basically, identity politics seems to breed more identity politics. Judith **Butler put the limitations of identity politics bluntly: "You can articulate your identity all you want; you need the damn resources in order to respond to the concrete problems of bodies in pain."**241 **To get the resources, you need to work with others; to care about other bodies in pain, you need to move beyond your own circumstances.** Racial patterns of inequality persist and expand.242 Yet, there remain twice as many whites as blacks below the poverty line.243 **Something more than identity politics is needed to get a grip on these developments and to engage in resistance to them.**244 A politics not of identities but of envisioned alternatives could bridge identity cleavages without demanding that people dissolve their differences in a pot of assimilation that does not absorb all. I do not want to understate the positive aspects of identity politics: valuable conceptions and occasions for being for oneself and forging solidarity with others based on a perception of a shared trait; important challenges to exclusionary practices; and effective questions about exclusionary practices that claim to be inclusive, such as colorblind policies that nonetheless produce virtually all-white beneficiaries. Identity politics also disturbs the repression of historic and continuing group-based injuries. Yet, ironically, **identity politics responds to group-based exclusions by reiterating the very same group boundaries. The problem is not only that responses to oppression reiterate the oppressive strategy of treating identity as fixed. The potentially multiple, fluid qualities of any person's identity seem to evaporate in the assertion of a single trait. Considerable power must be marshalled to accomplish this disappearing act, given the complexity of anyone's identity. And this magical result does not, at the same time, produce purposes or causes that effectively mobilize people against oppression.**

#### Favoring personal experience as an intrinsically valid, nonfalsifiable gesture fails – their notion of liberation is an illusion that prevents real change

Ilan Gur-Ze’ev Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa, Israel 1998 “Toward a Non-Repressive Critical Pedagogy,” http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~ilangz/Critpe39.html

**From this perspective, the consensus reached by the reflective subject taking part in the dialogue offered by Critical Pedagogy is naive, especially in light of its declared anti-intellectualism on the one hand and its pronounced glorification of “feelings”, “experience”, and self-evident knowledge of the group on the other. Critical Pedagogy**, in its different versions, **claims to inhere and overcome the foundationalism and transcendentalism of the Enlightenment’s emancipatory and ethnocentric arrogance**, as exemplified by ideology critique, psychoanalysis, or traditional metaphysics. **Marginalized** feminist **knowledge**, like the marginalized, neglected, and ridiculed knowledge of the Brazilian farmers, as presented by Freire or Weiler, is represented as legitimate and relevant knowledge, in contrast to its representation as the hegemonic instrument of representation and education. This knowledge **is portrayed as a relevant, legitimate and superior alternative to hegemonic education and the knowledge this represents in the center. It is said to represent an identity that is desirable and promises to function “successfully”.** However, **neither the truth value of the marginalized collective memory nor knowledge is cardinal here. “Truth” is replaced by knowledge whose supreme criterion is its self-evidence, namely the potential productivity of its creative violence, while the dialogue in which adorers of “difference” take part is implicitly represented as one of the desired productions of this violence**. My argument is that **the marginalized and repressed self-evident knowledge has no superiority over the self-evident knowledge of the oppressors. Relying on the knowledge of the weak, controlled, and marginalized groups, their memory and their conscious interests, is no less naive and dangerous than relying on hegemonic knowledge. This is because the critique of Western transcendentalism, foundationalism, and ethnocentrism declines into uncritical acceptance of marginalized knowledge, which becomes foundationalistic and ethnocentric in presenting “the truth”**, “the facts”, or “the real interests of the group” - even if conceived as valid only for the group concerned. **This position cannot avoid vulgar realism and naive positivism based on “facts” of self-evident knowledge ultimately realized against the self-evidence of other groups.**  **These conceptions are all historical, and do not take seriously the present Western system’s capacity for shaping all collective consciousness**, not only the ruling group’s. **The inner logic of the system is not relevant solely for the center. The system is to be understood as a complex of specific power relations and symbolic dynamics that contains and allows the potentials and limitations of groups and individuals**, identities and interests, conceptual possibilities, and economic-technological realities. **Within these limits, every element of the system is set, regulated, and activated, thereby receiving its “meaning” and aims.** This is the case from the level of the different elements of the psyche to the level of the global sub-systems of production, mobilization, distribution, and conquest. It is made possible by the formation of social, economic, and technological circumstances, as well as by conscious and the psychic ones, which are all contained within the limits of the present order of things. On the one hand**, the premises and practices of current standard Critical Pedagogy, by emphasizing the knowledge of marginalized people** (not necessarily marginalized knowledge), **might look like the realization of Foucault’s understanding of truth/power and the recognition that “each society has its regimes of truth....that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true”**.(64) On the other hand, **even from a Foucaultian perspective, the optimism of standard Critical Pedagogy neither recognizes nor challenges Foucault’s common ground with Critical Theory’s conceptions when he writes that “knowledge is also the field of coordination and subordination of statements in which concepts appear and are defined, applied and transformed...”.(**65) Deciphering these ways of constructing reality, identity, knowledge, and conceptual possibilities on a historical local and general level might release one from easy optimistic reliance on the vitalism that is implicitly understood to be contained in the alternative knowledge of the marginalized. **A pedagogy that overemphasizes the importance of the effectiveness of revolutionary praxis and whose yardstick is power is not to be counted as part of Critical Education** or Critical Pedagogy. A Critical Pedagogy that does not suffer from these weaknesses must present itself as an elaboration of the possibility of an alternative spirituality, and as part of an effort to transcend reality and the present realm of self-evidence.

#### This call for liberatory pedagogy is dangerous - their uncritical application of deliberation to address oppression cannot escape the homogenizing claim that such practices have normed within the white body – this turns their methodology.

Ilan Gur-Ze’ev Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Education, University of Haifa, Israel 1998 “Toward a Non-Repressive Critical Pedagogy,” http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~ilangz/Critpe39.html

**Giroux constructs an original synthesis of the Enlightenment’s universalistic commitment to liberate the repressed and a rejection of the concepts as the universality of reason, the validity of a general theory, and resistance of constructions and dynamics that are to be reconstructed and negated, even if not defeated or domesticated.** Today Giroux accepts the postmodern understanding of the plurality and inconsistancy of time fields, the different epistemological structure of different communities, and the legitimacy of political and epistemic difference; yet **he still insists on the possibilities of emancipation here and now.** Implicitly, in his thought these possibilities for emancipation are actual and universal, and his positive utopianism and his new epistemic assumptions are inconsistance. **Here arise violent potentialities of his concept of dialogue between teachers and students. He has not found a theoretical solution to the conflict between the authority of the self-evidence knowledge, criteria, goals, and interests of individual students of repressed collectives and the principles of** his own **Critical Pedagogy. While paying tribute to the self-evident knowledge of popular culture and criticizing elitist culture** and Critical Theory, **his own theory is elitist, sophisticated, and far from the reflective reach of those normalized and manipulated by popular culture and other manifestations of culture industry**.(43) It is a typical representative of both feminist and “patriarchal” Critical Pedagogy.(44) Acknowledgment of difference as the foundation of the “language of possibilities” may justify the optimism and positive utopianism of such a Critical Pedagogy. Yet it guarantees that this critique will not contemplate deeply and problematize the roots of existence and co-existence and question the possibilities of reality, but will realize its potential for philosophical violence and political terror. Giroux combines two salient elements that guarantee the political success of his Critical Postmodern Pedagogy. He ignores Critical Theory’s exposition of the systematic destruction of the individual’s potential for autonomy and reflectivity (45) and neglects their exposition of the disappearance of Spirit (46) and the exile of reason which was replaces by instrumental rationality. In his work Giroux combines these two neglections with negligence of a central postmodern position: the relation between knowledge and power. This last move allows him to disregard postmodern critique of “truth” claims of the intellectual as well as the emancipatory movement that “succeeds” in “liberating” individuals and collectives. **The very concept of the “we”, the “community”, as a manifestation of the violence of education that constitutes the self-evidence and the identity of both the oppressors and the oppressed stays non-problematic and is presented uncritically in this Critical Pedagogy. Exactly where he could use postmodernist understandings to reformulate some problematic modernist elements in his pedagogical ambitions, Giroux uses some of the most dangerous concepts. His concept of dialogue and alternative relations between teachers as intellectuals and students is based on modernistic attitudes towards voluntarism and vitalism, but there is no defined concept of reason; this is philosophically and politically very dangerous.**

#### Their elevation of personal narrative over policy deliberation is politically dangerous—their strategy is the same used by the Bush administration to justify invading Iraq—only a model of public argument which emphasizes clear rules and empirical analysis can create a successful framework for progressive politics

Tonn, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Maryland, College Park, 05 (Mari Boor “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public ,” Rhetoric & Public Affairs 8.3 (2005) 405-430)

This widespread recognition that access to public deliberative processes and the ballot is a baseline of any genuine democracy points to the most curious irony of the conversation movement: portions of its constituency. Numbering among the most fervid dialogic loyalists have been some feminists and multiculturalists who represent groups historically denied both the right to speak in public and the ballot. Oddly, some feminists who championed the slogan "The Personal Is Political" to emphasize ways relational power can oppress tend to ignore similar dangers lurking in the appropriation of conversation and dialogue in public deliberation. Yet the conversational model's emphasis on empowerment through intimacy can duplicate the power networks that traditionally excluded females and nonwhites and gave rise to numerous, sometimes necessarily uncivil, demands for democratic inclusion. Formalized participation structures in deliberative processes obviously cannot ensure the elimination of relational power blocs, but, as Freeman pointed out, the absence of formal rules leaves relational power unchecked and potentially capricious. Moreover, the privileging of the self, personal experiences, and individual perspectives of reality intrinsic in the conversational paradigm mirrors justifications once used by dominant groups who used their own lives, beliefs, and interests as templates for hegemonic social premises to oppress women, the lower class, and people of color. Paradigms infused with the therapeutic language of emotional healing and coping likewise flirt with the type of psychological diagnoses once ascribed to disaffected women. But as Betty Friedan's landmark 1963 The Feminist Mystique argued, the cure for female alienation was neither tranquilizers nor attitude adjustments fostered through psychotherapy but, rather, unrestricted opportunities.102 [End Page 423] The price exacted by promoting approaches to complex public issues—models that cast conventional deliberative processes, including the marshaling of evidence beyond individual subjectivity, as "elitist" or "monologic"—can be steep. Consider comments of an aide to President George W. Bush made before reports concluding Iraq harbored no weapons of mass destruction, the primary justification for a U.S.-led war costing thousands of lives. Investigative reporters and other persons sleuthing for hard facts, he claimed, operate "in what we call the reality-based community." Such people "believe that solutions emerge from [the] judicious study of discernible reality." Then baldly flexing the muscle afforded by increasingly popular social-constructionist and poststructuralist models for conflict resolution, he added: "That's not the way the world really works anymore . . . We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality—judiciously, as you will—we'll act again, creating other new realities."103 The recent fascination with public conversation and dialogue most likely is a product of frustration with the tone of much public, political discourse. Such concerns are neither new nor completely without merit. Yet, as Burke insightfully pointed out nearly six decades ago, "A perennial embarrassment in liberal apologetics has arisen from its 'surgical' proclivity: its attempt to outlaw a malfunction by outlawing the function." The attempt to eliminate flaws in a process by eliminating the entire process, he writes, "is like trying to eliminate heart disease by eliminating hearts."104 Because public argument and deliberative processes are the "heart" of true democracy, supplanting those models with social and therapeutic conversation and dialogue jeopardizes the very pulse and lifeblood of democracy itself.

#### The narrative paradigm is uniquely bad in the context of policy debate—precludes the possibility of meaningful comparison of political strategies.

McDonald, Director of Forensics at Western Washington University, and Jarman, Director of Debate at Wichita State, 95 (Kelly and Jeffrey W “GETTING THE STORY RIGHT: THE ROLE OF NARRATIVE IN ACADEMIC DEBATE,”)

A narrative perspective would be important for shaping the experience of individual debaters for future leadership as well as forcing them to make MORE compelling Gass (1988) represents the strongest critique of the Application of a narrative paradigm in academic debate. Rejecting any paradigmatic solution to the problems within debate practice through narrative, Gass advances the expert model for argument construction and evaluation. He makes three basic arguments against the narrative paradigm. First, Gass says the narrative paradigm lacks the precision needed for academic debate. Grounding his argument in the differences between “pure” and “applied” theories, Gass contends that “pure theories” do not require precision because they attempt to “explain, understand, or interpret phenomena.” In contrast , “applied” theories re- quire precision because they function to regulate, instead of explain phenomenon. Academic debate, because its theories act to regulate behavior, rather than explain it, requires precision. § Marked 10:58 § Gass argues that the narrative paradigm does not bring the necessary precision the activity requires. For instance, it provides no guidelines concerning how to resolve issues such as conditionality, counterplans, permutations, stock issues and fiat power. Without explaining how narrative rationality would resolve competing theoretical questions, Gass believes that the theory fails to provide the necessary precision required by academic debate.

## 2NC

### Case

### A2: Speed

#### Any listener can easily adjust to faster speech rates two to three times the “normal” rate.

**JANSE, ’03** [Esther; Ph.D. @ Utrecht institute of Linguistics OTS; “Production and Perception of Fast Speech”]

**Listeners can adapt to very fast rates of speech. They can quite easily learn to understand speech which is compressed to rates that are much faster than can ever be attained in natural fast speech.** In the Introduction Chapter, the question was raised whether this fact provides a challenge to the Motor theory of speech perception. The central claim of the Motor theory is that “to perceive an utterance, then, is to perceive a specific pattern of intended gestures”. But what then, if what listeners perceive cannot possibly be a pattern of intended gestures produced by a human speaker? For the perception of synthetic speech, Liberman & Mattingly (1985) claim that synthetic speech will be treated as speech if it contains sufficiently coherent phonetic information. In their view, “it makes no difference that the listener knows, or can determine on auditory grounds, that the stimulus was not humanly produced; because linguistic perception is informationally encapsulated and mandatory, he will hear synthetic speech as speech” (p.28). Consequently, the fact that people can listen to speech which is time-compressed to much faster rates than can be produced by human speakers is not a strong argument against the Motor theory. Time-compressed speech is still sufficiently phonetically coherent to be perceived as speech. Listeners will only have to perform a time-scaling step in order to derive the original gestures.

In normal everyday speech, speaker and listener tune in to each other. Listeners need to adapt to the speaker’s voice characteristics and dialect or regional accent. On the speaker’s side, speakers adapt their speech to the requirements of the communicative situation (Lindblom 1990; Nooteboom & Eefting 1994). An example of this type of co-operative behaviour is accentuation and deaccentuation. Accentuation is used by the speaker to guide the listener’s attention to new and informative words in the speech stream, whereas given or more redundant information is usually deaccented. Likewise, speech rate can also be varied according to contextual redundancy. Speakers may have to speak relatively slowly and carefully when they are conveying new information, but they can use a relatively fast speech rate when they are, e.g., recapitulating what they have just said. However, this pact between speaker and listener does not hold for time-compressed speech. Now the listener is presented with a global speech rate which is much faster than the speaker intended. In this chapter we hope to give some insight into how listeners deal with these unco-operative situations.

**In order to adapt to strongly time-compressed speech (two to three times the original rate), listeners need only a small amount of training** (Pallier et al. 1998). When adapting to time-compressed speech, **listeners are assumed to learn to make acoustic transformations on the signal in order to derive the correct speech segments and words.**

#### 4.Spreading boosts short-term memory, which is key to education and remembering everyday tasks.

**PSYCHOLOGY TODAY, ‘92** [October 1992 (report of the results of the Raine et al study)]

"If friends criticize you for talking too fast, at least they can't also accuse you of having a bad memory. **Speech rate is a strong index of short term memory span... 'Therefore, the faster you can talk, the greater your short-term memory**,' says Adrian Raine, PhD, a University of Southern California psychologist. **The link has been established for adults for some time**, Raine reports in Child Development. Now, he and his colleagues find **the correlation holds for kids as well**, a finding that promises short-term payoff in the classroom and long-term payoff in life. **Short-term memory is the power behind recall of phone numbers, directions, and other everyday tasks. It is also the foundation of arithmetic and reading skills... That raises the possibility that speech- training may be a short-cut to achievement**." (p.14)

#### 5. TURN: Working memory is critical to literacy and math --- which is key to keeping your GPA up, which is key to you staying in debate.

**HULME + MCKENZIE, ’92** [Charles & Susie. (1992). Working Memory and Severe

Learning Difficulties. Hillsdale, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Pg 45]

"In its broadest sense, **working memory refers to the use of temporary storage mechanisms in the performance of more complex tasks. So, for example, in order to read and understand prose, we must be able to hold incoming information in memory. This is necessary in order to compute the semantic and syntactic relationships among successive words, phrases, and sentences and so construct a coherent and meaningful representation of the meaning of the text**. This temporary storage of information during reading is said to depend on working memory. In this view **the ability to understand prose will depend o**n, among other things, **the capacity of a person’s working memory system**. **Such temporary storage of information is obviously necessary for the performance of a wide variety of other tasks apart from reading, such as mental arithmetic** (Hitch, 1978) **and verbal reasoning** (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974)."

#### 6. Speed is critical to linguistic abilities.

**STINE, WINGFIELD, + POON, ’96** [Elizabeth L., Arthur, & Leonard. “How much

and how fast: Rapid processing of spoken language in later adulthood.” Psychology and Aging, vol. 1, no. 4, 303-311]

"**At a very fast rate, several things must be accomplished. The various processes required to recode linguistic stimuli into meaning have been articulated for both spoken language** (Just & Carpenter, 1980; Marslen-Wilson & Tyler, 1980) **and written text** (Kintsch & vanDijk, 1978; J. Miller & Kintsch, 1980). **There must be some initial phase in which the stimulus is encoded, physical features** (visual or acoustic) **are extracted, and lexical access is achieved** (Just & Carpenter, 1980). **Next, the language content must be parsed into meaningful idea units in which relationships are determined among words** (Kintsch & vanDijk, 1978). **These relationships are typically represented in terms of propositions consisting of a predicate and one or more arguments that are related by the predicate. Third, relationships between idea units of the text must be established in order to construct overall structural coherence in the text. Finally, the text must be related to and integrated with world knowledge. Although such processes would undoubtedly have to work in both a top-down and bottom-up fashion, the output at each of these stages would have to be held in an online working memory for an effective integration of meaning**."

## 1NR

### Cap K

### Methodology

#### A materialist method is key - illumination of social and political relations through dialetical materialism is key to challenge dominate social ideologies.

Lukacs 1919 (George, Hungarian philosopher, He was the founder of Western Marxism, “What is Orthodox Marxism” http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm)

If the question were really to be formulated in terms of such a crude antithesis it would deserve at best a pitying smile. But in fact it is not (and never has been) quite so straightforward. Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research had disproved once and for all every one of Marx’s individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious ‘orthodox’ Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and hence dismiss all of Marx’s theses in toto – without having to renounce his orthodoxy for a single moment. Orthodox Marxism, therefore, does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx’s investigations. It is not the ‘belief’ in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a ‘sacred’ book. On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened only along the lines laid down by its founders. It is the conviction, moreover, that all attempts to surpass or ‘improve’ it have led and must lead to over-simplification, triviality and eclecticism. 1 Materialist dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic. This definition is so important and altogether so crucial for an understanding of its nature that if the problem is to be approached in the right way this must be fully grasped before we venture upon a discussion of the dialectical method itself. The issue turns on the question of theory and practice. And this not merely in the sense given it by Marx when he says in his first critique of Hegel that “theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses.” [[1]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#1) Even more to the point is the need to discover those features and definitions both of the theory and the ways of gripping the masses which convert the theory, the dialectical method, into a vehicle of revolution. We must extract the practical essence of the theory from the method and its relation to its object. If this is not done that ‘gripping the masses’ could well turn out to be a will o’ the wisp. It might turn out that the masses were in the grip of quite different forces, that they were in pursuit of quite different ends. In that event, there would be no necessary connection between the theory and their activity, it would be a form that enables the masses to become conscious of their socially necessary or fortuitous actions, without ensuring a genuine and necessary bond between consciousness and action. In the same essay [[2]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#2) Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible. “It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought.” Or, as he expresses it in an earlier work: [[3]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#3) “It will then be realised that the world has long since possessed something in the form of a dream which it need only take possession of consciously, in order to possess it in reality.” Only when consciousness stands in such a relation to reality can theory and practice be united. But for this to happen the emergence of consciousness must become the decisive step which the historical process must take towards its proper end (an end constituted by the wills of men, but neither dependent on human whim, nor the product of human invention). The historical function of theory is to make this step a practical possibility. Only when a historical situation has arisen in which a class must understand society if it is to assert itself; only when the fact that a class understands itself means that it understands society as a whole and when, in consequence, the class becomes both the subject and the object of knowledge; in short, only when these conditions are all satisfied will the unity of theory and practice, the precondition of the revolutionary function of the theory, become possible. Such a situation has in fact arisen with the entry of the proletariat into history. “When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing social order,” Marx declares, “it does no more than disclose the secret of its own existence, for it is the effective dissolution of that order.” [[4]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/orthodox.htm#4) The links between the theory that affirms this and the revolution are not just arbitrary, nor are they particularly tortuous or open to misunderstanding. On the contrary, the theory is essentially the intellectual expression of the revolutionary process itself. In it every stage of the process becomes fixed so that it may be generalised, communicated, utilised and developed. Because the theory does nothing but arrest and make conscious each necessary step, it becomes at the same time the necessary premise of the following one.

### Personal Experience

#### Identity politics is capitalism’s newest way of undermining class solidarity – it emphasizes difference which splits coalitions apart

Wood 94 (Ellen Meiksins, Ph.D. in Political Science, former political science professor at York University, Canada, former editor of the Monthly Review, June 13th, 1994, “Identity Crisis” published in “In These Times”, http://www.unz.org/Pub/InTheseTimes-1994jun13-00028?View=PDF)

If capitalism is, as I would argue, not just another specific oppression alongside many others but an all- embracing compulsion that imposes itself on all our social relations, what kind of politics follows from that? And if class relations constitute capitalism in a way that other "identities" don't, where should we situate class in identity politics? There are other questions, too. Identity politics has taught us to acknowledge and celebrate difference and to be more sensitive to the multiplicity of power and human oppression; but there still remains the question of where, among all our diversities, we should locate our solidarities. Here, it's hard to see how postmodern pluralism is much of an improvement over the old variety of liberal pluralism. The left used to criticize the old pluralism for its excessive individualism, and for creating a myth of the sovereign individual. This myth served as an instrument of capitalist hegemony by separating human beings into atomized individuals (or "interest groups")—while undermining solidarities of class. The new pluralism is again disaggregating people, this time into separate identities or even several separate identities for each individual; and in that respect, it too disables opposition to the existing order. Political organization has always been a matter of creating unity out of diversity and difference. There is no doubt that traditional class politics, in the form of the traditional labor and socialist movements, never dealt adequately with problems like gender or race. But this kind of politics did at least provide some basis for uniting diverse people in common emancipa- tory struggles. For all its failures, it had an inclusive program unequalled by any other emancipatory project. This is in sharp contrast to the new post-Marxist, postmodernist identity politics, which seems designed to drive people apart

#### Securing identities against the backdrop of capitalism makes class consciousness impossible by masking capital’s reign and containing individuals to their separate identity groups

Katz 2k (Adam, adjunct English instructor at Onondaga Community College, He received his Ph.D. in English literature from Syracuse, Published November 1, 2000, “Postmodernism and the Politics of ‘Culture’”, p.39-40; chapter can be found online here: http://clogic.eserver.org/1-1/katz.html)

Both the "economic" and the "cultural-ideological" aspects of social domination are recognized here, but in a way that separates them in an absolute way and makes it impossible to theorize the relations between them. The two possible courses of action posited by this passage are either to reflect an already existing collective will which is to be found in the "economy," or to fashion a new collective will. The very notion of the "economy" as something that one could "get a hold on" presupposes the economic reductionism that Hall is presumably contesting: that is, it accepts the notion of the "economic" as something self-contained and independent. In this case, as soon as the contending classes step outside of the "economy," they are no longer "classes" in any meaningful sense, but rather positions struggling for power in relation to political, moral, intellectual, cultural, ideological, and sexual questions. This rigid antinomy is reproduced in the "choice" between reflecting an already formed collective will and fashioning a new one. The possibility of constructing a new collective will out of the contradictions situated in the economic structure, contradictions which are articulated in relation to other cultural structures where the elements of such a will are emerging as a result of differentiated arenas of struggle, is excluded here. Instead, the collective will can be "fashioned" through a synthesis of positions immanent in these specific struggles themselves. 17. This becomes more evident in Hall's concluding chapters to The Hard Road to Renewal. There he argues that [e]lectoral politics--in fact, every kind of politics--depends on political identities and identifications. People make identifications symbolically: through social imagery, in their political imaginations. They "see themselves" as one sort of person or another. They "imagine their future" within this scenario or that. They don't just think about voting in terms of how much they have, their so-called "material interests." Material interests matter profoundly. But they are always ideologically defined. (261) Once again, there is a reference to the importance of material, ultimately class interests, and Hall also mentions that people have conflicting "interests" as well as conflicting "identities." However, the claim that both the economic and the ideological are "important"--by itself, a commonplace observation--can lead in one of two fundamentally opposed directions. One possibility is to theorize the material interests of social classes and engage in ideological struggle for the purpose of clarifying the contradictions which structure the ideologies and "identities" of oppressed groups, thereby making the production of oppositional class consciousness possible. The other possibility is to construct "images" and "identities" that are immediately accessible and intelligible within the framework of those contradictions, thereby resecuring subordinated subjects' "consent" for the social order which produces them. This latter possibility becomes the unavoidable consequence insofar as politics is defined as "'a struggle for popular identities'" (282). In addition, this possibility is also inevitable given Hall's reductive understanding of "material interests" as little more than "income levels" ("how much they have"), rather than in terms of the reproduction of all of the social and institutional conditions of the production of "effective" subjects.

### Root Cause

#### Capitalism reduces everything to market abstractions—negates value to life and justifies the extermination of devalued people.

Kovel 2 Professor of Social Studies at Bard, 02 (Joel, “The Enemy of Nature,” p140-141)

The precondition of an ecologically rational attitude toward nature is the recognition that nature far surpasses us and has its own intrinsic value, irreducible to our practice. Thus we achieve differentiation from nature. It is in this light that we would approach the question of transforming practice ecologically — or, as we now recognize to be the same thing, dialectically. The monster that now bestrides the world was born of the conjugation of value and dominated labour. From the former arose the quantification of reality, and, with this, the loss of the differentiated recognition essential for ecosystemic integrity; from the latter emerged a kind of selfhood that could swim in these icy waters. From this standpoint one might call capitalism a ‘regime of the ego’, meaning that under its auspices a kind of estranged self emerges as the mode of capital’s reproduction. This self is not merely prideful the ordinary connotation of ‘egotistical’ — more fully, it is the ensemble of those relations that embody the domination of nature from one side, and, from the other, ensure the reproduction of capital. This ego is the latest version of the purified male principle, emerging aeons after the initial gendered domination became absorbed and rationalized as profit­ability and self-maximization (allowing suitable ‘power-women’ to join the dance). It is a pure culture of splitting and non-recognition: of itself, of the otherness of nature and of the nature of others. In terms of the preceding discussion, it is the elevation of the merely individual and isolated mind-as-ego into a reigning principle. ‘~ Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that ‘counts’, a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way. The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accom­panied