# Marcuse K

## 1NC

#### The link is that the aff’s call for ABSOLUTE, UNFETTERED speech represents all speech as neutral, regardless of what’s said.

**Marcuse 1:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German Philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” Published in Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore, Jr., and Herbert Marcuse’s *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1965. RP

**Under a system of constitutionally guaranteed and (generally and without too many and too glaring exceptions) practiced civil rights and liberties, opposition and dissent are tolerated unless they issue in violence and/or in exhortation to and organization of violent subversion. The underlying assumption is that the established society is free, and that any improvement, even a change in the social structure and social values, would come about in the normal course of events, prepared, defined, and tested in free and equal discussion, on the open marketplace of ideas and goods.[**2] Now in recalling John Stuart Mill's passage, I drew attention to the premise hidden in this assumption: free and equal discussion can fulfill the function attributed to it only if it is rational expression and development of independent thinking, free from indoctrination, manipulation, extraneous authority. The notion of pluralism and countervailing powers is no substitute for this requirement. One might in theory construct a state in which a multitude of different pressures, interests, and authorities balance each other out and result in a truly general and rational interest. **However, such a construction badly fits a society in which powers are and remain unequal and even increase their unequal weight when they run their own course**. It fits even worse when the variety of pressures unifies and coagulates into an overwhelming whole, integrating the particular countervailing powers by virtue of an increasing standard of living and an increasing concentration of power. Then, the laborer, whose real interest conflicts with that of management, the common consumer whose real interest conflicts with that of the producer, the intellectual whose vocation conflicts with that of his employer find themselves submitting to a system against which they are powerless and appear unreasonable. The idea of the available alternatives evaporates into an utterly utopian dimension in which it is at home, for a free society is indeed unrealistically and undefinably different from the existing ones. Under these circumstances, whatever improvement may occur 'in the normal course of events' and without subversion is likely to be an improvement in the direction determined by the particular interests which control the whole. **He adds:** The tolerance which enlarged the range and content of freedom was always partisan-- intolerant toward the protagonists of the repressive status quo. The issue was only the degree and extent of intolerance. **In the** firmly established liberal society of England and **the United States, freedom of speech and assembly was granted even to** the radical **enemies of society, provided they did not make the transition from word to deed, from speech to action. Relying on the effective background limitations imposed by its class structure, the society seemed to practice general tolerance. But liberalist theory had already placed an important condition on tolerance** : it. was 'to apply only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties'. John Stuart Mill does not only speak of children and minors; he elaborates: 'Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion.'

#### Several impacts:

#### The alterantive: we must reject the aff’s representation of speech as something to be fully tolerated, and instead endorse Marcuse’s method of Liberating Tolerance. Liberating Tolerance means rejecting oppressive views. THIS IS AN ALTERNATIVE REPRESENTATION, NOT A POLICY.

**Bauer explains Marcuse:** Bauer, Fred. [Contributor to *The Weekly Standard*] “The Left and ‘Discriminating Tolerance.’” *The National Review*,June 2015. RP

**In** the light of this situation, Marcuse made **a** rather cunning inversion (one that has been aped countless times since by cultural organs across the United States): **The fact that society** is **so radically unequal means that we should be** intolerant **and repressive in the name of tolerance and liberty. He [R]ejected what he termed “indiscriminate tolerance” — a tolerance that accepts all viewpoints — in favor of “liberating tolerance” or “discriminating tolerance.”** Unlike many of his disciples, Marcuse was frank about what this intolerance would mean: “**Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left.**” When many in the media junked the Bush-era refrain, “Dissent is patriotic,” and began to suggest that dissent during the Obama administration was a product of some unhealthy motivation (especially racism), they were putting into practice Marcuse’s theory of “discriminating tolerance.” Elsewhere in “Repressive Tolerance,” **Marcuse outlined some of the other “apparently undemocratic” tactics that partisans of a true democracy should use**. This passage is worth quoting at length, not only because of its explicitness but also because of its prescience: **They would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, discrimination on the grounds of race and religion**, or which oppose the extension of public services, social security, medical care, etc. Moreover, the restoration of freedom of thought may necessitate new and rigid restrictions on teachings and practices in the educational institutions which, by their very methods and concepts, serve to enclose the mind within the established universe of discourse and behavior — thereby precluding a priori a rational evaluation of the alternatives. And to the degree to which freedom of thought involves the struggle against inhumanity, restoration of such freedom would also imply intolerance toward scientific research in the interest of deadly “deterrents,” of abnormal human endurance under inhuman conditions, etc.

#### And the alt’s impacts outweighs tolerating bigots.

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German Philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” Published in Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore, Jr., and Herbert Marcuse’s *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1965. RP

The **small and powerless minorities which struggle against the false consciousness and its beneficiaries must be helped: their continued existence is more important than the preservation of abused rights and liberties which grant constitutional powers to those who oppress these minorities. It should be evident by now that the exercise of civil rights by those who don't have them presupposes the withdrawal of civil rights from those who prevent their exercise, and that liberation of the Damned of the Earth presupposes suppression not only of their old but also of their new masters. Withdrawal of tolerance from regressive movements before they can become active; intolerance even toward thought, opinion, and word, and finally, intolerance in the opposite direction, that is, toward the self-styled conservatives, to the political Right--these anti- democratic notions respond to the actual development of the democratic society which has destroyed the basis for universal tolerance.** The conditions under which tolerance can again become a liberating and humanizing force have still to be created. When tolerance mainly serves the protection and preservation of a repressive society, when it serves to neutralize opposition and to render men immune against other and better forms of life, then tolerance has been perverted. And when this perversion starts in the mind of the individual, in his consciousness, his needs, when heteronomous interests occupy him before he can experience his servitude, then the efforts to counteract his dehumanization must begin at the place of entrance, there where the false consciousness takes form (or rather: is systematically formed)-- it must begin with stopping the words and images which feed this consciousness. **To be sure, this is censorship, even precensorship, but openly directed against the more or less hidden censorship that permeates the free media**. Where the false consciousness has become prevalent in national and popular behavior, it translates itself almost immediately into practice: the safe distance between ideology and reality, repressive thought and repressive action, between the word of destruction and the deed of destruction is dangerously shortened. Thus, the break through the false consciousness may provide the Archimedean point for a larger emancipation- -at an infinitesimally small spot, to be sure, but it is on the enlargement of such small spots that the chance of change depends.

#### And reps come first – they shape our understandings of the plan, and are key to avoiding serial policy failure. That means they DON’T get to weigh the case

**Crawford:** Crawford, Neta. [Professor of Political Science, Boston University] *Argument and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2002. RP

**Coherent arguments are unlikely to take place unless and until actors, at least on some level, agree on what they are arguing about**. The at least temporary resolution of meta-arguments regarding the nature of the good (the content of prescriptive norms); what is out there, the way we know the world, how we decide between competing beliefs (ontology and epistemology); and the nature of the situation at hand (the proper frame or representation) must occur before specific arguments that could lead to decision and action may take place. Meta-arguments over epistemology and ontology, relatively rare, occur in instances where there is a fundamental clash between belief systems and not simply a debate within a belief system. Such arguments over the nature of the world and how we come to know it are particularly rare in politics though they are more frequent in religion and science. **Meta-arguments over the “good” are contests over what it is good and right to do**, and even how we know the good and the right. They are about the nature of the good, specifically, defining the qualities of “good” so that we know good when we see it and do it. Ethical arguments are about how to do good in a particular situation. **More common are meta-arguments over representations or frame**s about **how we out to understand a particular situation**. Sometimes actors agree on how they see a situation. More often there are different possible interpretations. Thomas Homer-Dixon and Roger Karapin suggest, “**Argument and debate occur when people try to gain acceptance for their interpretation of the world”. For example, “is the war defensive or aggressive?”. Defining and controlling representations and images, or the frame, affects whether one thinks there is an issue at stake and whether a particular argument applies to the case. An actor fighting a defensive war is within international law; an aggressor may legitimately be subject to sanctions.** Framing and reframing involve mimesis or putting forward representations of what is going on. In mimetic meta-arguments, actors who are struggling to characterize or frame the situation accomplish their ends by drawing vivid pictures of the “reality” through exaggeration, analogy, or differentiation. **Representations of a situation do not re-produce accurately so much as they creatively represent situations in a way that makes sense.** “mimesis is a metaphoric or ‘iconic argumentation of the real.’ Imitating not the effectivity of events but their logical structure and meaning.” Certain features are emphasized and others de-emphasized or completely ignored as their situation is recharacterized or reframed. **Representation thus becomes a “constraint on reasoning in that it limits understanding to a specific organization of conceptual knowledge.”** The dominant representation delimits which arguments will be considered legitimate, framing how actors see possibilities. As Roxanne Doty argues, “the possibility of practices presupposes the ability of an agent to imagine certain courses of action. Certain background meanings, kinds of social actors and relationships, must already be in place.” If, as Donald Sylvan and Stuart Thorson argue, “politics involves the selective privileging of representations, “**it** may not matter whether one representation or another **is** true or not. Emphasizing whether frames articulate accurate or inaccurate perceptions misses the rhetorical import of representationhow frames affect what is seen or not seen, and subsequent choices. **Meta-arguments over representation are thus crucial elements of political argument because an actor’s arguments about what to do will be more persuasive if their characterization or framing of the situation holds sway.** But, as Rodger Payne suggests, “No frame is an omnipotent persuasive tool that can be decisively wielded by norm entrepreneurs without serious political wrangling.” Hence framing is a meta-argument.

## Add Ons

### Inevitable

#### EDUCATION IS NEVER NEUTRAL – people have to take a stance one way or the other, so censoring is *inevitable*

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

**This means that previously neutral, value-free, formal aspects of learning and teaching now become, on their own grounds and in their own right, political: learning to know the facts, the whole truth, and to comprehend it is radical criticism throughout, intellectual subversion**. In a world in which the human faculties and needs are arrested or perverted, autonomous thinking leads into a 'perverted world': contradiction and counter-image of the established world of repression. And this contradiction is not simply stipulated, is not simply the product of confused thinking or fantasy, but is the logical development of the given, the existing world. To the degree to which this development is actually impeded by the sheer weight of a repressive society and the necessity of making a living in. it, repression invades the academic enterprise itself, even prior to all restrictions on academic freedom. The pre-empting of the mind vitiates impartiality and objectivity: unless the student learns to think in the opposite direction, he will be inclined to place the facts into the predominant framework of values. Scholarship, i.e., the acquisition and communication of knowledge, prohibits the purification and isolation of facts from the context of the whole truth. An essential part of the latter is recognition of the frightening extent to which history is made and recorded by and for the victors, that is, the extent to which history was the development of oppression. And this oppression is in the facts themselves which it establishes; thus they themselves carry a negative value as part and aspect of their facticity. To treat the great crusades against humanity (like that against the Albigensians) with the same impartiality as the desperate struggles for humanity means neutralizing their opposite historical function, reconciling the executioners with their victims, distorting the record. Such spurious neutrality serves to reproduce acceptance of the dominion of the victors in the consciousness of man. Here, too, in the education of those who are not yet maturely integrated, in the mind of the young, the ground for liberating tolerance is still to be created. **Education offers still another example of spurious, abstract tolerance in the guise of concreteness and truth: it is epitomized in the concept of self-actualization. From the permissiveness of all sorts of license to the child, to the constant psychological concern with the personal problems of the student, a large-scale movement is under way against the evils of repression and the need for being oneself. Frequently brushed aside is the question as to what has to be repressed before one can be a self, oneself**. The individual potential is first a negative one, a portion of the potential of his society: of aggression, guilt feeling, ignorance, resentment, cruelty which vitiate his life instincts. If the identity of the self is to be more than the immediate realization of this potential (undesirable for the individual as a human being), then it requires repression and sublimation, conscious transformation. This process involves at each stage (to use the ridiculed terms which here reveal their succinct concreteness) the negation of the negation, mediation of the immediate, and identity is no more and no less than this process. 'Alienation' is the constant and essential element of identity, the objective side of the subject--and not, as it is made to appear today, a disease, a psychological condition. Freud well knew the difference between progressive and regressive, liberating and destructive repression. The publicity of self-actualization promotes the removal of the one and the other, it promotes existence in that immediacy which, in a repressive society, is (to use another Hegelian term) bad immediacy (schlechte Unmittelbarkeit). It isolates the individual from the one dimension where he could 'find himself': from his political existence, which is at the core of his entire existence. Instead, it encourages non-conformity and letting-go in ways which leave the real engines of repression in the society entirely intact, which even strengthen these engines by substituting the satisfactions of private, and personal rebellion for a more than private and personal, and therefore more authentic, opposition. The desublimation involved in this sort of self-actualization is itself repressive inasmuch as it weakens the necessity and the power of the intellect, the catalytic force of that unhappy consciousness which does not revel in the archetypal personal release of frustration - hopeless resurgence of the Id which will sooner or later succumb to the omnipresent rationality of the administered world - but which recognizes the horror of the whole in the most private frustration and actualizes itself in this recognition.

### Link – Tolerance

#### A supposedly “equal” playing field benefits the rich and powerful.

**Bauer:** Bauer, Fred [Fred Bauer is a writer from New England. His work has been featured in numerous publications, including The Weekly Standard and The Daily Caller. He also blogs at A Certain Enthusiasm. His Twitter handle is @fredbauerblog.] “The Le and ‘Discriminating Tolerance’.” *The National Review.* June 2015. RP

**A founding document of the new intolerance, Marcuse’s 50- year-old essay “Repressive Tolerance” levies a radical attack on the conventions of liberal democratic civilization**. The main thrust of “Repressive Tolerance” is as follows: The whole of society shapes what is politically possible for each of us, so any discussion of politics must attend to society as a whole. **However, from Marcuse’s perspective, Western society as a whole is thoroughly corrupted. His catalogue of horribles includes the “systematic moronization of children and adults alike by publicity and propaganda**, the release of destructiveness in aggressive driving, the recruitment for and training of special forces, the impotent and benevolent tolerance toward outright deception in merchandizing, waste, and planned obsolescence,” and many other things. Marcuse saw Western society as racially polarized, socially segregated, and economically divided. From his perspective, America in 1965 was addicted to war, exploitation, and cultural/sexual oppression. (In his 1955 Eros and Civilization, he considered the breaking of all sexual norms to be a key component of toppling the Western status quo.) Unlike many of his disciples, Marcuse was frank about what this intolerance would mean: ‘Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left.’ **Marcuse argued that, because of the radical repressiveness of Western society, a tolerance for all viewpoints actually contributed to social oppression. A pervasive network of assumptions and biases implicitly privileges the viewpoint of the powerful, so that seemingly “equal” presentations of opposite opinions actually end up benefiting the viewpoint of the powerful. He offered the example of a magazine running a piece criticizing the FBI along with one praising the FBI. Fair and balanced? Not so fast, Marcuse said: “the chances are that the positive [story] wins because the image of [the FBI] is deeply engraved in the mind of the people.” Because of social programming, the inhabitants of a given society automatically favor certain values. The ideological playing field’s lack of levelness means that seemingly equal presentations of ideas are not really equal.**

### Link – MOI

#### Dominant viewpoints always prevail in the free market when we take a hands off approach.

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

**By the same token, those minorities which strive for a change of the whole itself will, under optimal conditions which rarely prevail, will be left free to deliberate and discuss, to speak and to assemble - and will be left harmless and helpless in the face of the overwhelming majority, which militates against qualitative social change. This majority is firmly grounded in the increasing satisfaction of needs, and technological and -mental co-ordination, which testify to the general helplessness of radical groups in a well-functioning social system**. Within the affluent democracy, the affluent discussion prevails, and within the established framework, it is tolerant to a large extent. All points of view can be heard: the Communist and the Fascist, the Left and the Right, the white and the Negro, the crusaders for armament and for disarmament. Moreover, in endlessly dragging debates over the media, the stupid opinion is treated with the same respect as the intelligent one, the misinformed may talk as long as the informed, and propaganda rides along with education, truth with falsehood. **This pure toleration of sense and nonsense is justified by the democratic argument that nobody, neither group nor individual, is in possession of the truth and capable of defining what is right and wrong, good and bad.** Therefore, all contesting opinions must be submitted to 'the people' for its deliberation and choice. But I have already suggested that the democratic argument implies a necessary condition, namely, that the people must be capable of deliberating and choosing on the basis of knowledge, that they must have access to authentic information, and that, on this. basis, their evaluation must be the result of autonomous thought.

### Mpx - Repression

#### REPRESSION: forced tolerance legitimizes hate and destroys dissent.

**Sculos & Walsh:** Sculos, Bryant William [Department of Politics and International Relations, Florida International University] and Sean Noah Walsh [Department of Political Science & Economics, Capital University]. “The Counterrevolutionary Campus: Herbert Marcuse and the Suppression of Student Protest Movements.” *New Political Science*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 2016. MZ

Rice, Lagarde, and Kelly wish to speak. So do the student protestors. **The core issue is not really tolerance; it is obedience hidden behind a repressive demand for “toleration.”** The students at Rutgers, and beyond, know full well what Condoleezza Rice represents; they simply have no need to hear it again. To reiterate, Marcuse argued liberating intolerance would proceed by the use of “extralegal means”: Tolerance would be restricted with respect to movement of a demonstrably aggressive or destructive character (destructive of the prospects for peace, justice, and freedom for all). Such discrimination would also be applied to movements opposing the extension of social legislation to the poor, weak, disabled....**To tolerate propaganda for inhumanity vitiates the goals not only of liberalism but of** every **progressive political philosophy.** **Why should the students, or anyone else for that matter, tolerate speech by Condoleezza Rice, an architect of volitional war?** Why should they restrain their voices of dissent against Christine Lagarde, when the International Monetary Fund manages wealth for transnational capitalism? **Why should they sit in silence as Raymond Kelly makes the case for policies targeting African Americans, Latinos, and Muslims?** What case is there to be made from someone who should probably stand trial at the International Criminal Court? In that sense, eftist students are not so much being asked to let others speak. **Rather, [T]hey are being instructed to listen passively, listen to views they already understand are noxious.**They add:**The demand for university students on the Left to become more tolerant is not a call for the inclusion of additional points of view. It is, instead, a call to** silence, a call for exclusion of the students’ systemic critique**,** an effort **to disrupt localized refusals before they can coalesce into a Great Refusal. “Tolerance” of other views is paid for by silencing student voices.** It is a rather dialectical conversion of tolerance to its other—*intolerance* in the guise of greater inclusivity**. Precisely, then, because [I]t perverts the idea of liberty into another form of domination**, repressive tolerance has become another instrument of counterrevolution. Marcuse expressed consternation over threats to the cohesiveness of the New Left, observing that it had been “weakened to a dangerous degree” by tactics that had amplified internal fragmentation and enhanced “ideological conflicts within the militant opposition and the lack of organization.”59 **The silence following from** repressive tolerance **disrupts** the intellectual coalescence of the Great Refusal, stifles reason and neutralizes **dissent before it can even begin**. As Marcuse admonished, “Thus, within a repressive society, even progressive movements threaten to turn into their opposite to the degree to which they accept the rules of the game.” Sit quietly, listen, and be tolerant: that is the refrain of the Establishment. Repressive tolerance is not a force for merely stupefying the population. With renewed discontent on college campuses, it has become a means to undermine the dissent of the edu- cated, a means to prevent an organized, unified questioning of the Establishment and its system, a **tactic of the counterrevolution.**

### Mpx – Ideological Hegemony

#### IDEOLOGICAL HEGEMONY: “tolerance for all” is like saying “All Lives Matter” – it MASKS inequities in free speech that make real competition of ideas impossible.

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

**In the contemporary period, the democratic argument for abstract tolerance tends to be invalidated by the invalidation of the democratic process itself**. The liberating force of democracy was the chance it gave to effective dissent, on the individual as well as social scale, its openness to qualitatively different forms of government, of culture, education, work--of the human existence in general. The toleration of free discussion and the equal right of opposites was to define and clarify the different forms of dissent: their direction, content, prospect. **But with the concentration of economic and political power and the integration of opposites in a society** which uses technology as an instrument **of domination, effective dissent is blocked where it could freely emerge; in the formation of opinion, in information and communication, in speech and assembly.** Under the rule of monopolistic media--themselves the mere instruments of economic and political power--a mentality is created for which right and wrong, true and false are predefined wherever they affect the vital interests of the society. This is, prior to all expression and communication, a matter of semantics: the blocking of effective dissent, of the recognition of that which is not of the Establishment which begins in the language that is publicized and administered. The meaning of words is rigidly stabilized. Rational persuasion, persuasion to the opposite is all but precluded. The avenues of entrance are closed to the meaning of words and ideas other than the established one--established by the publicity of the powers that be, and verified in their practices. Other words can be spoken and heard, other ideas can be expressed, but, at the massive scale of the conservative majority (outside such enclaves as the intelligentsia), they are immediately 'evaluated' (i.e. automatically understood) in terms of the public language--a language which determines 'a priori' the direction in which the thought process moves. Thus the process of reflection ends where it started: in the given conditions and relations. Self-validating, the argument. of the discussion repels the contradiction because the antithesis is redefined in terms of the thesis. For example, thesis: we work for peace; antithesis: we prepare for war (or even: we wage war); unification of opposites; preparing for war is working for peace. Peace is redefined as necessarily, in the prevailing situation, including preparation for war (or even war) and in this Orwellian form, the meaning of the word 'peace' is stabilized. Thus, the basic vocabulary of the Orwellian language operates as a priori categories of understanding: preforming all content. These conditions invalidate the logic of tolerance which involves the rational development of meaning and precludes the 'closing of meaning. **Consequently, persuasion through discussion and the equal presentation of opposites (even where it is really, equal) easily lose their liberating force as factors of understanding and learning; they are far more likely to** strengthen **the established thesis and to repel the alternatives**. Impartiality to the utmost, equal treatment of competing and conflicting issues is indeed a basic requirement for decision-making in the democratic process--it is an equally basic requirement for defining the limits of tolerance. **But in a democracy with totalitarian organization, objectivity may fulfill a very different function, namely, to foster a mental attitude which tends to obliterate the difference between true and false, information and indoctrination, right and wrong.** In fact, the decision between opposed opinions has been made before the presentation and discussion get under way--made, not by a conspiracy or a sponsor or a publisher, not by any dictatorship, but rather by the 'normal course of events', which is the course of administered events, and by the mentality shaped in this course. Here, too, it is the whole which determines the truth. Then the decision asserts itself, without any open violation of objectivity, in such things as the make-up of a newspaper (with the breaking up of vital information into bits interspersed between extraneous material, irrelevant items, relegating of some radically negative news to an obscure place), in the juxtaposition of gorgeous ads with unmitigated horrors, in the introduction and interruption of the broadcasting of facts by overwhelming commercials. The result is a neutralization of opposites, a neutralization, however, which takes place on the firm grounds of the structural limitation of tolerance and within a preformed mentality. **When a magazine prints side by side a negative and a positive report on the FBI, it fulfills honestly the requirements of objectivity: however, the chances are that the positive wins because the image of the institution is deeply engraved in the mind of the people. Or, [I]f a newscaster reports the torture and murder of civil rights workers in the same unemotional tone [t]he[y] uses to describe the stockmarket or the weather,** or with the same great emotion with which he says his commercials, then such objectivity is spurious--more, it offends against humanity and truth by being calm where one should be enraged, by refraining from accusation where accusation is in the facts themselves. **The tolerance expressed in such impartiality serves to minimize or even absolve prevailing intolerance and suppression.**

### Mpx – False Dualism

#### FALSE DUALISM: the aff groups all speech under one umbrella, so that we can only have *both* protest and hate speech or *neither*.

**Sculos & Walsh:** Sculos, Bryant William [Department of Politics and International Relations, Florida International University] and Sean Noah Walsh [Department of Political Science & Economics, Capital University]. “The Counterrevolutionary Campus: Herbert Marcuse and the Suppression of Student Protest Movements.” *New Political Science*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 2016. MZ

This is the condition that Herbert Marcuse forewarned in one of his more controversial essays, “Repressive Tolerance.” Writing in 1965, Marcuse examined the dialectical repercussions of an essentially una- bridged, unrestricted toleration—a condition in which the demand for tolerance was all but boundless. Marcuse held that **advanced industrial nations in the West proceeded under the false premise that a free society could only be realized if it permitted nearly absolute toleration. The exercise of free speech, for example, to protest the war in Vietnam was apparently only guaranteed if it also allowed the National Socialist Party of America [Nazis] to march in the predominantly Jewish city of Skokie, Illinois. In that regard, [T]oleration was extended so far as to permit what any reasonable person could recognize as being necessarily harmful. Thus, the apparently slavish liberal insistence on absolute toleration had been extended so far as to become an instrument of repression As Marcuse writes: The toleration for the systematic moronization of children and adults** alike by publicity and prop- aganda, the release of destructiveness in aggressive driving, the recruitment for and training of special forces, the impotent and benevolent tolerance toward outright deception in merchandis- ing, waste, and planned obsolescence are not distortions and aberrations, **they are the essence of a system which fosters tolerance as a means for perpetuating the struggle for existence and suppressing the alternatives.**

### Mpx – Target Blaming

#### TARGET-BLAMING: complete free speech puts the burden on targets to “just look away” when confronted with hate.

**Sculos & Walsh:** Sculos, Bryant William [Department of Politics and International Relations, Florida International University] and Sean Noah Walsh [Department of Political Science & Economics, Capital University]. “The Counterrevolutionary Campus: Herbert Marcuse and the Suppression of Student Protest Movements.” *New Political Science*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 2016. MZ

Yale experienced similar events, though the initial catalyst was marginally different and the form that the repressive tolerance assumed largely pertained to debates around so-called “political correctness.”The student protests arose after two emails were distributed to stu- dents around Halloween in 2015. The first email was sent by the Yale Intercultural Affairs Council asking students to be cognizant of the racial and cultural wounds their costumes may inflict and to be sensitive to the feelings of students who might be o ended. Irked by that message, **a member of the faculty affiliated with Yale sent out her own email to the student body, stating, “if you don’t like a costume someone is wearing, look away, or tell them you are offended. Talk to each other. Free speech and the ability to tolerate offense are the hallmarks of a free and open society.”** Protests against the faculty member ensued shortly thereafter.26 **As with the University of Missouri,** there is a lengthy history of racism and injustice as policy at Yale **where there still stand statues, monuments, and buildings dedicated to slave-owners. The protesters contended there have been innumerable examples of blatant sexism and racism on campus over the years that the Yale administration has simply ignored.** The night that the infamous emails were sent out, it was widely reported that a fraternity refused entry to several black female students because the party was “for whites only.” The Yale administration’s response: silence.27 The protests were not about the right of any person to express his or her views, but instead a profound sense of dismay at a university official’s casual dismissal of quite reasonable concerns over racially sensitive issues. This was about the university, not the individual right of one person to speak their mind (though there are certainly cases of leftist activism wherein the right of an individual to speak has been illegally contravened or at least attempts to do so have occurred).28 Former neurosurgeon and Republican presidential candidate Ben Carson called the pro- testers at his alma mater “infantile” and claimed that perhaps as a society we have become “a little bit too tolerant.”29 He is not far o (just in the wrong direction). However, we ought to recall how Ben Carson was completely silent when a huge number of fraternity members on Yale’s campus paraded about campus chanting and holding signs that said “No means yes, yes means anal,” not what one would call a glowing endorsement of women’s rights and consent more broadly. One might judge by Carson’s silence that privileged white men on campus vocally advocating rape and forcible sodomy ought to be tolerated, yet calls by the historically oppressed and their allies for justice are unacceptable. No one was calling for a ban on costumes, but rather encouraging sensitivity for oppressed peoples, and outrage that recognition of historical injustices was so quickly trivialized by a representative of the institution. Accepting a demand to be silenced, in e ect submitting to silence, as an oppressed people, is a repressive brand of tolerance that dialectically inverts the true value of tolerance.30 Besides the hypocritical critiques from right-wing pundits and presidential candidates, what the Missouri, Yale, and other cases show is the pejorative use of political correctness deployed as a label portraying the protester as having only trivial complaints. This is a hall- mark of contemporary repressive tolerance. It is a gesture of malice that obscures real con- cerns, real injustices, behind claims of policing language and limiting free speech. From this view, if it was not for the purported intolerance of political correctness, and its word-police, real injustices (more real, somehow, than systematic racial abuse) could be recti ed. In truth, the invocation of political correctness is used to suppress complaints of racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression by characterizing them as, to use Carson’s word, “infantile.” **Though we only have space to get into the details of a few examples here, there are somewhere around [S]eventy-five schools that have had protest movements of varying size related to issues primarily of racism and sexism (some of the more widely publicized instances include Smith College, Amherst College and Ithaca College). At the same time, we have also seen the rise of a number of white student unions and white power organizations on college campuses (and in the US in general, especially since the election of President Obama in 2008 and the more recent presidential candidacy of reality TV star and business mogul Donald Trump). Repressive tolerance demands that oppressed people tolerate these organizations to the point where their own voices are threatened to be silenced[.], and silenced as university or state policy.**

### Mpx – Emboldening

#### EMBOLDENING: treating all speech as neutral gives the green light to oppressors.

**Sculos & Walsh:** Sculos, Bryant William [Department of Politics and International Relations, Florida International University] and Sean Noah Walsh [Department of Political Science & Economics, Capital University]. “The Counterrevolutionary Campus: Herbert Marcuse and the Suppression of Student Protest Movements.” *New Political Science*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 2016. MZ

**Under the banner that nearly everything must be permissible, all manner of destructive behaviors find adequate space to flourish.** For Marcuse, capitalism is predicated on the repres- sion of Eros, and the largely free reign of the death instinct.8 **That which is tolerated, more often than not, is violent and bellicos**e. At the **point where it becomes its own end, rather than an instrument for the achievement of a** rational, **humane**, and pacific **civilization, tolerance**—like any other tool—accommodates decidedly deleterious forms. For Marcuse, tolerance taken to its extreme, tolerance as its own objective, becomes dialectically inverted. It **becomes repressive. Rather than an instrument for freedom, it lapses under the weight of bellicosity in advanced industrial society, emerging as an absurdity that results in a totalitarian scene.** As Marcuse maintained, **“Tolerance is extended to policies and conditions, and modes of behavior which should not be tolerated because they are impeding, if not destroy- ing, the chances of creating an existence without fear and misery.”**9

### Mpx – Liberation

#### Indiscriminate tolerance props up oppressive ideas – ideas that are bad just move us further and further from liberation.

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

In the interplay of theory and practice, true and false solutions become distinguishable-- never with the evidence of necessity, never as the positive, only with the certainty of a reasoned and reasonable chance, and with the persuasive force of the negative. For the true positive is the society of the future and therefore beyond definition arid determination, while the existing positive is that which must be surmounted. But the experience and understanding of the existent society may well be capable of identifying what is not conducive to a free and rational society, what impedes and distorts the possibilities of its creation. Freedom is liberation, a specific historical process in theory and practice, and as such it has its right and wrong, its truth and falsehood. **The uncertainty of chance in this distinction does not cancel the historical objectivity, but it necessitates freedom of thought and expression as preconditions of finding the way to freedom--it necessitates tolerance. However, this tolerance cannot be indiscriminate and equal with respect to the contents of expression, neither in word nor in deed; it cannot protect false words and wrong deeds which demonstrate that they contradict and counteract the' possibilities of liberation. Such indiscriminate tolerance is justified in harmless debates, in conversation, in academic discussion; it is indispensable in the scientific enterprise, in private religion. But society cannot be indiscriminate where the pacification of existence, where freedom and happiness themselves are at stake: here, certain things cannot be said, certain ideas cannot be expressed, certain policies cannot be proposed, certain behavior cannot be permitted without making tolerance an instrument for the continuation of servitude.**

### Mpx – Totalitarianism

#### Unquestioning tolerance of any and all ideas leads us down the path to totalitarianism

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

Tolerance is an end in itself. The elimination of violence, and the reduction of suppression to the extent required for protecting man and animals from cruelty and aggression are preconditions for the creation of a humane society. Such a society does not yet exist; progress toward it is perhaps more than before arrested by violence and suppression on a global scale. As deterrents against nuclear war, as police action against subversion, as technical aid in the fight against imperialism and communism, as methods of pacification in neo-colonial massacres, violence and suppression are promulgated, practiced, and defended by democratic and authoritarian governments alike, and the people subjected to these governments are educated to sustain such practices as necessary for the preservation of the status quo. **Tolerance is extended to policies, conditions, and modes of behavior which should not be tolerated because they are impeding, if not destroying, the chances of creating an existence without fear and misery. This sort of tolerance strengthens the tyranny of the majority against which authentic liberals protested**. The political locus of tolerance has changed: while it is more or less quietly and constitutionally withdrawn from the opposition, it is made compulsory behavior with respect to established policies. **Tolerance is turned from an active into a passive state, from practice to non-practice: laissez-faire the constituted authorities. It is the people who tolerate the government, which in turn tolerates opposition within the framework determined by the constituted authorities. Tolerance toward that which is radically evil now appears as good because it serves the cohesion of the whole on the road to affluence or more affluence.** The toleration of the systematic moronization of children and adults alike by publicity and propaganda, the release of destructiveness in aggressive driving, the recruitment for and training of special forces, the impotent and benevolent tolerance toward outright deception in merchandizing, waste, and planned obsolescence are not distortions and aberrations, they are the essence of a system which fosters tolerance as a means for perpetuating the struggle for existence and suppressing the alternatives. The authorities in education, morals, and psychology are vociferous against the increase in juvenile delinquency; they are less vociferous against the proud presentation, in word and deed and pictures, of ever more powerful missiles, rockets, bombs--the mature delinquency of a whole civilization. According to a dialectical proposition it is the whole which determines the truth--not in the sense that the whole is prior or superior to its parts, but in the sense that its structure and function determine every particular condition and relation. **Thus, within a repressive society, even progressive movements threaten to turn into their opposite to the degree to which they accept the rules of the game.** To take a most controversial case: the exercise of political rights (such as voting, letter-writing to the press, to Senators, etc., protest-demonstrations with a priori renunciation of counterviolence) in a society of total administration serves to strengthen this administration by testifying to the existence of democratic liberties which, in reality, have changed their content and lost their effectiveness. In such a case, freedom (of opinion, of assembly, of speech) becomes an instrument for absolving servitude. And yet (and only here the dialectical proposition shows its full intent) the existence. and practice of these liberties remain a precondition for the restoration of their original oppositional function, provided that the effort to transcend their (often self-imposed) limitations is intensified. Generally, the function and value of tolerance depend on the equality prevalent in the society in which tolerance is practiced. Tolerance itself stands subject to overriding criteria: its range and its limits cannot be defined in terms of the respective society. In other words, tolerance is an end in itself only when it is truly universal, practiced by the rulers as well as by the ruled, by the lords as well as by the peasants, by the sheriffs as well as by their victims. **And such universal tolerance is possible only when no real or alleged enemy requires in the national interest the education and training of people in military violence and destruction. As long as these conditions do not prevail, the conditions of tolerance are 'loaded': they are determined and defined by the institutionalized inequality (which is certainly compatible with constitutional equality), i.e., by the class structure of society. In such a society, tolerance is de facto limited on the dual ground of legalized violence or suppression (police, armed forces, guards of all sorts) and of the privileged position held by the predominant interests and their 'connections'.**

### Alt Solvency

#### Liberal democracy has been tried and failed – neutrality towards the Right has accomplished nothing – the alt is key to a radical agenda

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

**UNDER the conditions prevailing in this country, tolerance does not, and cannot, fulfill the civilizing function attributed to it by the liberal protagonists of democracy, namely, protection of dissent.** The progressive historical force of tolerance lies in its extension to those modes and forms of dissent which are not committed to the status quo of society, and not confined to the institutional framework of the established society. **Consequently, the idea of tolerance implies the necessity, for the dissenting group or individuals, to become illegitimate if and when the established legitimacy prevents and counteracts the development of dissent**. This would be the case not only in a totalitarian society, under a dictatorship, in one-party states, but also in a democracy (representative, parliamentary, or 'direct') where the majority does not result from the development of independent thought and opinion but rather from the monopolistic or oligopolistic administration of public opinion, without terror and (normally) without censorship. **In such cases, the majority is self-perpetuating while perpetuating the vested interests which made it a majority**. In its very structure this majority is 'closed', petrified; it repels a priori any change other than changes within the system. But this means that the majority is no longer justified in claiming the democratic title of the best guardian of the common interest. And such a majority is all but the opposite of Rousseau's 'general will': it is composed, not of individuals who, in their political functions, have made effective 'abstraction' from their private interests, but, on the contrary, of individuals who have effectively identified their private. interests with their political functions. And the representatives of this majority, in ascertaining and executing its will, ascertain and execute the will of the vested interests, which have formed the majority. The ideology of democracy hides its lack of substance. **In the United States, this tendency goes hand in hand with the monopolistic or oligopolistic concentration of capital in the formation of public opinion, i.e., of the majority**. The chance of influencing, in any effective way, this majority is at a price, in dollars, totally out of reach of the radical opposition. Here too, free competition and exchange of ideas have become a farce. **The Left has no equal voice, no equal access to the mass media and their public facilities - not because a conspiracy excludes it, but because, in good old capitalist fashion, it does not have the required purchasing power**. And the Left does not have the purchasing power because it is the Left. These conditions impose upon the radical minorities a strategy which is in essence a refusal to allow the continuous functioning of allegedly indiscriminate but in fact discriminate tolerance, for example, a strategy of protesting against the alternate matching of a spokesman for the Right (or Center) with one for the Left. Not 'equal' but more representation of the Left would be equalization of the prevailing inequality. **Within the solid framework of pre-established inequality and power, tolerance is practiced indeed.** Even outrageous opinions are expressed, outrageous incidents are televised; and the critics of established policies are interrupted by the same number of commercials as the conservative advocates. Are these interludes supposed to counteract the sheer weight, magnitude, and continuity of system-publicity, indoctrination which operates playfully through the endless commercials as well as through the entertainment? **Given this situation, I suggested in 'Repressive Tolerance' the practice of discriminating tolerance in an inverse direction, as a means of shifting the balance between Right and Left by restraining the liberty of the Right, thus counteracting the pervasive inequality of freedom (unequal opportunity of access to the means of democratic persuasion) and strengthening the oppressed against the oppressed. Tolerance would be restricted with respect to movements of a demonstrably aggressive or destructive character (destructive of the prospects for peace, justice, and freedom for all). Such discrimination would also be applied to movements opposing the extension of social legislation to the poor, weak, disabled**. As against the virulent denunciations that such a policy would do away with the sacred liberalistic principle of equality for 'the other side', I maintain that there are issues where either there is no 'other side' in any more than a formalistic sense, or where 'the other side' is demonstrably 'regressive' and impedes possible improvement of the human condition. To **tolerate propaganda for inhumanity vitiates the goals not only of liberalism but of every progressive political philosophy**. If the choice were between genuine democracy and dictatorship, democracy would certainly be preferable. But democracy does not prevail. **The radical critics of the existing political process are thus readily denounced as advocating an 'elitism', a dictatorship of intellectuals as an alternative.** What we have in fact is government, representative government by a non- intellectual minority of politicians, generals, and businessmen. The record of this 'elite' is not very promising, and political prerogatives for the intelligentsia may not necessarily be worse for the society as a whole.

### Random Alt Card?

#### Question of competing methods

**Marcuse:** Marcuse, Herbert. [German philosopher, Frankfurt School] “Repressive Tolerance.” 1965. RP

**The author is fully aware that, at present, no power, no authority, no government exists which would translate liberating tolerance into practice, but he believes that it is the task and duty of the intellectual to recall and preserve historical possibilities which seem to have become utopian possibilities--that it is his task to break the concreteness of oppression in order to open the mental space in which this society can be recognized as what it is and does.**