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#### The role of the ballot is to determine the desirability of topical action:

#### The Aff violates this:

#### “USFG should” means the debate is solely about a policy established by governmental means

Ericson 3 – Jon M. Ericson, Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting – “The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb *should*—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, *should adopt* here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### Vote neg for two reasons:

#### First - predictable limits---allowing the aff to pick any grounds for debate makes engagement impossible by skirting a predictable starting point and undermining preparation and research. Radical aff choice shifts the grounds for the debate and puts the aff far ahead: they have incentives to cement their infinite prep by selecting the most one-sided ideas and can choose only orientations toward the word, not praxis with an actor or mechanism. Fairness is an intrinsic good, vital to the practice of debate, and logically prior to deciding any other argument.

#### Second- our Testing warrant:

#### A well-defined resolution is critical to allow an iterative process of argument testing and improvement---this does not require particular forms of argument, but does require a common point of disagreement.

Poscher ‘16

Director at the Institute for Staatswissenschaft and Philosophy of Law at the University of Freiburg (Ralf, “Why We Argue About the Law: An Agonistic Account of Legal Disagreement”, Metaphilosophy of Law, Tomasz Gizbert-Studnicki/Adam Dyrda/Pawel Banas (eds.), Hart Publishing, forthcoming. Modified for language that may offend)

Hegel’s dialectical thinking powerfully exploits the idea of negation. It is a central feature of spirit and consciousness that they have the power to negate. The spirit “is this power only by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it. This […] is the magical power that converts it into being.”102 The tarrying with the negative is part of what Hegel calls the “labour of the negative”103. In a loose reference to this Hegelian notion Gerald Postema points to yet another feature of disagreements as a necessary ingredient of the process of practical reasoning. Only if our reasoning is exposed to contrary arguments can we test its merits. We must go through the “labor of the negative” to have trust in our deliberative processes.104

This also holds where we seem to be in agreement. Agreement without exposure to disagreement can be deceptive in various ways. The first phenomenon Postema draws attention to is the group polarization effect. When a group of like‐minded people deliberates an issue, informational and reputational cascades produce more extreme views in the process of their deliberations.105 The polarization and biases that are well documented for such groups106 can be countered at least in some settings by the inclusion of dissenting voices. In these scenarios, disagreement can be a cure for dysfunctional deliberative polarization and biases.107 A second deliberative dysfunction mitigated by disagreement is superficial agreement, which can even be manipulatively used in the sense of a “presumptuous ‘We’”108. Disagreement can help to police such distortions of deliberative processes by challenging superficial agreements. Disagreements may thus signal that a deliberative process is not contaminated with dysfunctional agreements stemming from polarization or superficiality. Protecting our discourse against such contaminations is valuable even if we do not come to terms. Each of the opposing positions will profit from the catharsis it received “by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it”.

These advantages of disagreement in collective deliberations are mirrored on the individual level. Even if the probability of reaching a consensus with our opponents is very low from the beginning, as might be the case in deeply entrenched conflicts, entering into an exchange of arguments can still serve to test and improve our position. We have to do the “labor of the negative” for ourselves. Even if we cannot come up with a line of argument that coheres well with everybody else’s beliefs, attitudes and dispositions, we can still come up with a line of argument that achieves this goal for our own personal beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. To provide ourselves with the most coherent system of our own beliefs, attitudes and dispositions is – at least in important issues – an aspect of personal integrity – to borrow one of Dworkin’s favorite expressions for a less aspirational idea.

In hard cases we must – in some way – lay out the argument for ourselves to figure out what we believe to be the right answer. We might not know what we believe ourselves in questions of abortion, the death penalty, torture, and stem cell research, until we have developed a line of argument against the background of our subjective beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. In these cases it might be rational to discuss the issue with someone unlikely to share some of our more fundamental convictions or who opposes the (perspective) ~~view~~ towards which we lean. This might even be the most helpful way of corroborating a view, because we know that our adversary is much more motivated to find a potential flaw in our argument than someone with whom we know we are in agreement. It might be more helpful to discuss a liberal position with Scalia than with Breyer if we want to make sure that we have not overlooked some counter‐argument to our case.

It would be too narrow an understanding of our practice of legal disagreement and argumentation if we restricted its purpose to persuading an adversary in the case at hand and inferred from this narrow understanding the irrationality of argumentation in hard cases, in which we know beforehand that we will not be able to persuade. Rational argumentation is a much more complex practice in a more complex social framework. Argumentation with an adversary can have purposes beyond persuading him: to test one’s own convictions, to engage our opponent in inferential commitments and to persuade third parties are only some of these; to rally our troops or express our convictions might be others. To make our peace with Kant we could say that “there must be a hope of coming to terms” with someone though not necessarily with our opponent, but maybe only a third party or even just ourselves and not necessarily only on the issue at hand, but maybe through inferential commitments in a different arena.

f) The Advantage Over Non‐Argumentative Alternatives

It goes without saying that in real world legal disagreements, all of the reasons listed above usually play in concert and will typically hold true to different degrees relative to different participants in the debate: There will be some participants for whom our hope of coming to terms might still be justified and others for whom only some of the other reasons hold and some for whom it is a mixture of all of the reasons in shifting degrees as our disagreements evolve. It is also apparent that, with the exception of the first reason, the rationality of our disagreements is of a secondary nature. The rational does not lie in the discovery of a single right answer to the topic of debate, since in hard cases there are no single right answers. Instead, our disagreements are instrumental to rationales which lie beyond the topic at hand, like the exploration of our communalities or of our inferential commitments. Since these reasons are of this secondary nature, they must stand up to alternative ways of settling irreconcilable disagreements that have other secondary reasons in their favor – like swiftness of decision making or using fewer resources. Why does our legal practice require lengthy arguments and discursive efforts even in appellate or supreme court cases of irreconcilable legal disagreements? The closure has to come by some non‐argumentative mean and courts have always relied on them. For the medieval courts of the Germanic tradition it is bequeathed that judges had to fight it out literally if they disagreed on a question of law – though the king allowed them to pick surrogate fighters.109 It is understandable that the process of civilization has led us to non‐violent non‐ argumentative means to determine the law. But what was wrong with District Judge Currin of Umatilla County in Oregon, who – in his late days – decided inconclusive traffic violations by publicly flipping a coin?110 If we are counting heads at the end of our lengthy argumentative proceedings anyway, why not decide hard cases by gut voting at the outset and spare everybody the cost of developing elaborate arguments on questions, where there is not fact of the matter to be discovered?

One reason lies in the mixed nature of our reasons in actual legal disagreements. The different second order reasons can be held apart analytically, but not in real life cases. The hope of coming to terms will often play a role at least for some time relative to some participants in the debate. A second reason is that the objectives listed above could not be achieved by a non‐argumentative procedure. Flipping a coin, throwing dice or taking a gut vote would not help us to explore our communalities or our inferential commitments nor help to scrutinize the positions in play. A third reason is the overall rational aspiration of the law that Dworkin relates to in his integrity account111. In a justificatory sense112 the law aspires to give a coherent account of itself – even if it is not the only right one – required by equal respect under conditions of normative disagreement.113 Combining legal argumentation with the non‐argumentative decision‐ making procedure of counting reasoned opinions serves the coherence aspiration of the law in at least two ways: First, the labor of the negative reduces the chances that constructions of the law that have major flaws or inconsistencies built into the arguments supporting them will prevail. Second, since every position must be a reasoned one within the given framework of the law, it must be one that somehow fits into the overall structure of the law along coherent lines. It thus protects against incoherent “checkerboard” treatments114 of hard cases. It is the combination of reasoned disagreement and the non‐rational decision‐making mechanism of counting reasoned opinions that provides for both in hard cases: a decision and one – of multiple possible – coherent constructions of the law. Pure non‐rational procedures – like flipping a coin – would only provide for the decision part. Pure argumentative procedures – which are not geared towards a decision procedure – would undercut the incentive structure of our agonistic disagreements.115 In the face of unresolvable disagreements endless debates would seem an idle enterprise. That the debates are about winning or losing helps to keep the participants engaged. That the decision depends on counting reasoned opinions guarantees that the engagement focuses on rational argumentation. No plain non‐argumentative procedure would achieve this result. If the judges were to flip a coin at the end of the trial in hard cases, there would be little incentive to engage in an exchange of arguments. It is specifically the count of reasoned opinions which provides for rational scrutiny in our legal disagreements and thus contributes to the rationales discussed above.

2. THE SEMANTICS OF AGONISTIC DISAGREEMENTS

The agonistic account does not presuppose a fact of the matter, it is not accompanied by an ontological commitment, and the question of how the fact of the matter could be known to us is not even raised. Thus the agonistic account of legal disagreement is not confronted with the metaphysical or epistemological questions that plague one‐right‐answer theories in particular. However, it must still come up with a semantics that explains in what sense we disagree about the same issue and are not just talking at cross purposes.

In a series of articles David Plunkett and Tim Sundell have reconstructed legal disagreements in semantic terms as metalinguistic negotiations on the usage of a term that at the center of a hard case like “cruel and unusual punishment” in a death‐penalty case.116 Even though the different sides in the debate define the term differently, they are not talking past each other, since they are engaged in a metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the same term. The metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the term serves as a semantic anchor for a disagreement on the substantive issues connected with the term because of its functional role in the law. The “cruel and unusual punishment”‐clause thus serves to argue about the permissibility of the death penalty. This account, however only provides a very superficial semantic commonality. But the commonality between the participants of a legal disagreement go deeper than a discussion whether the term “bank” should in future only to be used for financial institutions, which fulfills every criteria for semantic negotiations that Plunkett and Sundell propose. Unlike in mere semantic negotiations, like the on the disambiguation of the term “bank”, there is also some kind of identity of the substantive issues at stake in legal disagreements.

A promising route to capture this aspect of legal disagreements might be offered by recent semantic approaches that try to accommodate the externalist challenges of realist semantics,117 which inspire one‐right‐answer theorists like Moore or David Brink. Neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics provide for the theoretical or interpretive element of realist semantics without having to commit to the ontological positions of traditional externalism. In a sense they offer externalist semantics with no ontological strings attached.

The less controversial aspect of the externalist picture of meaning developed in neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics can be found in the deferential structure that our meaning‐providing intentions often encompass.118 In the case of natural kinds, speakers defer to the expertise of chemists when they employ natural kind terms like gold or water. If a speaker orders someone to buy $ 10,000 worth of gold as a safe investment, he might not know the exact atomic structure of the chemical element 79. In cases of doubt, though, he would insist that he meant to buy only stuff that chemical experts – or the markets for that matter – qualify as gold. The deferential element in the speaker’s intentions provides for the specific externalist element of the semantics.

In the case of the law, the meaning‐providing intentions connected to the provisions of the law can be understood to defer in a similar manner to the best overall theory or interpretation of the legal materials. Against the background of such a semantic framework the conceptual unity of a linguistic practice is not ratified by the existence of a single best answer, but by the unity of the interpretive effort that extends to legal materials and legal practices that have sufficient overlap119 – be it only in a historical perspective120. The fulcrum of disagreement that Dworkin sees in the existence of a single right answer121 does not lie in its existence, but in the communality of the effort – if only on the basis of an overlapping common ground of legal materials, accepted practices, experiences and dispositions. As two athletes are engaged in the same contest when they follow the same rules, share the same concept of winning and losing and act in the same context, but follow very different styles of e.g. wrestling, boxing, swimming etc. They are in the same contest, even if there is no single best style in which to wrestle, box or swim. Each, however, is engaged in developing the best style to win against their opponent, just as two lawyers try to develop the best argument to convince a bench of judges.122 Within such a semantic framework even people with radically opposing views about the application of an expression can still share a concept, in that they are engaged in the same process of theorizing over roughly the same legal materials and practices. Semantic frameworks along these lines allow for adamant disagreements without abandoning the idea that people are ~~talking about~~ (discussing) the same concept. An agonistic account of legal disagreement can build on such a semantic framework, which can explain in what sense lawyers, judges and scholars engaged in agonistic disagreements are not talking past each other. They are engaged in developing the best interpretation of roughly the same legal materials, albeit against the background of diverging beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that lead them to divergent conclusions in hard cases. Despite the divergent conclusions, semantic unity is provided by the largely overlapping legal materials that form the basis for their disagreement. Such a semantic collapses only when we lack a sufficient overlap in the materials. To use an example of Michael Moore’s: If we wanted to debate whether a certain work of art was “just”, we share neither paradigms nor a tradition of applying the concept of justice to art such as to engage in an intelligible controversy.

#### Our testing arg *link turns* the Aff’s efforts to counter injustice. It’s also a reason to Negate their method based on external offense. Testing is the stronger mechanism for actualizing solvency for Aff and Neg impacts.

Connolly 17

William Connolly, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, Aspirational Fascism: The Struggle for Multifaceted Democracy under Trumpism, p. 694-777

If a dissident movement is to acquire momentum, the democratic Left must also identify more young leaders in multiple settings who are charismatic in democratic ways and who can inspire large constituencies as they counter the appeal of Trumpian authoritarian charisma. For Trump is a charismatic adversary whose rhetorical effectiveness has not yet been measured adequately by enough of his critics. He and Hitler are both right about one thing: there is a tendency in the professoriate to downplay the role of rhetoric in politics and the ubiquitous importance of the visceral register of culture to public life. We often love writing more than speech. There is thus a corollary reticence to working hard enough to counter a rhetoric organized around authoritarian leadership, militarism, whiteness, and aggressive national assertion with another mode that draws on our higher angels to encourage horizontal modes of organization and an ethos of presumptive generosity as it articulates the differential class, regional, and urban dangers of rapid climate change.

We both need to learn more about Trump and to rebut his rhetorical style with positive styles of engagement. Bernie Sanders shined a bright light here, too. For visceral group identifications do not always and only pass through the filter of a narcissistic leader, as a few steeped in Freudianism may think. They can also be mediated by horizontal connections on both the visceral and refined registers of cultural life— connections forged across a variety of associational meetings, church assemblies, blogs, family gatherings, classrooms, neighborhood groups, school boards, tavern conversations, unions, and so on— as we forge reciprocal ties of presumptive generosity and care.[ 12] Charismatic, pluralizing, egalitarian leaders support such horizontal connections and infusions in the ways they provide Democratic leadership.[ 13] It is possible to improve the internal ethos of the United States while coming to terms more nobly with its new condition in the world, even if the probabilities may point in another direction. Indeed, it is imperative to try to accomplish both together, because failure to do so risks unleashing the vast military power of the country in a series of destructive wars that could be calamitous for the world. Think merely of how climate change— a gathering planetary force massive in destructive power— is subject to denial in part because those who seek to return to an old “greatness” are told that such a return requires the modes of industry, mining, imperial power, triumphalism, and fossil fuel energy that powered growth the last time around.

Trump’s attack upon the media and the professoriate is strategically chosen in this respect. His tweets calling the media “the enemy of the people” and carriers of “fake news” must never be treated lightly. Above all, this is not a site, if there is any site, at which the Left should seek to “accelerate the contradictions” of the order to speed up its collapse.[ 14] The latter route, however unintentionally, is a route to fascism.

Trump’s goal is to trap the media in a bind: he hopes he can win if the media evades the charges he makes; he hopes he can win if they reply simply by correcting the evidence when he endlessly accuses them of fake news. The best strategy, perhaps, is to keep exposing how the Big Lie works, to respond with evidence-based claims to each Lie as you also explain why he pursues it, to play up dramatically how critical a press free from state control or intimidation is to a democratic society, and to explore the real and neglected grievances of those constituencies most tempted to embrace Trump tweets. Yes, the media often deserves intense criticism from the democratic Left for its softness on a neoliberal corporate culture, but the Left must also expose and attack Trumpian intimidation of it. It recently seemed unwise to me, for instance, when a few on the Left reenforced Trump and Putin denials of the Putin intervention in the election with statements that came close to describing this as fake news. The media and professoriate will both be vicious targets of Trump attacks for the next four years (at least), as he deflects attention from his probable collusion with Putin and the failure of his policies to uplift the working class. It is possible for critics on the Left to chew gum and walk at the same time, in this case, to hold the media accountable as you also defend it against vicious Trumpian assaults that could get worse as his false promises continue to encounter harsh realities.

I have doted a bit on the working class not because it could today become the center of a new movement toward egalitarian democracy oriented to both pluralism and the new planetary condition. We do not inhabit a Fordist era in which much of the working class is centered in large factories. That class is now even more dispersed geographically and underorganized into unions. It is often distributed in small clusters in fast-food restaurants, shopping mall stores, janitorial duties, farm work, small factories, prison work, security assignments, subordinate administrative duties, hospital services, and so on. Moreover, its dispersed distribution makes it easier for those outside those circumstances to ignore or deny its grievances, as they look merely at yearly income statistics and fail to register how differences in lifetime income and an evolving infrastructure of consumption make it harder for many with apparently decent incomes to make ends meet. Its very dispersion, disorganization, and uneven geodistribution, however, mean that, intelligently engaged, it could also forge indispensable elements in a vibrant pluralism that has been on the move for a while without its active involvement, a pluralism that can also constitute a key bulwark against aspirational fascism. That is why it is wise to appreciate the working class today as one dispersed minority among others.

### 1NC – Frames

#### Two Links

#### 1 – Ballot – The 1AC’s value stands on its own---responding to it with judgement and the ballot is a hollow validation that siphons off political energy and draws them into the oppressive gaze of the academy---vote Negative to decline affirmation

Phillips 99 – Dr. Kendall R. Phillips, Professor of Communication at Central Missouri State University, PhD in Speech Communication from Pennsylvania State University, MA in Speech Communication from Central Missouri State University, BS in Psychology and Sociology from Southwest Baptist University, “Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism: A Response to Sloop and Ono”, Philosophy & Rhetoric, Volume 32, Number 1, p. 96-101

My concern with this movement centers around an issue that Sloop and Ono seem to take as a given, namely, the role of the critic. On one hand, calling for the systematic investigation of existing marginalized discourses is a natural extension both of critical rhetoric (see McKerrow 1989, 1991) and of the general ideological turn in criticism (see Wander 1983). On the other hand, the ease of transition from criticism in the service of resistance to criticism of resistance may obscure the need to address some fundamental issues regarding the general function of rhetorical criticism in an uncertain and contentious world. Beyond licensing the critic to engage in political struggle, Sloop and Ono advocate the pursuit of covert resistant discourses.

Such a move not only stretches our understanding of rhetoric and criticism, but also alters significantly the relationship between critic and out- law. Critical interrogation of dominant discursive practices in the service of political/cultural reform is supplanted in favor of positioning covert out- law communities as objects of investigation. Invited to seek out subversive discourses, the critic is positioned as the active agent of change and the out-law discourse becomes merely instrumental. Rather than academic criticism acting in service of everyday acts of resistance, everyday acts of resistance are put into the service of academic criticism.

Rhetorical resistance

That we are "caught within conflicting logics of justice that are culturally struggled over" (Sloop and Ono 1997, 50) and that rhetoric is employed in these struggles seems an uncontroversial statement. Despite the theoretical miasma surrounding judgment, Sloop and Ono accurately note, the material process of rendering judgments (and of disputing the logics of litigation) continues in the world of actually practiced discourse. In the materially contested world, rhetoric is utilized both by those seeking to secure the grounds of dominant judgment and by those seeking to undermine or supplant dominant cultural logics with some out-law notion of justice.

The distinction between these two cultural groups, "in-law" and out- law, however, deserves some consideration prior to any discussion of the role of the critic as implied in the out-law discourse project. The discourse of the dominant or those within the bounds of superordinate logics of litigation is reminiscent of Michel De Certeau's (1984) strategic discourse. For De Certeau, strategies are utilized by those who have authority by virtue of their proper position. Strategies exploit the institutionally guaranteed background consensus by which power relations (and litigations) are maintained and advanced. In contrast, tactics are utilized by those having no proper place of authority within the discursive economy who must seek opportunities whereby the discourse of the dominant might be undermined and contested. To extend Sloop and Ono's definition, out-law discourses are those that can (and, by their analysis, do) take advantage of situations (e.g., race riots) to disrupt the regularity of dominant cultural groups.

The ongoing struggle between strategically instituted cultural dominants and the "out-law always lurk[ing] in the distance" (66) is acknowledged, even celebrated, by Sloop and Ono. What their acknowledgment fails to provide, however, is a clear need for critical intervention. Indeed, quite the reverse is presented: It is the critic (particularly the left-leaning critic) who needs out-law discourse. While the struggles over justice, equality, and freedom have gone on, the left-leaning critics are those who have theoretically excluded themselves from the disputes. The study of out-law dis- courses, then, provides a means to reinvigorate the intellectual and re-institute (academic) leftist thinking into popular political struggles (53-54). Thus, Sloop and Ono's project incorporates three types of rhetoric: the rhetoric of the in-law, presumably the traditional object of critical attention; the rhetoric of the out-law, the study of which may transform our understanding of judgment as well as reinvigorate leftist democratic critiques; and the rhetoric of the critics who, having lost their political po- tency, can exploit the discourse of the out-law to promote ideological struggles. It is to this critical rhetoric that I now turn.

Resistance criticism

Sloop and Ono (1997) clearly state the relationship they envision between the rhetorical critic and out-law discourse: "Ultimately, we will argue that the role of critical rhetoricians is to produce 'materialist conceptions of judgment,' using out-law judgments to disrupt dominant logics of judgment" (54; emphasis added). Here the critic seeks out vernacular discourse (60), focuses on the methods and values embodied in these communities (62), listens to and evaluates the out-law community (62-63), and chooses appropriate discourses for the purpose of disrupting dominant practices (63). Essentially, it is the critic who seeks out marginalized discourses and returns them to the center for the purpose of provoking dominant cultural groups (63).

Despite acknowledging the efficacy of out-law discourses, Sloop and Ono assume that the critiques generated and presented by the out-law community have only minimal effect. The irony, and indeed arrogance, of this assumption is evident when they claim: "There are cases, however, when, without the prompting of academic critics, out-law discourses serve local purposes at times and at others resonate within dominant discourses, disrupting sedimented ways of thinking, transforming dominant forms of judgment" (60; emphasis added). Sloop and Ono seem to suggest that such locally generated critiques are the exception, whereas the political efficacy of the academic critic is the rule. This seems an odd claim, given that the justification for their out-law discourse project is the lack of politically viable academic critique and the perceived potency of out-law conceptions of judgment. Their suggestion that out-law communities are in need of the academic critic contradicts not only the already disruptive nature of existing out-law discourses (the grounds for using out-law discourse), but also the impotence of contemporary critical discourse (the warrant for studying out-law discourse).

By this I do not mean that the critiques and theories generated by academically instituted intellectuals have not been incorporated into subversive discourses. Just as out-law discourses inevitably mount critiques of dominant logics, so, too, the perspectives on rhetoric and criticism generated by academics are used in resistance movements. Feminist critiques of patriarchy, queer theories of homophobia, postcolonial interrogations of race have found their way into the service of resistant groups. The key distinction I wish to make is that the existence of criticism (academic or self-generated) in resistance does not necessitate Sloop and Ono's move to a criticism of resistance.

What Sloop and Ono fail to offer is an adequate argument for "taking public speaking out of the streets and studying it in the classroom, for treating it less as an expression of protest" (Wander 1983, 3) and more as an object for analysis and reproduction within the political economy of the academy. Philip Wander made a similar charge against Herbert Wicheln's early critical project, and this concern should remain at the forefront of any discussion aimed at expanding the scope and function of criticism. Sloop and Ono offer numerous directives for the critic without addressing whether the critic should be examining out-law discourses in the first place. While it is too early to suggest any definitive answer to the question of criticism of resistance, some preliminary arguments as to why critics should not pursue out-law discourses can be offered:

(1) Hidden out-law discourses may have good reasons to stay hidden. Sloop and Ono specifically instruct us that "the logic of the out-law must constantly be searched for, brought forth" (66) and used to disrupt dominant practices. But are we to believe that all out-law discourses are prepared to mount such a challenge to the dominant cultural logic? Or, indeed, that the members of out-law communities are prepared to be brought into the arena of public surveillance in the service of reconstituting logics of litigation? It seems highly unlikely that all divergent cultural groups have developed equally, or that all members of these groups share Sloop and Ono's "imperial impulse" (51) to promote their conceptions and practices of justice.

(2) Academic critical discourse is not transparent. Here I allude to the overall problem of translation (see Foucault 1994; Lyotard 1988; Lyotard and Thebaud 1985; Zabus 1995) as an extension of the previous concern. Critical discourse cannot become the medium of commensurability for divergent language games. Are we to believe that the "use" of out-law dis- course by critics to disrupt dominant practices can fail to do violence to these diverse/divergent logics? Are out-law discourses merely tools to be exploited and discarded in the pursuit of returning leftist academic dis- course to the center?

(3) Perhaps the academic translation of out-law discourse could be true to the internal logic of the out-law community. And, perhaps the re-presentation of out-law logic within the academic community will bestow a degree of legitimacy on the out-law community. Nonetheless, the effect of legitimizing out-law discourse is unknown and potentially destructive. In an effort to siphon the political energy of out-law discourse into academic practice, we may ultimately destroy the dissatisfaction that serves as a cathexis for these out-law discourses. It seems possible that academic recognition might take the place of struggle for material opportunities (see Fraser 1997). But, will academic legitimation create any material changes in the conditions of out-law communities? I mean to suggest, not that it is better to allow the out-law community to suffer for its cause, but rather that incorporating the struggle into an (admittedly) impotent academic critique does not offer a prima facie alternative.

(4) Criticism of resistance denies the practical and theoretical importance of opportunity. Returning to De Certeau's notion of tactics, the crucial element of these discursive moves is their use of opportunity to disrupt the proper authority of the dominant. The kairos of intervention provides the key to undermining "in-law" discourses. But when is the "right moment in time" for the academic reproduction of out-law discourse? Mapping the points of resistance (ala Foucault and Biesecker) entails interrogating "in-law" discourses for their incongruities and contradictions, not turning the academic gaze upon those communities waiting for an opportunity. Out-laws do not lurk in the forefront (66), hoping to be exposed by academic critics; they wait for the right moment for their disruption. Rhetoricians can provide rhetorical instructions for seeking opportunities and for exploiting these opportunities (literally making the culturally weaker argument the stronger), but this does not justify interrogating (intervening in) the cultural logics of the marginalized.

The concerns raised here are not designed to dismiss Sloop and Ono's provocative essay. The divergent critical logic they outline deserves careful consideration within the critical community, and it is my hope that the concerns I raise may help to further problematize the relationship between

resistance and rhetorical criticism.

Rhetorical criticism

As I have suggested, my purpose is to use the provocative nature of Sloop and Ono's project to extend disputes regarding the ends of rhetorical criticism. Diverging perspectives on the ends of criticism have been categorized by Barbara Warnick (1992) as falling along four general lines: artist, analyst, audience, and advocate. Leah Ceccarelli (1997) discerns similar categories around the aesthetic, epistemic, and political ends of rhetorical criticism.

The out-law discourse project presents clear ties to the notion of critic as advocate. For Sloop and Ono, the critic is an interested party, discerning (and at times disputing) the underlying values and forces contained within a discourse. Additionally, however, the out-law discourse critic is an analyst focusing on the hidden, aberrant texts of the out-law and "rendering] an incoherent or esoteric text comprehensible" (Warnick 1992, 233). Now, I am not suggesting that a critic must serve only one function or that the roles of advocate and analyst are mutually exclusive; rather, these entanglings of power (political ends) and knowledge (epistemic ends) are inevitable. My concern is that we not neglect the complexity of these entanglements. Turning covert out-law discourses into objects of our analyses runs the risk of subjecting them both to the gaze of the dominant and to the power relations of the academy. As the works of Michel Foucault (especially 1979, 1980) aptly illustrate, practices presented as extending such noble goals as emancipation and humanity may endow institutions of confinement and objectification. Any justification for studying out-law dis- course because doing so may extend our political usefulness in the pursuit of emancipatory goals must not obscure the already existing power relations authorizing such studies. Our attempts to extend our domains of knowledge and expertise (authority) must not be pursued unreflexively.

#### 2a. The Aff deployed terms from the neoliberal lexicon. It’s irrel if it was intentional OR even a disingenuous deployment that aspired to K neolib. Speech acts grow more potent when such deployments are removed.

Kipnis ‘7

Andrew Kipnis - Senior Fellow and Professor Andrew Kipnis in The Department of Anthropology, The Australian National University – “Neoliberalism reified: suzhi discourse and tropes of neoliberalism in the People's Republic of China” - Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.) 13,383-400 - #E&F – modified for language that may offend - obtained via J-Stor database.

Another problem is that neoliberal policies, *however defined*, may be sincerely or disingenously pursued. Often enough, powerful *social actors* ~~mouth~~ (deploy) neoliberal slogans or ideology of one form or another in a crass attempt to grab power or exploit others. There may be no intention of actually enacting neoliberal policy or striving for neoliberal goals. This issue should be of crucial interest to those who believe (as the author of this article does not) that neoliberalism is systemic in the contemporary world. If neoliberalism is a systemic 'discourse' (as some governmen-tality theorists would have it), then it reproduces itself by producing 'responsibilized' subject/citizens who re-create neoliberal institutions. From this vantage, disingenuous applications of neoliberal discourse would thus work to undermine neoliberal-ism. But if neoliberalism is an 'ideology' that serves merely to mask the true workings of class domination, then disingenuous applications of neoliberal ideas are central to the reproduction of neoliberalism. In such a case, the actual production of autonomous, responsible citizen/subjects would undermine neoliberalism. Few who write as if neoliberalism were systemic in the contemporary world demonstrate awareness of this contradiction.

#### B. Neolib discourse *creates realities* which re-frame the social violence cited by the Aff. That link turns case … it’s also external offense via neolib’s perpetuation of sexualized, racialized, and socio-economic repression.

Della Faille ’15 Dr. Dimitri DELLA FAILLE (PhD, Sociology) is a professor in International Development and Social Sciences at Université du Québec en Outaouai - “A Sociological Understanding of Neoliberal Discourses of Development” - #E&F - https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02046915/document

This paper will attempt to show that social scientists studying development issues must consider these common ideas with considerable caution. We argue that words are, in fact, actions. And as such, they must be investigated. We contend that an examination of underdevelopment and "developing" societies must go beyond an artificial divide between discourse and action. But also, that it must not limit its definition of discourse to an act of deception. Otherwise, we run the risk of misunderstanding social problems, which is the basis for much social action and collective mobilization in the "developing" world. We will also propose in this paper a number of ways to examine language and discourse that go beyond received ideas. We will attempt to show that they are integral parts of action - whether scholarly, activist, administrative or otherwise - against underdevelopment. In the first place, we will focus most of our explanation on how neoliberal governance and policymaking use language, social representation and discourse to achieve their goals. Using example of neoliberal discourses, we will attempt to show how the main ideologies of the various contemporary development discourses transforms our perception and understanding of development problems. This transformation, we argue, exists both in imposing the use of specific words and in successfully controlling means of communication.

We will begin with a quick presentation of discourse and a definition of neoliberal ideologies. Then, we will demonstrate how discourse analysis could study neoliberal discourses by applying to documents about a natural disaster in the Philippines. After this demonstration, we present other various examples of discourse analysis as it applies to development discourses. Then, we present some of the major approaches and methodologies of discourse analysis. Before concluding, we will present some ethical considerations for the analysis of development discourses.

Words of Caution

A paper about language and discourse would fall short of its goal to draw attention to the use of language if it did not contain at least some form of criticism of usages of the word "development". We argue that calling societies "developing" is actually making a normative statement about the past trajectory, current status and expected future of these societies. Social scientists may contend that political, scientific, ethical or lay statements about development and underdevelopment are in fact "problematizations" of human societies. A problematization is a process by which social relations, practices, rules, institutions, and habits previously established are suddenly viewed as doubtful and problematic (Foucault 2001). The word "development" itself may carry different meanings around the world (Thornton et al. 2012). The understanding and expectations of actions in the name of "development" are conditioned by social representations and interpretations. However, we contend that development discourses are problematizations of the "developing" world because they transform the history of societies of Latin America, Asia, Africa and some parts of Europe into a long story of troubles and failures. They do that in order to justify social transformations and interventions (Escobar 1994). We also contend that they are problematizations because they produce cultural discourses that apply specifically to "developing" countries, and therefore reinforce ideas about the perceived superiority of "developed" countries over the rest of the world (Mohanty 1984).

This paper refuses to hierarchize societies based on perceptions of their economic achievement, their form of political governance or the global recognition of their cultural products. We recognize that discourses about "development" are problematizations, and that perceptions of any social, political or cultural inferiority of these regions, countries or populations must be criticized. We therefore use the term "developing" for some societies, not as a normative statement on regions, countries, and populations viewed as economically, socially, politically or culturally inferior to the "developed world", but rather as an unfortunate shortcut to describe regions and countries in which actors desire to act in the name of "development". There is a wealth of scholarly literature on criticism of the use of the word "development", some of which is evoked further in this paper.

We will give further explanations that might help you better understand why we must be cautious when comparing societies in terms of their perceived "development". Now that we explained why we, in this paper, are cautious of talking about "development" and "underdevelopment", let us very briefly present some aspects of discourse and its analysis.

Understanding discourse and its analysis

If discourse analysis is getting more recognition in development studies, before we further embark in this paper it must be noted that if you chose to study discourse, you might encounter disapproval (Ziai 2015). As we have argued elsewhere, discourse analysis is often viewed with reservations or criticized in the context of the study of "development" and "underdevelopment" (Delia Faille 2011; 2014). But very often, the criticism comes from misunderstanding of what discourse actually is. Discourse analysts face many commonly held ideas, as per the examples we have provided in the introduction of this paper. We believe that the best way for social scientists to justify the analysis of words, language and communication is to approach it with a clear definition of discourse that relates to the study of social relations and also to present convincing analysis. This section attempts to clarify our definition of discourse analysis and the following sections will attempt to illustrate how this analysis relates to the study of social relations and "development".

Social scientists studying discourses are examining the social and institutional constraints of language. At the conceptual level, language can be apprehended either as a social fact determined by material conditions and social domination, or as a field of social activity with specific rules and a social environment where meaning, social relations, and society are produced. Most discourse analysts adopt the latter conception. They attempt to reveal the strategies that aim to convey cultural values and ideologies, whether implicitly or explicitly. They define language as the production of meaning and the results of acts of communication that are conditioned by collective rules and social codes. Through the use of language, social groups and individuals come to build their identity, describe themselves, interact, and share ideas. Language is thus more than the use of specific vocabularies and grammars. It is an organized sequence of social acts that is not limited to speech or utterance. Some analysts study images and material artefacts as sequences of social acts and social strategies to convey ideologies.

In the 1960s French and British philosophers, sociologists and political scientists began to understand the production of language in terms of communication strategies. This new direction was dubbed the "linguistic turn" of humanities and social sciences (Rorty 1967). Based on several decades of debate in literary study, linguistics and anthropology, discourse analysis emerged as a new discipline. It proposed a way to see language as a field of social confrontation and struggles. Discourse is therefore understood as the social usage of language and studied as a social practice and a materialization of social relations. It means that discourse analysts are interested in the social practice of using language to put forward agendas, to express dissent, to defend a position, or to transmit values. They also study acts of silencing and censoring - such as prohibiting other worldviews from circulating and being heard. Therefore, discourse analysts see language as a series of social processes and they acknowledge that language is not limited to otherwise unrelated individual acts.

Discourse analysis could be described as a political understanding of the use of language in the context of unequal access to platforms of decision making, economic resources, and social recognition. As we will attempt to demonstrate throughout this paper, the study of discourse is not limited to looking for hidden agendas, lies or the uttering of meaningless and empty words. Deception is only one of the strategies used to convey worldviews, and it is not necessarily the most effective or even the most interesting for discourse analysts.

Some schools of discourse analysis criticize social reproduction of gender inequality, racism and social class. Critical Discourse Analysis is an example of this field. For this school of thought, discourse analysis is the social study of language, its social constraints and its effects (Fairclough 2001). Through language, social groups come to represent society in a way that perpetuates domination, positive or negative discrimination, and social repression. Critical discourse analysts look at the perpetuation of social conflicts and unequal relations of power. They examine issues related to gender, sexuality, social class, and ethnicity.

While our presentation of neoliberal discourses and its analysis does not fall totally under the umbrella of the school of Critical Discourse Analysis, this paper demonstrates how to analyse discourse in the context of the study of global inequalities, social discrimination and repression. We are critical of the current state of global politics, economy and society as it reproduces and reinforces inequalities. Therefore, the next section presents a critical analysis of neoliberalism understood as an ideology whose aim is to impose its ~~worldviews~~ (perspective) and the interest of the actors it attempts to defend and whose interests this ideology is putting forward in the context of development discourses.

#### We can defend the rest of the aff strategy and negate only certain parts. 2NR consolidation is best and we can subtract 2AC frames.

#### Only conditional tests of limited agreement incentivize narrow testing of their specific claims. Requiring us to disprove the entire aff forces extreme impact turns that lack nuance and political utility.

#### Nuanced testing is a better model of engagement to improve praxis.

Williams 15 – Douglas Williams, Third-Generation Organizer, BA in Political Science from the University of Minnesota at Morris, MPA from the University of Missouri Columbia, Doctoral Student in Political Science at Wayne State University, internally quoting Freddie DeBoer, Lecturer at Purdue University and PhD in Rhetoric and Composition from Purdue University and MA in English with a Concentration in Writing and Rhetoric from The University of Rhode Island, The South Lawn, <https://thesouthlawn.org/2015/03/10/the-dead-end-of-identity-politics/> [language modified]

What conversation is there to be had around that? It is as if the mere existence of her identity inoculates her from any critique. How did we get here?

—

Freddie DeBoer makes a great point in his piece on what he calls “critique drift“:

“This all largely descends from a related condition: many in the broad online left have adopted a norm where being an ally means that you never critique people who are presumed to be speaking from your side, and especially if they are seen as speaking from a position of greater oppression. I understand the need for solidarity, I understand the problem of undermining and derailing, and I recognize why people feel strongly that those who have traditionally been silenced should be given a position of privilege in our conversations. But critique drift demonstrates why a[n] [effective] ~~healthy~~, functioning political movement can’t forbid tactical criticism of those with whom you largely agree. Because critical vocabulary and political arguments are common intellectual property which gain or lose power based on their communal use, never criticizing those who misuse them ultimately ~~disarms~~ [undermines] the left. Refusing to say ‘this is a real thing, but you are not being fair or helpful in making that accusation right now’ alienates potential allies, contributes to the burgeoning backlash against social justice politics, and prevents us from making the most accurate, cogent critique possible.”

Look, I am Black. Also, sometimes, I can be wrong. Those two things are not mutually exclusive, and yet we have gotten to a point where any critique of tactics used by oppressed communities can result in being deemed “sexist/racist/insert oppression here-ist” and cast out of the Social Justice Magic Circle. And listen, maybe that is cool with some folks. Maybe the revolution that so many of these types speak about will simply consist of everyone spontaneously coming to consciousness and there will be no need for coalitions, give-and-take, or contact with people who do not know every word or phrase that these groups use as some sort of litmus test for the unwashed.

But for the rest of us who reside in a reality-based world, where every social interaction is not tailored for your idiosyncratic indignations, we know that casting folks out for the tiniest of offenses will lead to a Left that will forever be marginalized and ineffective. I have stated before that the kind of people who put out these lists and engage in the kind of identitarian caterwauling that has become rote copy on the Internet might actually want that, as a world where left-wing activism is made potent and transformative will be one where they cannot simply take comfort in their cocoon of self-righteousness. But damn them when I can turn on my computer and see one Black person after another being gunned down by police. Damn them when we have a president that can sit there with a straight face and speak the words of freedom and liberation while using the power at his disposal to deny those very concepts to others. And damn them when we can get thousands of words on Patricia Arquette drunk at a party or how it is privileged to not like the same musicians that they do, but we cannot seem to get any thoughts on how the biggest moment for communities of color since the 1960s is being squandered in a hail of intergenerational squabbling. And do not even get me started on people writing articles that malign long-standing activist organizations without a whiff of evidence that there has been any wrongdoing on their part.

## Case

### 1NC – Solvency

#### ( ) Presumption.

#### The 1AC is heavy on diagnosis and light on remedy. There’s a diagnosis of regimes of vioence, but little discussion of how the Aff re-distributes privilege.

#### Sure, the 1AC critiques Topicality – but that alone isn’t a reason to affirm. Vote neg on presumption - K Affs still have solvency burdens.

#### ( ) It’s not just D – if the Aff fails to generate new collectives it’s non-workable concept is a trap that empowers capitalist ideologies.

Bryant ‘12

(Levi Bryant is currently a Professor of Philosophy at Collin College. In addition to working as a professor, Bryant has also served as a Lacanian psychoanalyst. He received his Ph.D. from Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois, where he originally studied 'disclosedness' with the Heidegger scholar Thomas Sheehan. Bryant later changed his dissertation topic to the transcendental empiricism of Gilles Deleuze, “Critique of the Academic Left”, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/)

Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignoring how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park: The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this: Phase 1: Collect Underpants Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Profit! They even have a catchy song to go with their work: Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows: Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation! Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing? But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done! But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, *and when we do*, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc. What are your proposals? How will you meet these problems? How will you navigate the existing mediations or semiotic and material features of infrastructure? Marx and Lenin had proposals. Do you? Have you even explored the cartography of the problem? Today we are so intellectually bankrupt on these points that we even have theorists speaking of events and acts and talking about a return to the old socialist party systems, ignoring the horror they generated, their failures, and not even proposing ways of avoiding the repetition of these horrors in a new system of organization. Who among our critical theorists is thinking seriously about how to build a distribution and production system that is responsive to the needs of global consumption, avoiding the problems of planned economy, ie., who is doing this in a way that gets notice in our circles? Who is addressing the problems of micro-fascism that arise with party systems (there’s a reason that it was the Negri & Hardt contingent, not the Badiou contingent that has been the heart of the occupy movement). At least the ecologists are thinking about these things in these terms because, well, they think ecologically. Sadly we need something more, a melding of the ecologists, the Marxists, and the anarchists. We’re not getting it yet though, as far as I can tell. Indeed, folks seem attracted to yet another critical paradigm, Laruelle. I would love, just for a moment, to hear a radical environmentalist talk about his ideal high school that would be academically sound. How would he provide for the energy needs of that school? How would he meet building codes in an environmentally sound way? How would she provide food for the students? What would be her plan for waste disposal? And most importantly, how would she navigate the school board, the state legislature, the federal government, and all the families of these students? What is your plan? What is your alternative? I think there are alternatives. I saw one that approached an alternative in Rotterdam. If you want to make a truly revolutionary contribution, this is where you should start. Why should anyone even bother listening to you if you aren’t proposing real plans? But we haven’t even gotten to that point. Instead we’re like underpants gnomes, saying “revolution is the answer!” without addressing any of the infrastructural questions of just how revolution is to be produced, what alternatives it would offer, and how we would concretely go about building those alternatives. Masturbation. “Underpants gnome” deserves to be a category in critical theory; a sort of synonym for self-congratulatory masturbation. We need less critique not because critique isn’t important or necessary– it is –but because we know the critiques, we know the problems. We’re intoxicated with critique because it’s easy and safe. We best every opponent with critique. We occupy a position of moral superiority with critique. But do we really do anything with critique? What we need today, more than ever, is composition or carpentry. Everyone knows something is wrong. Everyone knows this system is destructive and stacked against them. Even the Tea Party knows something is wrong with the economic system, despite having the wrong economic theory. None of us, however, are proposing alternatives. Instead we prefer to shout and denounce. Good luck with that.

#### Framing point – every implicit indict on the TVA is posited and analytic, not proven. The word “antitrust” does not appear in their ev.

### 1NC – Subjectivity

#### It’s a cookie-cutter over simplification to say that all scholarship or all subjectivity is neoliberal – it elides the nuance necessary to win the alt

Watts 21 [Galen Watts is Guest Professor with Special Appointment and Banting Postdoctoral Fellow, based at KU Leuven, “Are you a neoliberal subject? On the uses and abuses of a concept” 8-6-2021 Sage Journals]

On neoliberalism (4): What is a ‘neoliberal subject’?

Admittedly, scholarship on ‘neoliberal subjects’ varies in its theoretical sophistication and empirical support. Moreover, as social scientists have become increasingly familiar with the theoretical frameworks informing neoliberalisms (2) and (3), the number of empirical studies making use of one or both of these conceptions has grown exponentially. So, let me be clear: in what follows, my concern is with a particular type of social scientific scholarship on neoliberalism (4) and the distinct errors and oversimplifications it perpetrates. What distinguishes this type of scholarship is that it seeks not merely to critique the ideal typical notion of a ‘neoliberal subject’ (as defined by neo-Marxists and/ or Foucaultians), but also to demonstrate empirically the extent to which either/both neoliberalisms (2) and (3) have successfully penetrated into the psychic and embodied lives of actual individuals, by means of three discursive criteria: within this scholarship, neoliberal subjects are (a) those who invoke the language of personal responsibility or have been ‘responsibilized’; (b) those who value autonomy and speak in the language of individualism; and (c) those who employ the rhetorics of authenticity and selfrealization, and who conceive of their self as a thing to be worked on and improved. The problem with these criteria, we shall see, is that they are excessively broad, multivalent and insufficient to prove what they purport to.

Personal responsibility and responsibilization. Sociologists seem to agree on the ‘centrality of the discourse of personal responsibility in the neoliberal era’ (Foster, 2016, p. 94). As Luxton (2010, p. 180) illustratively remarks in Neoliberalism in Everyday Life, ‘The extent to which people accept personal responsibility both reveals the depth to which neoliberal ideologies have penetrated personal life and shows the centrality of such ideologies for the success of neoliberalism’. Indeed, if one had to boil what it means to be a ‘neoliberal subject’ down to a single concept, ‘responsibilization’ – the process whereby individuals are ‘made responsible’ for their choices and actions, while the state increasingly surrenders responsibility for their health, economic security and well-being – would be a legitimate candidate. Across a range of studies, scholars claiming allegiance to either/both neo-Marxist and Foucaultian theoretical traditions more and more interpret invocations of ‘personal responsibility’ as evidence of ‘neoliberalism’. For instance, in her analysis of the popular memoir Eat, Pray, Love, authored by Elizabeth Gilbert, Williams (2014, p. 620) finds in the book’s pages what she refers to as a ‘neoliberal spiritual subject’ on the grounds that this subject ‘is held responsible for putting in the “work” necessary to be happy and healthy’. And paying homage to Foucault, Williams writes that reading Gilbert’s popular memoir calls to mind ‘the neoliberal vision of the individual as entrepreneur of the self’ (2014, p. 625). Similarly, in his study of mindfulness programs in UK schools, Reveley (2016, p. 498, p. 499) draws on a synthesis of neo-Marxist and Foucaultian approaches, which he argues hold that ‘neoliberalism’s ideological correlates are personal autonomy, self-reliance, and responsibility’ in order to make the case that these programs responsibilize individual subjects because they make them ‘responsible for their own emotional well-being’. Reveley (2016, p. 498) further contends that mindfulness ‘is a practical technique that transmits the neoliberal self-responsibilizing impulse down to young people’. And in her study of Mexican migrants participating in an English language program, Ullman (2012, p. 463), drawing explicitly on the work of Harvey and Rose, argues that because her study participants view learning English as their own personal responsibility, they are repeating a ‘neoliberal mantra’. While I do not doubt the affinities between neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3) and the rhetoric of personal responsibility, there are real problems with using the existence of the latter as evidence of the former. For one, there is nothing inherently ‘neoliberal’ about the discourse of personal responsibility, given its semantic approval by a whole gamut of other ideologies and political rationalities – be they, conservative, communitarian, civic republican and social democratic. Indeed, personal responsibility is a deeply entrenched value in democratic societies, widely considered integral to being a moral agent (Mounk, 2017, p. 160). For another, scholars have shown that in many texts alleged to disseminate ‘neoliberal discourse’, there often exist alternative conceptions of responsibility at play (e.g. Trunka & Trundle, 2014; Sletto & Nygren, 2016). Of course, an objection might be that whether or not individuals subscribe to alternative conceptions of responsibility, the fact of neoliberalism (1) cannot be dismissed. In other words, processes of responsibilization are taking place and these conditions force individuals to ‘become responsible’, regardless of their convictions. There is undoubtedly truth in this. As the Welfare State has been dismantled, leaving populaces increasingly unprotected and insecure, individuals have done what any and all humans do in the face of change: adapt. Thus, it is reasonable to conjecture that in order to ‘get by’ in these precarious times, we must become, to some extent, self-responsible subjects and furthermore, that reading Eat, Pray, Love, learning to practice mindfulness and accepting responsibility for learning English in some sense encourages and bolsters this process. Yet, even if the above story is correct, it is still not the case that what we end up with are going to be ‘neoliberal subjects’ if by this we mean something that bears some clear relation to neoliberalism (2), or even neoliberalism (3). Recall that neoliberalism (2) presumes a degree of popular, if alienated, consent; neoMarxist scholars presume that neoliberal ideology exists as doxa, in Bourdieu’s sense, informing common-sense understandings. But as Davies (2014, p. 316) remarks, there is a heated debate ‘as to whether neoliberalism is “alive,” “dead” or in some paradoxical “zombie” state’. While Don Kalb (2012, p. 319) contends that ‘neoliberalism, in whatever hybrid or even “parasitic” ... form, appears as less intellectually convincing, popularly legitimate, and more openly and radically confronted than ever in the last three decades’. In agreement, I would argue that neoliberal ideology is, in fact, extremely contested and actually not widely adhered to by ordinary citizens (even in the most ‘neoliberal’ country – America (see Saad, 2019)), so it seems unwarranted to treat the mere fact of adaptation as evidence of a wholesale embrace of neoliberal ideology. Indeed, we need to make space for the distinction proposed by Hilgers between ‘neoliberal dispositions’ and ‘dispositions produced by neoliberalism’ (2013, p. 85). But what of neoliberalism (3)? Arguably these case studies offer clear instances of neoliberal discourses and governmental technologies, which encourage individuals to become ‘entrepreneurs of the self’. But can we even say this much? Recall that, for Foucault, the new homo oeconomicus is the ultimate market actor, one who seeks opportunities for self-investment at every turn. It seems to me that this is patently not what we find in these case studies – or, more charitably, the evidence for this claim is rather weak. For why should we assume with Williams and Reveley that thinking one should bear some responsibility for one’s health and happiness is necessarily evidence of neoliberal reason? This stretches the notion of homo oeconomicus beyond anything resembling what one finds in Foucault’s writings. Or, consider how Ullman goes about identifying the ‘neoliberal mantra’ of the Mexican migrants she studied. One of her interviewees, Raul, informed her that he had a ‘failure of the will/una falta de voluntad’ because he only watched an hour of the English language program he had purchased. When asked why he did this, Raul responded that ‘it was boring’ (Ullman, 2012, p. 463) Ullman interprets this as follows: ‘This interpretation takes the program itself, its quality and the effectiveness of its pedagogical approach, out of the conversation, and makes learning English solely an individual responsibility’ – which, in Ullman’s view, is clearly ‘neoliberal’ (2012, p. 463). But is this conclusion justified? Is it really ‘neoliberal’ to feel one has failed personally because one got bored and failed to do one’s homework? Again, this is a long way from the figure of homo oeconomicus identified by Foucault. Still, there is another claim, implicit in Ullman’s analysis, which is worthy of consideration, as it has become increasingly common: discourses are allegedly ‘neoliberal’ to the extent that they obscure the structural dimensions of social life – that is, to the extent that they are methodologically individualistic.

Autonomy and individualism. Next to the discourse of personal responsibility, scholars tend to zero in on the language of autonomy and individualism as proof of ‘neoliberal subjectivity’. In fact, processes of responsibilization and ‘autonomization’ are generally considered discursively tethered, if not complementary. For instance, in their analysis of Norwegian and Turkish media discourse, Tu¨rken et al. (2016, p. 37), drawing on the work of Foucault and Rose, identify the normalization of ‘a responsible subject who needs “self-control” in order to “take charge of” and “to be able to live life”’ They write, ‘Different voices in our data discursively construct the individual as an autonomous subject who is encouraged to “take action”, “take personal responsibility”, and “work hard” to achieve a “happy life” (2016, pp. 37–38), thereby concluding that mainstream media discourse in these countries serves to disseminate ‘neoliberal thinking’ (2016, p. 35). In their study of psychotherapeutic discourse Lamarre et al. (2019, p. 239) write, ‘Neoliberal governmentality can be seen as a “conduct of conduct” (Foucault, 2008) or a strategic creation of a specific form of subjectivity’ (p. 239). They argue that psychotherapeutic discourse normalizes and produces this ‘normative neoliberal subjectivity’ which they characterize as ‘autonomous, freely choosing subjects continuously involved in self-improvement’ (2019, p. 244). They conclude, ‘Psychotherapy is inevitably informed by and potentially further perpetuates neoliberal ideology’ (Lamarre et al., 2019, p. 242). And in his study of ‘workplace spirituality’, invoking a synthesis of neoMarxist and governmentality approaches, LoRusso (2020, p. 6) contends that workplace spirituality is a ‘technology of the self’ which ‘produces the quintessential capitalist subject, a radically individualist subject for whom reality is itself merely the results of individual choices about how it is to be experienced’. Thus, for LoRusso, what makes ‘spirituality’ neoliberal is the fact that it promotes a ‘program of individual rather than social change’ (LoRusso, 2017, p. 68). Now, just as with the blanket condemnation of ‘personal responsibility’, the problem with automatically subsuming the language of autonomy and individualism under the conceptual umbrella of ‘neoliberalism’ is that it ignores Durkheim’s (1969) key insight that individualism is both a collective and polyvalent discourse, holding widely divergent consequences depending on how it is interpreted. Indeed, it is well established within sociology that there exist multiple individualisms, rooted in distinct cultural traditions (Bellah et al., 1985). Thus, as Barnett (2005, p. 11) fittingly cautions, by subsuming all individualistic rhetoric under the category ‘neoliberalism’ scholars theorize out of sight alternative political rationalities that, while wedded to the value of individual autonomy, may conceptualize this ideal in quite different ways. Moreover, as cultural sociologists have shown, individuals adopt different technologies, devices and discourses in different contexts, adapting them to their particular aims and present circumstances (Swidler, 1986). So, while it might be true that, in some instances, individuals invoke a methodologically individualistic discourse which exalts the individual over the social, it is theoretically naı¨ve to suppose that, by necessity, this discourse is always and everywhere invoked by said individual. As Scharff (2016, p. 115) remarks, ‘entrepreneurial discourses are negotiated in contexts that provide a range of discourses’. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to question any necessary connection between individualistic talk and endorsement of neoliberalism (2). Still, could we not plausibly interpret these case studies as instances of neoliberalism (3)? That is, as genealogical attempts to trace the forms of neoliberal reason underlying the governmental technologies and discourses of media, psychotherapy and workplace spirituality? Much as before, it is not clear that what we find in these case studies is in fact the kind of neoliberal reason of which Foucault has written, since mere talk of individual autonomy and free choice is insufficient evidence of homo oeconomicus. But even were we to accept this claim, it seems to me that these case studies do not actually limit themselves to neoliberalism (3), but rather make the leap to neoliberalism (4). The shift from neoliberalism (3) to neoliberalism (4) is subtle, but significant. It is characterized by a shift from the genealogical and textual analyses of Foucault and early governmentality scholars like Rose – which sought merely to chart the emergence of new discourses and associated technologies – to empirical analyses of how these discourses and technologies are allegedly internalized by actual subjects. Again, Foucault did not conceive of homo oeconomicus as a real empirical subject. Moreover, early governmentality scholars did ‘not suppose that governmental rationalities automatically determine subjectivities’ (Barnett et al., 2008, p. 629), nor did they concern themselves with the way specific discourses or technologies are implemented, adopted or refused by actual persons (Rose et al., 2006, p. 100). However, this epistemic humility has become increasingly rare in recent years – as these case studies aptly illustrate. For instance, Lamarre et al. write, ‘Following poststructuralist lines of thought, we might understand the power of the neoliberal capitalist state as both restrictive and Watts 11 productive, but always shaping what we know and how we know ourselves to be’ (2019, p. 239, emphasis added). While LoRusso maintains that, ‘At the individual level, these discourses penetrate, possess, and produce the expectations and dispositions of persons’ such that workplace spirituality ‘reshapes employees into willing participants in a neoliberal social order’ (LoRusso, 2020, p. 23, 13, emphasis added). Interestingly, Tu¨rken et al. (2016, p. 43) are more cautious. They conclude their study: ‘Although media is a powerful tool to disseminate meaning and thereby influence subjectivity in society, people do negotiate their own understandings and may even oppose media’s positioning of subjecthood’, adding, ‘The present study does not investigate how media discourse on self-development is negotiated by the readers’. And yet, after noting this critical and consequential limitation of their research, only a few lines below they boldly assert a claim for which they have provided little actual evidence: ‘the dominant individualistic subject of contemporary society is reproduced and refashioned as an entrepreneur of herself’ (Tu¨rken et al., 2016, p. 44). Accordingly, for these scholars, the homo oeconomicus identified by Foucault is no longer a mere speculative fiction of the human capital theorist’s making, but allegedly captures the psychic and embodied life of the majority of people in the twenty-first century.

The problem is that this methodological leap – from neoliberalism (3) to neoliberalism (4) – is frequently not warranted. As Tu¨rken et al. would admit, discourse analysis of media articles, psychotherapeutic manuals and workplace spirituality texts does not provide us with a transparent window into the psychic lives of individuals – what many accounts of ‘neoliberal subjectivity’ claim to have accessed. Indeed, the presumption that ‘publicly observable rationalities, procedures and techniques of state and non-state actors can be read as proxies for processes of subject-formation’ is simply untenable (Barnett et al., 2008, p. 626). And as Scharff (2016, p. 108) usefully reminds us, ‘there has been little empirical research that explores the contours of entrepreneurial subjectivity and, even more specifically, its psychic life’.

Here, then, we confront the gap between neoliberalism (3) and neoliberalism (4): It is one thing to identify discourses, technologies and apparatuses – it is something else entirely to contend that they actually induce subject-formation (Barnett, 2005, p. 10). Now, this is not to say that neoliberalism (3) cannot lead to neoliberalism (4). On the contrary, I do not doubt that neoliberal discourses have been internalized by some, shaping their behaviour and self-understanding. But the fact of the matter is these representative studies provide little evidence to show this. Furthermore, other empirical studies make clear that the story is far more complicated, involving processes of discursive contestation and refusal which are too often ignored. For instance, upon conducting interviews with freelance journalists about how they respond to popular ‘personal branding’ discourses within their industry, Vallas and Christin (2018, p. 24) found that ‘interviewees respond to entrepreneurial discourse in a multiplicity of ways, defying characterization in simple or uniform terms’. They also found that national cultural repertoires, occupational norms and the degree of material precarity experienced by these journalists considerably shapes the extent to which they become the ‘enterprising self’ naturalized in neoliberal reason (Vallas & Christin, 2018, p. 28). And in his qualitative study of how middle-class individuals read self-help books, Lichterman (1992, p. 422) writes, ‘They read books ambivalently, and in ongoing relation to other frameworks for situating personal selfhood in a social context’, thereby concluding, ‘We can not assume in advance that we know how strong or how unified an ideological message it is that self-help book readers read out of their self-help books’ (1992, p. 423). Houghton usefully explicates the implications that follow from these insights:

This difference between the actual and the ideal is a point that is at times forgotten in Foucauldian accounts of subjectivity: the extent to which individuals become a certain type of subject is always an empirical question, hence the need for empirical research. So, while we can talk of neoliberal subjects, this is not to say agents will operate exclusively through that frame. (Houghton, 2019, p. 622)

Ironically, while this might be typical of contemporary ‘Foucaultian accounts of subjectivity’, they actually conflict with the work of Foucault himself. As Green (2010, p. 318) notes, in his mature work Foucault endorsed the view that ‘disciplinary power is both more complex in its effect and perhaps less effective in subjectification than proposed by popular post-structural approaches’. It would seem, then, that even Foucault would have had trouble accepting much scholarship that claims to have identified neoliberalism (4).

Authenticity and self-realization. According to many sociologists, the ‘entrepreneurialization of subjectivity’ (Christiaens, 2019, p. 95) veils itself most conspicuously behind the language of authenticity and self-realization. The idea is that to speak, as so many today do, of the importance of ‘realizing one’s potential’, ‘improving oneself’ and ‘seeking personal growth’, is to have subjected oneself to neoliberal governmentality. To give some examples: in his analysis of the emerging discipline of Happiness Studies Binkley (2011, p. 383), an avowed disciple of Foucault, contends that ‘the current discourse on happiness’ serves as a technology of ‘neoliberal subjectification’. He writes, ‘To govern oneself through the maximization of one’s potential for happiness is to govern oneself as a subject of neoliberal enterprise’ (2011, p. 340). In their analysis of self-help discourse, Erjavec and Volcic (2009, p. 139), citing Wacquant and other neo-Marxists, critique ‘the (neo)liberal imperative of constant retraining, a “just-keep-on-learning” mentality, selfdevelopment and individual responsibility’. And in her study of contemporary spirituality, Altglas (2018, p. 87), drawing on Foucault and Rose, writes that ‘Spirituality’ entails ‘accepting the necessity for the individual to commit to a process of change, learning, and progress – what “spiritual seekers” and their teachers call “working on oneself”‘. She concludes, ‘Spirituality as self-discipline and the kind of self it celebrates... constitutes a particular way to exert power in affinity with neoliberalism’s political and economic mechanisms of privatisation’ (2018, p. 95). The notion that the rhetorics of authenticity and self-realization signal a ‘neoliberal subject’, while theoretically provocative, is problematic. For one, as Laidlaw (2015, p. 913) reminds us, ‘The idea of taking the self as a project of self-discovery in the West goes back at least to Stoicism and has been there in Asia in Buddhism and Confucianism for centuries’. In fact, the conviction that each individual has a potential that is unique to them, and that it is their life’s vocation to realize this is arguably constitutive of the modern identity (Taylor, 1989). So, why should we assume that maximizing one’s Watts 13 potential for happiness, a ‘keep-on-learning’ mentality, or continually seeking to develop one’s self are distinctly ‘neoliberal’? There seems to me no necessary connection between these qualities and endorsement of neoliberalism (2). Nor do I see a necessary connection between these features and the ‘entrepreneur of the self’ naturalized in human capital theory. Again, one potential response is that I have made an error in presuming that these scholars do, in fact, assume the success of these technologies and discourses in constituting or subjectifying actual individuals. Perhaps their only concern is with the governmental technologies and discourses themselves. That is, perhaps they are not endorsing neoliberalism (4), but rather limiting their analyses to neoliberalism (3). On this modified account, the claim would be that positive psychology, self-help and spiritual books function as technologies and devices of neoliberal governmentality, which naturalize ‘neoliberal discourse’, given their naturalization of the ideal of a self-responsible, autonomous and self-realizing subject. While this claim may be more modest, it is still not without issues. And the reason for this is that it is not merely neoliberalism which presupposes and prescribes the ideal of a self-responsible, autonomous and self-realizing subject, but that this has also been a staple of liberalism since its inception, given its critique of excessive government (Burchell, 1993). Indeed, it is for precisely this reason that Rose made sure to distinguish between ‘neoliberalism’ – which he views as a ‘highly specific rationality’ (Rose et al., 2006, p. 97) – and ‘advanced liberalism’ – which he views as ‘something with a more general salience, which underpins mentalities of government from all parts of the political spectrum’ (Rose, 1996, p. 60). In other words, according to Rose, while a neoliberal programme may well find alignment with advanced liberal forms of rule, it would be wrong to reduce the latter to the former. It should not surprise us, then, that Rose has offered strong words against what he refers to as

a kind of cookie-cutter typification or explanation, a tendency to identify any programme with neo-liberal elements as essentially neo-liberal, and to proceed as if this subsumption of the particular under a more general category provides a sufficient account of its nature or explanation of its existence. (Rose et al., 2006, p. 98).1

Furthermore, it is critical to note that Rose, like Foucault, has long distanced himself from the kind of socio-critique implicit in neoliberalism (2). And the reason for this is that he seems to think, given that advanced liberalism is the regnant form of political rule, we are all subject to it in one way or another (Barry et al., 1996).

Where does this leave us? I would put it this way: If we accept that neoliberalism (1) has created socio-economic conditions that have forced individuals to adapt and thereby become, to some extent, self-responsible subjects, then it might well be that all of us, simply by virtue of inhabiting these social conditions, have become ‘neoliberal subjects’. Indeed, if we accept Rose’s claim that we are all subject to advanced liberal forms of rule, then this would seem a natural corollary. However, the difficulty with this conception of ‘neoliberal subject’ is that it is not clear what ‘neoliberal’ in this instance actually means. It is clearly not neoliberalism (2), since this would entail not just adaptation, but acquiescence such that we, as individuals, had accepted the basic tenets of neoliberal 14 European Journal of Social Theory XX(X) ideology. Nor is it clear that it entails neoliberalism (3), which entails having one’s subjectivity constituted by neoliberal reason. Thus, it seems to me far more accurate to say that we are all (or most us, anyway) liberal subjects – those who, in one way or another, conceive of ourselves as self-responsible, autonomous and self-realizing subjects. Though it goes without saying that such a claim is not all that illuminating.

Conclusion

Let me be clear: I do not doubt that, in some cases, neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3) have led to the production of actual ‘neoliberal subjects’ – that is, living breathing homo oeconomicus. For instance, I would conjecture that the world of corporate finance is probably densely populated with such subjects (e.g. Neely, 2020). And indeed, in my own research, I have found that Charismatic Christians who subscribe to ‘prosperity gospel’ approximate the ‘enterprising self’ normalized in human capital theory (Watts, forthcoming). However, I am quite sceptical of the claim that neoliberal subjects populate each and every social sphere, as if we are all in the thralls of neoliberal ideology, or govern ourselves exclusively according to the dictates of neoliberal reason. That said, this obviously remains an urgent research question. But if we are to pursue it, we require a methodological approach that is sensitive to institutional specificities, the extent to which discourses are polyvalent, and the complexities involved in the production of psychic and embodied subjectivities, not just a loose discourse analysis of governmental texts.

Why? For both academic and political reasons. First, the academic: to the extent that neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3) exist, it only muddies the water to overinterpret them. Indeed, we would do better to practice analytic precision when labelling something (or someone) ‘neoliberal’. This is especially the case when researching across national contexts: it is simply not accurate that every citizen of Western liberal democracies is equally ‘neoliberal’, either in the sense that they adhere to neoliberal ideology or that they live according to neoliberal reason. And as a growing number of scholars have maintained, it is misleading to interpret the subjective lives of citizens of East Asia and the Global South as wholly colonized by either neoliberalisms (2) or (3) (Ferguson, 2009; Parnell & Robinson, 2012). However, even within specific national contexts, we must make sure to recognize that identities and discourses are multiple, such that mere invocations of aspects of ‘neoliberal discourse’ should not be taken as evidence of a comprehensive ‘neoliberal subjectivity’. In short, if our aim as social scientists is to capture the complexity, richness and diversity of subjective life in the twenty-first century, then we ought to broaden the ‘repertoire of subjectivity’ (Green, 2010, p. 331) carried in our analytic toolboxes.

Second, the political: for those of us who find something abhorrent about neoliberalisms (1), (2) and (3), it may actually undermine our cause to repeatedly give the impression that one or either of these have seeped into the subjectivities of everyone presently living. One reason for this is that to the extent that we overlook, or dismiss, extant alternative social and moral forms, we may unwittingly serve to bolster neoliberal ideology and reason, aiding and abetting their spokespeople in their goal of global domination. Indeed, John Welsh (2020, p. 68) suggests that if we are to oppose neoliberalism in all of its forms, academics must begin to ‘introduce contingency back into the interstices of this seemingly impenetrable edifice’. Interestingly, this strategy actually aligns with the mature work of Foucault, for whom scholarship should seek to disrupt that which is taken for granted. Drawing on this Foucaultian legacy, Cornelissen (2018, p. 144) convincingly argues that ‘resistance should be given a more prominent analytical role in the critique of neoliberalism’, adding, ‘resistance is not secondary to the elaboration of alternatives; rather, moments of refusal must guide the formulation of alternative analyses’. Cornelissen concludes, ‘what is at stake politically is our capacity to imagine practices or resistance to neoliberalism and to take seriously those modalities of resistance that already exist’. I could not agree more. And for this reason, I think we should be far more careful when invoking the monolithic notion of a ‘neoliberal subject’.

### 1NC – Steigler

#### Every facet of Stiegler’s arg is totalizing and wrong---incremental improvements to capitalism solve.

Beardsworth, 10—Head of the School of Politics and International Studies and Professor of International Politics at the University of Leeds (Richard, “Technology and Politics: A Response to Bernard Stiegler,” Cultural Politics (2010) 6 (2): 181–199, dml)

Now, for Stiegler, the question of technics is a Greek question because the relation between the human and the technical is explicitly posed by the Greeks, and any thinking on technology necessarily works within this Greek framework.5 Whatever one makes of this thesis technologically speaking, the question of the modern and contemporary autonomy of the economic from the social whole is nevertheless not Greek. With the end of the Cold War, with increasing trans-border activity of capital, goods, and, to a much lesser extent, labor, capital comes to determine the terms in which the allocation of scarce resources is made. Capital becomes, that is, general, and there is for the foreseeable future no alternative to it.6 All human beings live within the system of capital, whatever the particular node they live on, or conjunction they make with it. This system is highly unstable and dissymmetrical with immense imbalances in equality, natural resource distribution, financial assets, and terms of trade. With no alternative to capital, a revolutionary politics is no longer tenable. The ethical question driving political innovation has, consequently, to be worked out in terms of universally coordinated, but locally determined equilibriums between growth, sustainability, and equity. Given economic interdependence and the necessity of large transfers of technology and wealth from the developed world to the developing world in the context of climate change, effective financial regulation, economic coordination, and staggered development present the right strategies to tame the excesses of neoliberal global capitalism. Whether these strategies are feasible or not is at present an open question given recent government failure to regulate risk-taking and the evident dilemma, for developing countries, between the need for curtailed energy use, on the one hand, and industrialization and exit from poverty, on the other.

Now, whatever our answers to these large questions, the political question today—‘who are we?’—can only be appraised if the political economy of a globalized world becomes the direct object of critical attention. Only by foregrounding this object and its dilemmas will one have any chance of critical purchase on the political challenges ahead. In this context, Stiegler's foregrounding of technology to promote a new critique of political economy is decisive in purpose and tone, important in detail, but misplaced in general intent. Stiegler is right to stress again the pertinence of the economy for critical thought after “the supposed economism of Marxism” (2009: 29). His technologically trained focus on the alienated consumer is important within the cognitive dimension of contemporary capitalism and debt-led growth. But, if he is concerned to show, as a philosopher, the general lines of a re-invented critical political economy, his object and attention need to be much larger than his “Greek” framework affords. Since there is no systemic alternative to capitalism at this moment in history, the question of political economy is one of whether effective regulation of capitalism is possible or not for the world as a whole.

In this regard, I fear that Stiegler's rhetorical logic of excess testifies to a straightforward shift of Marxist terminology (from producer to consumer) rather than a reinvention of Marxism's object (political economy). I say this despite the deep interest in understanding cognitive capitalism and consumerism through Stiegler's categories. To take a few examples from only the last pages of Pour une nouvelle critique de l'économie politique: we are witnessing the “extreme disenchantment of the world” (2009: 88), a “generalized proletariat [of consumption]” (89), the “disappearance of the middle classes” (89), the “destruction” of social association (87), and “lawless and faithless” elites of capitalism (88). This logic of excess ignores the need today to make small distinctions, under the canopy of political regulation, within the world as a whole. The art of politics today is the prudential art of making critical distinctions within an economy of the same. “Critical philosophy” may wish to eschew such distinctions, but it does so at its practical peril when there is no alternative to capitalism, and when, just as importantly, the mid-term horizon is global coordination of a world economy under circumstances of economic imbalance, energy-crisis, and poverty.

The political questions today are therefore: “what kind of regulation of capitalism is ethically and empirically appropriate?”; “at what level is it appropriate?”; and “what instance should and can decide?”. These are vast and difficult questions for philosophy, political science, and economics: they will occupy minds and bodies for a long time to come. It is my belief that, within these questions and their distinctions, an engaged philosophy (which Stiegler rightly advocates) has an important role to play. A generalized technological reading of Marx creates in this context important cultural work; but it does not give itself the terms of a contemporary critique of political economy.

I end this section with one example of what kinds of matter need to be “adopted,” and how. There has been much talk recently of the regulation of financial offshore centers. Such talk, when coming from elite bodies in power, can serve as a smoke-screen to evade the major issue of imbalances within the world economy as a whole (particularly the northwestern problem of public and private debt). Worldwide coordinated investment in the real economy remains in this context an outstanding question. That said, the political regulation of these tax havens forms part of the ongoing struggle against international and national neoliberal practices, since it was financial offshore centers, starting with the Eurodollar markets, which helped promote capital mobility at the end of the 1970s.7 It is this capital mobility that ended the “social democratic contract” between capital and labor at the level of the nation-state and in the framework of the Bretton Woods international system of fixed exchange rates. It consequently paved the way for “disembedded” global capitalism, widespread debt-led growth, and, under worldwide conditions of financial contagion, massive social disorientation.8 The financial and economic crises of 2007–09 resulted from “de-regulation” of domestic and global assets (from mortgages to complex financial tools like swaps and derivatives). This de-regulation enabled financial capital accumulation from the 1970s onwards. It is now generally accepted that 60 percent of profits in the corporate sector have been finance-based in the last ten years (Brenner 2006: 293). To regulate offshore accounts in this context is therefore ideologically and structurally crucial for the political “adoption” of contemporary capitalism. For, owners of these accounts have fed the recent spiral of risk-taking (a half of global capital is estimated to lie in such accounts!), but they have continued to refuse the social costs of (their) national public life. The object of concern for critical political economy is consequently less the credit-card-consumer (and profits based on the capitalization of his or her external memory supports) than effective regulation of their economic causes.

That said, how, in today's world economy, can one regulate these capital accounts? This is the urgent political question. To stop the businesses of nations moving large amounts of their capital offshore to avoid domestic taxation suggests either the necessity of global taxation or renewed domestic regulation of capital outflow (as in the 1960s and 1970s in “embedded” liberal states). The political cosmopolitan response—global regulations of all international capital flows—is certainly the best response theoretically since capital competition thrives on exceptions to legal norms. It is however institutionally impractical given the weak status of international rule. Nation-state fiscal policy is practical since it can block capital displacement to more competitive national markets. National monetary policy requires, however, clear leadership, democratic example, and effective bureaucratic surveillance (and in the case of the EU it is already not possible given the monetary sovereignty of the European Central Bank). And so forth. My point is this.

These kinds of dilemmas immediately face any progressive thinking of political economy today: they require careful ethical and empirical exposition before one can make general critical claims. The regulation of financial offshore centers is actually one of the more simple problems of global cooperation to solve, although its structural effects will be deep concerning finance-led growth. How much more conceptual and empirical thinking is needed to work out market and government motivation for effective climate change mitigation; or to work out long-term the global imbalance between Chinese savings and US debt … Regarding these political dilemmas concerning effective regulation of global capital flows, I remain unconvinced that Stiegler's philosophico-technical reading of the economy can (1) properly delimit the economic problems that need to be adopted; and (2) tease out the differences of approach required to adopt contemporary economic conditions effectively. Under the general conditions of a capitalist world economy, however, these differences constitute the very condition of more local social re-motivation (Stiegler's very concern).

Economic alienation from social life should consequently not be thought within the “Greek” framework of technology (however differentiated this framework is). Dis-embedded global capitalism requires a new international political theory of legitimate and effective regulation. The above economic alienation includes the convergence between consumerism and the logic of the market and the importance of adopting the new media and informational economies. Of these Stiegler speaks with originality and impressive intellectual force. However, technical supports—and their lack of present political adoption—do not fundamentally determine our lack of a “we.” To argue so runs the risk of unilateral technological determinism. And this form of determinism ends up, ironically, missing its political end.

Stiegler and Freud: Sublimation and De-Sublimation

In a move that has become a trait of critical French philosophy, Bernard Stiegler moves to Freudian libidinal economy to underpin his analysis of contemporary capitalism, specifically the displacement of “alienation” from the producer to the consumer. As we saw above in his general re-reading of Marx, cognitive capitalism distinguishes itself from previous capitalist forms through the convergence between objects of the mind and the short-term logic of the market. This convergence creates the general crisis of memory and poverty of “spirit” that marks our time. As is now clear, the convergence and its consequences call for a critico-technological response, which Stiegler advances through his re-writing of the German and French phenomenological traditions in the contemporary context of the new media (the hyperindustrial support). Through this convergence, capitalism's capture of energy for production and consumption becomes increasingly invasive and unilateral. Since human memory lies in the technical support, and since we temporalize ourselves from out of this support, our contemporary industrial condition affects the whole mind–body complex of the human (Stiegler's current term for this is “organology'). Given, however, the rules of capital accumulation, decline in the rate of profit, and short-term profit-motivation, cognitive capitalism so captures the energy of the consumer that it blocks the sublimating processes of energy that constitute, for depth psychology, the condition of work, art, family, love, and the social bond in general. Hence the importance of Freud to Stiegler, but, equally, the need to inscribe Freud's meta-psychological model of “ego–superego–id” within the technical history of tertiary memory, retention, and protention.

For Stiegler, cognitive capitalism increasingly reduces desire to its constituent drives. Stiegler calls this reduction “negative sublimation” (2006a: 163–8, 173–4). It implies the break up of desire into its constituent elements of aggregation (the principle of life) and destruction (the death drive). This is a complex step in his technological critique of capitalism, and I do not have space here to develop it in full. I am also unsure that I could do so without a much deeper rehearsal of the Freudian problematic. Suffice it to say the following for my own argument. I refer to Pour une nouvelle critique de l'économie politique and Prendre soin de la jeunesse et des générations (Stiegler 2009, 2008a).

Under the negentropic logic of capitalist profit and its use of the contemporary technologies, it is the young consumer who is targeted. Due to this targeting, s/he is losing her/his primary identifications. Hypermnesic technical supports (from television, through CDs to the Internet, all soon in the one support of the “mobile” phone) confuse generational roles and differences and are gradually replacing the “care” of parenthood, and its attendant authority and role-modeling, with a violent disorder of dispersed identifications without meaning or rhythm. This replacement and confusion is leading—among the younger generations that temporalize out of the tertiary memory of the new technologies—to disintegration of the family intergenerational model, disaffection, and disindividuation. These generations lack—in depth psychological terms—a structuring superego to determine in their psychological apparatus the reality principle and conscience and, thereby, open up a human understanding of, and path to, law and justice. In other words, for Stiegler, cognitive capitalism attempts “to control the id” (2008a: 25) and “displace primary identifications with our ascendants” (2008a: 25, 31, 83) towards a new libidinal economy of commodity fetishism.

The human apparatus (technico-psychological from the beginning given ephiphylogenesis) is fundamentally threatened. Now, for Stiegler, this threat is radically new within the technical history of memory. The legacy of transgenerational identifications between the unconscious and conscious (mediated by our superego) is today undermined by the specifically “psychological” nature of the new “psychotechnologies” (2008a: 31). As Stiegler neatly puts it, Foucauldian “biopower” is being supplemented by this new “psychopower” of normalization (2008a: 31). With this replacement of the superego, desire is broken down into its primary constituents: the principle of life, on the one hand, and the death drive, on the other. Stiegler's “negative sublimation” focuses on the death drive: the “psychopower” of the new technologies “destroys desire” (2008a: 47) and, with “the confusion of generations” leads to “nihilism” (2008a: 47, 69, 79; compare also Stiegler 2006: 65–6: “the over-turning of the order of generations […] comes at the moment of […] of the revelation of economic vanity, of increasingly despairing existences”). Without the primary identifications with their parents, the young generations are also unable to envisage change since such identifications create the psychical framework within which we can alter our identities (2008a: 117). When the technical support becomes hyper-industrial, and cognitive capitalism comes to conjoin mind and matter, the concomitant displacements of desire risk, in other words, the very decomposition of desire. As a result, desire no longer projects itself out as the fulfillment of itself as a non-existent justice (to come).9 Due to this technological invasion of the id, “public reason” radically regresses (2008a: 47).

What is required in response, for Stiegler, is a politics of adoption of our new technological “environment” that is centered on a re-founding of public education (2008a: 137–43). The political struggle against cognitive capitalism becomes one of educating youth so that the young can begin to synthesize the deep attention-span of learning and critical reflection with the market-led hyper-attention of zapping (2008a: 137–43). This politics of education would prevent present technological sophists from destroying the legacy of “spirit” (unconscious and conscious retention/protention), return the technological pharmakon to its proper ambivalence, and open up the future. As Stiegler rightly argues in the context of the Internet, we need to “envisage new processes of transindividuation” (2008a: 158).

This overall argument on “psychopower” is dynamic, imaginative, and singular in its use of the “French” legacy of Freud. I will briefly pose some questions that rhyme with my larger observations concerning his re-writing of Marx. The question is again one of the specific autonomy of the domain under technological consideration and the political consequences of losing this autonomy theoretically.

Just as Stiegler gives us a technological reading of political economy, so he also gives a technological reading of libidinal economy. (They are obviously one and the same reading given his synthesis of both to describe the specificity of cognitive capitalism; I have broken them down here for analytical purposes.) Since the 1990s Stiegler re-thinks the Freudian problematic through technics (see Stiegler 1996b). Technics constitutes the condition of sexuality qua desire. This critique of Freud inscribes the whole of the psychical apparatus within the technical history of epiphylogenesis. It is clear that human sexuality has both evolved and is altered through technical developments. Stiegler is right to insist, with the paleontologist Leroi-Gourhan and Gilles Simondon, that hominization is a technical process of evolution and psychic and collective individuation. That said, sexuality is not reducible to technics. Human sexuality, together with the problematic of desire that it underpins, both transcends technological determination and is itself dependent on many variables. There are depth psychological constants (for example, the Oedipus complex) that determine the transgenerational legacy of the id beyond technical evolution. To argue otherwise (as Stiegler does; see 1996b) is not to engage with the autonomy of the depth psychological. What with the neurosciences' penetration into the mind–body complex, we are probably only now beginning to under stand this autonomy and multi-causality.

Stiegler is therefore correct, following Herbert Marcuse, to place technics within the evolution of sexuality and the vagaries of desire. There would be no Oedipus complex, specific to human animals, without the technological evolution of the human. But he goes too far when he makes the relation between technics and desire one of unilateral determination. The above argument that the “psychotechnologies” are attempting “to control the id,” if not “the psychical apparatus in general” (2009: 31), is one consequence of this unilateral determination. This is another technologically determinist judgment. It makes a background condition (technology) into a radical determination of the psychic apparatus as a whole. Such determinism tempts Stiegler into arguing for a general “crisis of spirit” at the moment of cognitive capitalism.

Let me recall in this context that, for Freud, sublimation (the turning of desire into law) constitutes a complex process that is dependent on many contingent factors. In distinction to all other animals, humans sublimate because they are diphasic: we undergo the latency period and, therefore, puberty—due, without doubt, to our technological specificity. As a result of this diphasic nature, the human animal turns its love of its protectors into an identification that, with the reversals of puberty, comes to structure and occupy the space of the superego. Identifying with our parents (and their parents, etc.) or taking distance from them constitutes, from the beginning, a complex process of love and hate that may lead, from puberty onwards, to too rigid a superego or too dissipated a one (or rather, to variations in-between). Freudian psychoanalysis suggests that it is very difficult to generalize with regard to this development. The absence of identifiable, recurrent, and protecting love can indeed create an uncoordinated psyche. It leads, in this case, to other forms of parental identification that are always ongoing in the infantile years precisely because the id transcends technically organized memory. Until the nuclear family is literally dissolved and not replaced by another form of social organization, we cannot consequently speak of a new generation that has lost its primary identifications and, therefore, following the Freudian logic of sublimation, lost a sense of the future, of law, and of justice. There are too many variables at play within the depth psychological dynamic of infantile protection and care for Stiegler to be so clear. Under new conditions of technology, one must be proactive and prudently regulate Internet flows (regarding collective security, obscenity, etc.). One must, however, wait to see what new forms of parenthood adopt the hyperindustrial support and what new forms of sublimation will come to structure the coming generations' sense of conscience. These new forms may be weaker than either traditional or modern forms of the close social bond. But this cannot be a cause of excessive concern—unless this polemical pitch is judged to be the right means to attract political concern and change public policy (and even here, I am unsure that it is). Ontologically speaking, these forms may lead to more innovative and creative behavior as much as to destructive and self-destructive behavior. I am arguing that we cannot know at this very early stage of our hyperindustrial age, although Stiegler is nevertheless right to call for critical synthesis. The political adoption of the hyperindustrial support will take time—as did monotheism to adopt non-orthographic writing and the social contract to adopt the alphabetical word.

The above uncertainty regarding the direction of the contemporary technology–human symbiosis constitutes, in Stiegler's terms, the “ambivalence” of technology. In Freudian terms, it is more simply the complexity of the human mind–body complex (on these themes, see Beardsworth 1996b). In these processes there is a constant dialectic between “negative” and “positive” sublimation: here, the reduction of law to capitalism on the one hand, and the embedding of capitalism within artistic and legal forms on the other. Stiegler cuts the knot of this ambivalence too quickly, or rather, generalizes too fast from almost exclusively French examples of de-sublimation (see Stiegler 2008a, esp. on the advertising techniques of Canal J.).

Regarding Freud, I would argue, in sum, that Stiegler gives a strong, original reading of contemporary affective life through the bridging of technology and the psyche. Conversely, it is a technological re-reading of Freud that flattens out the vagaries of human affect and human conscience, preventing a nuanced, comparative account of the relation between contemporary consumerism and normative thought and behavior. As a result, public education may be posited too quickly by Stiegler as the right political response.

This is not to deny the need for change in public education: far from it. The Internet clearly poses a problem. As the contemporary teacher knows, Internet-surfing produces a form of consciousness that is adept at “copy and paste,” but finds synthesis and judgment increasingly difficult. Stiegler's politics of critical reflection, with its emphasis on the vital role of education, is in this sense persuasive. That said, I would wish to keep a sense of global perspective. As is well-known, use of the Internet was crucial to the election of Barack Obama: it helped create a cultural transformation that proved strong enough to shift the American political landscape to the center. The use of mobile phones has transformed the electoral process in West Africa. The Internet is, in other words, already highly creative politically. Education must certainly help to supplement this emerging creativity with the art of judgment. Obama's domestic fate regarding healthcare reform since the campaign has shown, at the same time, how powerful the traditional media remain in shaping political perception and interests. Progressive liberal politics in one of the most technologically savvy of countries depends as much today on restructuring the power-bases of the traditional media as it does on providing an education in response to capitalist-led technological transformation of human memory. Stiegler would not disagree with this last point. As I said at the beginning of this paper, his political voluntarism was in the 1990s singular on the French theoretical continent. It means, to my mind, however, that philosophico-political reflection should consider the political adoption of technology at several levels of analysis and of policy, in a spirit of prudence, and with a sense of intellectual limits.

Conclusion

I have addressed the work of Stiegler through the names of Marx and Freud. In doing so, I have attempted to suggest that his work goes too quickly over what puts a break on the destructive side to capitalism. The future political project of democracy is, without doubt, to embed capitalism at the world level. And democratic freedom means that one must renounce gratifying one's immediate desires. This means political institution and self-restraint. Stiegler focuses rightly, and sometimes brilliantly, on the urgency of the political today, and on the importance of a political adoption of contemporary forms of industry within a general intellectual framework of retentional finitude. This latter framework of analysis is theoretically innovative and disciplinarily rich. Not to analyze the forms of institutional change at the appropriate level and not to give credit to the specificities of sublimation within capitalism tend, however, to make capitalism's field and dynamic too uniform, and Stiegler's responses to it too unilateral and too general (if not, too French). As a result, his theoretical world turns too quickly, at the precise moment when a slower speed and a finer set of distinctions are needed. Not that there is not enormous danger in our present world, not that a sense of urgency is not vital. Our description of it requires, however, theoretical terms that exposit it in its complexity so that theory can provide, precisely, the occasion for suitable political adoption and decision.

#### That means the Aff doesn’t solve.

Zechner and Hansen, 10—both have Ph.D.s from Queen Mary University (Manuela and Bue Rübner, “Unchained melodies of the new proletariat,” <https://www.generation-online.org/other/stieglerreview.htm>, dml) [language modifications denoted by brackets]

Stieglers argument points to a de facto impoverishment of everyday and collective intelligence, and as such points the way to important investigations into this contemporary everyday and its forms of solidarity an reproduction. But Stiegler ends up with a relatively limited critique that speaks from the position of paid labour only – even if it's now flexibilized, fee-based and possibly even precarious labour that is at stake. He is clear about the poverty of cognitive labour:

We thus have pure cognitive labour power utterly devoid of knowledge: with cognitive technologies, it is the cognitive itself which has been proletarianized. In this consists, then, cognitive capitalism, also known as 'creative' or 'immaterial' capitalism. And this is concretely expressed in the fact that the cognitive has been reduced to calculability – logos has become, pharmacologically and economically, ratio.(5)

Yet he still does not look beyond this cognitive field to find other cultures of knowledge and sharing. He talks about 'economies of contribution', imagining modes of networked production that put resources in common: however this still seems to be mainly about the sharing of ideas and IPs in generally competitive settings, a narrative by and for white educated males in industrialized countries of the west (6). Reading Stiegler's New Critique of Political Economy', one finds many sensitivities and intuitions, yet he insists on projecting new political economies into cognitarian fields rather than elsewhere. Missing out on the wealth of self-generating knowledges in the experiences of women and subaltern people, Stiegler also fails to address the repression and deprivation of reproductive knowledges that have occurred with colonization, housewifization and capitalist accumulation across the globe and centuries. Whether women and the subaltern have a different point of view on contemporary 'proletarianization' remains unknown: a promising story reverts to its usual protagonists.

While the proletarianization of workers was a condition of the development of the productivist model of Fordism the proletarianization of consumers was a solution to its limits, its inherent tendency to overproduction. The creation of a mass market did not only involve an increase in demand - presupposing both an increase in purchasing power and desire for goods - but the reliance of consumers on the market – that is, on their decreasing ability to live without it. This process, according to Stiegler, ‘fundamentally and practically weaken[ed] the Marxist theory of class struggle’ (p.40). However, this model has increasingly hollowed out savoir-vivre, and diminished the time necessary for the constitution of desire. In short the consumerist model undermines its own basis, tending towards crisis because it exhausts the libidinal energy which keeps it running.

Stiegler thus thinks of 20th century consumerism not as a question of class compromise (on the background of class struggle, imperialism and the global division of labour), but rather as an occasion to question as compromised the very concept of class antagonism itself. As consumerism itself, Stiegler’s consumption centred account tends to depoliticise capitalism. Stiegler diagnoses the ‘first planetary economic crisis’ as the crisis of the consumerist model, symptom of an ever falling rate of profit, yet without paying much attention to the fall of real wages in Western Countries in the past 25-30 years, or to the growing consumerist economies of China, India, Brazil, etc. (7)

Economies of contribution

The economy of contribution stands for a world of meaningful communalist relations, an economy that reclaims technologies and knowledges of work in ways that make both economics and work more meaningful – in Stieglers case (as in the case of so many theorists of 'cognitive', 'immaterial', 'creative' or 'knowledge' labour), via the emergence of digital technologies and computer networks. In this tech economy, 'work' can emancipate itself from the abstracted, alienated and measured activity that consists in the execution of programmed gestures, in the pushing of buttons upon a surface one can't grasp or hack: hacking is an exemplary self-driven activity that reinvents work, creativity and meaning, according to Stiegler. Work as the constant re-invention of meaning at the interface of the psychic, social and political: Stiegler insists on new hacker and geek cultures constituting such a new economy of contribution. A fair point, yet what revolutionary potential can be derived from such a minority white industrialized culture – is this really where the potentials to break with proletarianization have a privileged place today, should we really invest all that hope into relatively privileged knowledge workers? What about the 99% of others, who restlessly push buttons in call-centres, offices and home workstations? I very much doubt that the emancipation of creative labour as such can achieve any more than relative privilege for some people with computers.

As many philosophically and scientifically positioned theorisations, Stiegler's too fails to position itself with regards to its object, and as such presents a relative monofocal perspective which ends up resembling a 'god trick' in Donna Haraways terms – a perspective that fails to articulate itself in relation to its place, its others, its history in a thoroughly critical way. Donna Haraway calls for developing situated knowledges in the face of disembodied objectivity:

We need to learn in our bodies, endowed with primate colour and stereoscopic vision, how to attach the objective to our theoretical and political scanners in order to name where we are and where we are not, in dimensions of mental and physical space we hardly know how to name.(8)

The absence of a feminist and postcolonial viewpoint – or even recognition thereof – does make itself felt in Stiegler's work, and with this, questions of care and sustainability become somewhat shallow. Reproduction and the feminised everyday are finally left behind in favour of the conceptual pair production/consumption (9): this is why Stiegler’s 'care' remains too abstract a concept, without much indication of a practice beyond that of certain people working with computers. The notion of care sits in the right place, addressing an absence of certain practices of attention-giving within contemporary networked capitalism, and pointing to the need to invent new ways of putting things in common:

The economy of contribution is the stimulation of desire through the reconstitution of systems of care founded on contemporary pharmaka and constituting a new commerce of subsistences in the service of a new existence.(10)

Yet how to imagine 'subsistences' without an attention to reproduction, to care in its proper embodiment? As the Heideggerian concept of Sorge on which he draws heavily, Stiegler's 'care' is blind to [ignores] how any mode of care is internally and antagonistically split according to class, gender and race. Like many Marxist theorisations of labour, it overlooks the very activities that make life - and production and consumption – sustainable. The 'economy of contribution' sits rather awkwardly historically with women, who whether as mothers, wives, witches or prostitutes have developed and passed on an incredible wealth of knowledges and practices of care and communisation, despite having no access to mainstream institutions, public spaces or high technologies. It also sits strangely with cultures that haven't yet gone through quite as many cycles of accumulation to arrive at the techno-individual of Stieglers narrative: what about subsistence in this context, and all the knowledges that exist there? In the end, one senses a preference for white, male, philosophical referents in this work.

Interestingly, in relation to questions of care, Stiegler (11) points out that spaces of collaboration are not a matter of autonomy merely: a point missing in many autonomist and network theories that are purely affirmative of digital collaboration. This questioning of autonomy is a point feminists have made for decades, in speaking about an ethics of care, vulnerability and interdependency. What is at stake, what we must invent, is a way of thinking autonomy and heteronomy together: if we think 'economies of contribution' as spaces of both creativity and care, of interdependency as well as self-determination (12), and if we think the beyond the experiences of creative or cognitive labourers. Within Stieglers work, the frame of reference remains the state and an idea of encouraging spaces modelled on digital cooperation via policy (13): no touching upon non-industrial work, no referent beyond a bourgeois male subject, no rapport to embodied practices.

Technologies of attention

In speaking about how new information and communication technologies reshape work and relationality, Stiegler points to the ways in which new modes of attention formation emerge. Technology always differentially structures our attention, whether it is papyrus, the printing press, television, the telephone or internet - attention is a matter of the way we relate to the world, and thus of care. He sees new possible modes of care emerge from collaborative cultures across the internet in cultures of hacking and open source programming. For us, this opens a pertinent question particularly in context of the precarious, flexible and insecure work that neoliberal economies today run on: how might people look out for each other in these contexts, avoiding exploitation and collaborate and organise with both their autonomy and heteronomy in mind?

If one is looking for a hint at an answer that runs beyond the much-theorized realms of hacker culture, 'immaterial' and 'cognitive' labour, one may not find it in this book, however (14). The absence of a feminist viewpoint makes itself felt, and with it the questions of care and sustainability become somewhat shallow, leaving reproduction and the feminised everyday behind in favour of the conceptual pair production/consumption (15). Stiegler’s 'care' remains too abstract a concept. As the Heideggerian concept of Sorge on which Stiegler draws heavily, it is blind to how any mode of care is internally and antagonistically split according to class, gender and race. Meanwhile, as many Marxist theorisations of labour, it overlooks the very activities of reproduction that make life - and production and consumption - sustainable.

The New Critique of Political Economy risks leaving these questions untouched in its affirmation of an ‘economy of contribution’ that speaks always from the perspective of the universal and the rational – against a system of stupidity and short-termism, against the very being of the proletarians as proletarians. Having defined proletarianization as a sort of becoming-incapable we must ask: who can change this system? Are proletarians something other or more than simply proletarians? Which bodies are at stake here, and where?

### 1NC – Tech

#### Tech K wrong

#### The world is not encoded by algorithmic accumulation.

Markland, 21—Teaching Fellow in Politics and International Relations at Aston University (Alistair, “Epistemic Transformation at the Margins: Resistance to Digitalisation and Datafication within Global Human Rights Advocacy,” Global Society, February 3, 2021, dml)

As established in the first section of this article, proponents of what I have heuristically defined as the “transformation thesis” have emphasised the revolutionary ruptures wrought by digital connectivity and datafication. Some of these proponents illustrate these changes using field specific case studies, as with Duffield’s (2018) suggestion that the transition to a “cybernetic episteme” is reflected in humanitarian practice. Other authors have taken a more abstract view, including Chandler’s (2018) discussion of new modes of governance in the digital era, or the post-humanist drive to reconceptualise “humanity” under conditions of technological entwinement (Cudworth and Hobden 2013). These assertions of macro-level transformation are also supported by network sociology, led principally by Manuel Castells (2010) analysis of how revolutions in information technology, economic globalisation and an emergent “space of flows” interact to produce a new kind of “network society”. This linkage of societal transformation to economic forces is also characteristic of more critical anti-capitalist perspectives, as with the Marxist critique of “cognitive capitalism” (Moulier-Boutang 2012; Zukerfeld 2017). Although these approaches differ in their conceptual frameworks, they are united in their ambition to highlight universal epistemic transformations brought about by technological change.

One of the pitfalls of these totalising perspectives is the neglect of the particular in favour of the universal. For instance, networked thinking encourages assumptions about lateral transformation across socio-political fields that are connected to the digital universe. But not all spheres of social or political activity move at the same pace when they are exposed to technological innovation. Datafication and digitalisation are processes that have uneven impacts on different social and political fields. For example, the testimony of Facebook’s CEO Mark Zuckerberg to the Senate Judiciary and Commerce Committees in April 2018, where US lawmakers appeared confused by the social media giant’s basic business model, is a stark illustration of the gap that still exists between the world of Big Tech and the operating logics of mainstream democratic politics (Stewart 2018). Bigo and Bonelli (2019, 115) have found that even in the field of transnational intelligence, a sphere that could have much to gain from algorithmic techniques, technological expertise tends to be contracted out to third parties while traditional, human-sourced intelligence approaches remain dominant. Therefore, grasping for totalising processes risks ignoring the empirical specificity of divergent social microcosms.

To remedy this blind side in transformationalist thinking, I assert the utility of applying Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory when conceptualising how certain spheres of social or political activity—including the field of global human rights advocacy discussed in the previous section—mediate pressures for epistemic transformation and potentially isolate technological changes and agents to the margins. Employing field theory, Ole Jacob Sending (2015, 11) sees global governance as divided into separate fields, where “actors compete with each other to be recognised as authorities on what is to be governed, how, and why”. Examples of such fields include international development, security, peacebuilding, humanitarianism, and human rights advocacy. However, each field varies in terms of its specific “rules of the game” (Bourdieu and Waquant 1992, 99). Fields are bounded, game-like social structures that are constituted by a unique constellation of actors. These actors struggle for authority according to the field’s principles of legitimation (Bourdieu 1989, 17). These principles of legitimation, which define a field’s cultural capital, are durable to the extent that dominant actors remain invested in their reproduction. Actors’ prolonged immersion in these fields subsequently shapes their own practical sensibilities, so that the field’s logics are internalised as common sense within the habitus (Bourdieu 1990, 53). It is the embedment of the field’s doxa (common sense) within the habitus of invested actors that makes fields durable and resistant to radical transformations. As seen in the previous section, the rules governing the human rights field are associated with its logic of political influence, persuasion, and moral authority.

Critics of Bourdieusian field theory have argued that it is overly structuralist, reproductive, and cannot grasp “the ever-shifting constellations of actors, institutions, data and forms of expression that make up the expertise” (Waever and Leander 2018, 2). However, alternative approaches such as actor-network theory or assemblage-based theories fail to centralise the importance of social and political struggles between agents which are key in defining the trajectory of digitalisation and datafication. As Ruppert, Isin, and Bigo (2017, 3), “[d]ata does not happen through unstructured social practices but through structured and structuring fields in and through which various agents and their interests generate forms of expertise, interpretation, concepts, and methods that collectively function as fields of power and knowledge”. Similarly, “data is not an already given artefact that exists (which then needs to be mined, analysed, brokered) but an object of investment (in the broadest sense) that is produced by the competitive struggles of professionals who claim stakes in its meaning and functioning” (Bigo, Isin, and Ruppert 2019, 11). Technological change can influence the trajectory of different global political fields by enabling the entry of new types of actors (such as data consultants in the case of human rights advocacy), as well as by producing emergent sources of cultural capital and associated epistemic practices (such as expertise in geospatial imaging).

As Bigo and Bonelli (2019, 120) have observed in the case of the transnational intelligence field, technological change can be accompanied by the growing influence of private companies who “have played a substantial role in the recruitment of IT specialists, network engineers, data analysts, integration platform software designers, language and coding specialists, cryptologists, and mathematicians tasked with creating or combining algorithms”. Such entryism can have a revolutionary effect if those new actors are able redefine a field’s organising logic, cultural capital, and principles of legitimation. For example, looking at the case of Sudan in the 1990s as an antecedent to the transformation of humanitarianism, Duffield (2018, 85) traces how donor governments asserted greater control over NGOs, who subsequently “seamlessly morphed into the ‘implementing partners’ of donor governments”. Alongside growing private sector partnerships, these developments stimulated the neoliberal re-alignment of the humanitarian field away from Third World solidarity and the progressive support for autonomous change and towards the governance of precarity. This exposed the field to an epistemic transformation that privileged datafication based on a “surveillance logic of command and control” (ibid., 168).

However, not all global political fields are so structurally conducive to this kind of radical transformation. The example of the human rights advocacy field illustrates how a strong autonomous organising logic—a logic of persuasion—generates entrenched forms of field-specific cultural capital—qualitative and humanistic accounts of raw suffering that establish clear legal responsibilities. Actors can mobilise digital or data infrastructures to diversify the range of tools and media at their disposal, as illustrated by the (limited) use of geospatial technology, data visualisations in human rights reporting, and a growing reliance on social media platforms to engage audiences. However, they do not necessarily threaten the epistemic practices that are at the centre of human rights advocacy. This is because the transformative potential of new technologies and methods depends on their epistemic, political, social, or moral value in the eyes of the fields’ dominant actors. The integration of data-based approaches has been one of slow adaptation, not revolution, and technological specialists—often employed as third-party consultants rather than as full-time human rights professionals—remain at the margins. The Bourdieusian concept of habitus is also helpful in illuminating how fields with strong professional structures and specific educational and career trajectories can endow members with enduring dispositions that favour both the reproduction of existing epistemic practices and resistance to new ones. The habitus of human rights professionals is still primarily defined by legal, journalistic, and liberal-cosmopolitan moral/political dispositions, rather than technological expertise. So long as processes of doxic reproduction remain stable, the potential for epistemic transformation through datafication remains limited.

Conclusion

This article has cautioned against the analytical trend towards treating datafication as a general process acting to radically transform the epistemic and governance practices across global political fields. Because different social and political fields are unique social microcosms that contain divergent organising principles, readers should be wary of post-humanist analyses making totalising claims about alleged transformations in the human condition. The polemical teleology of transformationalism, an approach that is in vogue among Silicon Valley hype merchants like Elon Musk, public intellectuals, and a growing number of social scientists, is certainly attention grabbing, but it does not measure up against the actual way in which technological and methodological innovations are instituted within different fields of practice. International relations and global governance scholars working on the interstitial cross-roads between technology and various political or social lifeworlds need to be attentive to how digital and data transformations are mediated at the meso level of global politics. This article has demonstrated how epistemic transformation can be resisted at the meso level through observing changes and continuities among elite human rights organisations. Bourdieusian field theory, with its emphasis on legitimacy, social reproduction, and the durability of practical dispositions, offers a suitable framework for conceptualising the absence of epistemic rupture within the field of human rights advocacy. However, because digitalisation and datafication processes are mediated through the specific logics of a given field, more work needs to be done on examining how different organising principles shape the potentialities for epistemic transformation. Thus, in the future, more comparative empirical research will be needed to observe technological changes across different areas of global governance.

### 1NC – Care

#### Care without calculation is BAD - gets coopted by reactionary fascists.

Iveson, 12—Ph.D. from Goldsmiths, University of London (Richard, “Rewiring the Brain or, why our Children are not Human,” Parallax, 18:4, 121-125, dml)

According to Stiegler, we are forever engaged in a ‘battle of intelligence for maturity’, a battle ‘concomitant with the history of humanity’ (p.29). Today, however, this battle has been transformed into the life or death struggle of humanity itself. Unless things change rapidly, Stiegler insists, humanity as we know it will be destroyed, displaced by a dystopian, posthuman future whose inhabitants would be incapable not only of heeding Stiegler’s warning, but of even reading it. Proclaiming himself thus a prophet of and from potentially the last generation of mature adults, Stiegler seeks to hastily recall us to rational critique before the new media has its way and irretrievably restructures the connections which constitute intelligence so as to render such constitution impossible (p.33).

To instaurate critique, however, is no easy matter. It is not simply a question of educational reform, but of a revolution that impacts upon every level of society and beyond, intervening ceaselessly even at the neurological level. Moreover, a revolution by its very nature offers no guarantees. As Stiegler admits, the remedy he prescribes might also turn out to be the worst kind of poison. Indeed, one can all too easily envisage the appropriation of his discourse in the service of a right-wing defence of ‘family values’, and even in a renewed eugenicist discourse which (by way of A Clockwork Orange) deems synaptic rewiring a remedy for ‘delinquency’ within a regime of enforced ‘care’.

### 1NC – Rationality

**( ) Instrumental Reason and Rationality K is wrong and violent.**

**Jones 99** Richard Wyn Jones is a Welsh academic at Cardiff University, where he is currently Professor of Welsh Politics. Professor Wyn Jones is the former Director of the Institute of Welsh Politics and professor in Welsh politics and critical security studies at Aberystwyth University. Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory – 1999. ISBN 1-55587-335-9 (hc. :alk. paper) ON-LINE ED.: Columbia International Affairs Online, Transcribed, proofread, and marked-up in HTML, September 1999.

Although laughing at logic may be an entirely laudable reaction under their circumstances, **it** hardly represents a coherent plan for political action. Indeed, Dialectic of Enlightenment **represents the moment when critical theory**—or at least the strand represented by Adorno and Horkheimer—**abdicated the political battlefield**. If, as the authors suggest, “under the given conditions, the mere continuation of an existence maintaining individual skills of a technical or intellectual nature leads to cretinism even in the prime of life,” then all resistance is useless (Adorno and Horkheimer 1979: 240–241). Theory **The critique of instrumental reason** advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment **effectively heralds the end** of the vision of critical theory that animated the Frankfurt School’s work in the 1930s. As detailed in Chapter 1, Horkheimer’s original vision was of a theoretical orientation that attempted to integrate the insights of the specialized, “bourgeois” sciences within a framework organized intellectually by Marxian social theory and committed to developing an understanding of society in order to aid in the task of its transformation. The extent of the rupture from this position represented by Dialectic of Enlightenment is made explicit in the book’s introduction: Even though we had noticed for some time that in the modern scientific enterprise great discoveries are paid for with the growing decay of theoretical culture, we still thought that we might join in to the extent that we would restrict ourselves largely to criticizing or developing specialized knowledge. Thematically, at any rate, we were to keep to the traditional disciplines of sociology, psychology and the theory of knowledge. The fragments collected in this volume show, however, that we had to abandon that confidence. (translation from Habermas 1984: 454; Adorno and Horkheimer 1979: xi) In Dialectic of Enlightenment **the** specialized **sciences are regarded as irredeemably tainted** **by instrumental reason**: **They have no critical purchase** on their objects; **nor is there any possibility that it could ever be acquired. According to this** analysis**,** the familiar disciplines of **the social sciences are configured to gain a form of instrumental knowledge** about society **that will aid its further manipulation, and it is useless to hope that this could ever change.** In response to this situation, Adorno and Horkheimer “philosophized” critical theory (see Dubiel 1985: 94–95). **Instead of attempting to integrate the insights of** philosophy and the specialized **sciences**, they effectively truncated the project of critical theory. Rather than standing “between philosophy and social science,” to recall the title of a collection of Horkheimer’s early essays, critical theory was repositioned to become a purely philosophical enterprise (Horkheimer 1993). According to this wholly philosophical conceptualization, **critical theory was regarded as “a mental preserve, a** critical **island**, an encapsulation resistant to the instrumentalistic Zeitgeist” (Dubiel 1985: 95). **Critical theory did not attempt to engage theoretically with the real world**

; it became an effort to escape from that world’s clutches and a denial that the world contained any truth. One important result of this effort was that the possibility of immanent critique, a critical tool Horkheimer had championed in “Traditional and Critical Theory,” was abandoned. As discussed in Chapter 1, immanent critique was a technique adopted by the Frankfurt School in the 1930s in order to criticize any prevailing order without appealing to an external, ahistorical Archimedean point in order to ground that critique. Immanent critique depends on comparing an object (a particular institution or situation) with the unrealized possibilities existent within it. But of course if it is true that enlightenment and domination are thoroughly entwined, as the “black writers of the bourgeoisie” argue (Adorno and Horkheimer 1979: 117), if the baleful effects of instrumental reason have insinuated themselves into every aspect of human existence, if Adorno is correct to argue that “nothing complicitous with this world can have any truth” (Jameson 1990: 177–178), then immanent critique becomes impossible. In the hermetic society dissected in Dialectic of Enlightenment, there is no immanent “ought” or “might be” according to which the “is” might be measured. The abandonment of immanent critique left Adorno and Horkheimer with two choices. They could either succumb to a thoroughgoing relativism or attempt to identify a source of truth and grounding for critique external to society. Given their hostility toward relativism, which they regarded, to quote Adorno, as making “common cause with untruth” (Bronner 1994: 206), it is hardly surprising that they chose the latter path even if it left them open to many of the same charges that Horkheimer had made against traditional theory in “Traditional and Critical Theory.” As will be briefly discussed in the concluding remarks to this chapter, Adorno sought for truth in aesthetics, whereas Horkheimer adopted a godless theology. What is important to note here is that both men effectively abandoned all hope that progressive change was possible in the social realm. A further theoretical corollary of the critique of instrumental reason advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment was the ending of critical theory’s orientation toward political practice. The Horkheimer of “Traditional and Critical Theory” remained fully committed to Marx’s famous dictum in the “Thesis on Feuerbach”: “Philosophers have thus far only sought to understand the world; the point is to change it” (Marx 1976b: 5). Although he was less than sanguine that revolutionary change could be affected and certainly entertained no illusions about contemporary Communist parties, he still argued that the aim of the critical theorist should be to form “a dynamic unity with the oppressed class, so that his presentation of societal contradictions is not merely an expression of the concrete historical situation but also a force within it to stimulate change” (Horkheimer 1972: 215). But in the hermetic society depicted in Dialectic of Enlightenment, the proletariat has lost its emancipatory vocation. In a society wholly controlled by the iron logic of instrumental reason, Adorno and Horkheimer argue, human subjectivity has become an empty shell. Human beings have become mere pawns of instrumental rationality and in particular its most powerful modern manifestation, the culture industry. People cannot think for themselves let alone work for a better world. The philosophized critical theory of Dialectic of Enlightenment does not hope to change this situation. Indeed, Adorno and Horkheimer argue that any attempt to do so would inevitably implicate the theory in the logic of instrumental rationality. **The tragedy of the position in which the critical theorists found themselves is overwhelming**. ***If* their analysis is correct**, then **silence** in the face of the prevailing order **is** tantamount to **acquiescence** with it. **However, any attempt to intervene practically** to change that order **is doomed to succumb to** **and** even **strengthen** **the** very instrumental **rationality** that **they are attempting to resist**: It is characteristic of the sickness [of contemporary society] that even the best intentioned reformer who uses an impoverished and debased language to recommend renewal, by his adoption of the insidious mode of categorization and the bad philosophy it conceals, strengthens the very power of the established order he is trying to break. (Adorno and Horkheimer 1979: xiv) Caught between the Scylla of mute acceptance and the Charybdis of self–defeating efforts at political relevance, the only possible course open to Adorno and Horkheimer is that of pure negation. In a hermetic society **all critical theory can do is criticize the false totality in which it finds itself**. It cannot hope to propose alternatives or exhort people to action; rather, critical theory must consist solely of the steadfast rejection of any notion that the world contains anything remotely resembling justice, liberty, and beauty—“nothing complicitous with this world can have any truth.” And of course, given the totalitarian and totalizing impact of instrumental rationality on society, Adorno and Horkheimer are aware that it is highly unlikely that there can ever be an audience for their work. In response, they came to regard critical theory as a message in a bottle to be thrown at the mercy of history, its destination unknown. Even if the message should one day be taken up, then, in the words of Horkheimer, “we can hope for no more than that, would day ever break, our writings will be recognized as a very little star that had shown, though barely perceptible, in the horrible light of the present” (Dubiel 1985: 84). But of course the whole point of the analysis advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment is that day will never break, and **critical theory is** thus **condemned to perpetual** practical **irrelevance**. Emancipation is central to the version of critical theory developed by Horkheimer in “Traditional and Critical Theory.” Immanent critique depends on the possibility of emancipatory social change, and critical theory’s view of its own place in society—its ultimate aspiration to be involved in political praxis—also depends on such change being achievable. But the analysis advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment leads to the abandonment of all hope in the possibility of progressive development. However, a concept of emancipation continues to play an important role even in this revised understanding of critical theory, though the notion of what emancipation might mean has been certainly greatly modified. The understanding of emancipation adopted in “Traditional and Critical Theory” is an orthodoxly Marxian one. Horkheimer shares the classic Hegelian–Marxist vision of an emancipated society as a rational society. Such a society would result from a process in which humankind brought nature under its control through organized development planned in such a way that it benefited the species as a whole rather than simply individuals within it. But of course, according to the analysis advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment, the very process of the domination of nature, far from leading to emancipation, in fact leads to ever greater domination of humankind’s inner nature. The type of rationality necessary to domesticate and control the natural world leads to ever greater barbarism in human relations. In the light of this analysis, Adorno and Horkheimer suggest an alternative conceptualization of emancipation. Unsurprisingly, this conceptualization envisages a different relationship between humankind and nature wherein emancipation lies through a “reconciliation” with nature (Adorno and Horkheimer 1979: 54). Emancipation requires a realization by humanity that it is of nature rather than above nature and a concomitant development by humanity of a noninstrumental, nontechnical relationship with nature. Humanity must somehow learn how to value nature in and of itself. **But** **given** **that the critique of instrumental rationality** advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment **is itself based on totalizing assumptions** about humankind—**in effect, a set of** anthropological **claims about humanity’s relations** with its material surroundings, as well as intraspecies relationships—**all such depictions must remain at the level of hypothesis.** Adorno and Horkheimer cannot point to any concrete examples of what types of institutions and relationships might characterize a more emancipated society. Such examples have never existed, and given the all–pervading effects of instrumental rationality, it is clear that they never could. So the radically revised notion of emancipation advanced in Dialectic of Enlightenment is utopian in the negative sense: It has no relationship to the real world; it is literally unimaginable (Wellmer 1983: 92). To be sure, emancipation remains a kind of regulative ideal for Adorno and Horkheimer. But given that it is, by definition, indescribable and that any attempt to describe it inevitably succumbs to the very instrumentalist logic it endeavors to resist, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that **the commitment of critical theorists to emancipation became merely metaphysical** in character.

# Block

## T

### 2NC---TVA

#### ---Anti-Technocrat AFF---disproves all of their technocracy offense because this author worked in government and still advocates against technocrats directly.

Vaheesan ‘18

Sandeep Vaheesan previously served as a regulations counsel at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, where he helped develop and draft the first comprehensive federal rule on payday, vehicle title, and high-cost installment loans. Vaheesan has published articles and essays on a variety of topics in antitrust law, including the relationship between antitrust and workers and the political content of antitrust. His writing has appeared in the Berkeley Business Law Journal, Harvard Law & Policy Review, Nebraska Law Review, University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law, and Yale Law Journal Forum. He received a B.A. from the University of Maryland and a J.D. and M.A. from Duke University. “The Twilight of the Technocrats’ Monopoly on Antitrust?” – Yale Law Journal – vol 127 - JUNE 04, 2018 - #E&F - https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/the-twilight-of-the-technocrats-monopoly-on-antitrust

While the antitrust technocrats have been on the march, Congress has been dormant. Its antitrust activities have been confined to secondary issues.48 This combination of technocratic hyperactivism and legislative lethargy has created, in the words of Harry First and Spencer Waller, “an antitrust system captured by lawyers and economists advancing their own self-referential goals, free of political control and economic accountability.”49 Although proponents of technocratic antitrust may characterize it as “pure” or “scientific,” the reality is quite different as big business interests and their representatives dominate debate within this cloistered enterprise.50

This congressional indifference to antitrust is not inevitable. Despite prolonged quietude, Congress could become an active player in antitrust again. Some members of Congress are showing a renewed awareness of the field and an interest in reasserting control over the content of the antitrust statutes.51 The most democratically accountable branch of the federal government may be poised to take the lead on antitrust in the coming years, reclaiming authority over a technocracy that has not answered to the public in decades.

### 2NC---AT: Algorithms Thesis

#### ‘Technics’ and ‘mnetic desires’ do not explain society.

Susen, 20—Reader in Sociology at the School of Arts and Social Sciences of City, University of London (Simon, “No escape from the technosystem?,” Philosophy & Social Criticism, Vol 46, Issue 6, 2020, dml)

A major irony of Feenberg’s book is the following contradiction: on several occasions, he criticizes, and distances himself from, technological determinism; key parts of his argument suggest, however, that he himself flirts with, if not subscribes to, technological determinism. He rightly maintains, and convincingly demonstrates, that ‘society and technology are inextricably imbricated’.240 This insight justifies the underlying assumption that there is no comprehensive study of society without a critical sociology of technology. Yet, to contend that ‘[s]ocial groups exist through the technologies that bind their members together’241 is misleading. For not all social groups are primarily defined by the technologies that enable their members to relate to, and to bond with, one another. Indeed, not all social relations, or social bonds, are based on, let alone determined by, technology. Of course, Feenberg is right to argue that ‘technologically mediated groups influence technical design through their choices and protests’.242 Ultimately, though, the previous assertion is tautological. This becomes clear if, in the above sentence, we replace the word ‘technological(ly)’ with terms such as ‘cultural(ly)’, ‘linguistical(ly)’, ‘political(ly)’, ‘economic(ally)’, or indeed another sociological qualifier commonly used to characterize the specificity of a social relation. Hence, we may declare that ‘culturally, linguistically, politically, and economically mediated groups influence cultural, linguistic, political, and economic conventions through their choices and protests’. In saying so, we are stating the obvious. If, however, we aim to make a case for cultural, linguistic, political, or economic determinism, then this is problematic to the extent that we end up reducing the constitution of social arrangements to the product of one overriding causal set of forces (whether these be cultural, linguistic, political, economic, technological, or otherwise). While declaring that he is a critic of technological determinism, Feenberg – in central passages of his book – gives the impression that he is one of its fiercest advocates. Feenberg’s techno-Marxist evolutionism is based on the premise that ‘progress is realized essentially through technosystem change’243 – that is, on the assumption that, effectively, human progress is reducible to technological development. Feenberg is right to stress that ‘[t]echnical progress is joined indissolubly to the democratic enlargement of access to its benefits and protection from its harms’.244 ‘Concretization’,245 understood in this way, conceives of progress as a ‘local, context-bound phenomenon uniting technical and normative dimensions’.246 We may add, however, that progress has not only technical (or technological) but also economic, cultural, and political dimensions, which contain objective, normative, and subjective facets. At times, the differentiation between these aspects is blurred, if not lost, in Feenberg’s account, given his tendency to overstate the power of technology at the expense of other crucial social forces. In other words, progress is not only ‘inextricably entangled with the technosystem’,247 but it is also indissolubly entwined with the economic, cultural, and political systems in which it unfolds and for (or against) which it exerts its objective, normative, and subjective power. The preceding reflection takes us back to the problem of techno-reductionism: The struggle over the technosystem began with the labor movement. Workers’ demands for health and safety on the job were public interventions into production technology.248 All struggles over social (sub)systems have not only a technological but also various other (notably economic, cultural, and political) dimensions. Demands made by particular subjects (defined by class, ethnicity, gender, age, or ability – or a combination of these sociological variables) are commonly expressed in public interventions not only into production technology, but also into economic, cultural, and political systems. In all social struggles (including class struggle), technology can be an important means to an end, but it is rarely an end in itself. Put differently, social struggles are partly – but seldom essentially, let alone exclusively – about technology.

## Frames

### 2NC---Link

#### The Aff deploys the phrase “monopoly”. This terminology originates from a neoliberal lexicon. It *occludes the aff’s alternate perspectives on the world* AND simultaneously *secures a system of neoliberal violence*.

Saltman ‘7

Kenneth J. Saltman is an associate professor in the Department of Education Policy Studies and Research of the School of Education at DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois. “Schooling in Disaster Capitalism: How the Political Right Is Using Disaster To Privatize Public Schooling” - Teacher Education Quarterly, Spring 2007 - #E&F - https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795160.pdf

In education, neoliberalism has pervasively infiltrated with radical implications, remaking educational practical judgment and forwarding the privatization and deregulation program. The steady rise of privatization and the shift to business language and logic can be understood through the extent to which neoliberal ideals have succeeded in taking over educational debates. Neoliberalism appears in the now common sense framing of education through presumed ideals of upward individual economic mobility (the promise of cashing in knowledge for jobs) and the social ideals of global economic competition. In this view national survival hinges upon educational preparation for international economic supremacy. The preposterousness of this assumption comes as school kids rather than corporate executives are being blamed for the global economic race to the bottom. The "TINA" thesis (There Is No Alternative to the Market) that has come to dominate politics throughout much of the world has infected educational thought as omnipresent market terms such as "accountability," "choice," "efficiency," "competition," "monopoly," and "performance" frame educational debates. Nebulous terms borrowed from the business world such as "achievement," "excellence," and "best practices" conceal ongoing struggles over competing values, visions, and ideological perspectives. (Achieve what? Excel at what? Best practices for whom? And says who?) The only questions left on reform agendas appear to be how to best enforce knowledge and curriculum conducive to individual upward mobility within the economy and national economic interest as it contributes to a corporately managed model of globalization as perceived from the perspective of business. This is a dominant and now commonplace view of education propagated by such influential writers as Thomas Friedman in his books and New York Times columns, and such influential grant-givers as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

#### Here’s more proof that it’s the inadvertently naturalization of neoliberal rhetoric that’s vital to propping up the system’s violent underpinnings.

Greene ‘12

et al; internally quoting John Budd – an Emeritus Prof in the College of Education and Human Development at the Univ of Missouri - Margaret Greene, Masters Graduate, Department of Computer and Information Sciences University of Strathclyde – “The emergence and impact of neoliberal ideology on UK public library policy, 1997-2010” - Library and Information Science Trends and Research: Europe, Volume 6 – Dec 4th - #E&F - https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/34342/1/greene\_mcmenemy\_revised.pdf

Budd argues that neoliberalism operates most effectively through rhetoric (Budd, 2008) and consequently that the choice offered under this regime is illusionary and limited (p.174-75). The rhetoric of neoliberalism relies on naturalising the language of markets and transactions into everyday usage and which eventually means they can be represented as the truth.