## 1 – th

**Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the advantage area 30 minutes before round.**

**Violation: Graphical user interface, text, application, Teams

Description automatically generated**

#### Standards:

**1. Limits- plan affs means that their advantage could functionally be anything from the world which means we don't get a quality push versus the crux of their advantage. That forces the negative into reading either A] Advocacies that have nothing to with their advantage area or B] Really bad generics that the aff will always be ahead on. It makes clash non-specific and arbritary at best**

**2. Clash- not disclosing means we can’t to have any genuine chance at prepping a strategy.**

#### Paradigm:

Advocacy skills – they’re the only thing we leave the debate space with. This makes advocacy skills a prior question to the aff offense – understanding how to be antiracist in multiple instances outweighs any reasons why their aff specifically is good.

**No RVIs –**

a) chilling effect – they discourage me from checking against abuse.

b) theory baiting – they encourage the aff to be as abusive as possible and win the RVI.

**Drop the debater**

a) drop the argument doesn’t make sense on theory because that gets rid of their whole advocacy and destroys any neg offense.

b) they should lose to deter future abusive affs.

## 2 – th

#### Interpretation: the aff must disclose the framework of the 1ac 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation: SS in the doc.

#### It’s a voter for strat skew. My pre-round prep is eviscerated by not knowing what impacts matter under their fwk. This forces us to start preparing for the aff right when we get the aff which destroys clash because we cant form good 1nc strategy without knowing what matters. For example their model allows us to spend pre round prepping the rawls aff but then it is a util aff. This exacerbates the advantages of being aff because they already get infinite prep time and destroys neg flex.

## 3 – da

## A. Link

#### [Eidlin] Strikes put a band-aid on a broken leg – they do nothing to transform the employer-employee relationship.

Eidlim – brackets in text: Eidlin, Barry. [Assistant professor of sociology at McGill University and the author of Labor and the Class Idea in the United States and Canada]. “Why Unions Are Good – But Not Good Enough,” *Jacobin,* January 6, 2020. EM <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing>

Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of “the working class” or “working-class activity,” we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory’s central goals: overthrowing capitalism. Unions by their very existence affirm and reinforce capitalist class society. As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers, unions only exist in relation to capitalists. This makes them almost by definition reformist institutions, designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform it. Many unions have adapted to this conservative, managerial role. Others have played key roles in challenging capital’s power. Some have even played insurgent roles at one moment and managerial roles at others. When unions have organized workplace insurgencies, this has sometimes translated into political pressure that expanded democracy and led to large-scale policy reforms. In the few revolutionary historical moments that we can identify, worker organization, whether called unions or something else, has been essential. Thus, labor unions and movements have long been a central focus of Marxist debate. At its core, the debate centers around the role of unions in class formation, the creation of the revolutionary working-class agent. The debate focuses on four key questions. **First, to what degree do unions simply reflect existing relations of production and class struggle**, or actively shape those relations? Second, if unions actively shape class struggle, why and under what conditions do they enhance or inhibit it? Third, how do unions shape class identities, and how does this affect unions’ scope of action? Fourth, what is the relation between unions and politics? This question is comprised of two sub-questions: to what degree do unions help or hinder struggles in the workplace becoming broader political struggles? And how should unions relate to political parties, the more conventional vehicle for advancing political demands? The following is a chapter from [The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx](https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545) (Oxford University Press, 2019). It assesses Marxist debates surrounding trade unions, oriented by the four questions mentioned previously. It proceeds historically, first examining how Marx and Engels conceived of the roles and limitations of trade unions, then tracing how others within Marxism have pursued these debates as class relations and politics have changed over time. While the chapter includes some history of labor unions and movements themselves, the central focus is on how Marxist theorists thought of and related to those movements. Marx and Engels wrote extensively about the unions of their time, although never systematically. The majority of their writings on unions responded to concrete labor struggles of their time. From their earliest works, they grasped unions’ necessity and limitations in creating a working-class agent capable of advancing class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This [departed](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/wusa.12021) from previous variants of socialism, often based in idealized views of rebuilding a rapidly eroding community of artisanal producers, which did not emphasize class organization or class struggle. Writing in The Condition of the Working Class in England about emerging forms of unionism, Engels observed that even though workers’ primary struggles were over material issues such as wages, they pointed to a deeper social and political conflict: What gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They im­ ply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order. At the same time, Engels saw that, even as union struggles “[kept alive] the opposition of the workers to the … omnipotence of the bourgeoisie,” so too did they “[compel] the admission that something more is needed than Trades Unions and strikes to break the power of the ruling class.” Here Engels articulates the crux of the problem. First, unions are essential for working-class formation, creating a collective actor both opposed to the bourgeoisie and capable of challenging it for power.

#### [Andrew] Worker’s investment and management of the industry further entrenches capitalism.

**Andrew**: Andrew, Edward. [Canadian writer for the journal of political science] “Work and Freedom in Marcuse and Marx”, *Canadian Political Science Association and the Société québécoise de science politique,* June, 1970. EM https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3231633.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A59b6935b3a9423fc2d414dbd343c575b

**Marcuse is not concerned with "basic" transformations in society; he is not interested in the technical innovations that would make mechanized labour less mechanical: nor does he deal with reorganization of unions nor with workers' participation in industry. Rather, after his violent denunciation of capitalism, in the rather limp conclusion to One-Dimensional Man, he advocates an extension of the welfare state, the elimination of the spurious needs created by ad- vertising, an extension of birth control programs, an increase in privacy so as not to compel the sensitive to be inflicted with the "sounds, sights and smells" of the mass, the prevention of the pollution of air and water, the creation of parks and gardens, and the better treatment of animal life.**25 Many of these programs may be worthy objectives, but it is less clear that they would consti- tute basic changes in our economical system, changes which are fundamental to a socialist revolution. The reason that Marcuse does not advocate radical alteration in the economic base of society is because he perceives that capitalist modes of production are well on their way to becoming automated. Automation is "the very base of all forms of human freedom."26 **While men have to work, they cannot be free. Hence there is no point in the creation of machinery designed to actualize the human potential in work as human fulfilment can only be found outside the work process.** Nor is there any value in substantial alterations in the relations of production, alterations aimed at transferring the power of making technical and policy decisions (including control of training schools and institutes of education) from management to the unions. Radical alterations in the means and relations of production would only be palliatives; complete freedom, the aim of socialism, is only possible through the complete substitution of human labour by machines. **Moreover Marcuse sees the workers in modern societies to be so conditioned and manipulated by the ruling class that they are not capable of revolutionary action or industrial self-management.** The conservative character of modern workers militates "against the notion that the replacement of the prevailing control over the productive process by 'control from below' would mean the advent of qualitative change.""27 **Marcuse opposes the aim of "autogestion" (workers' control or management of industry) which is advocated by French and Italian unionists. This strategy cannot lead to ever-increasing power of the workers and a basis for a transition to socialism. Workers' control of industrial processes and policy would lead to the creation of vested interests of labour within the capitalist system, interests which would further entrench and solidify capitalism.28**

### B. Impacts

#### [Marcuse 1] THIS MAKES CAP STRONGER – people won’t fight against it if the conditions are better.

**Marcuse 1**:Marcuse, Herbert. [University of Berlin, University of Freiburg. Author of numerous books. Taught at Columbia, Harvard, and Brandeis universities.] “One – Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society”, *Beacon Press,* 1964. EM

Now it is precisely this new consciousness, this "space within," the space for the transcending historical practice, which is being barred by a society in which subjects as well as objects constitute instrumentalities in a whole that has its raison d'etre in the accomplishments of its overpowering productivity. **Its supreme promise is an ever-more-comfortable life for an ever-growing number of people who, in a strict sense, cannot imagine a qualitatively different universe** of discourse and action, for the capacity to contain and manipulate subversive imagination and effort is an integral part of the given society**.** Those whose life is the hell of the Affluent Society are kept in line by a brutality which revives medieval and early modern practices. For the other, less underprivileged people, **society takes care of the need for liberation by satisfying the needs which make servitude palatable and perhaps even unnoticeable**, and it accomplishes this fact in the process of production itself. Under its impact, the laboring classes in the advanced areas of industrial civilization are undergoing a decisive transformation, which has become the subject of a vast sociological research. I shall enumerate the main factors of this transformation:

**He adds:**

Such a qualitatively new mode of existence can never be envisaged as the mere by-product of economic and political changes, as the more or less spontaneous effect of the new institutions which constitute the necessary prerequisite. **Qualitative change also involves a change in the technical basis on which this society rests--one which sustains the economic and political institutions through which the "second nature" of man as an aggressive object of administration is stabilized. The techniques of industrialization are political techniques; as such, they prejudge the possibilities of Reason and Freedom.** To be sure, labor must precede the reduction of labor, and industrialization must precede the development of human needs and satisfactions. But as all freedom depends on the conquest of alien necessity, the realization of freedom depends on the techniques of this conquest. The highest productivity of labor can be used for the perpetuation of labor, and the most efficient industrialization can serve the restriction and manipulation of needs. When this point is reached, domination-in the guise of affluence and liberty--extends to all spheres of private and public existence, integrates all authentic opposition, absorbs all alternatives. Technological rationality reveals its political char- acter as it becomes the great vehicle of better domination, creating a truly totalitarian universe in which society and nature, mind and body are kept in a state of permanent mobilization for the defense of this universe.

#### [Marcuse 2] This is the construction of liberties under inequality and unfreedom.

**Marcuse 2**:Marcuse, Herbert. [University of Berlin, University of Freiburg. Author of numerous books. Taught at Columbia, Harvard, and Brandeis universities.] “One – Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society”, *Beacon Press,* 1964. EM

This kind of masterly enslavement is not essentially different from that of the typist, the bank teller, the high-pressure sales- man or saleswoman, and the television announcer. Standardization and the routine assimilate productive and non-productive jobs. **The proletarian of the previous stages of capitalism was indeed the beast of burden, by the labor of his body procuring the necessities and luxuries of life while living in filth and poverty. Thus he was the living denial of his society.** organized worker in the advanced areas of the technological society lives this denial less conspicuously and, like the other human objects of the social division of labor, he is being incorporated into the technological community of the administered population. Moreover, in the most successful areas of automation, some sort of technological community seems to integrate the human atoms at work. The machine seems to instill some drugging rhythm in the operators: "It is generally agreed that interdependent motions performed by a group of persons which follow a rhythmic pattern yield satisfaction-quite apart from what is being accomplished by the motions";

**He adds:**

**The new technological work-world thus enforces a weakening of the negative position of the working class: the latter no longer appears to be the living contradiction to the established society.** This trend is strengthened by the effect of the technological organization of production on the other side of the fence: on management and direction. Domination is transfigured into administration. The capitalist bosses and owners are losing their identity as responsible agents; they are assuming the function of bureaucrats in a corporate machine. Within the vast hierarchy of executive and managerial boards extending far beyond the individual establishment into the scientific laboratory and research institute, the national government and national purpose, the tangible source of exploitation disappears behind the fac;:ade of objective rational- ity. Hatred and frustration are deprived of their specific target, and **the technological veil conceals the reproduction of inequality and enslavement. With technical progress as its instrument, unfreedom-in the sense of man's subjection to his productive apparatus-is perpetuated and intensified in the form of many liberties and comforts.** The novel feature is the overwhelming rationality in this irrational enterprise, and the depth of the pre- conditioning which shapes the instinctual drives and aspirations of the individuals and obscures the difference between false and true consciousness. **For in reality, neither the utilization of other things the worker wants which the employer is not willing to give him.... We're searching. We're searching." Labor Looks At Labor.** A Conversation, (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1963) p. 16£ 21 Is it still necessary to denounce the ideology of the "managerial revolution?" Capitalist production proceeds through the investment of private capital for the private extraction and appropriation of surplus value, and capital is a social instrument for the domination of man by man. **The essential features of this process are in no way altered by** the spread of stock-holding, the separation of ownership from management, etc. administrative rather than physical controls (hunger, personal dependence, force), nor the change in the character of heavy work, nor the assimilation of occupational classes, nor **the equalization in the sphere of consumption** compensate for the fact that the decisions over life and death, over personal and national security are made at places over which the individuals have no control**.** The slaves of developed industrial civilization are sublimated slaves, but they are slaves, for slavery is determined’