



I

I

## **NSD21 Alienation AC**



## FW

1]Capitalism alienates humans, the labor of workers is unfree and controlled by the market. Under capitalism humans only exist to serve the market. Capitalism appropriates human product into a capitalist agent. Jaeggi 16

[Jaeggi, Rahel, et al. *Alienation*. Columbia University Press, 2016] SLS

**We can identify two dimensions of the deficit in the relation to self and world that Marx theorizes as alienation: first, the inability** meaningfully **to identify with what one does** and with those with whom one does it; **second, the inability to exert control over what one does**—that is, the inability to be, individually or collectively, the subject of one's actions. **Alienation** from the object—**from the product of one's own activity—means** at once **loss of control** and dispossession: **the alienated worker** (as the seller of her labor power) **no longer has at her disposal what she herself has produced**; it does not belong to her. **Her product is exchanged on a market she does not control and under conditions she does not control.** Alienation also means that the object must appear to her as fragmented: laboring under conditions of specialization and the division of labor, the worker has no relation to the product of her work as a whole. **As someone who is involved in one of the many specialized acts that make up the production** of Adam Smith's famous pin, **she has no relation to the pin as a finished product**, as small as the pin might be. Put differently, the product of her specific labor—**her specific contribution to the production of the pin—does not fit for her into a meaningful whole, a unity with significance.** The same pairing of powerlessness and loss of meaning (or impoverishment) marks the worker's alienation from her own activity. **Alienated labor is**, on the one hand, **unfree activity, labor in which and into which one is forced. In her labor the alienated worker is not the master of what she does.** Standing under foreign command, **her labor is determined by an other**, or heteronomous. "If he relates to his own activity as to an unfree activity, then he relates to it as an activity performed in the service, under the domination, the coercion, and the yoke of another human being."<sup>5</sup> And, being powerless, **the worker can neither comprehend nor control the process as a whole of which she is a part but that remains untransparent to her.** At the same time, **alienated labor is also characterized by**—as a counterpart to the product's fragmentation—**the fragmentation and impoverishment of laboring activity.** Thus Marx also regards as alienated **the dullness and limited character of the labor** itself, "**which make the human being into as abstract a being as possible**, a lathe, etc., and transforms her into a spiritual and physical monstrosity" (as he says in his "Comments on James Mill"). Alienation from others, from the world of social relations of cooperation, also reflects these two dimensions: in alienated labor the worker has no control over what she, together with others, does. And **in alienated labor others are for her, one could say, "structurally indifferent."**<sup>6</sup> It is interesting and of great importance for his theory that **Marx denounces not only the instrumentalization of the worker by the owner of her labor power but also the instrumental relation to herself that the worker acquires through it.** From Marx's perspective, the instrumental relation that the worker develops (or is forced to develop) to herself and to her labor under conditions of alienation also appears problematic—or, more forcefully, "inhuman." What is alienating about **alienated labor** is that it **has no intrinsic purpose, that it is not (at least also) performed for its own sake.** Activities performed in an alienated way are understood by those who carry them out not as ends but only as means. In the same way, one regards the capacities one acquires from or brings to the activity—and therefore also oneself—as means rather than ends. In other words, one does not identify with what one does. Instrumentalization, in turn, intensifies into utter meaninglessness: When Marx says that **under conditions of alienation life itself becomes a means** ("life itself appears only as a means to life")<sup>7</sup>—**what should be an end takes on the character of a means**—he is describing a completely meaningless event, or, as one could say, the structure of meaninglessness itself. Formulated differently, for Marx the infinite regress of ends is meaninglessness. In this respect Marx is an Aristotelian: there must be an end that is not itself in turn a means.<sup>8</sup> Here we see the concept's many layers: as alienated one does not possess what one has oneself produced (and is therefore exploited and dispossessed);<sup>9</sup> one has no control over, or power to determine, what one does and is therefore powerless and unfree; at the same time, **one is unable to realize oneself in one's own activities and is therefore exposed to meaningless, impoverished, and instrumental relations with which one cannot identify and in which one experiences oneself**

as internally divided. Conversely, the “real appropriation” that Marx contrasts with this type of alienation represents a form of wealth that goes beyond the mere distribution of property.<sup>10</sup> Appropriation in this sense includes taking possession of, gaining power over, and finding meaning in something. Thus the content of what could one could call Marx’s conception of the good life is an idea of self-realization understood as an identificatory, appropriative relation to oneself and to the world.<sup>11</sup>

**2]Challenging Cap should come first because challenging it is necessary for all other oppressive structures – anything else ignores intersections between those oppressions, Ollman<sup>[1]</sup>**

So why should people involved in the social movements be interested in Marxism? Well—because most of them/us are also workers (white collar as well as blue collar), and Marxism is invaluable in helping to develop a strategy that serv[ing] es their/our interests as workers. Because the other forms of domination from which they we suffer all have a capitalist component, and Marxism best explains it. Because even those parts of these oppressions that are older than capitalism have acquired a capitalist form and function, so that a Marxist analysis of capitalism is required to distinguish what is historically specific in their operation from what is not. And, lastly, because overturning capitalism is the necessary (though not sufficient) condition for doing away with all forms of domination including domination over nature, and only a class conscious working class has the numbers (still), the power (potentially), and the interests (always) to bring about a change of this magnitude. Hence, the priority Marxists give to class analysis and class based politics (which does not rule out organizing around other oppressions at specific times for specific purposes). The priority given to class here (not to “the workers” but to “us as workers”) has nothing to do with who is hurting more or which form of oppression is more immoral or which dominated group happens to be in motion, and everything to do with what is the adequate framework and vantage point for grasping the specific manner in which all these oppressions are interacting now and how best to get rid of them all. (And this is what Albert caricatures as a “master discourse”). I do not expect that simply making these claims has convinced anyone that they are right, but I hope they help clarify where the real disagreements between Marxist and social movement theorists lie, and, hence, what is worth discussing if we are ever to construct the united movement that is needed to achieve our—yes!—common goals.

**The standard and role of the ballot is resisting alienation and capitalism**

**Prefer our Standard**

**If we do not resist alienation we have no free will, the ability to make ethical choices stems from being free, thus nothing and no one is moral under alienation**

**Capitalism causes alienation because labor is appropriated for the free market, we must resist capitalism**

**Alienation isn’t the same oppression or structural violence – it is not only the literal denial of freedom, but also the failure to realize that freedom and relation to the world – alienation comes first.**

Rahel **Jaeggi 2** (August 2014). “Alienation.” Columbia University Press. Translated by Frederick Neuhouser and Alan E. Smith. Edited by Frederick Neuhouser. Rahel Jaeggi is professor of social and political philosophy at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Her research focuses on ethics, social philosophy, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology, social ontology, and critical theory. LHP SLS

What then is alienation? “It seems that whenever he feels that something is not as it should be, he characterizes it in terms of alienation.”<sup>7</sup> This re- mark of Richard Schacht’s about Erich Fromm seems an apt description of how the concept is often used (and not only by Fromm). However, as varied as the aforementioned phenomena might be, they provide an initial sketch of the concept of alienation. An alienated relation is a deficient relation one has to oneself, to the world, and to others. Indifference, instrumentalization, reification, absurdity, artificiality, isolation, meaninglessness, impotence—all these ways of characterizing the relations in question are forms of this deficiency. A distinctive feature of the concept of alienation is that it refers not only to powerlessness and a lack of freedom but also to a characteristic impoverishment of the relation to self and world. (This is how we should understand the dual meaning Marx means to convey[s] when he describes alienation in

terms of the "double loss of reality" of the world and the human being: having become unreal, **the individual fails to experience herself as "effective," and the world, having become unreal, is meaningless and indifferent.** It is the complexity of these interrelations that has made alienation into the key concept of diagnoses of the crisis of modernity and one of the foundational concepts of social philosophy. As an expression of a crisis in contemporary consciousness (as Hegel might have regarded it), the modern discussion of alienation stretches from Rousseau and Schiller, via Hegel, to Kierkegaard and Marx. Elevated to the "sickness of civilization par excellence,"<sup>8</sup> alienation became, from the eighteenth century onward, a cipher used to communicate the "uncertainty, fragmentation, and internal division" in humans' relations to themselves and to the world that accompanied the growth of industrialization. It was this diagnosis that Marx captured in his theory of alienation and put to work in his critique of capitalism. And the "modern human's loss of an essential definition or calling" shapes the existentialist question,<sup>9</sup> deriving from Kierkegaard, of what it means both to be oneself and to lose oneself. To this tradition, experiences of indifference and radical foreignness appear as nothing less than an ontologically situated misapprehension of the world and the human's relation to self and world, which, despite all divergences from the Marxian diagnosis, also has something in common with it. Diagnoses of alienation in their modern form always concern (for example) freedom and self-determination and the failure to realize them. Understood in this way, alienation is not simply a problem of modernity but also a modern problem.

## **Our greatest ethical obligation is to resist capitalism – it's relevant under any moral theory. MORGARIDGE:**

Morgaridge, Clayton, Prof of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College, 1998, Why Capitalism is Evil 08/22 <http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html> SLS

Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior. The 20th century proves otherwise. What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other. So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response? This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism. But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care. Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably

survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism. Nevertheless, I want to claim, the **putting the world at the disposal of** those with **[with] capital has done more damage to the ethical life than anything else.** To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism,** Marx writes, **everything** in nature

and everything that human beings are and can do **becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to** the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of **markets and** the circulation of **money.** For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. **Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are**

**valuable only** if they can be used **to turn a profit** [1] If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced.

Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. **Capital profits from the production of** food, shelter, and all the **necessities** of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as

caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. **Therefore ethics,** the overriding commitment to meeting human need, **is left out of deliberations about what** the heavyweight **institutions of** our **society are going to do.** Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always

with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. **Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.**





## Offense

**Resolved: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike**

**Workers are harassed and threatened when exercising their legal right to collectivize which helps to reinforce alienation because the worker's right to regulate their work is being taken away Lafer and Loustaunau 20**

"Fear At Work" 7/23/20 Lafer, Gordon and Loustaunau, Lola.

<https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/>  
LHP SLS

**Most American workers want a union in their workplace but very few have it, because the right to organize**—supposedly guaranteed by federal law—**has been** effectively **cancelled out by** a combination of legal and illegal **employer intimidation tactics**. This report focuses on the legal tactics—heavy-handed tactics that would be illegal in any election for public office but are regularly deployed by employers under the broken National Labor Relations Board's union election system. Under this system, **employees in workplace elections have no right to free speech or a free press, are threatened with losing their jobs if they vote to establish a union, and can be forced to hear one-sided propaganda** with no right to ask questions or hear from opposing viewpoints. **Employers**—including many respectable, name-brand companies—**collectively spend \$340 million per year on "union avoidance" consultants** who teach them how to exploit these weakness of federal labor law **to** effectively **scare workers out of exercising their legal right to collective bargaining**.

The Plan Solves:

**The plan uniquely solves because it resists both capitalism and alienation. Strikes allow workers to exercise agency and break free from alienation. Workers are able to begin the fight against capitalism by emancipating themselves from alienation and fighting to regulate their own work. Gourevitch 18**

"A Radical Defense of the Right to Strike" 6/21/18 Gourevitch, Alex.

<https://jacobinmag.com/2018/07/right-to-strike-freedom-civil-liberties-oppression> LHP SLS

Second, **strikes** don't just aim at winning more freedom — they **are** themselves **expressions of freedom**. When **workers** walk out, they're **using their own individual and collective agency to win the liberties they deserve**. **The same capacity for self-determination that workers invoke to demand more freedom is the capacity they exercise when winning their demands**. Freedom, not industrial stability or simply higher living standards, is the name of their desire. Put differently, **the right to strike** has both an intrinsic and instrumental relation to freedom. It **has** intrinsic **value as an** (at least implicit) **demand for self-emancipation**. **And** it has instrumental value insofar **as** the strike is **an effective means for resisting the oppressiveness of a class society and achieving new freedoms**.

**The Right to Strike must be prioritized in the resistance against Alienation and Capitalism because it fights the system of capitalism and the structures which sustain it.**

### **Gourevitch 18**

**"A Radical Defense of the Right to Strike"** 6/21/18 Gourevitch, Alex.

<https://jacobinmag.com/2018/07/right-to-strike-freedom-civil-liberties-oppression> LHP SLS

Still, the question remains: why should **the right to strike be given moral priority over other basic liberties**? The reason is not just that liberal **capitalism produces economic oppression** but that **the economic oppression that workers face is in part created and sustained by the very economic and civil liberties that liberal capitalism cherishes**. **Workers find themselves oppressed because of the way property rights, freedom of contract, corporate authority, and tax and labor law** operate. Deeming these liberties inviolable doesn't foster less oppressive, exploitative outcomes, as its defenders insist — quite the opposite. **The right to strike has a stronger claim to be protecting a zone of activity that serves the aims of justice itself — coercing people into relations of less oppressive social cooperation. Simply put, to argue for the right to strike is to prioritize democratic freedoms over property rights.**

- 1) The burden of the AFF is to prove that alienation is being resisted by the plan. As long as alienation is being decreased by the plan, capitalism is being resisted.**
- 2) Strikes are the best way to decrease alienation and resist capitalism because they allow the workers to emancipate themselves from alienation and take the first steps towards controlling the means of production through standing up to their capitalist employers. Even if alienation or capitalism are not being ended by the strikes, the plan still solves and the aff wins because it is the only and best way to actively resist capitalism and regain agency.**
- 3) Whether strikes materialize or not, recognizing worker's right to strike (aka doing the aff) actively resists capitalism, alienation, and capitalist agents, which gives workers free will.**

**Alienation reduces the subject to mere productivity and violates our species being, making the worker undergo intense psychological violence.**

### **Wartenberg 82**

**"Species-Being" and "Human Nature" in Marx** by Thomas E. Wartenberg Human Studies, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1982) p. 86-88 LHP AM  
The importance of the concept of species-being is not exhausted, however, with its role in Marx's critique of Hegel. It also grounds a criticism of the capitalist form of economic organization different in kind from others also present in Marx's writing. This critique asserts neither that capitalism will inevitably fall apart, not that it is unfair insofar as it is based upon exploitation of the worker, although it is arguable that such critiques are also present in Marx's writings. **The best metaphor for this aspect of Marx's criticism of capitalism is that it stunts development of the human species, reducing the human being to a mere animal.** We have already seen **that Marx sees freely chosen productive activity as the human species-character.** Contrary to Hegel, **he holds that we are able to achieve freedom through the engagement in freely chosen projects of objectification, and not by means of any denial of objectivity itself. But it is precisely these sorts of projects that capitalism,**

with its system of alienated (estranged) labor, prohibits from the worker Since the worker is forced by the capitalist to labor for an entire day in order to earn enough money to meet his/her basic animal needs, **the human capacity for freedom becomes a slave to our basic animal natures. Estranged labor reverse the relationship [between our human and animal life activity] so that man, just because he is a conscious being, makes his life activity, his *being* [Wesen], a mere means for his existence** (Marx, 1974, p. 328) Without going into the exact nature of development of the capitalist social relations that allow the capitalist to perpetrate such a feat, the nature of Marx's claim is clear. **Under capitalism, the human species—being is not allowed to realize human freedom, but functions merely to keep the worker alive.** Whereas the satisfaction of our animal needs for food, clothing and shelter *ought* to function as the means toward a realization of our specifically human natures, under the capitalist form of social organization, this relationship is reversed—inverted. **A worker uses all of his/her human capabilities for labor simply in order to stay alive, and to reproduce him/herself.** Let us recall that the concept of an essential nature of the human being functioned within the philosophic tradition to ground a specific form of activity as that most appropriate to the human being. While Marx does not accept a particular form of activity as the distinctively human, he does claim, as we have seen, that freely chosen conscious activity is our specific nature. And, following Hegel's lead, he sees such activity as possible only within a certain form of social organization. The work of material production can achieve this character [as "attractive work, the individual's self-realization"] only (1) when its social character is posited, (2) when it is of a scientific and at the same time general character, not merely human exertion as a specifically harassed natural force, but exertion as subject which appears in the production process not in a merely natural, spontaneous form, but as an activity regulating all the forces of nature. (Marx, 1976, pp. 611-612) Here we see Marx positing the possibility of a society organized in such a way so as to realize human beings through labor, rather than one that consumes their "being" simply in order to let them "exist." **This vision of an alternative form of social organization requires the development of the labor process made possible by capitalism, but it harnesses such development for the sake of human beings. The concept of the human species-being is crucial, therefore, not only in providing us with a critique of capitalism as a form of social organization, but also in order to grasp the outlines of a form of organization that would allow for the full realization of human freedom,** something both Kant and Hegel deemed the central task for humanity, and which Marx sees as the central goal of a communist society. One feature of such a form of economic and social organization would be that the amount of time an individual had to labor simply would be minimized. As a result, **there would be a maximum of time during which individuals, free of the demands of subsistence, could undertake their own projects of objective self-realization** As Marx puts it in a passage whose real content has often been overlooked by commentators.

**1) If capitalism is not resisted now, it will continue to harm the planet and everyone on it. Alienation removes humanity from man, but the physical consequences of capitalism reek havoc onto the Earth.**

**Capitalism causes war, violence, environmental destruction and extinction.**

**Robinson 18** (William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, "Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State" Critical Sociology) RE

**Each major episode of crisis in the world capitalist system has presented the potential for systemic change. Each has involved the breakdown of state legitimacy, escalating class and social struggles, and military conflicts, leading to a restructuring of the system, including new institutional arrangements, class relations, and accumulation activities that eventually result in a restabilization of the system and renewed capitalist expansion. The current crisis shares aspects of earlier system-wide structural crises, such as of the 1880s, the 1930s or the 1970s. But there are six interrelated dimensions to the current crisis that I believe sets it apart from these earlier ones and suggests that a simple restructuring of the system will not lead to its restabilization – that is, **our very survival** now **requires** a **revolution against global capitalism** (Robinson, 2014). These six dimensions, in broad strokes, present a "big picture" context in which a global police state is emerging. First, **the system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. We have already passed tipping points in climate change, the nitrogen cycle,****

and diversity loss. For the first time ever, **human conduct is** intersecting with and fundamentally **altering the earth system** in such a way **that threatens** to bring about a sixth mass **extinction** (see, e.g., Foster et al., 2011; Moore, 2015). These ecological dimensions of global crisis have been brought to the forefront of the global agenda by the worldwide environmental justice movement. Communities around the world have come under escalating repression as they face off against transnational corporate plunder of their environment. While capitalism cannot be held solely responsible for the ecological crisis, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system given **capital's** implacable **impulse to accumulate and** its accelerated **commodification of nature**. Second, the level of global social polarization and **inequality is unprecedented**. The richest one percent of humanity in 2016 controlled over half of the world's wealth and 20 percent controlled 95 percent of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just five percent (Oxfam, 2017). These escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of overaccumulation: the TCC cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to chronic stagnation in the world economy (see next section). Such extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge of social control to dominant groups. As Trumpism in the United States as well as the rise of far-right and neo-fascist movements in Europe so well illustrate, **cooptation also involves the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled towards scapegoated communities**. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization. **Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression** that lend themselves to projects of 21st century fascism. Third, the sheer magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as well as the magnitude and concentrated control over the means of global communication and the production and circulation of symbols, images, and knowledge. Computerized wars, **drone warfare**, robot soldiers, bunker-buster bombs, a new generation of **nuclear weapons**, **satellite surveillance**, **cyberwar**, spatial control technology, **and so forth**, have changed the face of warfare, and more generally, of systems of social control and repression. We have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society, a point brought home by Edward Snowden's revelations in 2013, and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication and symbolic production. If global capitalist crisis leads to a new world war the destruction would simply be unprecedented. Fourth, **we are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism**, in the sense that **there are no longer** any new **territories of significance to integrate** into world capitalism and new spaces to commodify are drying up. The capitalist system is by its nature expansionary. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion – from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism. At the same time, the privatization of education, health, utilities, basic services, and public lands is turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital's control into "spaces of capital," so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. What is there left to commodify? Where can

the system now expand? New spaces have to be violently cracked open and the peoples in these spaces must be repressed by the global police state.