### 1

#### The aff only displaces a collective struggle against capitalism – their focus on a singular disruption makes the alternative impossible – aff quote Creating networks of micropolitical communities

Dean Prof of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges 2012 Jodi The Communist Horizon p 13-15

The boundaries to what can be thought as politics in certain segments of the post-structuralist and anarchist Left only benefit capital. Some activists and theorists think that micropolitical activities, whether practices of self-cultivation or individual consumer choices, are more important loci of action than large-scale organized movement-an assumption which adds to the difficulty of building new types of organizations because it makes thinking in terms of collectivity rarer, harder, and seemingly less "fresh." Similarly, some activists and theorists treat aesthetic objects and creative works as displaying a political potentiality missing from classes, parties, and unions. This aesthetic focus disconnects politics from the organized struggle of working people, making politics into what spectators see. Artistic products, whether actual commodities or commodified experiences, thereby buttress capital as they circulate political affects while displacing political struggles from the streets to the galleries. Spectators can pay (or donate) to feel radical without having to get their hands dirty. The dominant class retains its position and the contradiction between this class and the rest of us doesn't make itself felt as such. The celebration of momentary actions and singular happenings-the playful disruption, the temporarily controversial film or novel- works the same way. Some on the anarchist and post-structuralist Left treat these flickers as the only proper instances of a contemporary left politics. A pointless action involving the momentary expenditure of enormous effort-the artistic equivalent of the 5k and 10k runs to fight cancer, that is to say, to increase awareness of cancer without actually doing much else-the singular happening disconnects task from goal. Any "sense" it makes, any meaning or relevance it has, is up to the spectator (perhaps with a bit of guidance from curators and theorists).

Occupation contrasts sharply with the singular happening. Even as specific occupations emerge from below rather than through a coordinated strategy, their common form-including its images, slogans, terms, and practices-links them together in a mass struggle.

The power of the return of communism stands or falls on its capacity to inspire large-scale organized collective struggle toward a goal. For over thirty years, the Left has eschewed such a goal, accepting instead liberal notions that goals are strictly individual lifestyle choices or social-democratic claims that history already solved basic problems of distribution with the compromise of regulated markets and welfare states a solution the Right rejected and capitalism destroyed. The Left failed to defend a vision of a better world, an egalitarian world of common production by and for the collective people. Instead, it accommodated capital, succumbing to the lures of individualism, consumerism, competition, and privilege, and proceeding as if there really were no alternative to states that rule in the interests of markets.

#### The focus on localized particularism 🡺 capitalism

Dean Prof of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges 2012 Jodi The Communist Horizon p 173-175

An emphasis on the drive dimension of melancholia, on Freud's attention to the way sadism in melancholia is "turned round upon the subject's own self," leads to an interpretation of the general contours shaping the Left that is different from Brown's. Instead of a Left attached to an unacknowledged orthodoxy, we have one that has given way on the desire for communism, betrayed its historical commitment to the proletariat, and sublimated revolutionary energies into restorationist practices that strengthen the hold of capitalism. This Left has replaced commitments to the emancipatory, egalitarian struggles of working people against capitalism --commitments that were never fully orthodox, but always ruptured, conflicted, and contested-with incessant activity (like the mania Freud associates with melancholia) and so now satisfies itself with criticism and interpretation, small projects and local actions, particular issues and legislative victories, art, technology, procedures, and process. It sublimates revolutionary desire to democratic drive, to the repetitious practices offered up as democracy (whether representative, deliberative, or radical). Having already conceded to the inevitably of capitalism, it noticeably abandons "any striking power against the big bourgeoisie," to return to Benjamin's language. For such a Left, enjoyment comes from its withdrawal from responsibility, its sublimation of goals and responsibilities into the branching, fragmented practices of micropolitics, self-care, and issue awareness. Perpetually slighted, harmed, and undone, this Left remains stuck in repetition, unable to break out of the circuits of drive in which it is caught, unable because it enjoys them.

#### Capitalism undergirds multiple forms of violence— class consciousness is necessary

LaBeouf ‘17--(Workshy, Leninist anti-imperialism @ Guevarista economics, “The Decaying Nature of Capitalism Poses Only Two Possible Futures: Socialism or Barbarism”, January 4th, 2017, <https://medium.com/@JoinedAtTheArse/the-decaying-nature-of-capitalism-poses-only-two-possible-futures-socialism-or-barbarism-b3a144432320>) kb

So far I have focused on the inevitable developments which are once again making socialism increasingly desirable and necessary. Of at least equal importance is a moral imperative that means it’s never a bad time to become a communist. That’s because, as with poverty and war, the capitalist mode of production is the primary source of racism, ableism and sexism (and by extension, homophobia and transphobia). We have already seen how imperialism impoverishes 100s of millions of people around the world (21,000 a day are starved to death) without a care for their religion, race, gender or sexuality. Racism inside the imperialist countries is primarily an extension of national oppression/neo-colonialism. When imperialist countries experience labour shortages at home, workers from the oppressed nations are ‘imported’ in larger numbers for cheap labour (thus constantly reproducing racism’s material basis by creating a ‘super-exploited’, ‘super-oppressed’ layer of the working class). The greatest example of this in Britain took place after WW2, when the country needed to be rebuilt as cheaply as possible. When there is more of a labour surplus, such as the present period, deportations increase and border controls tighten. For example, after the 1973 recession, deportations increased 11-fold over the next seven years. The overall number of people allowed to settle fell by 20% (by 42% in terms of people from the Commonwealth). Migrant workers, and women generally, tend to be the least well supported by the big trade unions, experience the worst jobs and living conditions, and are the easiest to throw out of employment and into the ‘reserve army of labour’ that capitalism needs to function (because unemployment holds down wages and ‘disciplines’ workers). The capitalist mode of production is the primary source of women’s oppression. Women have been oppressed in all class societies throughout history, and women’s oppression under capitalism takes a particular form in relation to how social production is organised — a dual oppression that compels women to reproduce the working class gratis at home (privatised labour), while also comprising part of a cheap reserve army of labour ready to serve capital as workers. This material basis for the oppression of women is fundamental and can only be changed by the overthrow of capitalism and its replacement by socialist relations of production, which will socialise house and care work, liberate the family from its status as an economic unit and therefore women from their status as solely instruments of production. Discrimination is primarily the expression of ideologies which in turn express class privilege, however they are dressed up, necessarily invented to justify economic and political exclusion. White supremacy was the invented justification for colonialism, for instance. This may sound crude or simplistic but stripping politics down to its foundations is what makes materialism so enlightening. Rather than making the argument that imperialist controls on the movement of oppressed people is racist, the best defence of immigration offered by social democrats tends to be that immigrants contribute more to the economy than vice-versa, reflecting the fact that the exploitation of cheap foreign labour contributes to the material basis of a labour aristocracy. Various racist ideologies are drummed into the population through ruling class media outlets in order to keep the masses divided among themselves instead of united against capital. While ‘intersectional feminism’ is an excellent tool for exposing unexamined prejudices and challenging state or societal discrimination, a materialist, class-based and anti-imperialist analysis is also needed to overcome its sometimes essentialising limitations. That sexism and racism are intrinsic to the capitalist system has been shown again by the necessity of austerity. As this LSE study states: “Austerity has had a greater adverse impact on women, especially ethnic minority and low-income families, who have born 78.9 per cent of the welfare cuts in the 2015 government budget.” Likewise, disabled people have suffered greatly from austerity. By the Department for Work and Pensions’ own admission, 90 people per month are dying after being told they are fit for work. Capital is happy to see the end of an abundant supply of labour die off — disabled people have been savagely targeted because they are the most vulnerable and least ‘productive’ for capital. In fact, it is society under capitalism which disables people through structures of exclusion, and by literally limiting the accessibility of public spaces and services. In Britain, half of the people living in poverty either live with a disabled person or are themselves disabled. What’s more, the above factors combined with the alienating effects of capitalist society — where individualism is sacred and collectivism belittled, where stress is normalised and rest is mocked — degrades mental wellbeing on a widespread scale. This is exacerbated by the fact that social and mental health care services under capitalism are woefully inadequate. None of this is to say that racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia and ableism will disappear the night after a revolution, but to argue that the economic foundations that constantly reproduce these forms of oppression will be dismantled during the process of building socialism.

#### The alternative is socialism from below—recognizing historical materialism and using it as a building block for socialist party politics creates for hope for the proletariat.

Selfa ‘16--(Lance, a frequent contributor to the ISR, and writes a column on U.S. politics in Socialist Worker newspaper, “Socialism in the Air”, Summer 2016, Issue #101, <http://isreview.org/issue/101/socialism-air>) kb

In Two Souls, Draper reviews and critiques the main theories of socialism from above—utopianism, elitist anarchism, social democracy and Stalinism. While the exact historical references may not be current, the trends of social thought he challenges are still with us. Ideas of utopianism permeated the Occupy encampments of 2011. “Anarcho-liberalism” remains a key influence among newly radicalizing people. And Sanders’s own version of socialism is derived from the socialism from above of European social democracy. The argument here isn’t that “the more things change, the more they stay the same.” As Draper pointed out, when people reject capitalism, they often gravitate to one or another version of socialism from above that is on offer. It often seems easier and more natural for people to place their hopes in a savior from above. But only socialism from below offers the prospect of a transformation that would place ordinary people in charge of the economy and society. As Draper put it in his conclusion, How does a people or a class become fit to rule in their own name? Only by fighting to do so. Only by waging their struggle against oppression—oppression by those who tell them they are unfit to govern. Only by fighting for democratic power do they educate themselves and raise themselves up to the level of being able to wield that power. There has never been any other way for any class. . . . In the last analysis, the only way of proving [theories of “socialism from above”] false is in the struggle itself. That struggle from below has never been stopped by the theories from above, and it has changed the world time and again. To choose any of the forms of Socialism-from-Above is to look back to the old world, to the “old crap.” To choose the road of Socialism-from-Below is to affirm the beginning of a new world. Today, we’re at the beginning of this conversation. Millions of people today may express favorable opinions of socialism. But what they mean by socialism requires a lot of unpacking. And winning them to a conception of socialism from below, an idea that animates this journal, is a challenge for socialists today. Discovering what socialism really is. At the turn of the last century, the German socialist Werner Sombart asked, in the title of his book, Why Is There No Socialism in the United States? He answered the question with a famous quip: “On the reefs of roast beef and apple pie socialistic utopias of every sort are sent to their doom.”13 Today, more and more people are having trouble affording roast beef and apple pie. So when socialists today say the United States is a class society, most people agree with us. The collapse of Stalinism has made it easier to talk about what socialism really is. When it’s explained to people—a world where the means of production and distribution are collectively and democratically controlled; where everyone has a job, food, and housing; where racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression are abolished and where there are no wars—it sounds pretty reasonable. But if a substantial section of a new generation is open to the ideas of socialism, the question of organization—whether we need one, and what forms it can take—poses many challenges and, of course, many opportunities. The starting point is to build organizations of socialists that commit to creating a political alternative independent of the two main capitalist parties and their subsidiaries. Karl Marx’s greatest contributions were always made in the course of the class struggle, while attempting to organize it and to influence it. As Marx said many times, he was not the first socialist. But he was the first to organize a political movement under the slogan “the emancipation of the working class is the act of the working class.” In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and his lifelong collaborator Frederick Engels explained why socialists need to be organized: The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement. Put in more modern terms, the most committed socialist fighters and activists need to come together in an organization because collectively they can influence the wider movement. And an organization of comrades committed to changing the world—and debating, discussing, and organizing how best to do that—is the key to “clearly understanding” what the movement needs to win its aims. In the United States, part of the clear understanding involves recognition that the Democratic Party must be soundly rejected as any sort of vehicle for fundamental social change. Today, there is an international ruling-class consensus that says we must live through a “decade of austerity” to overcome the imbalances of the period that blew up in 2008. But we need to ask ourselves: is that the future we want for ourselves or our children? Do we want a state of permanent war lasting for decades? Do we want a world where the United States spends more on weapons than the rest of the world combined—while two billion people live on less than one dollar a day? Movements like Occupy and Black Lives Matter show that there is a growing group of young activists who are deciding for themselves what they will do in the face of these questions. They are looking not only for ideas to change the world, but also for organizations to embody that alternative. Socialists today need to think the same way: how we can build from the struggles of today the kind of political alternative that we need to the current system. As British socialist Duncan Hallas wrote in a seminal contribution on socialist organization, reprinted in ISR 100,15. That alternative must be more than a mere collection of individuals giving general adherence to a platform. It must also be a center for mutual training and debate, for raising the level of the raw activist to that of the experienced, for the fusion of the experiences and outlook of manual and white collar workers and intellectuals with ideas of scientific socialism. It must be a substitute for those institutions, special schools, universities, clubs, messes and so on, through which the ruling class imbues its cadres with a common outlook, tradition and loyalty. And it must do this without cutting off its militants from their fellow workers. Transforming a new generation of socialists from isolated or individual militants into an organized, and conscious, force will be a key task in years to come.

#### The ROB is to vote for the debater that best engages in socialist party politics. Only a denucleated modernity provides a new framework for structural change in social movements

Blühdorn ‘6[--(Ingolfur, associate Professor in Politics / Political Sociology @ the Department of European Studies @ the University of Bath](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1368431006060461) , “Self-Experience in the Theme Park of Radical Action? Social Movements and Political Articulation in the Late-Modern Condition” pg. 33) kb

Analysis of the late-modern condition and the dilemma of denucleated modernity provides a new framework for the interpretation of contemporary social movements and non-conventional political articulation. Of course, these forms of political participation cannot unproblematically be described as direct responses to the outlined crises of self-referentiality. Indeed, attempts to explain social movements as the response to structural strains and systemic crises have always been confronted with difficulties to explain the connection between systems and actors. Systems cannot be assumed to have either the cognitive capacities to become aware of their crises, or the agency to take co-ordinated remedial action. Actors, on the other hand, cannot easily be assumed to respond to abstract systemic crises, but their mobilization and action will require some kind of personal grievances as motivational foundation. In fact, even the link between personal grievances and political mobilization is rather uncertain. Structural strains approaches have been criticized not only because they undermine the rationality of social movements, shifting them closer towards irrational, passionate or emotional eruptions, but also because they cannot explain why only in rare cases personal grievances really translate into mobilization and political action, especially into collective action. It was not least for these reasons that social movement research turned from structural strain and grievances approaches to resource mobilization theories and the investigation of political opportunity structures (e.g. Laraña et al., 1995; Crossley, 2002). It therefore seems difficult to interpret contemporary social movements and new forms of political articulation as directly responding to the systemic problems which have been outlined above. But it has been suggested above that the condition of late-modern society, i.e. its systemic crisis of self-referentiality, can be alleviated through the reconstruction of the autonomous subject and identity. And while social movements cannot easily be regarded as responding to systemic crises, they can indeed be interpreted as centring on the reconstruction of the autonomous self. As a matter of fact, exactly this has always been seen as a key dimension of social movement activity. Taking account of the fact that social movements are much more than campaigns for specific political goals, Rucht (1990) and others have suggested a distinction between goal-oriented, instrumental dimensions in social movement activity and more identity-oriented, expressive ones. Already in the early 1980s Habermas (1981) noted that the sub- cultural and counter-cultural new social movements of that time no longer sought to capture the state, i.e. political control, but were increasingly concerned with identity politics and conflicts over lifeworld issues. Giddens’s (1991) concept of life politics and Beck’s (1992) notion of sub-politics point in a similar direction.

### 2

#### Interpretation: ****the aff may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of the resolution****

**Violation: they don’t – CX proves**

#### Net benefits –

**1. Procedural fairness – even if this specific method is debatable – the way it frames the rez makes it nearly impossible to negate.**

**A) I can’t go for any disad, specific CPs, solvency turns, etc in order to answer the aff, you’ll just delink my offense in the 1ar by claiming implementation is irrelevant – which could also apply to any generic I’d read to compensate that assumes the aff takes a tangible action. Kills neg ground since certain principles are good in the abstract; it only makes sense taking everything into context. Ground is key to fairness since equal access to arguments controls equal access to the ballot.**

#### B) Limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months, which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subject to well-researched scrutiny. Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution.

#### Procedural fairness outweighs –

**A) The best solutions are formed with critical contestation from multiple sides – it’s more likely we make a good liberation strategy if both debaters can engage and test it.**

#### B) Inescapable – every argument you make concedes the authority of fairness: i.e. that the judge will evaluate your arguments. Absent some judge-debater reciprocal relationship, they could just hack against or for you. Means that there is always some implicit policing in debate and the impact turns are terminally non-unique. Also proves that if they win fairness doesn’t matter you should vote neg on presumption because you have no reason to not just hack for me.

#### C) Tangibility – voting aff has no terminal impact- it doesn’t educate anyone or cause us to make some societal shift whereas theory norms are set all the time like nibs and brackets. The judge isn’t really voting for anything when they affirm: you can’t set a norm with this aff.

#### 3. They don’t get to weigh case against T

#### A) Evaluation – even if their arguments seem true, that’s only because they already had an advantage – fairness is a meta constraint on your ability to determine who best meets their ROB. If one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the *truth value* of who wins on the AC so cross-applications don’t work. Which means don’t weigh the case against T since I couldn’t disprove the case isnce it was non-t.

#### B) The AC is the starting point for the discussion and I win that that the AC is flawed, then it means that the starting point for evaluating substance is flawed. So, the T determines the value of the debate to begin with.

#### C) Fairness is the evaluative mechanism to determine the better debater regardless of the role of the ballot. Thus, the question is not should we use their role of the ballot, but rather whether or not the way that they presented their offense is good for debate. Absent fairness you don’t know how best met their burden under any role of the ballot.

**TVA – ban patents for hormones I literaly have an aff like this on my wiki that talks about how it leads to gender hacking and prevents testrone and estrogen shoratges world wide and reasons why that’s bad act as neg ground and don’t prove the TVA fails**

**Competing Interpretations**

**1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom because debaters keep being barely reasonable**

**2. No briteline to reasonability**

**Drop the debater:**

**1. Sets a precedent that debaters can’t read illegitimate arguments.**

**2. Dropping them and their advocacy are functionally the same.**

**No RVI’s**

**1. Real world applicability- proving that you’re being fair doesn’t mean you get voted up.**

**2. RVIs center the debate on theory instead of substance because it’s the only place the round can be decided. substance clash is important—it’s the only education unique to debate and outweighs on time frame; we only get two months to talk about the topic.**

### Case

#### The aff is basically theirs a problem with plastic in the ocean so we should stop using straws sure the aff decreases some aspect of capitalism but it doesn’t solve for any of the root cause

#### On their testrone and gender stuff Not just strucutere of pharma but how gender goes back into capitalism and colonialism which ruptureing just the pharma industry cant solve Only alt solves

#### On their method of drag kinging its already been commodified IE ru pauls drag race or companies comodifiying clothing from notabal drag kings capitalism is best at co-opting individual queer radical movements when its not combined with a political move ment against cap so their method fails and only alt solves case

#### No perms In a method debate we are both trying to end the same issue just different methods of achiving it IE micro political are large political movements. Means that perms are nonsensical because we are critiquing their method of solvency as failing