## CX

How is vitue ethics able to be compatible with permissibility?

If a virtuous person, only matters intent, if someone raped someone with good intent should they not be apprehended?

Basically justifies capitalism, if people think that’s good ex

## FW

#### Ethical obligations ends up collapsing to util, because the aff depends on real life consequences, like greed and self interest, allows for consequentialist thinking.

#### Opderbeck 1 card- literally talks about how patents have bad consequences so double bind, either consequences matter in which case the neg outweighs, or b, consequences don’t matter and they don’t get access to their offense, then you would err neg on presumption.

#### 1] virtues are dependent on cultural values, e,.g. in the past women were considered virtuous if they were quiet and docile, which is an independent voter, which means you should reject a system that measures people based on societal standards out of their control

#### 2] virtues are and were inaccessible to certain minority groups, e.g. black people were not considered people during the era of American slavery which meant white people didn’t view them as capable of virtue

#### 3) virtues can’t allow judgement of choices, e.g. the holocaust was not “wrong” in virtue ethics, it was just a possible reflection that nazis lacked a virtue of compassion

#### Anti exploitation is a good virtue and that is what the alt does, so in order to solve the affirmative case, we must negate, because the aff ends up perpetuation the impacts of the aff and causes

#### Also

#### virtues are unverifiable, since a virtue is an internally possessed structure that indv people have, we can never know if someone was acting w good virtues thru just their observable actions. This requires deontic normative actions, e.g. For example we cannot describe how to possess the virtue of honesty except by noting the duty to always tell the truth. And since they say that deontology fails, this means their theory doesn’t make sense and also fails to guide action.

#### That means judge you default to consequentialism.

#### 1] you can predict things to happen, which is what happens all of the time, also if we don’t focus on consequences, causes paralysis

#### 2] you can make broad assumtions, somethings are more likely and proven will cause consequences which is what we should focus on

#### 3] some things are objectively bad, like subject oppression, discrimination, and death are all univerilizable, this argument is inchoerent

#### Your framework is incoherent, since we can never force virtues, and the aff is advocating for maximizing virtues making agents use it, then it just ends up creating false character which the aff says is bad

#### Ends up collapsing to util, even your cards in the aff says how greed is bad and withholds things form the community, which is a bad consequence

#### Cap solves case, we won’t be able to solve things because instead of focusing on good qualities, we end up competing to reach the top of the ladder.

#### Without alt cap will inevitable cause for more competition, it doesn’t matter if youre ethical,

## ASPEC

#### Concede no rvis, neg theory first because aff gets infinite time to prep case and allows for abuse, no rvis at all, concede no rvis on. Neg theory

**A. Violation – The Affirmative fails to specify an agent of action.**

**B. Failure to specify is illegitimate and a voting issue.**

**Ground – Specifying the agent is critical to disads of both politics and economics. Also key to counterplans regarding types of agents and congressional actions and kritiks of political methods.**

**Moving Target –No spec allows the affirmative to shift out of 1NC arguments by allowing 2AC clarification about the agent.**

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse

## Case

#### We are prefiat because we perfomatively deconstruct capitalism

#### No post fiatoffense, so only can evaluate offense from prefiat offense

#### Link is preand post fiat is because it is what the opponent said is both

#### Cap causes all of the issues of the affirmative, there is no way to affirm with cap cause virtues are skewed because all we focus on is capital and the gain of material

#### People don’t just stop doing things just because it is done, checks through policymakers

#### the affirmative isn’t able to open source anything because everything is inherently competitive. Because of capitalism

#### neg abuse was justified because they don’t

#### permissibility flows neg, because we only have to prove aff false, because if we cant prove aff false, flows neg

## Cap

#### Links don’t need to state explicit lines of the aff, we are able to prove you are creating these impacts, then we win. Because death is objectively bad. Cap turns their evidence, because cap creates greed. Cant perm a performance, at best they get post fiat offense, links das to the perm

#### Any ethical system created from within capitalism will be co-opted by it - their appeal to “ethics” is a distraction from class struggle

**Red Critique 5** (Winter/Spring, “Left Populisms”, <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2005/leftpopulisms.htm>)

**Having declared class dead, class politics a dead-end, and class analysis just plain boring (if not impossible), the Left has eagerly embraced the subtleties and nuances of “ethics”. Ethics, the Left has said, is necessary because scientific knowledge of class—which is necessary for any transformative politics—is the bête noire of freedom, democracy and difference. The ethical person, the Left insists, “recognizes” that there is, after all, no definite basis upon which to bring about fundamental transformation of class for social justice and economic equality. All that can be done is to act “ethically” within capitalism. Ethics, in other words, is the politics of conscientious capitulation to capital. The epitome of conscientious capitulation is the “lesser of two evils” and “anything but Bush” approach—now canonized in such films as** Michael Moore’s **Fahrenheit 9/11**, which has become **the pinnacle of “left cinematherapy” in the face of brutal imperialist onslaught. Such an approach opportunistically proclaims “outrage” against Bush, the current face of the war and U.S. capital’s imperialist interests, only to replace it with a new, seemingly more “ethical” face that leaves intact the system of production for profit that produces the imperialist war economy. Ethics allows the left to see the war in Iraq as a scandal, but not the wars against Afghanistan and Yugoslavia (or Iran or North Korea, for that matter). The ethical Left opposes the moralist Christian fundamentalism and jingoistic nationalism of U.S.-based capital and supports a savvier but equally religious “global ethics” favoring U.S. capitalist interests that rely heavily on foreign investment. Which is to say that the left’s “ethical” values,** like the Right’s religious and moral values, **are no more than a translation of inter-capitalist competition into cultural values. Conscientious or not, they both leave working people**, who now more than ever need an un-subtle politics to end exploitation, **with no choice but to consent to the dictates of capital accumulation.**

#### Capitalism alienates people not only from themselves but from society as a whole and only relating them through exchange- Volition is an intrinsic feature of humans, alienation from oneself and others undermines the capacity for one to connect with their volition hence, undermining their humanity and ability to connect with others-turns case because their subjugation of more people into workers is antithetical to that of any ethics.

Marcuse 64(Herbert Marcuse was a was a German-American philosopher, sociologist, and political theorist, associated with the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory. **“**Reason & Revolution. Part II, The Rise of Social Theory.” 1964 MN IM)

**Marx explains** the **alienation of labor as** exemplified in, first, **the relation of the worker to** the product of **his labor and, second**, the relation of the worker **to his** own **activity.** The worker in capitalist society produces commodities. Large-scale commodity production requires capital, large aggregations of wealth used exclusively to promote commodity production. The commodities are produced by independent private entrepreneurs for purposes of profitable sale. **The worker** labors for the capitalist, to whom he **surrenders**, **through** the **wage contract**, **the product of his labor.** Capital is power to dispose over the products of labor. The more the worker produces, the greater the power of capital becomes and the smaller the worker’s own means for appropriating his products. Labor thus becomes the victim of a power it has itself created. Marx summarizes this process as follows: ‘**The object** which **labor produces**, its product, **is** encountered as **an *alien entity****,*a force **that has become *independent*of its producer.** **The realization of labor is its objectification.** Under the prevailing economic conditions, this realization of labor appears as its opposite, the negation [*Entwirklichung*] of the laborer. **Objectification appears as** loss of and **enslavement by the object**, **and appropriation as alienation** and expropriation’. Once turned to the laws of capitalist commodity production, labor is inevitably impoverished. For, ‘the more the worker toils, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects he produces to oppose him, and the poorer lie himself becomes ..’. Marx shows this mechanism at work in the movement of wages. The laws of commodity production, without any external aids, maintain wages at the level of stationary poverty. [As a result,] the realization of labor appears as negation to such an extent that the worker is negated to the point of starvation. The objectification appears as a lossof the objects to such an extent that the worker is deprived of the most necessary objects of life and labor. Moreover, labor itself becomes an object of which he can make himself master only by the greatest effort and with incalculable interruptions. Appropriation of the object appears as alienation to such an extent that the more objects the worker produces the less he possesses and the more he comes under the sway of his product, of capital. **The worker** alienated from his product **is at the same time alienated from himself.** **His labor** itself **becomes no longer his own**, and the fact that it becomes the property of another bespeaks an expropriation that touches the very essence of man. Labor in its true form is a medium for man’s true self-fulfillment, for the full development of his potentialities; the conscious utilization of the forces of nature should take place for his satisfaction and enjoyment. In its current form, however, it cripples all human faculties and enjoins satisfaction. **The worker** ‘does not affirm but **contradicts his essence’.** ‘Instead of developing his free physical and mental energies, he mortifies his body and ruins his mind. **He** therefore first **feels** he is with **himself when he is free from work and apart from himself when he is at work.** He is at home when he does not work and not at home when he does. **His working is**, therefore, not **done** willingly but **under compulsion.** **It is forced** labor. It is, **therefore**, not the satisfaction of a need, but **only a *means*for** the **satisfaction of wants outside of it’.** In consequence, ‘Man [the worker] feels himself acting freely only in his animal functions like eating, drinking and begetting ... whereas in his human functions he is nothing but an animal. The animal becomes the human and the human the animal’. This holds alike for the worker (the expropriated producer), and for him who buys his labor. The process of alienation affects all strata of society, distorting even the ‘natural’ functions of man. The senses, the primary sources of freedom and happiness according to Feuerbach, are reduced to one ‘sense of possessing’. They view their object only as something that can or cannot be appropriated. Even pleasure and enjoyment change from conditions under which men freely develop their ‘universal nature’ into modes of ‘egoistic’ possession and acquisition. Marx’s analysis of labor under capitalism is thus quite deep seated, going further than the structure of economic relationships to the actual human content. Relations such as those between capital and labor, capital and commodity, labor and commodity, and those between commodities are understood as human relations, relations in man’s social existence. Even the institution of private property appears as ‘the product, result and inevitable consequence of the alienated mode of labor,’ and derives from the mechanisms of the social mode of production. The alienation of labor leads to the division of labor so characteristic of all forms of class society: ‘Each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape a division that is not overcome when the abstract freedom of the individual is proclaimed in bourgeois society. Labor separated from its object is, in the last analysis, an ‘alienation of man from man’; the individuals are isolated from and set against each other. They are linked in the commodities they exchange rather than in their persons. Man’s alienation from himself is simultaneously an estrangement from his fellow men. Marx’s early writings are the first explicit statement of the process of reification (*Verdinglichung*) through which capitalist society makes all personal relations between men take the form of objective relations between things. Marx expounds this process in his *Capital*as ‘the Fetishism of Commodities’. **The system of capitalism relates men to each other through** the commodities they **exchange.** **The** social **status of individuals, their standard of living, the satisfaction of their needs, their freedom, and their power are all determined by the value of their commodities.** The capacities and needs of the individual have no part in the evaluation. Even man’s most human attributes become a function of money, the general substitute for commodities. Individuals participate in the social process as owners of commodities only. Their mutual relations are those of their commodities. Capitalist commodity production has this mystifying result, that it transforms the social relations of individuals into ‘qualities of ... things themselves [commodities] and still more pronouncedly transforms the interrelations of production themselves into a thing [money]’. The mystifying result arises from the specific mode of labor in commodity production, with its separate individuals working independently of each other, and fulfilling their own needs only through those of the market: The fetishism of commodities has its origin ... in the peculiar social character of the labor that produces them. As a general rule, articles of utility become commodities, only because they are products of the labor of private individuals or groups of individuals who carry on their work independently of each other. The sum-total of the labor of all these private individuals forms the aggregate labor of society [*gesellschaftliche Gesamtarbeit*]*.*Since the producers do not come into contact with each other until they exchange their products, the specific social character of each producer’s labor does not show itself except in the act of exchange. In other words, the labor of the individual asserts itself as a part of the labor of society, only by means of the relations which the act of exchange establishes directly between the products, and indirectly, through them, between the producers. To the latter, therefore, the relations connecting the labor of one individual with that of the rest appear, not as direct social relations between individuals at work, but as what they really are, material relations between persons [*sachliche Verhältnisse von Personen*] and social relations between things.

#### The alternative is to use a historical materialist lens in the debate space to create solidarity of the working class to forefront a socialist transformation from below against the capitalist stratification

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>)

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 organization**sof 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 **organiz**ation **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 Role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best methodologically and performatively deconstructs the capitalist mode of production.

#### Reasons to prefer:

#### Alienation- capitalism alienates people from each other by relating them through exchange, and separating them from their desires, this renders people as expendable, and means that as long as capitalism exists under any ethical framework everything will be permissible, makes my framing a prerequisite to accessing theirs.

#### Epistemological- capitalist logic is engrained in our psyche meaning that it controls what we perceive as true, this means that we must deconstruct it before able to make normative decisions because it underpins all that, makes my framing a prerequisite before accessing theirs.