# Cap Aff

#### Our volition is the structure of our will and it is binding—it is the only way we can feel anything like emotions, form relations or use reason to make decisions and generate intentions.

#### Our will is dependent on our interactions with the people around us, which explains why the subject can be fluid and stable at the same time. I am different now than I was 10 years ago, but if I did something messed up we shouldn’t immediately forget about it.

#### Motivation determines what our conceptions of goodness are what leads us to take actions in support of it—we respond to things differently depending on how they affect our will. We cannot strictly abide by external rules because they disregard individuality and contextual circumstances, but still need an objective set of rules for people to remain ethical.

#### The only solution is a concept of alienation: a criterion concerned with how someone is able to exercise their volition, not what they will. Alienation is the obstruction of ones will and their relations with the world.

#### Since everyone is presumed equal, everyone has an obligation to establish conditions of non-alienation, including the state. Thus: the standard is resisting alienation

#### Independently prefer:

#### 1. Performativity—every argument assumes creative productivity i.e. that you are able to pursue an end and that this is done consciously. Thus embracing the standard is a prior question to the very nature of debate since we cannot make any arguments without it.

#### 2. Moral accountability requires non-alienation. If you are alienated from your ends there is no way you can be morally responsible for what you do because it wasn’t you rationally willing and doing it. Thus the only way to identify moral responsibility is to not be alienated. This means the AC is key to actualize any other ethic.

#### Impact Calc: The standard is not consequentialist—it’s not concerned with the effects of removing subsidies on fossil fuels or the alternati ves that would replace them. It’s only concerned with the procedures of subsidies.

**Capitalism is alienating because the laborer is distanced from the act or working, it turns a life into becoming means rather than an end. Jaeggi 16** Rachel Jaeggi; et al. *Alienation*; Columbia University Press, 2016; Rahel Jaeggi is Professor for Practical Philosophy with Emphasis on Social Philosophy and Political Philosophy at the Humboldt University of Berlin – brackets for gendered language

**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 dispos- session: the alienated worker** (as the seller of her labor power) **no longer has at her [their] disposal what she herself [they] 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 [their] 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 [their] 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 impoverish- ment) 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.”**5 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**.”6 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 condi- tions 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. Instrumental- ization, 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”)7—**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 Aris- totelian: there must be an end that is not itself in turn a means.8 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);9 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.10 **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.**

#### The only hope is to reclaim our power is committing ourselves to the communist horizon as an organizing principle for collectivity. Any individual act of resistance will be coopted because one person's power is not enough to overturn violence. Commitment to a universal principle of communism becomes a way of combatting alienation through authentic politics. Dean 16

[Jodi, Prof. of Political Science @ Hobart and William Smith, Crowds and Party, pp. 153-154. Dean received her B.A. in History from [Princeton University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Princeton_University) in 1984. She received her MA, MPhil, and PhD from [Columbia University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Columbia_University) in 1992. Before joining the Department of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, she taught at the [University of Texas at San Antonio](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Texas_at_San_Antonio). She has held visiting research appointments at the Institute for the Human Sciences in Vienna, [McGill University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McGill_University) in Montreal, and [Cardiff University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cardiff_University) in Wales.]

How do and can we imagine political change underthe conditions of communicative capitalism? Is political change just aggregated personal transformation, communism as viral outbreak or meme-effect, #fullcommunism? Do we think that “autonomous zones of freedom and equality will emerge like so many mushrooms out of the dregs left behind in capital flight and the shrinking of state social provisioning? Or do we optimistically look to democracy, expecting (all evidence to the contrary) that communism, or even upgraded social democracy, will arise out of electoral politics? All these **fantasies imagine that political change can come about without political struggle.** **Each pushes away the fact of antagonism, division, and class struggle as if late neoliberalism were not already characterized by extreme inequality, violence, and exploitation, as if the ruling class did not already use military force**, police force, legal force, and illegal force **to maintain its position.** Politics is a struggle over power. **Capital uses every resource—state, non-state, interstate—to advance its position. A Left that refuses to organize itself in recognition of this fact will never be able to combat it.** “In communicative capitalism, **individual acts of resistance**, subversion, cultural production, and opinion expression, no matter how courageous, **are easily absorbed into the circulatory content of global personal media networks**. Alone, they don’t amplify; they can’t endure. **They are easily forgotten** as new content rushes into and through our feeds. We indulge in fantasies of the freedom of our expression, our critical edge and wit, disavowing the way such individuated freedom is the form of collective incapacity. Against states and alliances wielded in the service of capital as a class, diverse and separate struggles are so many isolated resistances, refusals to undertake the political work of pulling together in organized, strategic, long-term struggle. The constant churn of demands on our awareness disperses our efforts and attention. What **the Left should** **be** doing is **coordinating**, consolidating, and linking **its efforts so that they can amplify each other**. We don’t need multiple, different campaigns. **We need an organized struggle against capitalism capable of operating along multiple issues in diverse locations**. “Crowds push back. From the perspective of the party, we see them as the insistent people. Fidelity to the insistence of the egalitarian discharge demands that **we build the infrastructure capable of maintaining the gap of their desire. The more powerful the affective infrastructure we create, the more we will feel its force, interiorizing the perspective of the many into the ego-ideal that affirms our practices and activities and pushes us to do more than we think we can.** Radical pluralists and participatory democrats sometimes imply that there can be a left politics without judgment, condemnation, exclusion, and discipline. **Denying the way that collective power works back on those who generate it, they suggest we can have the benefits of collectivity without its effects.** But **“working back” is an inextricable dimension of collectivity’s capacity to cut through the self-interest of individual needs and produce enduring bonds of solidarity.** Collective activities always have effects in excess of their immediate goals. Rather than fearing these effects, **rather than remaining stuck in the fantasy that an individual can change the world**, and rather than remaining so gripped by fears of power that “we fantasize a politics that can abolish it, we should confront the force of collectivity directly and take responsibility for generating it and using it. **The party capable of building an affective infrastructure that can cut through the barriers of capitalist expectation will err.** **It is not, cannot be, and should not be believed to be infallible.** Sometimes it may turn its immense energies on itself. **If we can’t bear it, we aren’t the Left, the communists, we need.** Anyone who is unwilling to talk about the party should not talk about political transformation.”

#### Capitalism will produce extinction – climate change, rising fascism, and imperial violence produce crises that depoliticize the left in favor of local forms of resistance. Thus the Role of the Ballot is to is to endorse the debater with the best educational praxis for revolutionary planning.

Escalante, 19 (Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist, graduate school drop out, “TRUTH AND PRACTICE: THE MARXIST THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE,” *Failing That, Invent;* [https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/09/08/truth-and-practic-the-marxist-theory-of-knowledge](https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/09/08/truth-and-practic-the-marxist-theory-of-knowledge/))

So, why does all this matter? What is at stake in an attempt to outline the Marxist Epistemology? The world we live in today is in a dire state. Climate destruction continues at a fast pace, and every with every passing day, capitalism proves itself to be incapable of addressing this. Capitalist production and its endless drive for resources to match artificial market demands has created a climate crisis that leaves us on the brink of potential extinction. Governments around the world are turning to far right and fascist leaders to assuage their fears of an uncertain future, and the most marginalized and oppressed suffer because of it. Fascism is on the rise, and history tells us very clearly what that can result in without opposition. The decaying US empire continues to lash out in violence across the globe in a desperate attempt to re-assert its power and hegemony. Whole countries are destroyed in its desperate bids for more fossil fuels. The world burns from America’s white phosphorus weaponry. The need for a revolutionary movement capable of replacing capitalism with something better has never been so clear. The choice between socialism or barbarism has never been so stark. More and more people are starting to realize that reform cannot save us, that capitalism and imperialism themselves are the problem, and that we must unite and band together to fight for a better world. The question then is: how will we know what strategies, what tactics, and what ideas to unite around? If the skeptics and postmodernists are correct that knowledge is always relative and localized, then we cannot built a global and universal strategy to unite around. If they are correct then we are doomed to small acts of localized or individual resistance in the face of apocalypse. To embrace such a vision of the world (with its accompanying epistemological skepticism) is to embrace defeat. The masses do not want to embrace defeat, they want to know how to fight back. Marxism can provide the tools necessary to engage in that fight. Marxism, with its self criticism and its insistence on incorporating the valuable ideas of its critics has created a means for unifying workers across the globe with anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles. The Marxist belief in the possibility of true ideas, tested and verified in practice, creates the possibility for unity on a global scale. The scientific status of Marxism means that as our climate changes, as our world looks more and more grim, Marxism will adapt through struggle and practice; it will provide us with the ideas and tools we need to fight and win. There will be no victory for the workers of the world without the ability to wield a revolutionary science. What is at stake in questions of Marxist epistemology is the very possibility of creating a philosophical and scientific basis for revolution. We must defend this possibility. We must defend the scientific status of Marxism, and must insist on the possibility of victory.

#### Thus, I affirm: States ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike

#### This is not a call for state action as such, but rather a call and recognition to return to the revolutionary tradition of dictatorship of the proletariat. The aff strips the reformist content of the topic to the revolutionary form of the demand in an ambivalence towards debate’s prevailing bourgeois institutionalism. Rather than a liberal demand for state-sponsored peace, the aff is orienting this debate toward organized communist planning to achieve rights of workers by and for the masses.

Dean and Heron, 20 (Jodi, communist party organizer and Professor of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, NY; Kai Heron editor at ROAR Magazine and a casualized academic with research interests in political theory, ecology, psychoanalysis, and political economy. “Revolution or Ruin,” *E-Flux*, Journal #110 - June 2020, <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/110/335242/revolution-or-ruin/>)

For Riofrancos, a politics of pure negation is unhelpful because it mistakes the GND for a “prepackaged solution” to the climate crisis that one either accepts or rejects wholesale. She proposes that the plan is better thought of as an ever-changing “terrain of struggle” with “the potential to unleash desires and transform identities” and reasons that if the final shape of the GND is still to be decided, then to reject it is to cede important territory to fossil capital. As an alternative, she suggests that we “take our cue from social movements that adopt a stance of critical support, embracing the political opening afforded by the Green New Deal while at the same time contesting some of its specific elements, thus pushing up against and expanding the horizon of possibility.” “Critical support” for the GND is as unsatisfactory as a politics of “pure negation.” Like all democratic socialist strategy, it subordinates working class struggle to the task of electing progressive candidates. It gives up on the left’s revolutionary tradition to focus instead on the more “realistic” task of agitating for gradual leftward shifts in the Overton window. As with all political strategies, the efficacy of democratic socialism rests on the achievability of its aims. While Jeremy Corbyn’s election as Labour’s leader in 2015 and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s success in 2018 gave democratic socialism a boost, the Democratic National Committee’s opposition to Bernie Sanders and the 2019 UK election have shown the limits of mainstream parties’ tolerance for socialism. To think it possible to implement a progressive GND with the DNC that we have, the Supreme Court that we have, the House of Lords that we have, or the patterns of property and land ownership that we have—that is to say, with the capitalist state that we have—is to assume that the institutions of ruling class power can be used for mass benefit without removing the ruling class. Riofrancos proposes that “extra-parliamentary, disruptive action from below” should be combined with “creative experimentation with institutions and policies,” but surely by now—in the midst of compounding crises—we should be beyond experimenting with bourgeois institutions on bourgeois terms. Riofrancos’s “critical support” excludes the option of building towards revolution. As her argument unfolds, it moves from defending the GND as an important site of struggle to arguing that it is the site of struggle. To question the GND’s electoralism is to make a choice for “resignation cloaked in realism,” to acquiesce to an endless “waiting for [the] ever-deferred moment of rupture.” The obvious but unspoken third option here, though, is to build toward the moment of “rupture,” or more concretely the seizure of power, outside of the Democratic or Labour Parties. No doubt this option remains unspoken because it is too “unrealistic,” too undemocratic, and too “authoritarian” for democratic socialists to countenance. Let’s look at this third option more closely. To build towards an eco-communist revolution, we need to avoid both a politics of pure negation and a politics of “critical affirmation.” As Marx argued, revolutions need dialectics. They need us to find what Fredric Jameson calls the “dialectical ambivalence” in capitalism. This means training ourselves to locate aspects of the present that point beyond themselves and towards the communist horizon. Lenin did precisely this after the outbreak of the First World War. Rather than joining with the majority of the socialist parties of the Second International in capitulating to imperialist war, and rather than wallowing in melancholia following the betrayal of so many of his German comrades as they voted for war credits, Lenin saw in the war an opportunity for revolutionary advance. Those interested in the emancipation of the working class needed to fight not for peace but for the dialectical conversion of nationalist war to civil war. The war, and the collapse of the Second International, was the opportunity for something new. What would it mean to think dialectically about the GND? We think it would mean stripping the policy’s reformist *content* away from its revolutionary *form*. For decades environmental movements in the capitalist core have busied themselves fighting for local solutions to global problems: cooperatives, local currencies, urban agriculture, and ethical consumerism. As these experiments blossomed, the climate crisis continued unabated. More pipelines were built, more indigenous land was stolen, more fires raged, and more species flickered out of existence. In their form the GND and GIR put localism aside. Both recognize that the climate crisis demands a state-led, centrally planned, and global response. They take for granted that we need a state to intervene on behalf of nature and workers against capital. The fact that the GND and GIR promise to do this is what makes capitalists fear them. Those who are excited about the promise of the GND—such as Riofrancos—have similarly turned towards the state as a terrain of struggle and a locus of power. Consciously or not, these movements have learned from the failures of Climate Camp, Occupy, and the Movement of Squares. It is not enough to suspend the normal running of things. Taking responsibility means taking power and organizing society in what Marx called the interests of “freely associated workers,” or more controversially, the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” The struggles to implement the GND and GIR tell us that environmentalists are increasingly aware of the need to seize the state—and the need to develop a fighting organization with the capacity to do so.