# T

#### Interpretation – the affirmative must only garner offense from the implementation of the resolution

#### Violation: they garner offense from their scholarship and discourse – “prioritize scholarship that ethically constructs us as subjects”, they want you to vote aff based off of their method and performance

#### Definitions:

#### Appropriation requires a permanent settlement or taking for exclusive use – temporary use not included

**Gorove 69** Stephen Gorove, Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, 37 Fordham L. Rev. 349 (1969). Available at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol37/iss3/2> Stephen Gorove (1917-2001) was a space law education pioneer who helped develop international treaties establishing jurisdictional boundaries and liability limits for space exploration and relevant issues. He served as a professor of space law and director of space studies and policy, from 1991-1998, at the University of Mississippi. He organized the first North American international space law conference, which was held at the University of Mississippi in 1969. He founded and chaired the editorial advisory board for the first space law journal, the Journal of Space Law, in 1973. He served as the first director of the NASA-sponsored National Center for Remote Sensing, Air and Space Law from 2000 until his passing.

With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation. By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation. The question may also be asked whether or not the purpose of appropriation, that is whether it takes place in the name of science, for enrichment, or for any other purpose would have a bearing on the question of its lawfulness. Normally, the purpose of appropriation should have little bearing on the prohibition except that to constitute appropriation, the acquisition must be carried out for the purpose of one's own or exclusive use. However, since the Treaty proclaims freedom of scientific investigation in outer space, 6 there seems to be some support for the argument that if the appropriation takes place in the name of science or in the course of a scientific investigation in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, such use would not be prohibited under the Treaty. Nonetheless, if the proclaimed principle is taken literally, the same argument could not be used with equal force in a case where the scientific investigation was carried out on the earth. It is doubtful whether the Treaty intended such effect, but if it did not, it is unfortunate that it fails to make it clear.

#### Private company is defined as

Chen, 21, Learn about Private Companies, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/privatecompany.asp, Investopedia,

A private company is a firm held under private ownership. Private companies may issue stock and have shareholders, but their shares do not trade on public exchanges and are not issued through an [initial public offering](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/i/ipo.asp) (IPO). As a result, private firms do not need to meet the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) strict filing requirements for [public companies](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/publiccompany.asp). In general, the shares of these businesses are less liquid, and their [valuations](https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/09/how-to-value-shares-in-private-company.asp) are more difficult to determine.

#### Meriam webster defines outer space

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/outer%20space>

: space immediately outside the earth's atmosphere broadly : interplanetary or interstellar space

#### Prefer our interp – 2 impacts

#### Procedural fairness and competitive equity – their interpretation *explodes limits*, opening the floodgates to an infinite scope of 1ACs that 2Ns can't reasonably be expected to prepare for – it also allows the aff to *pre-determine the terrain of competition* and contestation by adapting any methodology, analytic, or literature base, which only grants the neg *concessionary ground* and forces us to debate against truisms – this kills neg ground and creates a structural side-bias for the aff. *Debate is fundamentally a competitive game*, which means that fairness is a d-rule and a prerequisite to evaluating aff offense. They obviously care about fairness bc they follow speech times, etc. If procedural fairness is irrelevant, then I get a 2NR.

#### Idea Testing/Argument-skills – A well-defined resolution is critical to allow the neg to refute the aff in an in-depth fashion---this process of negation produces iterative testing and improvement, where we learn to improve our arguments based on our opponents’ arguments. This means that a) they are only winning the arguments they are bc of my inability to predictably prepare and respond to them. And, b) don’t weight the aff against topicality because a predictable stasis point is a pre-req to truth-testing the aff. We can’t know if their arguments are true without testing them so always evaluate T first.

#### The Topical Version of the Aff proves that they could have still included a discussion of set col while defending the resolution. If I prove that a TVA exists, it’s terminal defense to the K, resolving all unique offense. The TVA is if they just defended the entirety of the resolution without attempting to garner extra offense from their discourse and method.

#### Drop the debater: Hold the line – do not let them severe out of their extra topical offense. Time has already been lost debating it and it would be unfair to let them kick out of offense. That would allow them to run 10 different advocacies and kick out of the non-T ones making it impossible to be neg. Also voting neg is important to shape the norms of debate.

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interps because reasonability is arbitrary and invites intervention. Also, topicality is a yes or no question. You either are topical or you are not topical.

#### No RVIS: You shouldn’t win for following the rules and RVIS would lead to a chilling effect preventing a check on legitimate abuse.

# K

#### The mythological grouping of all indigenous groups with land justifies romantic myths about cultural identities that provoke militarization and scapegoating – treating the globe as a commons where no identity is entitled to any land ownership is crucial to build the institutions capable of solving both the assault on Native peoples worldwide and global environmental catastrophe

**Dean 15** [Jodi, Professor of Humanities and Social Sciences at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, “This Changes Some Things,” March 17. 2015, *Politics, Theory, Action,* <http://jdeanicite.typepad.com/i_cite/2015/03/this-changes-some-things.html>]

The second problem is Klein's association of communities with indigeneity and land. Klein writes, "communities with strong ties to the land have always, and will always, defend themselves against businesses that threaten their ways of life" (309). Here again she denies division, as if everyone in a community agreed on what constituted a threat, as if they were all similarly situated against a threat, as if they were never too deluded, tired, or exploited to defend themselves, as if they could never themselves constitute a threat to themselves. Cities, towns, states, and regions make bad decisions all the time; they stimulate industries that destroy them. Klein, though, has something else in mind, "a ferocious love" that "no amount of money can extinguish." She associates this love "with an identity, a culture, a beloved place that people are determined to pass on to their grandchildren, and that their ancestors may have paid for with great sacrifice." She continues, "And though this kind of connection to place is surely strongest in Indigenous communities where the ties to the land go back thousands of years, it is in fact Blockadia's defining feature" (342). Participants in my seminar found this description racist or fascist. Even though this is not Klein's intent, her rhetoric deploys a set of myths regarding nature, and some people's relation to nature, that make some people closer to nature (and further from civilization) than others. It also justifies an intense defense of blood and soil on the part of one group's attachment to a place such that others become foreign, invaders, rightly excluded as threats to our way of life, our cultural identity. Given that climate change is already leading to increased migration and immigration and that the US and Europe are already responding by militarizing borders, a language of cultural defense and ties to the land is exactly what we don't need in a global movement for climate justice. Klein's argument, though, gets worse as it juxtaposes indigenous people's love of place with the "extreme rootlessness" of the fossil fuel workforce. These "highly mobile" pipefitters, miners, engineers, and big rig drivers produce a culture of transience, even when they "may stay for decades and raise their kids" in a place. The language of rootless echoes with descriptions of cosmopolitan Jews, intellectuals, and communists. Some are always foreign elements threatening our way of life. In contrast, I imagine climate politics as breaking the link between place and identity. To address climate change, we have to treat the world itself as a commons and build institutions adequate to the task of managing it. I don't have a clear idea as to what these institutions would look like. But the idea that no one is entitled to any place seems better to me as an ethos for a red-green coalition. It requires us to be accountable to every place

#### A focus on discourse is an abandonment of real change – we must use a materialist focus to solve oppression

Cloud 1 (Dana L. Cloud, Associate Professor, Communication Studies UT Austin, “The Affirmative Masquerade,” American Communication Journal, Volume 4, Issue 3, Spring 2001, <http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol4/iss3/special/cloud.htm>)

At the very least, however, it is clear that **poststructuralist discourse theories have left behind** some of **historical materialism’s most valuable conceptual tools for** any **theoretical and critical practice that aims at informing practical, oppositional political activity on behalf of** historically exploited and **oppressed groups**. As Nancy Hartsock (1983, 1999) and many others have argued (see Ebert 1996; Stabile, 1997; Triece, 2000; Wood, 1999), **we need to retain concepts such as standpoint epistemology** (wherein truth standards are not absolute or universal but arise from the scholar’s alignment with the perspectives of particular classes and groups) **and fundamental, class-based interests** (as opposed to understanding class as just another discursively-produced identity). We need extra-discursive reality checks on ideological mystification and economic contextualization of discursive phenomena. Most importantly, **critical scholars bear the obligation to explain the origins and causes of exploitation and oppression in order** better **to inform the fight against them**.  In poststructuralist discourse theory, **the "retreat from class**" (Wood, 1999) **expresses an unwarranted pessimism about what can be accomplished in late capitalism with regard to** understanding and **transforming** system and **structure at the level of the economy and the state**. **It** substitutes meager cultural freedoms for macro-level social transformation even **as millions of people around the world feel the global reach of capitalism more deeply than ever before**. At the core of the issue is a debate across the humanities and social sciences with regard to whether we live in a "new economy," an allegedly postmodern, information-driven historical moment in which, it is argued, organized mass movements are no longer effective in making material demands of system and structure (Melucci, 1996). In suggesting that global capitalism has so innovated its strategies that there is no alternative to its discipline, arguments proclaiming "a new economy" risk inaccuracy, pessimism, and conservatism (see Cloud, in press). While a thoroughgoing summary is beyond the scope of this essay, there is a great deal of evidence against claims that capitalism has entered a new phase of extraordinary innovation, reach, and scope (see Hirst and Thompson, 1999).  Furthermore, both class polarization (see Mishel, Bernstein, and Schmitt, 2001) and the ideological and management strategies that contain class antagonism (see Cloud, 1998; Parker and Slaughter, 1994) still resemble their pre-postmodern counterparts. A recent report of the Economic Policy Institute concludes that in the 1990s, inequality between rich and poor in the U.S. (as well as around the world) continued to grow, in a context of rising worker productivity, a longer work week for most ordinary Americans, and continued high poverty rates.  Even as the real wage of the median CEO rose nearly 63 percent from 1989, to 1999, more than one in four U.S. workers lives at or below the poverty level. Among these workers, women are disproportionately represented, as are Black and Latino workers. (Notably, unionized workers earn nearly thirty percent more, on average, than non-unionized workers.) Meanwhile, Disney workers sewing t-shirts and other merchandise in Haiti earn 28 cents an hour. Disney CEO Michael Eisner made nearly six hundred million dollars in 1999--451,000 times the wage of the workers under his employ (Roesch, 1999). According to United Nations and World Bank sources, several trans-national corporations have assets larger than several countries combined. Sub-Saharan Africa and the Russian Federation have seen sharp economic decline, while assets of the world’s top three billionaires exceed the GNP of all of the least-developed countries and their combined population of 600 million people (Shawki and D’Amato, 2000, pp. 7-8).  **In this context of a real** (and clearly bipolar) **class divide in** late **capitalist society,** the postmodern party is a masquerade ball, in which theories claiming to offer ways toward emancipation and progressive critical practice in fact **encourage scholars** and/as activists **to abandon** any **commitment to crafting oppositional political blocs** with instrumental and perhaps revolutionary potential. Instead, on their arguments, we must recognize agency as an illusion of humanism and settle for playing with our identities in a mood of irony, excess, and profound skepticism. Marx and Engels’ critique of the Young Hegelians applies equally well to the postmodern discursive turn: "They are only fighting against ‘phrases.’ They forget, however, that to these phrases they themselves are only opposing other phrases, and that they are in no way combating the real existing world when they are merely combating the phrases of this world" (1976/1932, p. 41).  Of course, the study of "phrases" is important to the project of materialist critique in the field of rhetoric. The point, though, is to explain the connections between phrases on the one hand and economic interests and systems of oppression and exploitation on the other. Marxist ideology critique, understands that classes, motivated by class interest, produce rhetorics wittingly and unwittingly, successfully and unsuccessfully. Those rhetorics are strategically adapted to context and audience. Yet **Marxist theory is not naïve in** its **understanding** of intention or individual **agency**. Challenging individualist humanism, **Marxist** ideology **critics regard people as "products of circumstances**" (and changed people as products of changed circumstances; Marx, 1972b/1888, p. 144).  Within this understanding, **Marxist** ideology **critics can describe and evaluate cultural discourses** such as that of racism or sexism **as strategic and complex expressions of both their moment in history and of their class basis**. Further, this mode of critique seeks to explain both why and how social reality is fundamentally, systematically oppressive and exploitative, exploring not only the surface of discourses but also their often-complex and multi-vocal motivations and consequences. As Burke (1969/1950) notes, **Marxism is both a method of rhetorical criticism and a rhetorical formation** itself (pp. 109-110). There is no pretense of neutrality or assumption of transcendent position for the critic.  Teresa Ebert (1996) summarizes the purpose of materialist ideology critique:   Materialist critique is a mode of knowing that inquires into what is not said, into the silences and the suppressed or missing, in order to uncover the concealed operations of power and the socio-economic relations connecting the myriad details and representations of our lives. It shows that apparently disconnected zones of culture are in fact materially linked through the highly differentiated, mediated, and dispersed operation of a systematic logic of exploitation. In sum, materialist critique disrupts **‘what is’ to explain how social differences**--specifically gender, race, sexuality, and class--**have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation, so that we can change them. It is the means for** producing transformative knowledges**.** (p. 7)

#### Postmodernism’s focus on signs and discourse trades off with a focus on materiality, foreclosing an effective anticapitalist struggle

McLaren and Torres 99 (Peter McLaren, professor of education at U of California Los Angeles, and Rudolfo Torres, Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, Chicano/Latino Studies, and Political Science, “Racism and Multicultural Education: Rethinking ‘Race’ and ‘Whiteness’ in Late Capitalism”, Chapter 2 of “Critical Multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education”, edited by Stephen May, p.51-52, Questia)

Preoccupied with celebrating the undecidability and incommensurability of discourses, and uninterested in class politics, postmodernists have thus foreclosed the possibility of mounting a programme of anticapitalist struggle. While discursive undecidability is surely a feature of the textuality of everyday life, we must remember that this is a second-order feature and it is not antiseptically removed from the concrete determinations of capital. Language partakes of a second-order materiality but its features of signification-i.e., the organization, inflection and uncontainability of discourse-should not be confused with the multiple concrete determinations that make up the materiality of class struggle. Global capitalism has a way of reshaping, reinflecting, and rearticulating postmodern discourses of dissent such that they fit securely within the manageable compass of business interests and are underwritten by safe abstract civic ideals and non-threatening constitutional-jurisprudential discourses of diversity. Despite all of the fashionable talk about the deterioration of the nation-state, the weakening patterns of cultural affiliation and social practices, and the creolization and/or hybridization of cultural identities, discourses always converge and pivot around objective labour practices. While postmodernists are correct in arguing that discourses classify, codify, commodify, and often yolk together disparate realms of signification, in their hip cleverness they are able to mount only a corporate-sponsored rebellion. The fashionable apostasy, insurgent posturing, and often sexy and always incorrigible avant-garde transgression that we have come to expect from the postmodernists haemorrhages our understanding of the relation of cultural production to the international division of labour. Through the textual supplication of the deconstructionists, modernism is given a nose-bleed and perhaps an unintended face-lift. While the postmodernists celebrate ethnic diversity and a free marketplace of ideas, their publishers mainly see green as they are able to package such post-beatnik antiauthoritarianism to a new generation of graduate students who want the thrill of rebellion without threatening their own security as future academics. Postmodernists have become capitalism's new voguish flunkies, who operate almost entirely in the officially sanctioned precincts of dissent: the sociology seminar room or bookstore. Consequently we do not maintain, as does Jean Baudrillard for example, that labour has been transformed simply into a sign among other signs, into a structure of obedience to a code. Furthermore, we do not believe that capitalism has passed from a phase where labour is exploited to one where it is only marketed and consumed. We do not want to reduce 'being a worker' to its sign value or a practice of unequal gift exchange as Baudrillard suggests. The enemy of the worker is not the code so much as the social relations of production. Within much of the analysis by postmodernists, regimes of signification have been wrenched from their material location in narratives of human struggle. They are discovered hovering helter-skelter over the turmoil of the real. We do not believe that within postmodern cultures human needs are irrelevant. Indeed, material and symbolic needs are vitally important. The development of global postmodern cultures has done little to undermine the pervasive destructive capacities of exploitation that accompany capitalism. Consequently, as critical educators, we must never deflect our glances from the global mode of production or the dangers of internationalized class domination.

#### Capitalism ensures 100s of millions live in extreme poverty and perpetuates oppression

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.

#### Cap is the root cause of settler violence

Jackson 20 Jackson, Elizabeth. CHANGING SEASONS OF RESISTANCE: IMPACTS OF SETTLER COLONIALISM AND CLIMATE CHANGE IN INDIGENOUS WORLDS. Humboldt State University, 2020, https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1436&context=etd, Accessed 1 Feb 2022. Elizabeth Jackson has a Master of Arts in Sociology from Humboldt State University.

In this paper I argue that capitalism, a product of the European invaders, plays a significant role in the degradation of Indigenous peoples and the Earth. Both sociologists and political scientists have connected neoliberal capitalism to our planet’s rapid environmental degradation and the demise of Indigenous populations, particularly since the industrial revolution. In her study, Jodi Melamed (2011) details the shift from a white supremacist modernity to a postmodern Western World that is officially antiracist, but with normalized racial violence when People of Color get in the way of the Capitalist free-market. Currently, there are many wars occurring over global resources, such as the oil wars in the Middle East and fights between Indigenous Peoples in Latin America and the corporations that are expelling them from their lands for monoculture palm oil production. The structures of settler colonialism force Indigenous People to struggle against capitalist corporations and governments that continue the forceful takeover and poisoning of their land and water supplies. From the start, Europeans brought with them beliefs and customs that were informed by Christianity and laced with white supremacy. This Eurocentric lifestyle and mindset was officially sanctioned through the Doctrine of Discovery and concepts such as “manifest destiny.” Settler States such as North America and Australia claimed that Indigenous frameworks of sentient ecology meant that Indigenous People were “wasting God’s bounties,” conveniently creating a manifest destiny ideology that combined religion, white land ownership, displacement and genocide of Indigenous people, and a slavery driven capitalist economy (Samson and Gigoux 2017). The Doctrine of Discovery, which originated in a papal bull (Declaration from the Pope), stated that European nations would acquire title to the lands they “discovered,” and the Indigenous inhabitants would lose their rights to it. This doctrine was first used by the Portuguese monarchy to seize West Africa in 1455. After Columbus’s infamous voyage in 1492, another papal bull was written claiming that the land in what is now eastern United States and parts of the Caribbean would belong to Portugal. A few years later a dispute between Spain and Portugal’s claim to the lands led to the Treaty of Tordesillas which stated that only “non-Christian” lands fell under the Doctrine of Discovery.

#### The alternative is to establish a communist party that will prepare and organize for the revolution

Dean 12Dean, J., 2012. *The Communist Horizon*. 1st ed. Verso Books.

What's the alternative? Trusting our desire for collectivity. This means acknowledging how autonomy is only ever a collective product, fragments are pa1ts of ever larger wholes, and dispersion is but the flipside of concentration. We might think here in terms of a dynamic rather than an either/or: dispersed local actions matter; they ru·e amplified when they are linked to a movement that can bring out huge numbers of people for massive events. And these massive events are more than just spectacles, more than momentary hints at the people's will, when they are strengthened by the specific achievements of specific, targeted campaigns. In many ways, this has already been a key component of Occupy. Yet, too much movement rhetoric denounces centralization and celebrates locality such that people lose confidence in anything but the local and the community-based. Likewise, strong structures, structures that can grow, structures with duration, need vertical and diagonal components in addition to horizontal ones. Again, this has been obviously true in the movement, yet much of the rhetmic of Occupy celebrates only horizontality, treating verticality as a danger to be fought at every turn. Diagonality is basically neglected, which means we haven't put much energy into developing structures of accountability and recall. Collective power isn't just coming together. It's sticking together. And sticking together requires a willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of others. Many are already doing this, yet the movement doesn't acknowledge it insofar as its language celebrates and valorizes autonomy over collectivity. Collectivity is present in the common language and common actions in the movement, but not to and for itself. It's sometimes asserted, sometimes experienced. But it has to be collectively desired and collectively built-hence the need for a party. In sum, the Occupy movement demonstrates why something like a party is needed insofar as a party is an explicit assertion of collectivity, a structure of accountability, an acknowledgment of differential capacities, and a vehicle for solidarity. It also gives us a sense of the form such a party might take: a self-conscious assertion of the overlap of two gaps in the maintenance of collective desire. Some depict the Leninist paity as a spectre of honor, the remnant of the failed revolution the tenors of which must be avoided at all costs. In such a vision (which may not be concretely held by anyone but seems vaguely intuited by many), communism is reduced not simply to the ac tual (which is always necessarily ruptured, incomplete, irreducible to itself, and pregnant with the unrealized potentials of the past) but to the parody of one ac tuality, an actuality that has in fact changed over time and from different perspec tives. Through this reduction (which is an ongoing process), actuality is displaced by an impossible figure, a figure so resolute as to be incapable of revolutionary change. Rigid, exclusive, dogmatic-it's hard to see how such a party could even function in a revolutionary situation much less ever attract members in the first place: how would it get people to show up, to march, to write and distribute newspapers, to put their lives on the line? How would it grow or spread? In contrast, Lukacs's account of the Leninist party suggests an organization formed as the subjectification of two lacks, the chaos of revolution and the non-knowledge of the party. 12 Lukacs argues that Lenin's pruty presupposes the actuality of revolution. It's a political organization premised on the fact of revolution, on the fact that the terrain of politics is open and changing and that revolutions happen. Revolutions ru·e not messiani c events wherein long-awaited deities intervene in human affairs. They are results, conditions, and effects of politics wherein states are overthrown, dismantled, distributed, reconfigured, redirected. In the chaos of revolution, tendencies in one direction can suddenly move in a completely opposite direction. Because the revolutionary situation is characte1ized by unpredictability and upheaval, no iron laws of history provide a map or playbook that revolutionaries can follow to certain victory. That revolution is actual means that decisions, actions, and judgment cannot be perpetually defen-ed. When we take them, we are fully exposed to our lack of coverage in history, to the chaos of the revolutionary moment. We have to be confident that the revolutionary process will bring about new constellations, arrangements, skills, and convictions, that through it we will make something else, something we haven't yet imagined. For the Leninist party, to wait, to postpone until we are sure, until we know, is to fail now. The actuality of revolution requires discipline and preparation, not because the communist pruty can accurately predict everything that will occur-it cannot-and not because it has an infallible theoryit does not. Its theory, like the conditions in which it is set, is open to rigorous c1iticism, testing, and revision. Discipline and preparation enable the party to adapt to circumstances rather than be completely molded or determined by them. The party has to be consistent and flexible because revolution is chaotic. The actuality of revolution is thus a condition of constitutive non-knowledge for which the party can prepare. It's a condition that demands response, if the party is to be accountable to the exploited and oppressed people, if it is to function as a communist party. A communist party is necessary because neither capitalist dynamics nor mass spontaneity Immanently produce a proletarian revolution that ends the exploitation and oppression of the people. A revolutionary period brings together and confuses multiple and changing groups and classes. Different spontaneous tendencies, degrees of class consciousness, and ideological persuasions converge. The Leninist party doesn't know what the people want. It's a form for dealing with the split in the people, their non-know ledge of what they, as a collectivity, desire. As Lukacs Wiites, "If events had to be delayed until the proletruiat entered the decisive struggles united and clear in its aims there would never be a revolutionary situation." 13 What the pruty knows is that such a lack of knowledge must not impede action because it cannot forestall the actuality of revolution. The party, then, is an organization situated at the overlap of two lacks, the openness of history as well as its own non-knowledge. The communist party occupies this site and subjectifies it; it provides a form for political subjectivity as it works in "total solidarity with and support for all the 13 Ibid., 31. OCCUPATION AND THE PA RTY 243 oppressed and exploited within capitalist society." 14 This dedication requires constant interaction with the struggling, proletarianized people. Constant interaction installs a double dynamic in the party. On the one hand, it must be stric tly disciplined. On the other, it must be flexible and responsive, capable of leaming from and adapting to the ever-changing situation. As it learns from the struggling masses, the party provides a vehicle through which they can understand their actions and express their collective will, much as the psychoanalyst provides a means for the analysand to become conscious of her desire. Is One might object that my use of Lukacs to present a view of the Leninist party as a form responsive to lack and contingency is selective at best. Such an objection could emphasize Lukacs's claim that "because the pruty, on the basis of its knowledge of society in its totality, represents the interests of the whole proletaiiat (and in doing so mediates the interests of all the oppressed-the future of mankind), it must unite within it all the contradictions in which the tasks that 14 Ibid., 30. 15 Slavoj Zizek, Revolution at the Gates, London: Verso, 2002. 244 THE COMMUNIST HOR IZON anse from the very heart of this social totality are expressed." 16 This objection misses its target: to unite contradictions is not to resolve them. The party doesn't resolve contradictions; it expresses them as contradictions. Leninist revolutionruies take on themselves the demands and confli cts of the revolution. They perform the revolutionary situation, in all its chaos and unce1tainty. To this extent, the Leninist party cannot be a party that makes demands on the people; it is a party that makes present to the people the demands they are already making on themselves, but can't yet acknowledge.

#### The RoB is whoever best deconstructs capitalism: Centering debate on capital is critical to combat capitalism — educators need to support class analysis

McLaren and Farahmandpur ‘7—(P. McLaren, Critical Studies @ Chapman U and UCLA urban schooling prof, R. Farahmandpur, Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, associate professor of Communication – U Windsor, “More Unequal: Aspects of Class in the United States”, 2007, pg. 10-12) kb

As the drums of war drown out dissent and as accountability and testing regimes are imposed upon public schools, critical educators advocate for a curriculum that enables students to conceptualize, analyze, theorize, and critically reflect upon their experiences in the world. Despite their seeming singularity, experiences are not fashioned in isolation. Because experiences, though idiosyncratic, are part of a larger ensemble of social relations, it is important for students to interrogate their own experiences in the context of understanding how oppression and exploitation function within the larger totality of capitalist society. The long-term goal of education is the transformation of the existing social order. And that means teachers and students should have a number of theoretical approaches to work from—with a Marxist analysis of class as the centerpiece. This approach is not new, having been developed over the years by exponents of the work of the late Brazilian educator Paulo Freire. Fortunately, the work of Freire has managed to avoid the halting attention to which many other radical educators seem depressingly prone. For decades his work has been at the helm of critical pedagogy and popular education and his legacy seems assured. That is good news for the educational Left. Although insufficienly heralded in the United States, Freire's masterwork, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, can claim a one-of-a-kind status in the annals of the educational Left. More than any other single book, Freire's signature opus continues to shape the ways in which many leftist teachers and educators frame political and ideological questions related to teaching and learning in their classrooms.23 Freirean pedagogy has inspired and motivated a new generation of educators and activists to defend democratic principles, values, and practices in their classrooms and schools against the neoliberal onslaught in an age of terror, fear, and permanent war. Viewing human beings as a "presence in the world" (this holds true even in a consumer- driven, mass-produced culture run by taste merchants and reality-television producers), Freire maintains that taking risks is an essential characteristic of our "existing being."24 He reminds us that education, both as a political and ideological activity, involves taking risks. Our presence in the world is not a neutral presence. As political and ideological agents, we are compelled to take a stance within it. As Freire notes: "Nobody can be in the world, with the world, and with others in a neutral manner."25 Thus "being" is a being in the world. Freire sees history impregnated with possibility and hope. However, to make that possibility tangible in the lives of the oppressed, he believes that we must actively engage and intervene in the world. What does "being in the world" entail? Freire explains that our presence in the world is not to adapt to it but to work toward transforming it. Freire emphasizes that adapting to the world is only a process—a temporary phase—toward intervening and transforming the world. Thus adaptation is a "moment in the process of intervention^6 Furthermore, Freire argues that we live in an ethical world. Our ideological and political orientation compels us to make moral and ethical decisions. Freire reminds us that our actions have a universal dimension, and that "being in the world" entails recognizing our responsibilities and commitments toward other human beings. Freire views human beings as both subjects and objects of history. In other words, though the forces of history shape our past and present, we can change the course of history, and in the process make history. As Freire puts it, "The future does not make us, we make ourselves in the struggle to make it."27 We can break away from the chains of history passed down to us from previous generations and make our own history. In short, Freire acknowledges that human beings are conditioned by history, but he refuses to accept that they are determined by it, because for Freire history is possibility. Freire maintains that a critical reading of the world involves denouncing the existing oppression and injustices in the world. At the same time, it involves announcing the possibility of a more humane and just world. For Freire, reading the world is both a pedagogical-political and a political-pedagogical undertaking. Denouncing the world is an act that involves criticizing, protesting, and struggling against domination and domestication. The act of announcing a new world entails hope and possibility, and this stipulates envisioning a new democratic society outside of capitalism's law of value. Elsewhere, Freire makes an important distinction between the role of education in helping students develop critical thinking skills and as training and preparation for entering the workforce.28 He cautions us against reducing education to a set of techniques and skills. Freire incessantly asserts that education can effectively be employed to "make and remake" ourselves. Education, as Freire conceives it, involves knowing that you know, and knowing that you don't know. It entails developing a "critical curiosity" and a radical reorientation toward the world. For Freire, critical pedagogy involves learning to question the world by cultivating an "epistemological curiosity." He encourages teachers and educators to imagine, dream, and struggle toward building the foundations of a new democratic society. They must also be willing to be a "presence" in the world by engaging in a dialectical process of what he calls "reading the word and the world." Donaldo Macedo and Ana Maria Araujo Freire underscore what is meant by "reading the word and the world" when they assail those literacy specialists who teach reading as a method disarticulated from the world of exploitation and oppression, antiseptically detached from the totality of capitalist social relations. Specialists who equate the process of becoming literate to acquiring a discrete set of cognitive skills "domesticate the consciousness via a constant disarticulation between the reductionistic and narrow reading of one's field of specialization and reading of the universe within which one's specialization is situated."29 Such "pseudocritical educators" are thus "semiliterate"—they can read the word but are woefully unable to read the world, that is, they are able to read the texts of their specialty but remain "ignorant of all other bodies of knowledge that constitute the world of knowledge."30 Jose Ortega y Gasset calls such a specialist a "learned ignoramus" who—as Macedo and Freire explain—is "mainly concerned with his or her own tiny portion of the world, disconnected from other bodies of knowledge .. . [and] never able to relate the flux of information to gain a critical reading of the world."31 Paulo Freire emphasized that a critical reading of the world implies "a dynamic comprehension between the least coherent sensibility of the world and a more coherent understanding of the world."32. Learned ignoramuses are all around us. For instance, how can education specialists in science and math and computer technology ignore how teaching advances in these areas have aided the military industrial complex that enables the United States to exercise its domination of less developed countries of the world, that allows industry to subject the poor to the ravages of capital, that facilitates the devastation of our ecosystems, and that makes possible breakthroughs in medicine that benefit only those who can afford to pay for treatment? In our own classrooms we are careful not to approach the struggle for socialism from the Olympian standpoint of eternity—as a primrose path that leads the faithful to that luminous workers' council on the hill. We eschew Utopian blueprints in favor of serious discussions that deal with questions of power, the state, and various forms for organizing for socialist democracy. For instance, we explore the current debate between the Zapatistas (who do not wish to take state power) and the supporters of Hugo Chavez (Chavistas who believe that the state can be transformed from the bottom up by taking state power). In some cases we have traveled with our students to Venezuela and Mexico and have participated in such debates firsthand. The critical revolutionary pedagogy that we support advances these and other issues from the perspective of a problem-posing rather than a solution-giving pedagogy. It eschews magic bullet solutions and instead favors the practice of historical materialist critique. It mandates approaching the process of teaching and learning within the larger context of certain fundamental questions. In the wake of the dictatorship of the financial markets, where, in the words of Robert Went, the "invisible hand" of the market is mercilessly arid ruthlessly strangling millions of working-class men, women, and children, how do we liberate creative human powers and capacities from their inhumane form, namely, capital?33 What does it mean to be human? How can we live humanely? What ethical and moral actions must we take to live humanely? How can teachers recognize the important role they play in the battle between labor and capital? These questions along with others can only be answered in the course of revolutionizing educational practices, which will largely depend on the willingness of teachers to join anti- imperialist struggles. Teachers need to support de-colonizing pedagogies and make efforts to work with new social movements, including indigenous groups, in their fight against capital's deadly assault on the poor and the planet that sustains all of us. Teachers must recognize that, as workers, their interests and those of their fellow educators worldwide are tied to the defeat of neoliberal capitalism and the creation of a post-capitalist, socialist society.

# Case

#### Their romanticism of indigenous peoples immobilizes and incarcerates them in the past. This essentializing of culture mimes the language of colonialism, flipping the K

Arjun Appadurai, February 1988 (Professor at the Department of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, Cultural Anthropology, Volume 3, No.1, Place and Voice in Anthropological Theory,pp. 36-49, Putting Hierarchy in Its Place, JSTOR)

So what does it mean to be a native of some place, if it means something more, or other, than being from that place? What it means is that natives are not only persons who are from certain places, and belong to those places, but they are also those who are somehow incarcerated, or confined, in those places.' What we need to examine is this attribution or assumption of incarceration, of imprisonment, or confinement. Why are some people seen as confined to, and by, their places? Probably the simplest aspect of the common sense of anthropology to which this image corresponds is the sense of physical immobility. Natives are in one place, a place to which explorers, administrators, missionaries, and eventually anthropologists, come. These outsiders, these observers, are regarded as quintessentially mobile; they are the movers, the seers, the knowers. The natives are immobilized by their belonging to a place. Of course, when observers arrive, natives are capable of moving to another place. But this is not really motion; it is usually flight, escape, to another equally confining place. The slightly more subtle assumption behind the attribution of immobility is not so much physical as ecological. Natives are those who are somehow confined to places by their connection to what the place permits. Thus all the language of niches, of foraging, of material skill, of slowly evolved technologies, is actually also a language of incarceration. In this instance confinement is not simply a function of the mysterious, even metaphysical attachment of native to physical places, but a function of their adaptations to their environments. Of course, anthropologists have long known that motion is part of the normal round for many groups, ranging from Bushmen and Australian aborigines, to Central Asian nomads and Southeast Asian swidden agriculturalists. Yet most of these groups, because their movements are confined within small areas and appear to be driven by fairly clear-cut environmental constraints, are generally treated as natives tied not so much to a place as to a pattern of places. This is still not quite motion of the free, arbitrary, adventurous sort associated with metropolitan behavior. It is still incarceration, even if over a larger spatial terrain. But the critical part of the attribution of nativeness to groups in remote parts of the world is a sense that their incarceration has a moral and intellectual dimension. They are confined by what they know, feel, and believe. They are prisoners of their "mode of thought." This is, of course, an old and deep theme in the 38 history of anthropological thought, and its most powerful example is to be found in Evans-Pritchard's picture of the Azande, trapped in their moral web, confined by a way of thinking that admits of no fuzzy boundaries and is splendid in its internal consistency. Although Evans-Pritchard is generally careful not to exaggerate the differences between European and Azande mentality, his position suggests that the Azande are especially confined by their mode of thought: Above all, we have to be careful to avoid in the absence of native doctrine constructing a dogma which we would formulate were we to act as Azande do. There is no elaborate and consistent representation of witchcraft that will account in detail for its workings, nor of nature which expounds its conformity to sequences and functional interrelations. The Zande actualizes these beliefs rather than intellectualizes them, and their tenets are expressed in socially controlled behavior rather than in doctrines. Hence the difficulty of discussing the subject of witchcraft with Azande, for their ideas are imprisoned in action and cannot be cited to explain and justify action. [Evans-Pritchard 193753243; emphasis mine] Of course, this idea of certain others, as confined by their way of thinking, in itself appears to have nothing to do with the image of the native, the person who belongs to a place. The link between the confinement of ideology and the idea of place is that the way of thought that confines natives is itself somehow bounded, somehow tied to the circumstantiality of place. The links between intellectual and spatial confinement, as assumptions that underpin the idea of the native, are two. The first is the notion that cultures are "wholes": this issue is taken up in the section of this essay on Dumont. The second is the notion, embedded in studies of ecology, technology, and material culture over a century, that the intellectual operations of natives are somehow tied to their niches, to their situations. They are seen, in Levi-Strauss's evocative terms, as scientists of the concrete. When we ask where this concreteness typically inheres, it is to be found in specifics of flora, fauna, topology, settlement patterns, and the like; in a word, it is the concreteness of place. Thus, the confinement of native ways of thinking reflects in an important way their attachment to particular places. The science of the concrete can thus be written as the poetry of confinement.'