### 2NC OV vs. K Affs

#### We must have a historical material understanding of the world to effectively allow ourselves to transition away from exploitation of labor – that’s Tumino 1. They reify the system of capital by ignoring a focus on material struggle.

#### This has a few impacts

#### A. The logic of capitalism results in extinction through the creation of ecological catastrophe and violent imperialist wars that will turn nuclear. That’s our Foster 5 evidence.

#### B. Class divisions are the root of all other opressions – that’s Kovel – class can uniquely appropriate the mechanisms of power such as the state to systematically deny resources to that enable the oppression of other groups.

#### C. It turns the aff

#### Discourses of sexuality promote capitalism and can’t be universalized as a struggle

Lowe 95 (Donald M. Lowe. Ed. Of positions: east asia cultures critique. 1995 The Body in Late Capitalist USA)

The new discourse and semiotics of sexual pleasure took off in late capitalism because, with such commodities as the oral contraceptive pill (introduced in 1960), and then the IUD, we can, for the first time ever, have sex without worrying about natal reproduction. The obverse side of this is natal reproduction without sex, i.e., in vitro fertilization, artificial insemination, and ovum transfers. Freed from social reproduction, the new sexuality came to be exploited for the sake of late-capitalist consumption. This is what distinguishes the new sexuality of late capitalism from the bourgeois sexual regulations of industrial capitalism studied by Foucault. It publicizes the promise of sexual pleasure, contradicting the repressive. disciplinary sexuality. The new sexuality is not only discursive and semiotic, but also consumptuary. Quite aptly, the successful sex manual, Alex Comfort's The Joy of Sex (1972), was subtitled "A Cordon Bleu Guide to love-making," and its contents were organized into "Starters" "Main Courses," and Sauces & Pickles." New commodities are packaged and produced specifically for the new sexuality. Pat Califia has said, “S/M is not about pain, but about power." (quoted in Ehrenreich, Hess, and Jacobs 1986, p. 130) But sadomasochism 353 ritual of dominance and submission, a theater of fantasy, requires such paraphernalia as handcuffs, straps, whips, leathers, etc. Thus, Ehrenreich, Hess, and Jacobs report that S1M theater, previously the practice of a few, is now available to even the midwestern housewife through mail-order catalogues. From a strictly capitalist viewpoint, it is the ideal sexual practice .... S/M owes its entrance into the sexual mainstream to its paraphernalia: The symbols arid gear precede the actual practice into the homes and imaginations of millions. (p. ia-s) Besides the direct consumption of sexual implements. late-capitalist production/consumption is able to tap the reservoir of sexual fantasy which the new semiotics of sexuality stimulate. A Lou Harris study reports that sixty-five thousand sexual references a year arc broadcast during the prime afternoon and evening hours on television alone. "'That's an average of 27 an hour. . including 9 kisses, hugs, 10 sexual innuendos and between i and a references each to sexual intercourse and to deviant or discouraged sexual practices.'" Thus a typical American viewer sees nearly fourteen thousand instances of sexual material during the popular time slots each year. (New York Times, January 27, 1988) I propose that the technologies of the look and the relay of juxtaposed images and signs (cf., supra, chapter a. sec. Li) are at the center of this semiotics of sexuality. The two techniques, together with the design and production of commodities as packages of changing product characteristics, contribute to the construction of sexual lifestyle as a signifier for late capitalist production and accumulation of exchange value. The look in the modern West is sexual It is an aspect of the primacy of sight in the modern Western hierarchy of sensing. (Lowc toz) This primacy of sight is culturally arid historically specific not universal. Nor does sex have to be visual in orientation, since seeing is the most distancing of the five human senses. Specific to the modern West is the look constituted as the male gaze-visually subjugating and territorializing the female body. Underneath this look are all the binary oppositions in bourgeois culture which construct the power of male over female. Twcntieth-centurv visuality is very much a masculinist one. Photography, cinematography, and television are the technologies of the look, working to enhance the visualization of sexuality. But technologies are not neutral. Their applications depend on the assumptions and purposes of the addressers Photography, cinematography, and television do not simply extend the male gaze. With their different techniques of shots, montage, and narrativity, they repackage and transform the hegemony of the mate gaze in late capitalism.

#### D. We have an ethical obligation to repudiate capitalism regardless of the ability of our alternative to solve

Marsh 95 (James, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, “Critique, Action, Liberation” p. 334-335)

An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed it may seem unlikely, given this particular person’s past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over **our** capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations**.** I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but i remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. Ideologies of scientific elitism, therefore, as they function in capitalist society are correct if there is no such thing as ethical, constitutive reason operating in community**.** If such constitutive reason is possible and actual in human beings as human in community, then scientific elitism is false. Men and women acting democratically and participatively do have a capacity to understand themselves and their lives in a way that is cogent and in touch with reality. Indeed, many of the popular movements in Europe, England, and the United States in the last twenty years such as feminism, environmentalism, civil rights, and antiwar movements, often acting against the advice or opinion of experts have shown themselves to be right and effective. In the Vietnam War, for example, millions of people in the united states taking to the streets in protest proved the “best and the brightest” in the white house, pentagon, and state department wrong. The “best and the brightest” according to the standards of scientific elitism proved to be deluded. The presence of an ethical, political rationality in all of us as human invalidates scientific elitism at its core. As I am arguing it here, a fundamental link exists among dialectical phenomenology, ethical, constitutive rationality, and democracy. Philosophy and ethics, properly understood, are antielitist. To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental, indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial**.** What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet’s “to be or not to be” speech? What does an empirical of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx’s capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso’s Guernica? To the extend, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason by the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factural, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

### A2: Perm – Do Both (K Aff)

#### You cannot permute a method – it strips out all of the conceptual theory that allows us both understand the world and to create a praxis to end oppression

Tumino 1 [Stephen, Prof English at Pitt, ““What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online]

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups. The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

#### The permutation is severance – it severs out of the methodology of capitalism rooted in the 1AC. This a voting issue because it creates a moving target that steals neg ground a makes it impossible to debate.

#### Ethics DA – We have ethical obligation to repudiate capitalism – this means any risk a link is a reason to reject the permutation

Marsh 95 (James, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, “Critique, Action, Liberation” p. 334-335)

An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed it may seem unlikely, given this particular person’s past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over **our** capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations**.** I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but i remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. Ideologies of scientific elitism, therefore, as they function in capitalist society are correct if there is no such thing as ethical, constitutive reason operating in community**.** If such constitutive reason is possible and actual in human beings as human in community, then scientific elitism is false. Men and women acting democratically and participatively do have a capacity to understand themselves and their lives in a way that is cogent and in touch with reality. Indeed, many of the popular movements in Europe, England, and the United States in the last twenty years such as feminism, environmentalism, civil rights, and antiwar movements, often acting against the advice or opinion of experts have shown themselves to be right and effective. In the Vietnam War, for example, millions of people in the united states taking to the streets in protest proved the “best and the brightest” in the white house, pentagon, and state department wrong. The “best and the brightest” according to the standards of scientific elitism proved to be deluded. The presence of an ethical, political rationality in all of us as human invalidates scientific elitism at its core. As I am arguing it here, a fundamental link exists among dialectical phenomenology, ethical, constitutive rationality, and democracy. Philosophy and ethics, properly understood, are antielitist. To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental, indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial**.** What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet’s “to be or not to be” speech? What does an empirical of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx’s capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso’s Guernica? To the extend, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason by the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factural, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

### A2: Perm – Do the Alt

#### Perm is severance – the alt rejects the aff and the 1AC – that’s bad

#### A. Strategy skew- not knowing whether the plan will change makes it impossible for the negative to form a cohesive strategy.

#### B. Doesn’t test competition—all permutations would be allowable when the affirmative doesn’t have to advocate anything they previously advocated

#### This is a voter for fairness and education.

### Feminism – 2NC Link Wall

Flow

#### 1. The naturalization of capitalism link - that’s the 1NC Brown evidence. The articulation of feminity as a politicized identity naturalizes bourgeois privilege as the goal of action.

#### AND, Empirics support this naturalization process – politicization of feminism gets harnessed to support economic growth as the goal of action. Furthermore these logics justify interventions abroad.

Brenner 10, Johanna, activist and member of Solidarity: a democratic, revolutionary socialist, feminist, anti-racist organization, and associate editor of the journal Against the Current, “Free-Market Feminism,” Monthly Review 62.7, December, online

Mainstream feminist ideology has also been harnessed to legitimize a neoliberal corporate agenda in the global South. Structural adjustment programs of economic deregulation and public sector cutbacks have been justified by the World Bank as expanding opportunities for young women factory workers in export-processing zones. Microcredit programs for women are touted as solutions to their impoverishment. Meanwhile, nongovernmental organizations run by and for women (and dependent on foreign donors for funding) have not only facilitated the dismantling of public services but have also co-opted women’s activism. Individual empowerment for some women has been substituted for the collective empowerment that only comes when economic development benefits workers, farmers, and communities. Although Eisenstein tends to oversimplify some complex feminist debates about the impact of capitalist expansion on women’s lives in the global South, she makes a good case that, since the 1990s, major institutions organizing neoliberal capitalism have used “women’s empowerment” to distract attention from the distinctly disempowering effects of their structural adjustment programs. Turning from economic to political violence, Eisenstein links mainstream feminism to the war on terror. She offers a historically grounded analysis of Islamophobia as the latest in a long line of discourses through which imperialist projects are justified in terms of “saving” colonized women from the men of their patriarchal, “backward” cultures. From national organizations such as the Feminist Majority to Condoleezza Rice and Laura Bush, feminist outrage was mobilized to validate the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. Eisenstein systematically unveils and challenges assumptions behind Islamophobia, arguing, for example, that contemporary Islamic fundamentalism, far from being inherent to Islamic tradition, is in fact a modern political movement emerging out of capitalist economic, political, and cultural domination as well as imperialist violence. She points out that the status of women varies considerably across the Muslim world in relation to political economies, histories of incorporation into the market, organization of the state, and so forth. Eisenstein’s explication of work by Muslim feminist scholars and activists in this chapter is especially useful, providing an effective alternative to mainstream feminist ideas about the needs and interests of Muslim women.

#### 2. The labor link –

#### Feminism creates a false conciousness that serves the needs of transnational capitalism by expanding and satisfying its labor force

Cotter 3 (Jennifer, The Red Critique, “The Class Regimen of Contemporary Feminism, http://www.redcritique.org/Spring2003/theclassregimenofcontemporaryfeminism.htm)

It is important to clearly re-state here that the "problem" with excluding the dialectical materialist critique of social totality from feminism is not that feminism does not go "far enough" without it but that, by erasing the relation of women to the mode of production, it actually helps transnational capitalism cover over its "trouble spots", its fundamental contradictions and the economic crises that result from them. The gestures in feminism toward "materialism" and "Marx" without a historical grasping of the social relations of production are ways to help update ruling class ideology and dismantle the revolutionary knowledges necessary to emancipate women from exploitation. Such "updatings" are driven by the needs of transnational capitalism in crisis. Transnational capitalism, to be clear, is increasingly a highly unstable system of production, which requires desperate and violent "solutions" to help try and create "stability" and "equilibrium". Not only does this show up in the daily struggles of workers who are forced to go without basic needs in health care, social security, education… so that the ruling class can fund massive military expenditures in order to protect or gain access to conditions necessary to stave off a decline in profit, it also shows up within the ruling class itself in the form of increased bankruptcies and failed business ventures as wealth gets concentrated into fewer hand. The "root" issue is that the objective structures of private property in capitalism are based on exploitation and the accumulation of socially produced wealth (capital) in the hands of the few and the increased immiseration and impoverishment of the majority. Crisis brought on by the concentration of wealth is endemic to capitalism. As capital accumulates, it becomes increasingly difficult for the ruling class to maintain its rate of profit, in part because the rate at which labor-power must be exploited in order not simply to reproduce existing wealth but to produce new wealth exceeds the historical capabilities of the proletariat. In short, it "overproduces" capital. As a response, capitalists must seek new technologies and labor saving devises and means to raise the productivity of workers and thus increase the rate at which workers can be exploited. In order to stave off falling rates of profit, capital must produce labor-saving technologies, expand production to create new needs (and thus, new sites for profit), and at the same time export capitalist production to new regions where access to reserves of cheap labor can be found. All of this requires a continuous supply of labor-power from which surplus-labor can be extracted. The transnational ruling class, therefore, has every interest in battling over the life conditions of workers of the world in order to control the development and growth of the laboring population and thus, the rate at which it can be exploited. Contemporary feminism has served as a most effective ally of transnational capitalism by helping to inculcate women into the labor needs of transnational capitalism now. The "differences" between the feminists that I have discussed thus far—that is, those such as Probyn who see the "post-" as an enabling condition for women and those such as Rich, Mies and Bennholdt-Thomsen who see it as disenabling for women—is not all that vast. This is because both positions articulate the labor needs of transnational capitalism. Their "differences" are not fundamental differences over the social relations of production. Rather, they are "differences" that are the effect of these relations of production: the fact that capitalism brings about "uneven development", that its constant quest for profit which requires it to expand production, export capital, etc. also requires that it have both "skilled" and "unskilled" labor. Their "differences", in short, are local differences—specific needs of capital for particular kinds of labor—that are determined by the general need of capitalism for a continuous supply of labor-power that it can exploit for profit. The problem for feminism is not the status of the "post-" (whether feminists are "for" or "against" it; whether women are living under "modernity" or "postmodernity", etc). Rather, it is the private ownership of the means of production that cuts across the local differences in production for women in the international division of labor. For instance, "delectable feminism", with its emphasis on an "ethics" for "care of the self", is especially useful for articulating the labor needs of transnational capitalism in the imperialist nations of the North. In order to turn over a profit, capital needs to maintain a skilled labor force to work increasingly complex means of production but at the same time, as a means of securing high rates of profit, it must maintain such a workforce while still keeping the social cost of its reproduction low. Delectable feminism helps with this task by focusing on strategies for women that are aimed, on the one hand, at expanding the market by creating new "needs" so that workers can absorb some of the cost of "overproduction" and, on the other, at reducing the social cost of the laboring population so that wages can be lowered and the rate of exploitation can be raised. It articulates a new "ethics" for transnational capitalism that will enable women of the North to adjust to the specific historical labor needs that capitalism requires of them now in order to maintain profit.

#### 3. The patriarchy link –

#### Strategies for resistance unified around “patriarchy” fragment effective opposition to capitalism.

Smith 94 (Sharon. “Mistaken Identity”, International Socialism Journal, spring, issue 62, <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj62/smith.htm>)

The newly emerging women's liberation movement quickly embraced the ideas of both separatism and consciousness-raising as its organising principles. So, for example, the New York Radical Feminists issued this as its founding statement in 1969: We believe that the purpose of male chauvinism is primarily to obtain psychological ego satisfaction, and that only secondarily does this manifest itself in economic relationships. For this reason we do not believe that capitalism, or any other economic system, is the cause of female oppression, nor do we believe that female oppression will disappear as a result of a purely economic revolution.14 The ideas behind this manifesto were later developed into a theory of women's oppression, which was eventually adopted in one form or another by radical and socialist feminists alike: the theory of patriarchy. While different versions of the patriarchy theory emerged in the 1970s, they had one thing in common: they all separated the root cause of women's oppression from the needs of class society and located it instead with men. Juliet Mitchell summed up the essence of the theory of patriarchy when she argued, 'We are dealing with two autonomous spheres, the economic mode of capitalism, and the ideological mode of patriarchy.' Although socialist feminists attempted to integrate class politics with the theory of patriarchy, this proved extremely difficult to do, both in theory and in practice. As socialist feminist Heidi Hartmann said of the 'marriage of Marxism and feminism' in 1981, 'either we need a healthier marriage or we need a divorce.'15But even before the splits which gave birth to separatist or 'radical' feminism, the idea that 'the personal is political' was well entrenched. This was another habit acquired from the Maoist style of the New Left, which placed emphasis on personal experience and emulated the Chinese practice of 'speaking bitterness'.16 Initially consciousness-raising was seen as a way to propel women into action. Thus an early group calling itself 'Redstockings', issued a manifesto in July 1969, which declared: Our chief task at the present is to develop female consciousness through sharing experiences and publicly exposing the sexist foundation of all our institutions. Consciousness-raising is not 'therapy'...but the only method by which we can ensure that our programme for liberation is based on the concrete realities of our lives.17But rather than channelling women into greater political involvement, consciousness-raising tended to lead women away from activity. The typical consciousness-raising group lasted nine months, and most women left the women's movement after that. For many of those who stayed, consciousness-raising became an end in itself. And it led to a turn away from politics and an ever greater atmosphere of personalism within the movement. Even Redstockings, quoted above, dissolved itself within less than two years of issuing its 'manifesto'. In the words of one feminist involved, 'When you stop looking out, and turn exclusively inward, at some point you begin to feed on each other. If you don't direct your anger externally--politically--you turn it against yourselves.'18The politics of separatism exacerbated this tendency in organisations of radical feminists. Although set up as 'non-hierarchical', the picture was hardly one of mutual support. Instead the atmosphere tended to be intensely moralistic and extremely judgmental towards lifestyle. One woman who participated in a women's liberation group said afterwards, 'If [consciousness-raising is] all you do, then the enemy becomes the enemy within. First they attack leaders, then lifestyle, then racism.' Another described, 'In the name of anti-elitism, they were trying to pull off the most elite thing possible. The meeting ended with charges and counter-charges and a distinct lack of a feeling of sisterhood.'19 Some women's liberation groups carried the idea of lifestyle politics to an extreme, by forming living or other collectives based upon strict women-only guidelines. One extreme such living collective was Boston's 'Cell 16', which demanded that every woman living there practise celibacy; only one third of the women could be married; and any woman who had a male child was forced to give him up.20Within a few years of its founding, the radical wing of the women's movement in the US had fragmented into inward looking consciousness-raising groups or personalistic living collectives. The slogan, 'The personal is political,' had been carried to its logical conclusion: changing one's lifestyle was what mattered, not changing the world. Radical feminists had rejected the socialist explanation that the source of women's oppression lies in class society, but replaced it with a theory which could not lead the movement forward. The reason was straightforward. The theory of patriarchy divorced the cause of women's oppression from class society--a system which oppresses and exploits the vast majority of people for the benefit of a very few. Instead it targeted men--and men's need to dominate women--as the root of the problem. This left the problem of women's oppression as one to be fought out at the level of individual relationships. And it excluded men, whatever their social class, from playing a role in fighting for women's liberation. Moreover, since separatism explains the division between men and women as biologically rooted, this means that the rupture must be permanent. However radical the concept of patriarchy may have sounded in theory, in practice it was a recipe for passivity and divisiveness. Particularly when combined with the high degree of personalism which existed, the logic of separatism promoted fragmentation rather than unity on the basis of oppression. At the same time as it played down the immense differences which exist between women of different classes. The politics of separatism led directly to fragmentation even within radical feminist organisations. Although separatist theory argues that the main division in society is between men and women, it reduces women's oppression to a problem of personal relationships. If that reasoning is used to understand other forms of oppression, then men are not the only oppressors: whites are oppressors, straight people are oppressors, and so forth. And many women suffer multiple forms of oppression, as victims of national or racial discrimination, or as lesbians. During the 1970s, as activism declined, radical feminist collectives became more and more fragmented and demoralised, and whole organisations became internalised and splintered along these lines. The biggest schism took place between lesbians and straight women. There were other divisions as well, including those over racism and 'classism' (used in this context, meaning snobbery) within the movement. But the radical women's movement never attracted large numbers of working class or black women, or Latinas, for the simple reason that the need to fight alongside men in the fight against racism or in the class struggle made separatist ideas unappealing. The black feminist bell hooks [sic] summed up the reasons in 1984. She argued that separatists 'did not question whether masses of women shared the same need for community'. And, she continued, because 'many black women as well as women from other ethnic groups do not feel an absence of community among women in their lives despite exploitation and oppression', the emphasis on 'feminism as a way to develop shared identity and community' doesn't help them to fight their exploitation and oppression.21As the radical feminist movement disintegrated over the years, the assumption behind separatism took hold: that only those who suffer a certain type of oppression can fight against it. The concept of a unified revolutionary movement was thus replaced by one in which each oppressed group would form its own 'autonomous' movement. This conception, 'movementism', was the precursor to identity politics.22

### Solvency Takeout

#### Ecological discourse must confront material realities within the environment before substantive progress can be made

Oppermann 11 (Serpil, “Ecocriticism’s Theoretical Discontents” in Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Nature vol. 4 no. 2 June 2011)

**The fundamental problem facing ecocriticism**, I argue, **concerns representations of the material world as the realm of the extra-textual.** Part of the problem here has to do with "the value and the limitation of the inescapably discursive form" of knowledge of the world (Hutcheon 127). Within mainstream ecocriticism's debates, this has been mistakenly perceived as an erasure of the relation of reference to the world. The main point of contestation about theory in ecocriticism, then, is specifically about the referent's discursive nature, because it is often associated with its erasure. It is important to note that, by interrogating the possibility of unmediated access to reality, post-structuralism has irrefutably challenged the realist notion of representation that presumes a natural link between word and world. Ecocriticism's reaction to theory is generally premised on this denaturalization of literary realism's assumed transparency. **For ecocritics, this challenge is often confused** with reducing reality to linguistic constructivism, or **with the idea that reality is constructed only in language. That is why we need to advance a critical perspective in which both discursivity and materiality (in other words, discursive practices and material phenomena) can be integrated in a relational approach.** The accountability of such an approach must, however, lie in a correct identification of the ethical, epistemological, and ontological concerns of ecocriticism's wider interest in human and non-human systems. **What is needed is a new framework that can integrate ontological and epistemological considerations in ecocritical studies**, so that it becomes possible to reframe, as Wendy Wheeler concurs, "critical understandings of the relationship between signs, texts, languages, and world" ("Postscript" 139). But, if ecocriticism is to offer a non-anthropocentric transformation of the human discourses of this planet (and all of its inhabitants), "perhaps the most important thing it can do," as Karla Armbruster suggests, "is to confront and explore the very aspects of [. . .] poststructuralist thought that mostly challenge it and stretch its capacities" (23).

### Discourse

#### Turn, 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)

#### Turn, Privileging discourse and ideas guarantees mystifying the material conditions that cause class oppression – only a return to material criticism can confront the material oppression of global capitalism

Zavarzadeh 3 (Mas’ud, “The Pedagogy of Totality” p.3-4, in “JAC: A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture, and Politics”, Volume 23.1, http://www.jaconlinejournal.com/archives/vol23.1.html)

Berube's lesson obscures this CIA which is an extension of U.S. corporations and whose task is to wage a clandestine class war against the working people of the world to keep the world safe for U.s. investment. There is no hint in his teaching of the event that the CIA's actions might be symptoms of the systematic aggression of market forces against the workers and that the event might be an outcome ofmarket forces. In his teaching, the CIA becomes a story machine producing absorbing stories that circle around personalities, places, and actions but lead nowhere. They build an illusion of knowing. Analysis ofthe economic role ofthe CIA (which produces material knowledge of global relations) is ob- structed by details that have no analytical effect. Why, for instance, did the CIA fight to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan? Berube's "waging the cold war" seems to imply that the dynamic of the conflict is "ideology." The U.S. and the Soviets simply had two different "political" systems and cultures. Thus, in Berube's version ofhistory, it is natural that the CIA wanted to drive the Soviets out of Afghanistan and increase the U.S.'s sphere of political and cultural power in the region. The conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States is, in other words, a clash of ideas. Underlining his pedagogy is, in other words, a view of history as an expansionism of "power" (see Hardt and Negri) and as conflicts of "ideologies" (see Fukuyama). It is based on the notion that "discourse" and "ideas" shape the world since, ultimately, history itself is the discursive journey ofthe Soul toward a cultural and spiritual resolution of material contradictions. This theory mystifies history by displacing "class" (labor) with "ideas" and "discourse," and it consequently produces world history as a "clash of civilizations" that rewrites the world in the interest of the Euroamerican capitalism (see Huntington). According to the clash theory (which is the most popular interpretive axis o f 9/ 11), people do what they do because of their "culture" not because they exploit the labor of others (and live in comfort), or because their labor is exploited by others (and therefore they live in abj ect poverty). The event, in other words, is an instance of the clash of civilizations: culture ("values," "language," "religion," the "affective") did it. "They" hate "our" way of life ("Their 'values' clash with our 'values"'). Since "values" are transhistorical, the clash is spiritual, not material. But culture, didn't do it. Contrary to contemporary dogma (seeHall,"Central- ity"), culture is not autonomous; it is the bearer of economic interests. Cultural values are, to be clear, inversive: they are a spiritualization of material interests. Culture cannot solve the contradictions that develop at the point of production; it merely suspends them. Material contradictions can be solved only materially - namely, by the class struggles that would end the global regime of wage labor. The event is an unfolding of a material contradiction not a clash of civilizations. If teaching the event does not at least raise the possibility of a class understanding of it, the teaching is not pedagogy; it is ideology (as I outline it later in this essay).