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#### Links - The affirmative’s call to a ‘marketplace of ideas’ where progress is made is a ruse—Privileged perspectives always win out. That is terminal defense on their solvency claims—counterspeech can solve nothing unless we strip the system apart. Beijer ’16 [Carl Beijer](http://www.carlbeijer.com/) Friday, May 6, 2016 Three critiques of liberal discourse http://www.carlbeijer.com/2016/05/three-critiques-of-liberal-discourse.html

**The discourse is controlled by capital.** Barack Obama, in The Audacity of Hope*,* articulates a vision of discourse that has always been central to liberalism: After all, the Constitution ensures our free speech...[and] the possibility of a genuine marketplace of ideas, one...of "deliberation and circumspection"; a marketplace in which, through debate and competition, we can expand our perspective, change our minds, and eventually arrive not merely at agreements but at sound and fair agreements. (145) The subtext here - that good and virtuous ideas will necessarily prevail in the public discourse, absent government censorship - dates back to at least the early seventeenth century. Then, we saw the sort of controversies that largely shape our ideas about free speech today. Milton, for example, in protest of a law subjecting *any* publication to Parliamentary approval, made just the sort of argument we hear from liberal rationalists today: "Let [Truth] and Falshood grapple...who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?" The left's critique of this intellectual tradition has always been that under capitalism there is no such thing as a "free and open encounter" of ideas. What actually happens, under capitalism, is that good and virtuous ideas get drowned out by people with large platforms and expensive megaphones. Even if the government protects "a genuine marketplace of ideas", it will not be a free market when capital gives some people louder voices than others. It is easy to misunderstand this as a narrow point about what happens when say a poor person tries to argue with a rich person, or about how the rich can deliberately and actively use their wealth to propagandize society. Both of those are problems, but the bigger problem is how capitalism passively and systematically gives advantages to favored ideas. No matter how powerless and marginal I am, and no matter how idiotic and ridiculous the thing that I say is, if it is something that the rich find agreeable, I am far more likely to get a platform and a megaphone. This means that our entire intellectual climate is constantly shaped and dominated by the interests of the rich. A leftist understanding of discourse, as Chomsky writes, focuses on this inequality of wealth and power and its multilevel effects...It traces the routes by which money and power are able to filter out the news fit to print, marginalize dissent, and allow the government and dominant private interests to get their messages across to the public. (Manufacturing Consent, 1) The media (which Chomsky specifically has in mind here) is the most obvious ideological organ through which capital controls our discourse, but it must also be emphasized that literally everything that exists under capitalism, and that is subject to the power of the wealthy, also becomes an instrument for controlling our discourse. These "Ideological State Apparatuses", [as Althusser called them](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm), also include our religion, our system of education, our family, our laws, our politics, our unions, and even our general culture. For this reason, what liberalism teaches us to think of as the "marketplace of ideas" is almost completely irrelevant to the state and evolution of our discourse. The way society talks and thinks about things, the problematic tendencies and ideas that dominate our culture, the proliferation of microaggressions and bigoted narratives, the erasures and framings and subtexts that liberal discourse policing fixates on constantly - all of this largely expresses the power and preference of capital. This is not an exhaustive picture of how discourse works; for example, there are also fundamentally bio-psychological factors, like instinctive tribalism and various quirks of cognitive psychology, that not even the power of capitalism can overcome in our discourse. But even in cases like this, liberal rationalistic discourse is largely irrelevant (instinctive bias for example can generally only be overcome through personal therapy, not through logical argumentation or deliberate norm-setting). Ultimately, the only thing that can meaningfully impact the discourse is to tear down the platforms and turn off the megaphones. Everything else is shouting into a fugue.

#### The discourse of free speech in universities instills neoliberal ideologies. Anarchist News 10: Anarchistnews.org, “The university, social death, and the inside joke”, published 18 February 2010, http://anarchistnews.org/content/university-social-death-and-inside-joke

The University is also the perfect focal point for an economy based on simulation. There, we are taught to question everything; this allows for the constant entropy and reabsorption of signs, ideal for living in what Autonomist theorist Franco Berardi calls ‘semiocapitalism’. In Symbolic Exchange and Death, Baudrillard tells us that our new economy "conforms to the global usage we have of the surrounding world of reading and selective decoding - we live less as users than as readers and selectors, reading cells.”[39] Yet he adds that “by the same token you are yourself constantly selected and tested by the medium itself.” The subject of the hyperreal economy is increasingly analogous to the student; constantly undergoing evaluation, constantly producing and reproducing value. Berardi explains in his work Precarious Rhapsody that “the worker does not exist any more as a person. He is just the interchangeable producer of microfragments of recombinant semiosis which enters into the continuous flux of the network.”[40] A precarious worker may have several jobs in a day. They may be paid by performance, graded like a student might be. Increasingly, a society dependent on affective labor is turning every job interview into an audition, an evaluation not just of the education and experience, but also of the social capital of the candidate. Many in the field of cultural studies have commented on the increasing dependence of corporations on the internet, on social networking sites and viral marketing. Others have talked of participatory management schemes, of the conflation between work and play, or on the growing importance of fan and venture labor. Yet a vital conclusion remains to be drawn, in that all these modulations are analogous to emulating ‘the poverty of student life’. Baudrillard tells us that “the school no longer exists because every strand of social process is shot through with discipline and pedagogical training.” [41]Modern capitalist enterprise seeks to reappropriate the University as the new model of the semiotic economy.

#### Extinction - Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause to go unquestioned. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet**.** What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinctionin the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidlysince the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid**.** What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority**.** Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature**,** a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### The Role of the Ballot goes to whoever best proposes an anti-capitalist pedagogy, re-evaluating education tactics is the only way to end the anonymization of workers the capitalist mindset engrains

Zizek & Daly 04

[Glyn. Lecturer in International Studies at the University College Northampton; Slavoj Zizek, world famous philosophy on psychoanalysis and capitalism; Conversations with Žižek. 14-19]

For Žižek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture - with all its pieties concerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette - Žižek is arguing for a politics that might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the trascendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Žižek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with the economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any retrograde return to economism. Žižek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular, we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the developing world). And Žižek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity; to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency of today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle.

#### If we do not escape that ontological view that humans are a resource, by failing to rethink our capitalist ontology, we will reach a point of ontological damnation that is worse than extinction. Zimmerman,

(Professor of Philosophy at Tulane), 94 (Michael, Contesting the Earth’s Future, p. 104).

Heidegger asserted that human self-assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might "bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth." This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one's soul by losing one's relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur an ontological clearing through which such life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity's one-dimensional disclosure of entities virtually denies them any "being" at all, the loss of humanity's openness for being is already occurring.55 Modernity's background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material "happiness" for everyone by reducing nature to pure energy.56 The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity's slow-motion destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided nuclear war only to survive as contented clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. But most of them could not agree that the loss of humanity's relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never "disclosed" by humanity.

#### Voting negative refuses the affirmative in favor of Historical Materialist Pedagogy. International inequality is sutured by the unequal circulation of capital. Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary moment. Only starting from the structural antagonisms produced by wage labor can lead to transformative politics.

**Ebert ‘9** [Teresa, Associate Professor of English, State University of New York at Albany, THE TASK OF CULTURAL CRITIQUE, pp. 92-95]

Unlike these rewritings, which reaffirm in a somewhat new language the system of wage labor with only minor internal reforms, **materialist critique aims at ending class rule. It goes beyond description and explains the working of wage labor and the abstract structures that cannot be experienced directly but underwrite it. Materialist critique unpacks the philosophical and theoretical arguments that provide concepts for legitimizing wage labor** and marks the textual representations that make it seem a normal part of life. In short, **instead of focusing on micropractices** (prison, gender, education, war**, literature, and so on**) in local and regional terms, **materialist critique relates these practices to the macrostructures of capitalism and provides the knowledges necessary to put an end to exploitation.** At the center of these knowledges is class critique. **Pedagogy of critique is a class critique of social relations and the knowledges they produce** . Its subject is wage labor, not the body without organs . An exemplary lesson in pedagogy of critique is provided by Marx, who concludes chapter 6 of Capital, " The Buying and Selling of Labour-Power, " by addressing the sphere within which wages are exchanged for labor power and the way this exchange is represented in the legal, philosophical, and representational apparatuses of capitalism as equal . He provides knowledge of the structures of wage labor and the theoretical discourses that sustain it. I have quoted this passage before and will refer to it again and again. Here is the full version: We now know how the value paid by the purchaser to the possessor of this peculiar commodity, labour-power, is determined. The use-value which the former gets in exchange, manifests itself only in the actual usufruct, in the consumption of the labour-power. The money-owner buys everything necessary for this purpose, such as raw material, in the market, and pays for it at its full value . The consumption of labourpower is at one and the same time the production of commodities and of surplus-value. The consumption of labour-power is completed, as is the case of every other commodity, outside the limits of the market or the sphere of circulation. Accompanied by Mr. Moneybags and by the possessor of labour-power, we therefore take leave for a time of this noisy sphere, where everything takes place on the surface and in view of all men, and follow them both into the hidden abode of production, on whose threshold there stares us in the face "No admittance except on business . " Here we shall see, not only how capital produces, but how capital is produced. We shall at last force the secret of profit making. This sphere that we are deserting, within whose boundaries the sale and purchase of labour-power goes on, is in fact a very Eden of the innate rights of man. There alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham. Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labour-power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agents, and the agreement they come to, is but the form in which they give legal expression to their common will. Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own. And Bentham, because each looks only to himself. The only force that brings them together and puts them in relation with each other, is the selfishness, the gain and the private interests of each. Each looks to himself only, and no one troubles himself about the rest, and just because they do so, do they all, in accordance with the pre-established harmony of things, or under the auspices of an all-shrewd providence, work together to their mutual advantage, for the common weal and in the interest of all. On leaving this sphere of simple circulation or of exchange of commodities, which furnishes the "Free-trader vulgaris" with his views and ideas, and with the standard by which he judges a society based on capital and wages, we think we can perceive a change in the physiognomy of our dramatis personae. He, who before was the money-owner, now strides in front as capitalist; the possessor of labour-power follows as his labourer. The one with an air of importance, smirking, intent on business; the other, timid and holding back, like one who is bringing his own hide to market and has nothing to expect but-a hiding. **Materialist critique is fundamental to** a **transformative** feminist **politics**. **Through critique the subject develops historical knowledges of the social totality: she acquires, in other words, an understanding of how the existing social institutions** (motherhood, child care, love, paternity, taxation, family, . . . and so on ) **are part of the social relations of production, how they are located in exploitative relations of difference, and how they can be changed. Materialist critique**, in other words, **is that knowledge practice that historically situates the conditions of possibility of what empirically exists under capitalist relations of class difference**-particularly the division of labor-and, more important, points to what is suppressed by the empirically existing: what could be, instead of what actually is. **Critique indicates**, in other words, **that what exists is not necessarily real or true but only the actuality under wage labor. The role of critique in pedagogy is exactly this: the production of historical know ledges and class consciousness of the social relations, knowledges that mark the transformability of existing social arrangements and the possibility of a different social organization**--one that is free from necessity. Quite simply then, **the pedagogy of critique is a mode of social knowing that inquires into what is not said, into the silences and the suppressed or the missing**, in order to unconceal operations of economic and political power underlying the myriad concrete details and seemingly disparate events and representations of our lives . **It shows how apparently disconnected zones of culture are in fact linked by the highly differentiated and dispersed operation of the systematic, abstract logic** of the exploitation of the division of labor that informs all the practices of culture and society. It reveals how seemingly unique concrete experiences are in fact the common effect of social relations of production in wage labor capitalism. In sum, materialist critique both disrupts that which represents itself as natural and thus as inevitable and explains how it is materially produced. **Critique, in other words, enables us to explain how social differences,** specifically gender, race, sexuality, and class, **have been systematically produced and continue to operate within regimes of exploitation-namely, the international division of labor in global capitalism-so we can change them**. It is the means for producing politically effective and transformative knowledges . The claim of affective pedagogy is that it sets the subject free by making available to her or him the unruly force of pleasure and the unrestrained flows of desire, thereby turning her or him into an oppositional subject who cuts through established representations and codings to find access to a deterritorialized subjectivity. But the radicality of this self, at its most volatile moment, is the radicality of the class politics of the ruling class, a class for whom the question of poverty no longer exists. The only question left for it, as I have already indicated, is the question of liberty as the freedom of desire. Yet this is a liberty acquired at the expense of the poverty of others. The pedagogy of critique engages these issues by situating itself not in the space of the self, not in the space of desire, not in the space of liberation, but in the revolutionary site of collectivity, need, and emancipation. **The core of the pedagogy of critique is that education is not simply for enlightening the individual to see through the arbitrariness of signification and the violence of established representations . It recognizes that it is a historical practice and, as such, it is always part of the larger forces of production and relations of production. It understands that all pedagogies are, in one way or the other, aimed at producing an efficient labor force.** Unlike the pedagogy of desire, the pedagogy of critique does not simply teach that knowledge is another name for power, nor does it marginalize knowledge as a detour of desire. **It acknowledges the fissures in social practices-including its own-but it demonstrates that they are historical and not textual or epistemological**. It, therefore, does not retreat into mysticism by declaring the task of teaching to be the teaching of the impossible and, in doing so, legitimate the way things are. Instead, the pedagogy of critique is a worldly teaching of the worldly.

### CP

Text: Public colleges and universities ought not restrict constitutionally speech except for hate speech defined by campus speech codes.

#### Speech codes help minority activists engage and openly-deliberate, not restricting speech only empowers the most racist activists to harass minorities Khan 15’ Tariq Kahn writer for the “Hampton Institute” A working class think tank, November 10th 2015, Masking Oppression as free Speech: An Anarchist Take” <http://www.hamptoninstitution.org/masking-oppression-as-free-speech.html#.WENnHKIrI6U>

The flawed notion that overly-sensitive "PC" students are shutting down free speech is harmful. Student initiatives on campuses to challenge things such as racial or gender micro-aggressions are not challenges to free speech and they are not based on the idea that micro-aggressions are "offensive." Micro-aggressions must be challenged because they are oppressive, not because they are offensive. Racist speech leads to an environment that is conducive to racist violence. It marginalizes students of color and makes the university not "uncomfortable," but unsafe. Anti-LGBT speech makes campus unsafe, not merely "uncomfortable" for LGBT students. Misogynist speech creates an environment that is conducive to sexual assault. Any decent social scientist knows this. It is not about people being "uncomfortable" or "offended." It is about people being unsafe and oppressed. White frat boys would have us believe that they are being unfairly "silenced" because women and people of color don't laugh at their misogynistic or racist jokes, meanwhile anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist students and professors face actual repression from law-makers, wealthy donors, campus administrators, police, and vigilantes. The same foolish people who boycott stores for saying "Happy Holidays" instead of "Merry Lord Jesus God Almighty and the Bible Christmas!" complain that Black students fighting against actually-existing racial violence are "oversensitive." The threat to campus free speech and academic freedom is not anti-racist or feminist students. The threat to free expression in academia is real, and it is coming down the social hierarchy from rich and powerful establishment interests, not upward from "coddled" students. The beautiful ideal of free expression is cheapened when oppression is allowed to go unchecked under the guise of a disingenuous notion of "free speech."

#### Negate to grieve those lives harassed and silenced by hate speech on campus. Grief for these specific individuals brings them into our frame of reference and creates an ethical reorientation

**Lloyd 08**

Moya (pf Loughborough Univ, feminist author) “Towards a cultural politics of

vulnerability Precarious lives and ungrievable deaths” Judith Butler’s Precarious Politics. 2008

Mourning and politics Precarious Life, published in 2004, contains a series of essays in which Butler reﬂects on politics in the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001 (‘9/11’). In particular, she is concerned with the political opportunity that was lost when, instead of attempting to ‘redeﬁne itself as part of the global community’, the US ‘heightened nationalist discourse, extended surveillance mechanisms, suspended constitutional rights and developed forms of explicit and implicit censorship’ as public criticism came to be all but silenced (Butler 2004a: xi).1 So what was the lost political opportunity in question? It was, Butler asserts, a chance to acknowledge the fact of human interdependency (that my life depends on ‘people I do not know and may never know’); to reﬂect on the relation between human vulnerability and violence; and to consider ‘what, politically, might be made of grief besides a cry for war’ (2004a: xii). ‘9/11’, that is, furnished an occasion on which to ‘start to imagine a world in which violence might be minimized, in which an inevitable interdependency becomes acknowledged as the basis for a global political community’ (Butler 2004a: xii–xiii). Although the US administration eschewed this opportunity, Butler does not. In Precarious Life, she ponders, to borrow from the book’s subtitle, ‘the powers of mourning and violence’. Butler’s interest in grief and mourning is not new. It is explored in detail, for instance, in Antigone’s Claim. Here, drawing on arguments ﬁrst advanced in Gender Trouble, and developed in Bodies that Matter and The Psychic Life of Power, she explores how heteronormative sexuality works to restrict the public expressions of grief amongst sexual minorities. Moreover, via the story of Antigone, Butler tackles the issue of what happens when against the edict of the state an individual (Antigone) attempts publicly to mourn for a person deemed ungrievable, unmournable by the state and indeed, whose very body it constructs as unburiable. (Recall that the ruler Creon forbids the burial of Polyneices.) In the essay ‘Violence, Mourning, Politics’, contained in Precarious Life, Butler extends this analysis of mourning in new directions. She not only considers how conventions or norms of mourning are shaped by power relations (a thesis already encapsulated in her arguments in Antigone’s Claim and elsewhere).2 She now speculates about how the experience of mourning might open up ‘another kind of normative aspiration within the ﬁeld of politics’ (Butler 2004a: 26); speciﬁcally, an opportunity for rethinking politics, and particularly international politics, in a less aggressive, more ethical mode. In saying this it is important to be aware that Butler is not interested in developing an account of grief or mourning per se. She is interested in them only because they expose the precariousness of life and our vulnerability to the Other. Grief and mourning, that is, are symptomatic of the interdependent nature of human existence. So how does this argument work? **In the act of ‘undergoing’ grief and mourning, Butler surmises, ‘something about who we are is revealed, something that delineates the ties we have to others’, moreover ‘that shows us that these ties constitute who we are, ties or bonds that compose us’** (2004a: 22, my emphasis). It is not only that loss makes a ‘tenuous ‘‘we’’ of us all’ (Butler 2004a: 20) since at some time we will all experience the loss of someone (through death, or simply through separation). It is not even that loss and vulnerability are effects of ‘being socially constituted bodies, attached to others, at risk of losing those attachments, exposed to others, at risk of violence by virtue of that exposure’ (Butler 2004a: 20). **What is critical is that grief and mourning are forms of ‘dispossession’ (Butler 2004a: 28): when loss occurs, that is, ‘I think I have lost ‘‘you’’ only to discover that ‘‘I’’ have gone missing as well’** (Butler 2004a: 22).3 **Loss reveals the subject’s dependence on an other for its own sense of self and thus for its continued existence.** With the dispossession that follows the loss of the other, **a transformation in the self takes place. I am no longer what I was.** It is precisely at the moments **when one body is undone by another** – and for Butler the body is central to her conceptualisation of vulnerability since it is the body that exposes us or opens us up to the other: to their gaze, their touch, their violence (Butler 2004b: 21) – that **human existence is explicitly exposed as one of interdependence.** Vitally, it is this porosity to the other (a corporeal porosity) that is also the source of an ethical connection with the other. Although grief is often assumed to be privatising, Butler demurs. She argues that actually, **mourning ‘furnishes a sense of political community of a complex order’ by foregrounding ‘the relational ties that have implications for theorizing fundamental dependency and ethical responsibility’** (Butler 20004a: 22, my emphasis). Loss exposes the fact that the one thing that all humans share is a physical dependence on other humans for their survival. Clearly violence – individual or state-sponsored; pre-emptive or retaliatory – is one of the principal means by which that survival is put at risk. **In order to counter such violence, and to acknowledge ethically the fact of our being ‘invariably in community’** (Butler 2004a: 27) **with the other, what Butler suggests is the development of a ‘point of identiﬁcation with suffering itself’** (2004a: 30). Instead of denying human vulnerability, **in order to recognise [human vulnerability], losses must be grieved**. **The difﬁculty, of course, is that not all human lives are deemed to be worthy of grief**; indeed, **not all deaths count** as deaths deserving public acknowledgement. It depends on the social norms regulating the scene of recognition (Butler 2005a). Bearing this in mind, from an ethical perspective identifying with suffering has to be allied, for Butler, with a certain critical reﬂexivity about the ways in **which particular lives ﬁgure** as more vulnerable or more valuable than others; in short, **as more human than others** (Butler 2004a: 30). **Making grief into a resource for either ethics or politics invites the question: ‘Who counts as human? Whose lives count as lives?** ... **What makes for a grievable life?’** (Butler 2004a: 20). It is Butler’s emphasis in Precarious Life on the regulatory production of the human and the kinds of normative violence that are operative in ranking who can be mourned or grieved, and more broadly, who counts, that I find most compelling. **Butler** marshals plenty of examples to **demonstrate[s] what she calls ‘a differential allocation of grievability’ [is] at work in the world today. She compares the public grief ensuing in the US over [we grieve] the death of journalist [but not] Daniel Pearl with the San Francisco Chronicle’s refusal** (on the basis that it would cause offence) **to publish either obituaries or memorials for a group of dead Palestinian women and children killed by Israeli troops**. She exposes how **the unmournability of specific lives serves to dehumanise them and thus to effect a form of normative violence against them, a violence, that is, that cannot be seen as violence because we cannot see such lives as lives at all**. Finally, she identiﬁes how mourning as an act of nation building is predicated upon a process of ‘national melancholia’, wherein **certain deaths are disavowed as deaths.** Her point, of course, is not just that **the norms deﬁning who counts** (in all the senses just noted: mournability, grievability, liveability and recognisability as human) **are socially conditioned; it is also that such normatively driven accounting also serves a variety of political purposes.** I am also persuaded by her contention that the experience (both individual and collective) of **mourning might motivate people to act politically [for instance]**. Certainly **grief** at losing a son or daughter in the armed forces serving in Iraq since 2003 **has galvanised parents to become active members of the antiwar movement** on both sides of the Atlantic (McRobbie 2006: 85, n. 2). Take, for instance, Reg Keys of ‘Military Families Against the War’, who stood against Tony Blair in Sedgeﬁeld in the 2005 General Election, campaigning under the strapline ‘War-torn families unite’. Moreover, it is also clear that there are already many instances at work of an ethical or political identiﬁcation with suffering of the kind that Butler advocates. Butler herself cites two particularly potent examples. First, she explores how the ‘shock, outrage, remorse and grief’ produced by the circulation of photos of Vietnamese children being burned and killed by napalm, photos the US public ‘were not supposed to see’, was pivotal in turning the tide of public opinion against the Vietnam War (Butler 2004a: 150). The US public (or at least sectors thereof) identiﬁed with the vulnerability, indeed destruction, of the lives on view and expressed ethical outrage at their (continued) treatment. Second, she touches very brieﬂy upon the activities of Women in Black as an example of feminist opposition to militarism. What is noteworthy about this network is precisely that the silent vigils it holds in cities throughout the world exemplify the very identiﬁcation with suffering that Butler’s ethics advocates: when women, that is, reﬂect on their own suffering and the suffering of other women who have ‘been raped, tortured or killed in concentration camps, women who have disappeared, whose loved ones have disappeared or have been killed, whose homes have been demolished’.4 Butler, however, is not simply concerned with reﬂecting on the kinds of human accounting that prioritise certain lives and that negate particular deaths. She is positing an ethics of responsibility towards the other based on vulnerability. This account of vulnerability draws on arguments that Butler makes in Psychic Life about primary dependency and is thus intrinsically connected to the idea of ek-stasis that she deploys throughout her work.

#### The US’s protection of hate speech ties back to empowering racist and xenophobic groups against minorities Epps 14’ Garret Epps, Writer for The Atlantic, February 7th 2014, “Free Speech isn’t Free” http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/02/free-speech-isnt-free/283672/

U.S. law only began to protect hateful speech during the 1960s. The reason, in retrospect, is clear—repressive Southern state governments were trying to criminalize the civil-rights movement for its advocacy of change. White Southerners claimed (and many really believed) that the teachings of figures like Martin Luther King or Malcolm X were "hate speech" and would produce "race war." By the end of the decade, the Court had held that governments couldn't outlaw speech advocating law violation or even violent revolution. Neither Black Panthers nor the KKK nor Nazi groups could be marked off as beyond the pale purely on the basis of their message. Those decisions paved the way for triumphs by civil rights, feminist, and gay-rights groups. But let's not pretend that nobody got hurt along the way. The price for our freedom—a price in genuine pain and intimidation—was paid by Holocaust survivors in Skokie and by civil-rights and women's-rights advocates subjected to vile abuse in public and private, and by gay men and lesbians who endured decades of deafening homophobic propaganda before the tide of public opinion turned.

## On

### Case

#### All of their offensive impact claims are in the context of NSA surveillance, not educational surveillance. Students can push back against censoring Reddit, not the global surveillance state.

#### Even if they did, there have already been movements that have failed. Things like the resistance against the war in Vietnam, resistance against COINTELPRO, and drone surveillance in the Middle East.

#### Free speech is a gateway to normalize victim-blaming. It creates claims that the oppressed made the choice to be oppressed and that they themselves need to take responsibility for it. Now that’s messed up.

**Fish ‘12:** Stanley Fish writes in “The Harm in Free Speech” on June 4th, 2012 at 9:00 PM. Stanley Eugene Fish is an American literary theorist, legal scholar, author and public intellectual. He is currently the Floersheimer Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law at Yeshiva University's Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in New York City. Education: Yale University (1962), University of Pennsylvania Awards: Guggenheim Fellowship for Humanities, US & Canada, PEN/Diamonstein-Spielvogel Award for the Art of the Essay Nominations: National Book Award for Arts and Letters (Nonfiction). [http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/04/the-harm-in-free-speech/]; AB

With the phrase “on his own merit,” Frankfurter gestures toward the view of dignity he is **reject**ing, **the view in which dignity wells up from inside of a [person]** man (or woman) **and depends on an inner strength that asserts itself no matter how adverse or hostile external circumstances may be, including the circumstance in which the individual is confronted with signs, posters and pamphlets demeaning his race or ethnic origin or religion or sexual preference. In this picture, the responsibility for maintaining dignity rests with the individual and not with any state duty to devise rules and regulations to protect it. Some who take this position argue that if the individual feels victimized by expressions of hate directed at the group to which he “willy-nilly” belongs, that is his or her own choice.** Waldron’s example is C. Edwin Baker (“Harm, Liberty and Free Speech,” Southern California Law Review, 1997), who writes: “A speaker’s racial epithet … harms the hearer only through her understanding of the message … and [harm] occurs only to the extent that the hearer (mentally) responds one way rather than another, for example, as a victim rather than a critic of the speaker.” **In this classic instance of blaming the victim, the fault lies with a failure**

**to resolve; self-respect was just not strong enough to rise to the occasion in a positive way. Waldron** calls this position “silly” (it Is the majority’s position in Plessy v. Ferguson) and **points out that it mandates and celebrates a harm by requiring victims of hate speech to grin and bear it: “It should not be necessary,” he declares, “for [hate speech victims] to laboriously conjure up the courage to go out and try to flourish in what is now presented to them as a … hostile environment.” The damage,** Waldron explains, **is already done by the speech “in requiring its targets to resort to the sort of mental mediation that Baker recommends.” To that those targets are put on the defensive, “racist speech has already succeeded in one its destructive aims.”**

#### Hate speech has intrinsic harm and permeates all facets of society, particularly against women—turns case

Horne ‘16: (Solveig, Minister of Children and Equality in Norway, “Hate Speech — A Threat to Freedom of Speech,” 03/08/2016, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/solveig-horne/hate-speech--a-threat-to_b_9406596.html> //)

**Hate speech** in the public sphere takes place online and offline, and **affects young girls and boys, women and men**. We also see hate speech attacking vulnerable groups like people with disabilities, LGBT-persons and other minority groups. Social media and the Internet have opened up for many new arenas for exchanging opinions. Freedom of speech is an absolute value in any democracy, both for the public and for the media. At the same time, opinions and debates challenge us as hate speech are spread widely and frequently on new platforms for publishing. **Hate speech may cause fear and can be the reason why people withdraw from the public debate. The result being that important voices that should be heard in the public debate** are silenced. We all benefit if we foster an environment where everybody is able to express their opinions without experiencing hate speech. In this matter we all have a responsibility. I am especially concerned about women and girls being silenced. **Attempts to silence women in the public debate through hate speech, are an attack on** women’s human rights. No one should be silenced or subjected to threats when expressing themselves in public. Women are under-represented in the media. In order to get a balanced public debate it is important that many voices are heard. We must encourage women and girls to be equal participants with men. Hate speech prevents women from making their voices heard. I also call upon the media to take responsibility in this matter. In some cases the media may provide a platform for hate speech. At the same time, I would like to stress that a liberal democracy like Norway strongly supports freedom of speech as a fundamental right. The Norwegian government takes hate speech seriously. In November, prime minister Erna Solberg and I launched a political declaration against hate speech on the behalf of the Norwegian government. Anyone can sign the declaration online and take a stand against hate speech. Politicians, representatives of labour unions and organizations are among those who have signed and supported the declaration. This year the Government will launch a strategy against hate speech. In this connection I have organised several meetings involving organizations and individuals to round table discussions on hate speech, and and received a lot of useful input for our strategy. **One of the things I heard about is how destructive hate speech can be for women and girls who participate in the public debate. Some are ridiculed, subjected to sexually offensive language and even threatened with rape and violence**. This underlines the importance of combating hate speech. We cannot afford that women are silenced in the public debate, because of their gender. We need arenas for dialogue, tolerance and awareness of the consequences of hate speech. It is important that we discuss this issue with our own children and in schools. We adults have a great responsibility. We need to think about how we express ourselves when children are present. What we say in our family settings have consequences for how our children behave against other people - online and offline. In order to combat hate speech we also need knowledge. I have initiated a research that will look into attitudes towards Jews and how minorities look at other minorities. In addition, the University of Oslo has established a centre for research on right-winged extremism. One of the centre`s mandate is to look into hate speech. The police plays a vital role in the fight against hate speech. Some expressions of opinions are forbidden by law. The new Norwegian General Civil Penal Code’s section 185 protects against serious hate speech which wilfully or through gross negligence is made publicly. The Norwegian police forces has established a net patrol that are working on this issue. Additionally they have strengthen their efforts against hate crime. Hate speech may be directed against people on the basis of ethnicity, religion, disability or sexual orientation. **Hate speech can have serious consequences for individuals, groups and the whole society. It is important to take a stand and show that this cannot be tolerated**. Politicians, organizations and other actors in the public debate must show responsibility and actively work against hate speech.

#### Their affirmative causes a shift towards private surveillance companies taking the place of the College / Unveristy.

#### Harvard, St. Augustine’s University, Johns Hopkins, Occidental College, are all examples that your author gives as bad for student surveillance. However, they are also all private. Double bind, you are either untopical or you don’t solve the aff.

#### Free Speech and notions of deliberation reinscribe racist violence and cause more oppression

**Delgado and Yun ‘94:** Richard Delgado - Charles Inglis Thomson Professor of Law, University of Colorado. J.D. 1974, University of California, Berkeley. David H. Yun – Member of the Colorado Bar. J.D. 1993, University of Colorado. “Pressure Valves and Bloodied Chickens: An Analysis of Paternalistic Objections to Hate Speech Regulation.” California Law Review. 1994. <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1712&context=californialawreview>

D. "More Speech"-Talking Back to the Aggressor as a Preferable Solution to the Problem of Hate Speech Defenders of the First Amendment sometimes argue that minorities should talk back to the aggressor.85 Nat Hentoff, for example, writes that antiracism rules teach black people to depend on whites for protection, while talking back clears the air, emphasizes self-reliance, and strengthens one's self-image as an active agent in charge of one's own destiny.8 6 The "talking back" solution to campus racism draws force from the First Amendment principle of "more speech," according to which additional dialogue is always a preferred response to speech that some find troubling.87 Proponents of this approach oppose hate speech rules, then, not so much because they limit speech, but because they believe that it is good for minorities to learn to speak out. A few go on to offer another reason: that a minority who speaks out will be able to educate the speaker who has uttered a racially hurtful remark."8 Racism, they hold, is the product of ignorance and fear. If a victim of racist hate speech takes the time to explain matters, he or she may succeed in altering the speaker's perception so that the speaker will no longer utter racist remarks.8 9 How valid is this argument? Like many paternalistic arguments, it is offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith. In the nature of paternalism, those who make the argument are in a position of power, and therefore believe themselves able to make things so merely by asserting them as true.90 They rarely offer empirical proof of their claims, because none is needed. The social world is as they say because it is their world: they created it that way.91 In reality, those who hurl racial epithets do so because they feel empowered to do so. 92 Indeed, their principal objective is to reassert and reinscribe that power. One who talks back is perceived as issuing a direct challenge to that power. The action is seen as outrageous, as calling for a forceful response. Often racist remarks are delivered in several-on-one situations, in which responding in kind is foolhardy. 93 Many highly publicized cases of racial homicide began in just this fashion. A group began badgering a black person. The black person talked back, and paid with his life.94 Other racist remarks are delivered in a cowardly fashion, by means of graffiti scrawled on a campus wall late at night or on a poster placed outside of a black student's dormitory door.95 In these situations, more speech is, of course, impossible. Racist speech is rarely a mistake, rarely something that could be corrected or countered by discussion. What would be the answer to "Nigger, go back to Africa. You don't belong at the University"? "Sir, you misconceive the situation. Prevailing ethics and constitutional interpretation hold that I, an African American, am an individual of equal dignity and entitled to attend this university in the same manner as others. Now that I have informed you of this, I am sure you will modify your remarks in the future"? 96 The idea that talking back is safe for the victim or potentially educative for the racist simply does not correspond with reality. It ignores the power dimension to racist remarks, forces minorities to run very real risks, and treats a hateful attempt to force the victim outside the human community as an invitation for discussion. Even when successful, talking back is a burden. Why should minority undergraduates, already charged with their own education, be responsible constantly for educating others?

#### Giroux’s answering himself, his views on deliberation assume a false political sphere that never existed, deliberation is controlled by the state

**Crawford 97** [Alice, Department of Communication, University of Pittsburgh, 1997, “Critique and reproduction of civic humanist pedagogy in Henry Giroux's Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life”, Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy, 11:3-4, 315-327]

1. First objective: save the spheres! The first objective of the civic humanist agenda involves a concern with the public sphere, that much-longed-for space in which free citizens once allegedly gathered to speak openly about their political concerns, and in which other citizens actually listened to them. The quest to (re) create such a space is the prime directive for the civic humanists, as the public sphere is the place in which the civic arts are practiced. The civic humanist attempt to contribute to this re-expansion, or at least preservation is, importantly, couched in the language of democracy. The spheres of discourse in which deliberation takes place are those of the democratic state, not newly forged spaces; the public sphere that needs revitalization is a democratic public sphere. Giroux shares the civic humanists' concern with the public sphere, and pays particular attention to the school itself as such a place, rather than as merely a preparatory field for the real world. The task of the educator is, in Giroux's eyes, as follows: to struggle collectively as transformative intellectuals, that is, as educators who have a social vision and commitment to make public schools democratic spheres, where all children, regardless of race, class, gender, and age can learn what it means to be able to participate fully in a society that affirms and sustains the principles of equality, freedom, and social justice.4 The preparatory role of the school is still important however; students are learning to participate in a society that transcends the boundaries of the enlightened schoolyard, and, if this society is not already a place in which they may all participate fully, Giroux would have them join in effecting the appropriate transformation: the call for the development of democratic public spheres outside colleges of education [and other schools] points to the need to reconstruct a cultural politics in which educators and other intellectuals develop a public voice and become part of any one of a number of social movements in which they can put their theoretical and pedagogical skills to use in building historical blocs capable of emancipatory social change In the use of' reconstructing' here and elsewhere, we can see that Giroux, like the civic humanists, indulges in a bit of nostalgia for more politically involved times. Like the civic humanists described by Fusfield, Giroux believes that what is needed to vitalize—or revitalize—democracy, is 'the (re)vitalization of spheres of discourse where open public deliberation through speech-making is still possible.'6 Giroux quotes Thomas Ferguson to this effect: the prerequisites for effective democracy are not really automatic voter registration or even Sunday voting, though these would help. Rather, deeper institutional forces—flourishing unions, readily accessible third parties, inexpensive media, and a thriving network of cooperatives and community organizations—are the real basis of effective democracy.' Unions, third parties, and other networks are some of Giroux's 'counterpublic spheres' (under which rubric he also includes churches and journals) that he believes educators, as transformative intellectuals, need to recognize as important sites for citizenship education, as he commends Dewey and other social reconstructionists for doing.8 He intends to follow their lead in seeking a larger and more active role for educators in developing spaces in which oppositional discourse can flourish. There is implicit in this concern with the public sphere that it is the arena in which the individual is both able and obliged to find meaning and purpose. In Fusfield's words: They are concerned... to preserve the deliberative voice—and therewith personal integrity—of ordinary citizens in a modern—and now postmodern—society which, in numerous ways, has become increasingly inimical to hearing such voices and granting such integrity.8 Without the opportunity to define oneself through activity in the public sphere, i.e. to exercise one's deliberative voice, one's life is allegedly impoverished in important ways ; in its absence, one disintegrates. ' Citizenship' is Giroux's name for that activity which we engage in within the public sphere in order to transcend the limits of the privatelydefined self, and he contrasts his definition against the Right's conception of citizenship in which this transcendence is displaced by the imperatives of the state: citizenship in this case becomes a process of dialogue and commitment rooted in a fundamental belief in the possibility of public life and the development of forms of solidarity that allow people to reflect and organize