**Capitalism is an inertial system- any vestige left remaining will inevitably spin back up. The affirmative merely attacks a single instance of capitalism, but allows the system as a whole to remain intact. A complete negation is the only alternative.**

kovel 2002

[Joel, Prof at Bard, Enemy of Nature, Zed Books]p. 142-3

The value-term that subsumes everything into the spell of capital sets going a kind of wheel of accumulation, from production to consumption and back, spinning ever more rapidly as the inertial mass of capital grows, and generating its force field as a spinning magnet generates an electrical field. This phenomenon has important implications for the reformability of the system. Because capital is so spectral, and succeeds so well in ideologically mystifying its real nature, attention is constantly deflected from the actual source of eco-destabilization to the instruments by which that source acts. The real problem, however, is the whole mass of globally accumulated capital, along with the speed of its circulation and the class structures sustaining this. That is what generates the force field, in proportion to its own scale; and it is this force field, acting across the numberless points of insertion that constitute the ecosphere, that creates ever larger agglomerations of capital, sets the ecological crisis going, and keeps it from being resolved. For one fact may be taken as certain — that to resolve the ecological crisis as a whole, as against tidying up one corner or another, is radically incompatible with the existence of gigantic pools of capital, the force field these induce, the criminal underworld with which they connect, and, by extension, the elites who comprise the transnational bourgeoisie. And by not resolving the crisis as a whole, we open ourselves to the spectre of another mythical creature, the many-headed hydra, that regenerated itself the more its individual tentacles were chopped away. To realize this is to recognize that there is no compromising with capital, no schema of reformism that will clean up its act by making it act more greenly or efficiently We shall explore the practical implications of this thesis in Part III, and here need simply to restate the conclusion in blunt terms: green capital, or non-polluting capital, is preferable to the immediately ecodestructive breed on its immediate terms. But this is the lesser point, and diminishes with its very success. For green capital (or ‘socially/ecologically responsible investing’) exists, by its very capital-nature, essentially to create more value, and this leaches away from the concretely green location to join the great pool, and follows its force field into zones of greater concentration, expanded profitability — and greater ecodestruction.

**Vote Negative to adopt the method of structural historicism.**

**METHOD IS THE FOREMOST POLITICAL QUESTION BECAUSE ONE MUST UNDERSTAND THE EXISTING SOCIAL TOTALITY BEFORE ONE CAN ACT ON IT—GROUNDING THE SITES OF POLITICAL CONTESTATION ON KNOWLEDGE OUTSIDE OF LABOR AND SURPLUS VALUE MERELY SERVE TO HUMANIZE CAPITAL AND PREVENT A TRANSITION TO A SOCIETY BEYOND OPPRESSION**

tumino 2001

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

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

## Case

**Video games program us to become neoliberal machines, constantly seeking out greater and more possessions. It is impossible to create a meaningful dialogue about games because the history- the birth of the industry into the height of neoliberal growth- cannot be severed. It taints everything these games represent.**DOHO 11 (January 14, 2011, Author unnamed, but is a PhD Student in Communications and Cultures, <http://dropouthangoutspaceout.tumblr.com/post/2753901971/neoliberalism-and-videogames-as-public-good>)

In the popular narrative around videogames the most puzzling for many observers is the rapid growth and entrenchment of videogames in extreme representations of transgressive fantasies of violence and war. Avoiding the pitfalls of the moral panic that exists around these topics, the question of why the growth of such digital representations mirrored the growing economic success of the industry as a whole needs to be seriously considered. Why have those videogames that have had some of the largest financial success been those that represent war, apocalypse and a general fear of the other? Why is the dominant ideology in many online worlds analogous to neoliberalism in economic policy and identity politics (Dyer-Witheford & de Peuter, 2009). The growth of rewards-based incentive games that encourage repetitive, assembly-line behaviour and the collection of digital commodities is also on the rise as social networking platforms like facebook and foursquare become ubiquitous gaming platforms. ¶ Until the late 1970s and early 1980s telecommunication and broadcasting (as well as other cultural industries) were considered public services. The main thrust of which included public subsidy, public regulation (state sanctioned monopoly or public ownership of telecoms), and public input into the development and use of communications technology. Essentially the *public* was at the heart of issues associated with communication and culture. The goals and mandates of these organizations were up to the state’s conception of what was in the public interest. This meant obscenity regulation (in the United States implemented through the Federal Communications Commission) and concepts like the fairness doctrine (A US policy guaranteeing opposing political opinions access to airtime in broadcasting) (Bar & Sandvig, 2008). This also meant protecting and projecting what was deemed culturally important to citizens (CRTC CanCon regulations after the Massey Commission), as well as guaranteeing access to such communication (Lorimer et al, 2008). The social and public implications and consequences of communication defined the discourse of various states.¶ Post-1979, this is no longer the case, due mostly in part to de and re-regulation of markets (the decrease of government intervention and the increase of voluntary industry self-regulation), and the privitization of communications and broadcasting industries the game, so to speak, has changed. From 1979 to the crash of 2007 the rhetoric of Western governments focused on the efficiency of self-regulating markets and Adam Smith’s invisible hand (Lorimer et al, 2008). The greater social goal of broadcasting was considered to have already been achieved (mainly, citizens had access to signals and the technology to use them). Margaret Thatcher famously said that “…there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women, and there are families. (Women’s Own, 1987)” Neoliberalism was thus constructed on the primacy of the individual, rational choice, free markets and private property. This shift away from the impact on nation-building and the public goals of communication and culture gave birth to the environment that mass-market videogame production grew up in. During the growth (read: shrinking) of the neoliberal state the hardware and software manufacturer Atari began making huge inroads in the arcade and later, home console markets (Montfort & Bogost, 2009).While the videogame market would suffer a industry-wide crash soon thereafter, the introduction and popularity of the Nintendo Entertainment System after its North American debut in 1985 made videogaming a permanent fixture in the contemporary home(Baer, 2005). This means that videogames literally never had a chance to be included in the old discourse of communication and culture as a public good and as public service. When they came into being the discourse had shifted from consumers as citizens to citizens as consumers. (Hesmondhalgh, 2007; Shiller, 2003; Lax; 2009)¶ What this has ostensibly resulted in an environment around game development that stifles discussion of videogames as artifacts that interact with publics in any fashion outside of entertainment and pleasure. This statement comes with a caveat: few *major* studios will suggest that their videogames have any political or social value to their existence outside of pleasure.[1](https://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&view=js&name=main,tlist&ver=4NGb8kRDZ_0.en.&am=!U8qYy82zslH7BT6isQU2WndlkPEM2V7CH6W43BKFWuwUdXYLOGl_SW8&fri#sdfootnote1sym) They want people to enjoy them, but not place them in any larger political context. A good example is the release of two high budget shooter videogames in the last year. One is a sequel in the highly profitable *Call of Duty* franchise, titled *Black Ops*. In response to a question concerning the historical context and controversial nature of *Black Ops,* which takes place during the height of the Cold War in the 1960s, with levels taking place in Laos, Vietnam and Cuba,producer Dan Bunting was quoted as saying:¶ *At the end of the day it’s an entertainment product and we’re creating an entertainment experience. It is more about the story that you’re living through in this game. It’s a fictional story that’s inspired by a lot of real life events. So, we’re not trying to make any political messages or give any history lessons. It is about experiencing this game within the context of that war (Grant, 2010).*

#### Even their aff got played- the call to make video games appear to be a medium for social change is a trick by the videogame industry to extend their protection under the first amendment by CLAIMING they make a political statement- The cards written for their aff are LITERALLY neoliberal tools to increase the profits of those companies.

DOHO 11 (January 14, 2011, Author unnamed, but is a PhD Student in Communications and Cultures, <http://dropouthangoutspaceout.tumblr.com/post/2753901971/neoliberalism-and-videogames-as-public-good>)

Electronic Arts and other development houses have long been lobbying for videogames to continue being considered forms of speech, and thus extending their protection under the first amendment in the United States. Ian Bogost denounced the fact that Electronic Arts backed down to government pressure on the inclusion of the Taliban in *Medal of Honor* because if developers want their work to be considered speech, they need to assert that what they are saying is worthwhile to the public, and that self-censorship resulting from government criticisms of their message is regressive. Specifically, in that it suggests videogames are nothing more than distraction, not worthy of saying anything important (Bogost, 2010). Speech is protected in the public sphere due to the it’s importance in rational debate and discourse. Institutional discourses like those of EA and Activison highlight the contemporary environment of production and how ultimately, the interaction with the public is one of selling to consumers, not citizens, reflecting the dominant ideology and subject position of neoliberalism.

**Video games, especially Metal Gear Solid 4, advance imperialist violence by normalizing killing and violence. This is a conscious effort from the Military Industrial Complex**

John **Sanbonmatsu** **95** (“War Simulation and the Militarization of Everyday Life,” in Gender, Race, and Class in Media: A Critical Reader, p. 429-430) Associate professor of humanities & arts.

War Simulation and the Militarization of Everyday Life To frame my discussion, I want to draw on Herbert Marcuse's analysis of how media and technology serve to integrate conscious­ness into the circuits of capitalism and impe­rialism. Marcuse argued that the repression of human libidinal or instinctual needs by Western society yields ever more destructive forms of culture. As capitalism becomes more advanced, a gap opens up between, on one hand, the creative and productive forces of society, our potential to make the world a livable one, and, on the other, pathological forms of social life and behavior that are in reality quite harmful: mobilization for per­petual war, destruction of nature, and heightened aggressiveness in all arenas of life and culture. The result is "a suicidal ten­dency on a truly social scale" (Marcuse, 1968, p. 268). Such a system meanwhile requires a particular form of human person­ality or consciousness to maintain itself. Freud believed that the repression or taming of our biological instincts was the price we paid for our entry into society. The healthy human individual channels or "sublimates" his or her instinctual needs into socially pro­ductive activities—art, work, family rela­tions, and so on. However, Marcuse argued that in the context of a pathological social order, society might cause such strain in the individual as to produce what he termed "surplus" repression, in effect taking the individual's libidinal instincts and channel­ing them into socially *destructive* forms. Technology is the characteristic mecha­nism of such aggression. As the distillation of an "instrumentalist" mentality, technol­ogy strengthens the life-denying system and effectively shields it from possible revolt by those whom it has stripped of power and dignity. Particularly, in the sphere of mass media, the dominant culture blurs together or integrates existential opposites—death and life, killing and culture, sadism and joy. The new "unities" then get sold back to us as commodities. As Marcuse (1968) wrote, The brutalization of language and image, the presentation of killing, burn­ing, and poisoning and torture inflicted upon the victims of neocolonial slaugh­ter is made in a common-sensical, fac­tual, sometimes humorous style which integrates these horrors with the pranks of juvenile delinquents, football contests, accidents, stock market reports, and the weatherman, (p. 259) Marcuse's framework is helpful in reveal­ing the hidden meaning of contemporary video game culture. For, notwithstanding the seeming diversity of video games on the market today—for example, massively multiple-player online role-playing games (MMORPGs), puzzle and educational games, driving simulations, sports and fash­ion games, and so on—themes of violence, aggression, and war predominate. In 2008, the three most popular new online games were *Grand Theft Auto IV; Star Wars: Force Unleashed,* a futuristic battle game; and *Fallout 3,* a futuristic first-person shooter and combat strategy game. The other top 10 online games included the violent first-person shooter war games *Gears of War 2, Gill of Duty,* and *Metal Gear Solid 4: Fable II,* a fan­tasy adventure game in which the hero fights various dangerous enemies; *Super Smash Mario Brothers Brawl,* a Hobbesian "war of all against all," using popular animated char­acters; *Madden N.F.L. '09,* a complex simu­lation of commercial male football; and *WWE Smackdown vs. Raw* '*09,* an ultra- violent simulation of the misogynistic cable program, World Wrestling Entertainment, in which players inhabit the avatars of muscular male fighters and use extreme fighting tech­niques to kill their opponent—by setting their opponents' bodies on fire (Freierman, 2008). As this list suggests, many of the leading games are both masculinist and militaristic.To understand why, it is essential to appreci­ate the institutional origins of the medium in the U.S. national security state apparatus, where patriarchal dreams of "virtuous" dom­ination and control of others materialized into functional high-tech weapons systems. The emergence of a permanent war economy in the United States after World War II, and with it the functional integra­tion of capitalist industry and academic institutions into cold war nuclear war plan­ning, led to computerization and a new cul­ture of simulation. A watershed came in 1961 when academic researchers working for the Department of Defense at M.I.T. developed a digital game called *Spacewar.* Other researchers soon grasped the military potential of combining traditional war game simulations with computerization. In the late 1970s, the Office of Naval Research established the "Theater-Level Gaming and Analysis Workshop for Force Planning," and hy rhe early 1980s, rhe United States was spending many millions of dollars on computer simulations like S1MNET, which allowed dispersed partici­pants to engage in real-time "war" over a virtual battlefield (Lenoir &: Lowood, 2005). By the 1990s, finally, the Pentagon had built an elaborate network bringing together commercial video game design companies, university researchers, and U.S. military personnel to create what critics have called a "military-industrial-academic- entertainment complex." Today, the video game is the sine qua non of modern high-tech war fighting, an indis­pensable tool at all stages of conflict, from recruitment (e.g., *America's Army,* a MMORPG released by the U.S. Army in 2002 and since played by millions; Nichols, 2010) through training (e.g., *Marine Doom,* the military adaptation of the FPS video game, *Doom,* which teaches soldiers to kill unreflexively) to actual battlefield use. Among today's war game centers is DAR- WARS, a program funded by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for rhe U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and Marine Corps, which uses "webcentric, simulation-based trainers (to] take advan­tage of widespread PC-based technology, including multi-player games, virtual worlds, intelligent agents, and online communities."' Meanwhile, in Afghanistan, NATO pilots trained, perhaps, at PEO STRI (the U.S. Army's Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training, and Instrumen­tation, headquartered in Orlando, Florida) use computer-mediated weapons to drop real munitions on real people. And in Nevada and Arizona, U.S. Air Force pilots and CIA-sponsored mercenaries remotely operate robotic Predator and Reaper drones to launch lethal missile attacks in Syria or Pakistan, 7,500 miles away. As Marcuse emphasizes, the form and content of technological artifacts and mass culture in a repressive or destructive order tend to serve the ideological and practical needs of that order. In this regard, commer­cial video games do critical ideological work in preparing the population for perma­nent war mobilization and military aggres­sion, by normalizing and dehistoricizing state violence and demonizing "autho­rized" enemies of the U.S. state. While many Americans believe they live in a nation that uses violence as a last resort and then only in self-defense, the facts of U.S. foreign policy over the past century tell a different story, of illegal military interven­tion, counterrevolutionary warfare, support for pro-U.S. dictatorships around the world, and paroxysms of ruthless violence (Johnson, 2004). Yet military FPS (first- person shooter) games, including historical games depicting past wars, uncritically cel­ebrate U.S. military and technological supremacy and depict America's enemies as dangerous savages worthy of extermina­tion. The narrative content of many post-9/11 games in particular reiterates the values and policy assumptions of the so- called war on terror, mapping the world cognitively to prepare American soldiers and citizenry alike "for colonial exercises of spatial domination" (King & Leonard, 2010, p. 91). As Hogljnd (2008) observes, such games serve the interests of the U.S. state by constructing the entire Middle East "as a frontier zone where a perpetual war between U.S. interests and Islamic terror­ism" can be enacted.' The result is a new Orientalism in which "the gamer involved in a military shooter set in the Middle East

This causes is an assimilative process translating into inevitable violence, genocide and colonialism. Metal Gear solid continues the narrative of the American War Hero, out in the foreign frontier saving the world. We become psychologically primed to believe that American exceptionalism is a sexy bicep we should flex at every available moment.

Nayar in ’99

(Jayan, RE-FRAMING INTERNATIONAL LAW FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: Orders of Inhumanity, Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, Fall, 1999, 9 Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs. 599, MDA)

Despite the vision of world-order founded on a notion of a universal society of humankind aspiring toward a universal common good, (first given meaning within a conceptual political-legal framework through the birth of the so-called "Westphalian" state system n14 ), the materialities of "ordering" were of a different complexion altogether. Contrary to the disembodied rhetoric of world-order as bloodless evolution, the new images of the world and languages of "globality" did not evolve out of a sense of "hospitality" n15 to the "other," the "stranger." Rather, the history of the creation of the post-Westphalian "world" as one world, can be seen to be most intimately connected with the rise of an expansionist and colonizing world-view and practice. Voyages of "discovery" provided the necessary reconnaissance to image this "new world." Bit by bit, piece by piece, the jigsaw of the globe was completed. With the advance of the "discoverer," the "colonizer," the "invader," the "new" territories were given meaning within the hermeneutic construct that was the new "world."[\*607] The significance of this evolution of the world does not, however, lie merely in its acquiring meaning. It is not simply the "idea" of the world that was brought to prominence through acts of colonization. The construction of the "stage" of the world has also occurred, albeit amid the performance of a violent drama upon it. The idea of a single world in need of order was followed by a succession of chained and brutalized bodies of the "other." The embodied world that has been in creation from the "colonial" times to the present could not, and does not, accommodate plurality. The very idea of "one world" contains the necessary impetus for the absorption, assimilation, if not destruction, of existing worlds and the genocide of existing socialities. This violence of "order-ing" within the historical epoch of colonialism is now plainly visible.

**Video games are largely unethical. This should be a given. Gaming communities are breeding grounds for racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, and just about any other phobia you can think of. Devon, we know you will not vote for unethical arguments- this is the epitome of that.**

#### Metal Gear Solid 4 is the worst thing a video game could be. Let’s start with the unforgivable racism, outside of the already imperialist message:

1. **The only reoccurring black character in the game is named Drebin, who naturally must be a government arms dealer by day, and an underground arms dealer at night, who only drinks Narc Soda, talks Jive, and has a pet monkey who he is repeatedly represented as. BUT WAIT, THERE’S MORE. Drebin obviously can’t be a unique character. You first meet Drebin 893, who you later come to find out is one of an ENDLESS ARMY OF IDENTICAL LOOKING BLACK MEN who are only differentiated by A NUMBER after the word “Drebin.” Black men are only seemed as disposable cogs in the military industrial complex.**

**Every instance of racism must be rejected on ethical grounds, but it gets worse for you- racism is a tool of the neoliberal system. The aff pushes cap out the door only for it to return through the window.**

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, “Putting Materialism back into Race Theory”, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm)

This essay advances a materialist theory of race. In my view, race oppression dialectically intersects with the exploitative logic of advanced capitalism, a regime which deploys race in the interest of surplus accumulation. Thus, race operates at the (economic) base and therefore produces cultural and ideological effects at the superstructure; in turn, these effects—in very historically specific way—interact with and ideologically justify the operations at the economic base [1]. In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, thetransformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression. By freedom, I do not simply mean a legal or cultural articulation of individual rights as proposed by bourgeois race theorists. Instead, I theorize freedom as a material effect of emancipated economic forms. I foreground my (materialist) understanding of race as a way to contest contemporary accounts of race, which erase any determinate connection to economics. For instance, humanism and poststructuralism represent two dominant views on race in the contemporary academy. Even though they articulate very different theoretical positions, they produce similar ideological effects: the suppression of economics. They collude in redirecting attention away from the logic of capitalist exploitation and point us to the cultural questions of sameness (humanism) or difference (poststructuralism). In developing my project, I critique the ideological assumptions of some exemplary instances of humanist and poststructuralist accounts of race, especially those accounts that also attempt to displace Marxism, and, in doing so, I foreground the historically determinate link between race and exploitation. It is this link that forms the core of what I am calling a transformative theory of race. The transformation of race from a sign of exploitation to one of democratic multiculturalism, ultimately, requires the transformation of capitalism.

#### Ethical obligation to reject racism- voting aff cedes the public sphere, destroying their offense.

Giroux ‘11

Henry A Giroux, Truthout, Occupy Colleges Now: Students as the New Public Intellectuals, 21 November 2011, <http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=5046:occupy-colleges-now--students-as-the-new-public-intellectuals>

Of course, such a position is at odds with those intellectuals who have retreated into arcane discourses that offer the cloistered protection of the professional recluse. Making few connections with audiences outside of the academy or to the myriad issues that bear down on everyday lives, many academics became increasingly irrelevant, while humanistic inquiry suffers the aftershocks of flagging public support. The Occupy Wall Street protesters have refused this notion of the deracinated, if not increasingly irrelevant, notion of academics and students as disinterested intellectuals. They are not alone. Refusing the rewards of apolitical professionalism or obscure specialization so rampant on university campuses, Roy has pointed out that intellectuals need to ask themselves some very "uncomfortable questions about our values and traditions, our vision for the future, our responsibilities as citizens, the legitimacy of our 'democratic institutions,' the role of the state, the police, the army, the judiciary, and the intellectual community."[[1]](http://truth-out.org/index.php#1) Similarly, Scarry points to the difficulty of seeing an injury and injustice, the sense of futility of one's own small efforts, and the special difficulty of lifting complex ideas into the public sphere.[[2]](http://truth-out.org/index.php#2) Derrida has raised important questions about the relationship between critique and the very nature of the university and the humanities, as when he writes: The university without condition does not, in fact, exist, as we know only too well. Nevertheless, in principle and in conformity with its declared vocation, its professed essence, it should remain an ultimate place of critical resistance - and more than critical - to all the power of dogmatic and unjust appropriation.[[3]](http://truth-out.org/index.php#3)

**This game fails in its representations of women as well**

* **The boss of this game- a male- has control over the four mini bosses- four women who are severely afflicted with PTSD, whose trauma was exploited as they were given animal suits and turned into killing machines. They are only referred to by their animal names (i.e Crying Wolf). You then get to free them from their suits and have the option of sexually assaulting them or killing them.**

This translates to real acts of sexual assault, rape, and violence against women.

Totilo 11 (Steven, 2/10/11, Interviewing psychologist and author Carol Lieberman http://kotaku.com/5757307/the-doctor-who-said-video-games-cause-rape-explains-what-she-meant)

"The more video games a person plays that have violent sexual content," she said, carefully choosing her words during a phone interview with Kotaku, "the more likely one is to become desensitized to violent sexual acts and commit them."P¶ That's a less direct version of what she said in the Fox News piece, in a comment that sent gamers into a frenzy: "The increase in rapes can be attributed in large part to the playing out of [sexual] scenes in video games."P¶ (Reporters typically trim quotes for space, flow or emphasis; Dr. Lieberman's full quote about sexual violence and games to Fox News was: "Video games have increasingly, and more brazenly, connected sex and violence in images, actions and words. This has the psychological impact of doubling the excitement, stimulation and incitement to copycat acts. The increase in rapes can be attributed, in large part, to the playing out of such scenes in video games.")P¶ Fox News didn't really get Lieberman wrong. She's been pushing back against what she sees as the harmful influence of violent video games and other violent media for years. In a chapter of a book written for TV host Larry King, she bundled video games with violent movies, toys, and rap lyrics as "modern weapons of mass destruction" that "are causing us to destroy each other - on playgrounds and battlegrounds."P¶ She believes that violent media does encourage more aggressive behavior and says there are "thousands" of studies that support the view she and others share. "The thing is that all these thousands of studies relate violent media,including video games, to an increase in violence in general." She's been wary of the effects of the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles cartoon in the 80s compelling kids to karate chop each other on playgrounds, and testified to Congress about the impact of violent media. She's seen in the history of people she's studied in her clinical and forensic work an obsession with video games, which makes her wary of the influence of the medium.P¶ The Doctor Who Said Video Games Cause Rape Explains What She Meant¶ Dr. Lieberman couldn't cite a specific study that showed that video games cause rape but she argues that it is a logical conclusion to reach: "That fits under the idea of people becoming more violent or aggressive, the more violent media they consume," she said.P¶ She described her comments, part of a longer interview with Fox News about violent games and media, as "just stuff that's second nature to me. I've been talking about this for years.P¶ And so, games do cause rape?P¶ "I would have to dig into the things I have in hard copy or search the Internet," she said, "But rape [pause] there have been sexual crimes and the video games have become more sexual …"P¶ Kotaku was putting Lieberman on the spot. We called her and she answered. So even though she'd been getting criticized by gamers over e-mail for a couple of days, she didn't have her notes handy. She did, however, wind her way into an articulation of her concern about the changing nature of video games. "They've become more sexual," she said. "And, according to Freud, our impulses… we're born with natural drives toward aggression and sex. The aggression drive is normally socialized, when we grow up, to become ambition. The sexual drive, as we grow up, is connected to love, if we grow up in a healthy way.P¶ "The irony is here are people trying to say video games don't cause people to be violent, but the ones I've read are very violent. They're out of control."¶ "When people combine sexual and violent images, particularly in video games where you're not just passively watching, you're pushing buttons, you're getting physically involved in this act, it has a particularly stimulating impact. It stimulates the sex center of the psyche and the violence center of the psyche and make the whole effect more stimulating. And so it's natural that the more the violent impulses are stimulated...[she paused] it's not that everyone goes out and kills but people become more aggressive with getting into parking spots or everyday things… so when there are also sexual things, like words in this new game they are using, or images, it stimulates the two centers in the psyche and makes the overall impact linking sex and violence — and desensitizing people to violent sex — more impactful, more inciteful."P¶ Lieberman was demonstrating some familiarity with the game she was describing. Bulletstorm is many things, including both a game we've written positive impressions about and a first-person shooter that celebrates a player's ability to kill multiple enemies with verbal accolades such as "gang bang."P¶ Lieberman is not a gamer, says she's never even played Pac-Man; though she suspects that Jared Lee Loughner, the man who allegedly tried to assassinate a Congresswoman last month, was a player of violent video games, a theory that has yet to be confirmed. She doesn't think games alone trigger any of this. She believes that troubled upbringings are a major factor and explain why so many gamers don't resort to the awful behaviors that concern her.P¶ For the effort of sharing her perspective with Fox News, Lieberman has suffered the brunt of gamers. They've bombarded her with negative e-mails. She plucked one at random for me, a missive from someone who signed their name as JohnnyMassiveHomoCuntP¶ The e-mailer wrote: "I played Bulletstorm demo, and like I felt I need to rape someone. So I went into this kind of deep trance, which caused me to rape 10, 15 years-old girl. [sic] What do I do now? The game made me do it. Please help me. By the way, you look like a fucking deadbeat pornstar. Yours truly, JohnnyMassiveHomoCunt OMG LOL my shift broke. P.S. Playing Mass Effect gave me a sudden need to shoot you in the head. Would you please come here so I can fulfill my needs?"¶