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## \*\*GENERAL AFF AT\*\*

### Perm solves

**The alt alone is coopted – you need a multitude of standpoints means the perm solves**

**Carroll 10 –** \*founding director of the Social Justice Studies Program at the University of Victoria(William, “Crisis, movements, counter-hegemony: in search of the new,” Interface 2:2, 168-198)

Just as hegemony has been increasingly organized on a transnational basis – through the globalization of Americanism, the construction of global governance institutions, the emergence of a transnational capitalist class and so on (Soederberg 2006; Carroll 2010) – counter-hegemony has also taken on transnational features that go beyond the classic organization of left parties into internationals. What Sousa Santos (2006) terms the rise of a global left is evident in specific movementbased campaigns, such as the successful international effort in 1998 to defeat the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI); in initiatives such as the World Social Forum, to contest the terrain of global civil society; and in the growth of transnational movement organizations and of a ‘democratic globalization network’, counterpoised to neoliberalism’s transnational historical bloc, that address issues of North-South solidarity and coordination (Smith 2008:24). As I have suggested elsewhere (Carroll 2007), an incipient war of position is at work here – a bloc of oppositional forces to neoliberal globalization encompassing a wide range of movements and identities and that is ‘global in nature, transcending traditional national boundaries’ (Butko 2006: 101). These moments of resistance and transborder activism do not yet combine to form a coherent historical bloc around a counter-hegemonic project. Rather, as Marie-Josée Massicotte suggests, ‘we are witnessing the emergence and re-making of political imaginaries…, which often lead to valuable localized actions as well as greater transborder solidarity’ (2009: 424). Indeed, Gramsci’s adage that while the line of development is international, the origin point is national, still has currency. Much of the energy of anti-capitalist politics is centred within what Raymond Williams (1989) called militant particularisms – localized struggles that, ‘left to themselves … are easily dominated by the power of capital to coordinate accumulation across universal but fragmented space’ (Harvey 1996: 32). Catharsis, in this context, takes on a spatial character. The scaling up of militant particularisms requires ‘alliances across interrelated scales to unite a diverse range of social groupings and thereby spatialize a Gramscian war of position to the global scale’ (Karriem 2009: 324). Such alliances, however, must be grounded in local conditions and aspirations. Eli Friedman’s (2009) case study of two affiliated movement organizations in Hong Kong and mainland China, respectively, illustrates the limits of transnational activism that radiates from advanced capitalism to exert external pressure on behalf of subalterns in the global South. Friedman recounts how a campaign by the Hong Kong-based group of Students and Scholars Against Corporate Misbehavior to empower Chinese mainland workers producing goods for Hong Kong Disneyland failed due to the lack of local mobilization by workers themselves. Yet the same group, through its support for its ally, the mainland-based migrant workers’ association, has helped facilitate self-organization on the shop floor. In the former case, well-intentioned practices of solidarity reproduced a paternalism that failed to inspire local collective action; in the latter, workers taking direct action on their own behalf, with external support, led to ‘psychological empowerment’ and movement mobilization (Friedman 2009: 212). As a rule, ‘the more such solidarity work involves grassroots initiatives and participation, the greater is the likelihood that workers from different countries will learn from each other’, enabling transnational counter-hegemony to gain a foothold (Rahmon and Langford 2010: 63).

**Reformism from with-in solves**

**Dixon 1 –** Activist and founding member of Direct Action Network Summer, Chris, “Reflections on Privilege, Reformism, and Activism”, Online

To bolster his critique of 'reformism,' for instance, he critically cites one of the examples in my essay: demanding authentic we need revolutionary strategy that links diverse, everyday struggles and demands to long-term radical objectives, without sacrificing either. Of course, this isn't to say that every so-called 'progressive' ballot initiative or organizing campaign is necessarily radical or strategic. Reforms are not all created equal. But some can fundamentally shake systems of power, leading to enlarged gains and greater space for further advances. Andre Gorz, in his seminal book Strategy for Labor, refers to these as "non-reformist" or "structural" reforms. He contends, "a struggle for non-reformist reforms--for anti-capitalist reforms--is one which does not base its validity and its right to exist on capitalist needs, criteria, and rationales. A non-reformist reform is determined not in terms of what can be, but what should be." Look to history for examples: the end of slavery, the eight-hour workday, desegregation. All were born from long, hard struggles, and none were endpoints. Yet they all struck at the foundations of power (in these cases, the state, white supremacy, and capitalism), and in the process, they created new prospects for revolutionary change. Now consider contemporary struggles: amnesty for undocumented immigrants, socialized health care, expansive environmental protections, indigenous sovereignty. These and many more are arguably non-reformist reforms as well. None will single-handedly dismantle capitalism or other systems of power, but each has the potential to escalate struggles and sharpen social contradictions. And we shouldn't misinterpret these efforts as simply meliorative incrementalism, making 'adjustments' to a fundamentally flawed system.

### Perm- Current structures

**Perm – Use current financial structures to challenge capitalism.**

**Alliances with members of the ruling class are essential to defeating capitalism**

**Hart 01** Faculty of University of Aberdeen, Scotland(Keith, “Money in an unequal world”, 9/1/01, Anthropological Theory 1:307, Sage SW)

It may be that nothing short of world revolution will lead us out of the present impasse. A ﬁrst step in this direction, however, would be to form an anthropological vision of our moment in history that is genuinely global and open to the economic currents shaping the world today. In pursuit of such a vision, the argument begins with the contradiction between agrarian civilization and the machine revolution of which capitalism is both the source and the outcome. My label for the convergence of machines and money at this time is ‘virtual capitalism’. Just as the factory proletariat once struggled for the value generated by the ﬁrst industrial revolution, some of us will have to engage with governments and corporations for the value generated by means of the internet. In order to do so, we need to grasp the potential of the forms of money and exchange emerging under these circumstances, with a view to developing ﬁnancial instruments that serve the interests of each of us and people in general. A major strategic consideration is whether the unﬁnished middle-class revolution against the old regime is still necessary to democratic progress and, if so, where that leaves hitherto failed attempts to bring about the end of capitalism in the name of the working class. Whatever these terms may mean today, a major conclusion drawn here is that the middle classes are still central to the struggle against inequality, not least because of their privileged access to the new information technologies. In Marxist terms, the petty bourgeoisie have traditionally swung between the powerful and the powerless, often adopting the interests of the dominant classes as their own, but sometimes leading the movement for greater equality and freedom. My arguments are addressed principally to those middle-class individuals who may still be capable of stirring themselves on behalf of the general human interest. It is unlikely that the demise of capitalism is a plausible aim at this time; rather, alliances with the more progressive elements of a capitalism strongly restructuring itself at the global level seem indispensable.

### Gibson-Graham

**Representations of capitalism as hegemonically dominant preclude the realization of actual social change. Changing this view is a pre-requisite to the alt.**

**Gibson-Graham 06** – J.K., pen name shared by feminist economic geographers Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson (“The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, pg 2-5)

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes "capitalism" as an economic and social descriptor.4 Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term - passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism - as well as systematic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of "capitalist hegemony" deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelihood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, "capitalist hegemony" operates not only as a constituent of, but also as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imagination.5 What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted?6 If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate that world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem). The discursive artifact we call "capitalist hegemony" is a complex effect of a wide variety of discursive and nondiscursive conditions.7 In this book we focus on the practices and preoccupations of discourse, tracing some of the different, even incompatible, representations of capitalism that can be collated within this fictive summary representati n. These depictions have their origins in the diverse traditions of Marxism, classical and contemporary political economy, academic social science, modern historiography, popular economic and social thought, western philosophy and metaphysics, indeed, in an endless array of texts, traditions and infrastructures of meaning. In the chapters that follow, only a few of these are examined for the ways in which they have sustained a vision of capitalism as the dominant form of economy, or have contributed to the possibility or durability of such a vision. But the point should emerge none the less clearly: the virtually unquestioned dominance of capitalism can be seen as a complex product of a variety of discursive commitments, including but not limited to organicist social conceptions, heroic historical narratives, evolutionary scenarios of social development, and essentialist, phallocentric, or binary patterns of thinking. It is through these discursive figurings and alignments that capitalism is constituted as large, powerful, persistent, active, expansive, progressive, dynamic, transformative; embracing, penetrating, disciplining, colonizing, constraining; systemic, self-reproducing, rational, lawful, self-rectifying; organized and organizing, centered and centering; originating, creative, protean; victorious and ascendant; selfidentical, self-expressive, full, definite, real, positive, and capable of conferring identity and meaning.8 The argument revisited: it is the way capitalism has been "thought" that has made it so difficult for people to imagine its supersession.9 It is therefore the ways in which capitalism is known that we wish to delegitimize and displace. The process is one of unearthing, of bringing to light images and habits of understanding that constitute "hegemonic capitalism" at the intersection of a set of representations. This we see as a first step toward theorizing capitalism without representing dominance as a natural and inevitable feature of its being. At the same time, we hope to foster conditions under which the economy might become less subject to definitional closure. If it were possible to inhabit a heterogeneous and open-ended economic space whose identity was not fixed or singular (the space potentially to be vacated by a capitalism that is necessarily and naturally hegemonic) then a vision of noncapitalist economic practices as existing and widespread might be able to be born; and in the context of such a vision, a new anticapitalist politics might emerge, a noncapitalist politics of class (whatever that may mean) might take root and flourish. A long shot perhaps but one worth pursuing.

**Representing capitalism as a bounded, monistic entity precludes noncapital alternatives and furthers hegemonic, capitalocentric modes of thought**

**Gibson-Graham 06** – J.K., pen name shared by feminist economic geographers Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson

(“The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, pg 43-45, IWren)

What interests me most here is the question of why the economism of which capitalism is the bearer is so difficult to moderate or excise. And what may account for the economic monism or hegemonism that accompanies most representations of capitalist society and development? Here a partial answer may be found in the metaphysics of identity that Althusser sought to undermine. Operating under an "imperative of unity" (Hazel 1994: 4) western conceptions of identity entail both the unity of an object with itself (its self-resemblance) and its one-to one relation with the sign by which it is known: one word with one meaning, corresponding to one thing. To such an essentialist reading of identity "capitalism" designates an underlying commonality in the objects to which it refers. Thus we are not surprised to encounter a capitalism that is essentially the same in different times and places (despite the fact that sameness as the precondition of meaning is exactly what various structuralist and poststructuralist traditions have sought to undermine.) By virtue of their identification as capitalist settings, different societies become the sites of a resemblance or a replication. Complex processes of social development - commodification, industrialization, proletarianization, internationalization - become legible as the signatures of capitalism rather than as unique and decentered determinations. When capitalism exists as a sameness, noncapitalism can only be subordinated or rendered invisible (like traditional or domestic economic forms). Noncapitalism is to capitalism as woman to man: an insufficiency until and unless it is released from the binary metaphysics of identity (where A is a unified self-identical being that excludes what it is not).34 If capitalism/man can be understood as multiple and specific; if it is not a unity but a heterogeneity, not a sameness but a difference; if it is always becoming what it is not; if it incorporates difference within its decentered being; then noncapitalism/woman is released from its singular and subordinate status. There is no singularity of Form to constitute noncapitalism/woman as a simple negation or as the recessive ground against which the positive figure of capitalism/man is defined. To conceptualize capitalism/man as multiple and different is thus a condition of theorizing noncapitalism/woman as a set of specific, definite forms of being. It is easy to appreciate the strategic effectiveness of reading the texts of capitalism deconstructively, discovering the surplus and contradictory meanings of the term, the places where capitalism is inhabited and constituted by noncapitalism, where it escapes the logic of sameness and is unable to maintain its ostensible self-identity (see chapter 10). But overdetermination can be used as an additional anti-essentialist theoretical strategy to complement and supplement the strategy of deconstruction. Taken together these strategies have the potential to undermine capitalism's discursive "hegemony" and to reconceptualize its role in social determination. Representations of society and economy cannot themselves be centered on a decentered and formless entity that is itself always different from itself, and that obtains its shifting and contradictory identity from the always changing exteriors that overdetermine it. Just as postmodernism obtains its power from modernism (its power to undermine and destabilize, to oppose and contradict),35 so can an overdeterminist approach realize its power and strategic capacity by virtue of its oppositional relation to the preeminent modes of understanding both language categories and identity/being. To the extent that we conceptualize entities as autonomous, bounded, and discrete (constituted by the exclusion of their outsides), and as the unique referents that give each sign a stable and singular meaning, to that extent does the strategy of thinking overdetermination have the power to destabilize theoretical discourse and reposition the concepts within it.36 Through the lens of overdetermination, identities (like capitalism) can become visible as entirely constituted by their "external" conditions. With an overdeterminist strategy we may empty capitalism of its universal attributes and evacuate the essential and invariant logics that allow it to hegemonize the economic and social terrain. Overdetermination enables us to read the causality that is capitalism as coexisting with an infinity of other determinants, none of which can definitively be said to be less or more significant, while repositioning capitalism itself as an effect. That the capitalist economy often escapes reconceptualization and so continues to function as an organizing moment, and an origin of meaning and causation in social theory, cannot be understood as a simple theoretical omission. It is also a reassertion of the hegemonic conceptions of language and determination that overdetermination is uniquely positioned to contradict. It is a testimony to the power of overdetermination that it has allowed certain post-Althusserian theorists to envision an "economy" that is not singular, centered, ordered or selfconstituting, and that therefore is not capitalism's exclusive domain.37 But it testifies to the resilience of the dominant conceptual context (it should perhaps be called a mode of thought) in which the objects of thought exist independently of thought and of each other that an autonomous economy still exists and operates in social representation. One can say that representations of the capitalist economy as an independent entity informed by logics and exclusive of its exteriors have allowed capitalism to hegemonize both the economic and the social field. One can also say, however, that overdetermination is a discursive strategy that can potentially empty, fragment, decenter and open the economy, liberating discourses of economy and society from capitalism's embrace. But that process, far from being over or even well on its way, has hardly begun.

### Ev prodict

**Prefer our evidence – their evidence is futile intellectual pride**

**Saunders 7-**Peter, Adjunct Professor at the [Australian Graduate School of Management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Graduate_School_of_Management), Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html

Andrew Norton notes that disaffected intellectuals since Rousseau have been attacking capitalism for its failure to meet ‘true human needs.’[(26)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#26) The claim is unfounded, so what is it about capitalism that so upsets them?  Joseph Schumpeter offered part of the answer. He observed that capitalism has brought into being an educated class that has no responsibility for practical affairs, and that this class can only make a mark by criticising the system that feeds them.[(27)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#27) Intellectuals attack capitalism because that is how they sell books and build careers.   More recently, Robert Nozick has noted that intellectuals spend their childhoods excelling at school, where they occupy the top positions in the hierarchy, only to find later in life that their market value is much lower than they believe they are worth. Seeing ‘mere traders’ enjoying higher pay than them is unbearable, and it generates irreconcilable disaffection with the market system.[(28)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#28)  But the best explanation for the intellectuals’ distaste for capitalism was offered by Friedrich Hayek in The Fatal Conceit.[(29)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#29) Hayek understood that capitalism offends intellectual pride, while socialism flatters it. Humans like to believe they can design better systems than those that tradition or evolution have bequeathed. We distrust evolved systems, like markets, which seem to work without intelligent direction according to laws and dynamics that no one fully understands. Nobody planned the global capitalist system, nobody runs it, and nobody really comprehends it. This particularly offends intellectuals, for capitalism renders them redundant. It gets on perfectly well without them. It does not need them to make it run, to coordinate it, or to redesign it. The intellectual critics of capitalism believe they know what is good for us, but millions of people interacting in the marketplace keep rebuffing them. This, ultimately, is why they believe capitalism is ‘bad for the soul’: it fulfils human needs without first seeking their moral approval.

**Their authors scapegoat capitalism – hold them to a high standard of causal evidence**

**Norberg 3** – Fellow at Timbro and CATO [Johan Norberg, In Defense of Global Capitalism, pg. 290-291]

All change arouses suspicion and anxiety, sometimes justifiably so; even positive changes can have troublesome consequences in the short term. Decisionmakers are unwilling to shoulder responsibility for failures and problems. It is preferable to be able to blame someone else. Globalization makes an excellent scapegoat. It contains all the anonymous forces that have served this purpose throughout history: other countries, other races and ethnic groups, the uncaring market. Globalization does not speak up for itself when politicians blame it for overturning economies, increasing poverty, and enriching a tiny minority, or when entrepreneurs say that globalization, rather than their own decisions, is forcing them to pollute the environment, cut jobs, or raise their own salaries. And globalization doesn't usually get any credit when good things happen—when the environment improves, the economy runs at high speed and poverty diminishes. Then there are plenty of people willing to accept full responsibility for the course of events. Globalization does not defend itself. So if the trend toward greater globalization is to continue, an ideological defense will be needed for freedom from borders and controls.

### Alt = war

**Alternatives to Capitalism end in war and genocide**

**Rummel 4** – prof. emeritus of political science at the University of Hawaii [Rudolph, The Killing Machine that is Marxism, Online]

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide. In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly then all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster. The Khmer Rouge – (Cambodian communists) who ruled Cambodia for four years – provide insight into why Marxists believed it necessary and moral to massacre so many of their fellow humans. Their Marxism was married to absolute power. They believed without a shred of doubt that they knew the truth, that they would bring about the greatest human welfare and happiness, and that to realize this utopia, they had to mercilessly tear down the old feudal or capitalist order and Buddhist culture, and then totally rebuild a communist society. Nothing could be allowed to stand in the way of this achievement. Government – the Communist Party – was above any law. All other institutions, religions, cultural norms, traditions and sentiments were expendable. The Marxists saw the construction of this utopia as a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism and inequality – and, as in a real war, noncombatants would unfortunately get caught in the battle. There would be necessary enemy casualties: the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, "wreckers," intellectuals, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, the rich and landlords. As in a war, millions might die, but these deaths would be justified by the end, as in the defeat of Hitler in World War II. To the ruling Marxists, the goal of a communist utopia was enough to justify all the deaths. The irony is that in practice, even after decades of total control, Marxism did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made living conditions worse than before the revolution. It is not by chance that the world's greatest famines have happened within the Soviet Union (about 5 million dead from 1921-23 and 7 million from 1932-3, including 2 million outside Ukraine) and communist China (about 30 million dead from 1959-61). Overall, in the last century almost 55 million people died in various Marxist famines and associated epidemics – a little over 10 million of them were intentionally starved to death, and the rest died as an unintended result of Marxist collectivization and agricultural policies. What is astonishing is that this "currency" of death by Marxism is not thousands or even hundreds of thousands, but millions of deaths. This is almost incomprehensible – it is as though the whole population of the American New England and Middle Atlantic States, or California and Texas, had been wiped out. And that around 35 million people escaped Marxist countries as refugees was an unequaled vote against Marxist utopian pretensions.

### Cede the political

**Attacks on capitalism cede the political—kills progressivism**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 13-14, DKP]

Unfortunately, progressives spend most of their time attacking capitalism rather than taking credit for all the reforms that led to America’s economic growth. If Americans were convinced that social programs and investment in people (rather than corporate welfare and investment in weaponry) helped create the current economic growth, they would be far more willing to pursue additional progressive policies. Instead, the left allows conservatives to dismiss these social investments as “too costly” or “big government.” It is crucial not to allow the right to define these progressive programs as “anticapitalist” and then attempt to destroy them. The Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton era’s attempt to “get the government off our back” was an effort (fortunately, largely a failure) to corrupt the highly successful progressive capitalism in America. While the Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton “reforms” subsidized the dramatic growth in the wealth of the richest Americans and had a devastating impact on the very poor, they didn’t change the basic institutions of progressive capitalism. It may take several generations to recover from the damage done to the poor, but even the far right has been unable (so far) to destroy progressive middle-class institutions such as Social Security or public schools.

**Apocalyptic predictions about capitalism will be dismissed—emphasis should be on progressive reform**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 14-15, DKP]

Leftists also need to abandon their tendency to make apocalyptic predictions. It's always tempting to predict that environmental destruction is imminent or the stock market is ready to crash in the coming second Great Depression. Arguments that the U.S. economy is in terrible shape fly in the face of reality. It's hard to claim that a middle-class American family with two cars, a big-screen TV, and a computer is oppressed. While the poor in America fell behind during the Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton era and the middle class did not receive its share of the wealth produced during this time, the economy itself is in excellent shape. Instead, the problem is the redistribution of wealth to the very rich under the resurgence of "free market" capitalism. Instead of warning that the economy will collapse without progressive policies, the left should emphasize that the progressive aspects of American capitalism have created the current success of the American economy after decades of heavy government investment in human capital. But the cutbacks in investment for education and the growing disparity between the haves and the have-notes are threatening the economy’s future success.

**Capitalism is inevitable—reform is the only option, revolutionary rhetoric cedes the political**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 15-16, DKP]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they’re hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism— they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What’s wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town— the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

**Overthrowing capitalism is a political non-starter—reforms are the only way that the left will be effective.**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 123]

The left often finds itself stuck in a debate between revolution and reform. To self-described revolutionaries, any attempt to reform the system is a liberal compromise that only delays the creation of a socialist utopia. The vision of workers casting off their chains and embracing the overthrow of capitalism is pure fantasy. No one actually knows what it means to overthrow capitalism, and it clearly isn't going to happen, anyway. Reforming American capitalism is not a halfhearted effort at modest change; it is a fundamental attack on the reigning ideology of "free market" capitalism. Progressive reforms, taken seriously, are revolutionary in every important sense. Reforms such as the New Deal were truly revolutionary for their time, and American capitalism has been saved from its own flaws by these progressive reforms. The problem is that these progressive reforms have not been carried far enough, in part because the revolutionary left has too often failed to support the progressives’ reformist agenda. The only leftist revolution in America will come from an accumulation of progressive policies, and so the question of revolution versus reform is irrelevant.

**Revolution will never happen overnight—progressive policies need to be built upon over time.**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 121-123]

Progressives need to be pragmatic in order to be powerful. However, pragmatism shouldn't be confused with Clintonian centrism and the abandonment of all substance. Pragmatists have principles, too. The difference between a pragmatic progressive and a foolish one is the willingness to pick the right fights and fight in the right way to accomplish these same goals. The current failure of progressivism in America is due to the structure of American politics and media, not because of a wrong turn that the movement took somewhere along the way. What the left needs is not a "better" ideology but a tactical adaptation to the obstacles it faces in the contemporary political scene. A pragmatic progressivism does not sacrifice its ideals but simply communicates them better to the larger public. The words we use shape how people respond to our ideas. It's tempting to offer the standard advice that progressives should present their ideas in the most palatable form. But palatable to whom? The media managers and pedestrian pundits who are the intellectual gatekeepers won't accept these ideas. By the time progressives transform their ideas into the political baby food necessary for inclusion in current debates, it barely seems to be worth the effort. Leftists need to seize the dominant political rhetoric, even though it may be conservative in its goals, and turn it in a progressive direction. Progressives need to use the antitax ideology to demand tax cuts for the poor. Progressives need to use the antigovernment and antiwelfare ideology to demand the end of corporate welfare. Progressives need to translate every important issue into the language that is permissible in the mainstream. Something will inevitably be lost in the translation. But the political soul underlying these progressive ideas can be preserved and brought to the public's attention. The left does not need to abandon its progressive views in order to be popular. The left only needs to abandon some of its failed strategies and become as savvy as the conservatives are at manipulating the press and the politicians. The language of progressives needs to become more mainstream, but the ideas must remain radical. In an age of soulless politicians and spineless ideologies, the left has the virtue of integrity. Until progressives become less self-satisfied with the knowledge that they're right and more determined to convince everyone else of this fact, opportunities for political change will not be forthcoming. Progressives have also been hampered by a revolutionary instinct among some leftist groups. According to some left wingers, incremental progress is worthless-that is, nothing short of a radical change in government will mean anything to them. Indeed, for the most radical left wingers, liberal reforms are a threat to the movement, since they reduce the desire for more extreme changes. What the revolutionaries fail to realize is that progressive achievements can build on one another. If anything approaching a political revolution actually happens in America, it will be due to a succession of popular, effective, progressive reforms.

### Alt fails- Abandons politics

**Monolithic focus on things like class or postmodernism hurts the left—political action is necessary**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 5-6, DKP]

The trend toward progressive attitudes among Americans has only accelerated. Today, Americans advocate gender equality on a level unthinkable at the time I was born, an era when airline stewardess were fired when they turned thirty, got married, or gained fifteen pounds. Today, racial equality is an ideal widely accepted, even if the reality falls short. Today, equality for gays and lesbians is a politically viable possibility, a remarkable leap for an issue that was virtually invisible at the time of the Stonewall riot. Today, environmental awareness and the enormous number of people who recycle would have been unimaginable to the small group of activists who gathered to celebrate the first Earth Day. Even though the American people have been moving to the left on a number of important issues, the two major political parties have shifted to the right. The left’s revival requires both the recognition of the disadvantages it faces and a willingness to fight against those barriers while making use of the advantages that progressives have over the right. The biggest advantage that the left holds is that it doesn’t have to be afraid of speaking the truth to the public. Conservatives, despite their assertions of public support, must always be wary of dealing too openly with Americans. That is, every idea on the right must be carefully vetted to ensure the proper spin control. Even “radical” ideas such as Steve Forbes’s flat tax must conceal the extent of tax cuts for the rich under the disguise of a universal tax reduction. This book argues that progressives need to reshape their arguments and their policy proposals to increase their influence over American politics. It also contends that the left need not sell its soul or jettison its diverse constituents in order to succeed. Rather than moderation, I urge a new kind of tactical radicalism. Rather than a monolithic left focused on class or labor or postmodernism or whatever the pet ideological project of the day is, I advocate a big-tent left capable of mobilizing all its people. Progressives already have the hearts and minds of the American people. What the left lacks is a political movement to translate that popularity into political action. What the left needs is a rhetorical framework and political plan of action to turn the progressive potential in America into a political force.

**Anti-capitalist or socialist rhetoric kills the possibility of progressives to influence public policy—they are labeled as crazy**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 7-10, DKP]

Dear Comrades: Socialism is dead. Kaput. Stick a fork in Lenin’s corpse. Take the Fidel posters off the wall. Welcome to the twenty-first century. Wake up and smell the capitalism. I have no particular hostility to socialism. But nothing can kill a good idea in America so quickly as sticking the “socialist” label on it. The reality in America is that socialism is about as successful as Marxist footwear (and have you ever seen a sickle and hammer on anybody’s shoes?). Allow your position to be defined as socialist even if it isn’t (remember Clinton’s capitalist health care plan?), and the idea is doomed. Instead of fighting to repair the tattered remnants of socialism as a marketing slogan, the left needs to address the core issues of social justice. You can form the word socialist from the letters in social justice, but it sounds better if you don’t. At least 90 percent of America opposes socialism, and 90 percent of America thinks “social justice” might be a good idea. Why alienate so many people with a word? Even the true believers hawking copies of the Revolutionary Socialist Worker must realize by now that the word socialist doesn’t have a lot of drawing power. In the movie Bulworth, Warren Beatty declares: “Let me hear that dirty word: socialism!” Socialism isn’t really a dirty word, however; if it were, socialism might have a little underground appeal as a forbidden topic. Instead, socialism is a forgotten word, part of an archaic vocabulary and a dead language that is no longer spoken in America. Even Michael Harrington, the founder of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), didn’t use the word socialism in his influential book on poverty, The Other America. The best reason for the left to abandon socialism is not PR but honesty. Most of the self-described “socialists” remaining in America don’t qualify as real socialists in any technical sense. If you look at the DSA (whose prominent members include Harvard professor Cornel West and former Time columnist Barbara Ehrenreich), most of the policies they urge— a living wage, universal health care, environmental protection, reduced spending on the Pentagon, and an end to corporate welfare— have nothing to do with socialism in the specific sense of government ownership of the means of production. Rather, the DSA program is really nothing more than what a liberal political party ought to push for, if we had one in America. Europeans, to whom the hysteria over socialism must seem rather strange, would never consider abandoning socialism as a legitimate political ideology. But in America, socialism simply isn’t taken seriously by the mainstream. Therefore, if socialists want to be taken seriously, they need to pursue socialist goals using nonsocialist rhetoric. Whenever someone tries to attack an idea as “socialist” (or, better yet, “communist”), there’s an easy answer: Some people think everything done by a government, from Social Security to Medicare to public schools to public libraries, is socialism. The rest of us just think it’s a good idea. (Whenever possible, throw public libraries into an argument, whether it’s about good government programs or NEA funding. Nobody with any sense is opposed to public libraries. They are by far the most popular government institutions.) If an argument turns into a debate over socialism, simply define socialism as the total government ownership of all factories and natural resources— which, since we don’t have it and no one is really arguing for this to happen, makes socialism a rather pointless debate. Of course, socialists will always argue among themselves about socialism and continue their internal debates. But when it comes to influencing public policy, abstract discussions about socialism are worse than useless, for they alienate the progressive potential of the American people. It’s only by pursuing specific progressive policies on nonsocialist terms that socialists have any hope in the long term of convincing the public that socialism isn’t (or shouldn’t be) a long-dead ideology.

**Anti-capitalism hurts the left—reform is the only feasible political strategy**

**Wilson 2k**-coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 11-13, DKP]

The left never has had a kind word for capitalism, which is one reason that progressives are so often marginalized in America, the country where capitalism is the true national religion. From our public celebration of filthy rich business leaders as celebrities to the vast array of magazines and books devoted to revealing the secrets of making money, capitalism is taken for granted. The left is always taking a dismal view of the American economy, pointing out (accurately) the flaws of our unequal system and its enormous gap between rich and poor. As a result, the “free market” capitalists take credit for the country’s tremendous economic success, even though progressive reforms have been largely responsible for the economic growth of the post– World War II era. Because the left refuses to embrace the term (and the right refuses to admit that it exists), the achievements of progressive capitalism have been overlooked. Although the left regularly criticizes the “free market” capitalist system, the alternatives are rarely discussed. Unfortunately, the left has devoted little attention to what capitalism might look like through progressive eyes. As a result, most people assume that the combination of the “free market” and corporate welfare in America is the only possible form of capitalism. The right is trying to make itself more appealing by using seemingly contradictory slogans such as George W. Bush’s “compassionate conservatism.” Similarly, the left needs to challenge the stereotypes of progressives and adopt “capitalism for everyone” as its slogan. The idea of economic self-determination, a living wage, and equal schools is appealing. The “capitalism for everyone” slogan also has another meaning: instead of capitalism for the big corporation, the rules need to be changed to make sure that capitalism doesn’t come at the expense of our environment or the health and safety of our workers. Progressive capitalism is not a contradiction in terms, for progressives support capitalism in many ways. Even nonprofit organizations and cooperatives are not antithetical to capitalism and the market; these groups simply use capitalism for aims different from the single-minded pursuit of profits. But the rules of supply and demand, the expenses and revenues, the idea of entrepreneurship and innovation, and the need to adapt to the market are essential. Any progressive magazine or institution that tries to defy the rules of capitalism won’t be around for very long and certainly won’t have the resources to mount a serious advocacy of progressive ideas. One of the most effective tactics of the environmental movement was encouraging consumers to consider environmental values when making capitalist choices about what products to buy. Today, a manufacturer who ignores environmental issues puts its profits at risk because so many people are looking for environmentally friendly products and packaging. Crusades against Coca-Cola for its massive output of non-recycled plastic bottles in America or against companies supporting foreign dictatorships are part of the continuing battle to force companies to pay attention to consumer demands. Of course, consumer protests and boycotts are only one part of making “capitalism for everyone.” Many progressive groups are now buying stock in companies precisely to raise these issues at stockholder meetings and pressure the companies to adopt environmentally and socially responsible policies. Unfortunately, the legal system is structured against progressive ideas. In 2000, Ben and Jerry’s Ice Cream was forced to sell out to a big corporation that might ignore its commitment to many progressive causes. The company didn’t want to sell, but the law demanded that the company’s duty to stockholders was to consider only the money involved. Imagine what would happen if our capitalist laws were designed to promote progressive ideas instead of impeding them. Instead of allowing a shareholder lawsuit against any company acting in a morally, socially, and environmentally conscious way, American laws should encourage these goals. The claim by some leftists that capitalism is inherently irresponsible or evil doesn’t make sense. Capitalism is simply a system of markets. What makes capitalism so destructive isn’t the basic foundation but the institutions that have been created in the worship of the “free market.”

### Alt fails- Blueprint key

**We need a blueprint– no revolution is possible without concrete action.**

**Kliman, 04** – PhD, Professor of Economics at Pace University (Andrew, Andrew Kliman’s Writings, “Alternatives to Capitalism: What Happens After the Revolution?” http://akliman.squarespace.com/writings/)

Neglect is not the only reason why revolutionaries have failed to concretize the vision of the new society. Many have opposed and continue to oppose this perspective on the ground that we should not draw up “blueprints for the future.” And many invoke Marx’s name on behalf of this position. It is true that he rejected such blueprints, but precisely *what* was he rejecting, and *why*? Talk of “blueprints” is often careless. It is important to recall that Marx was grappling with some honest-to-goodness blueprints of a future society. Fourier, for instance, stipulated how large each community (Phalanx) will be, how it will be laid out, how people will dine and with whom they will sit, and who will do the dirty work (a legion of “youngsters aged nine to sixteen, composed of one-third girls, two-thirds boys”). There is a great chasm between such blueprints, which Marx rejected, and what Dunayevskaya, in her final presentation on the dialectics of organization and philosophy, called “a general view of where we’re headed.” As Olga’s report suggests, the difference is not essentially a matter of the degree of generality, but a matter of the *self-development* of the idea. Dunayevskaya wrote that once *Capital* was finished and Marx was faced with the Gotha Program in 1875, “There [was] no way now, now matter how Marx kept from trying to give any blueprints for the future, not to develop a general view of where we’re headed for the day *after* the conquest of power, the day *after* we have rid ourselves of the birthmarks of capitalism” (*PON*, p. 5). Nor did Marx remain silent about this issue until that moment. For instance, in this year’s classes on “Alternatives to Capitalism,” we read the following statement in his 1847 *Poverty of Philosophy* (POP)*.*  “In a future society, in which … there will no longer be any classes, use will no longer be determined by the minimum time of production, but the time of production devoted to different articles will be determined by the degree of their social utility.” Even more important than Marx’s explicit statements about the new society is the overall thrust of his critique of political economy. Although it is true that he devoted his theoretical energy to “the critical analysis of the actual facts, instead of writing recipes … for the cook-shops of the future” (Postface to 2nd ed. of *Capital*), critique as he practiced it was not mere negative social criticism. It was a road toward the positive. He helped clarify what capital is and how it operates, and he showed that leftist alternatives will fail if they challenge only the system’s outward manifestations rather than capital itself. By doing this, he helped to clarify what the new society must not and cannot be like – which is already to tell us a good deal about what it must and will be like. “All negation is determination” (Marx, draft of Vol. II of *Capital*). I believe that there are two reasons why Marx rejected blueprints for the future. As this year’s classes emphasized, one reason is that he regarded the utopian socialists’ schemes as not “utopian” enough. They were sanitized and idealized versions of existing capitalism: “the determination of value by labor time – the formula M. Proudhon gives us as the regenerating formula of the future – is therefore merely the scientific expression of the economic relations of present-day society” (Marx, *POP*, Ch. 1, sect. 2). But this simply means that Marx rejected a particular kind of attempt to concretize the vision of the new society, not that he rejected the task itself. The other reason was that Marx, who aligned himself with the real movement of the masses, held the utopians’ schemes to be obsolete, or worse, once the working class was moving in another direction. I believe that this perspective remains valid, but that the subjective-objective situation has changed radically. Today, “what masses of people are hungering for[,] but which radical theoreticians and parties are doing little to address[, is] the projection of a comprehensive alternative to existing society,” as we stated in our 2003-04 Marxist-Humanist Perspectives thesis. Two months ago, Anne Jaclard spoke to a class of college youth. Many of them were eager for a concrete, well articulated vision of a liberatory alternative to capitalism, and they rejected the notion that its concretization should be put off to the future. Visitors to our classes, and participants in the “Alternatives to Capital” seminar on *Capital* in New York, have also demanded greater concreteness. How do we align with this real movement from below? Given the direction in which the masses’ thinking is moving, hasn’t resistance to concretizing a liberatory alternative become obsolete? I do not mean to imply that we should accommodate demands for easy answers. Like the Proudhonists and utopian socialists with whom Marx contended, many folks seem to think that concretizing an alternative to capitalism is simply a matter of articulating goals and then implementing them when the time comes. What we need to do when easy answers are demanded, I think, is convey the lessons we have learned – that the desirability of proposed alternatives means nothing if they give rise to unintended consequences that make them unsustainable, that political change flows from changes in the mode of production, and so forth – while also saying that which *can* be said about the new society, as concretely as it can be said. Resistance to concretizing a liberatory alternative to capitalism has been and continues to be defended principally in the name of anti-vanguardism. An anarcho-syndicalist named “marko” recently put forth this argument in opposition to Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel’s “parecon” (participatory economics): “Anarcho-Syndicalism demands that the detailed thinking about a future economy is to be decided by the liberated working class itself, not by a prior group of intellectuals. That is working class ‘self-emancipation’.”[[1]](#footnote-1) In our own organization, a member of the clique that abandoned Marxist-Humanism put forth a very similar argument. It has sometimes been suggested that Marx rejected blueprints for the same reason, but I know of no evidence for this. The evidence sketched out above indicates that he labored to concretize a liberatory alternative to capitalism throughout his life, and did not regard this work as antithetical to working-class self-emancipation. In any case, marko confuses and conflates thinking with policy-making in a quite telling way. It is generally unfair to nitpick at unknown authors’ internet posts, but marko’s phraseology – “detailed thinking about the future economy is to be decided” – is too peculiar to be merely an accidental slip. All proponents of workers’ self-emancipation agree that the *policies* of the future economy are to be decided upon by the working people themselves, but *thinking* simply cannot be shoehorned into the old problematic of “who decides?” Once again, a well-meaning attempt to posit spontaneity as the absolute opposite of vanguardist elitism ends up by placing the entire burden of working out a liberatory alternative to capitalism on the backs of the masses. And the newly liberated masses must somehow do this from scratch, having been deprived of the ability to learn from the theoretical achievements *and* mistakes of prior generations.

### Local movements fail

**Localized alternatives fail—capitalism is too powerful.**

**Carroll 10** – founding director of the Social Justice Studies Program at
the University of Victoria
(William, “Crisis, movements, counter-hegemony: in search of the new,”
Interface 2:2, SW)

Just as hegemony has been increasingly organized on a transnational basis through the globalization of Americanism, the construction of global governance institutions, the emergence of a transnational capitalist class and so on (Soederberg 2006; Carroll 2010) – counter-hegemony has also taken on transnational features that go beyond the classic organization of left parties into internationals. What Sousa Santos (2006) terms the rise of a global left is evident in specific movementbased campaigns, such as the successful international effort in 1998 to defeat the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI); in initiatives such as the World Social Forum, to contest the terrain of global civil society; and in the growth of transnational movement organizations and of a ‘democratic globalization network’, counterpoised to neoliberalism’s transnational historical bloc, that address issues of North-South solidarity and coordination (Smith 2008:24).As I have suggested elsewhere (Carroll 2007), an incipient war of position is at work here – a bloc of oppositional forces to neoliberal globalization encompassing a wide range of movements and identities and that is ‘global in nature, transcending traditional national boundaries’ (Butko 2006: 101). These moments of resistance and transborder activism do not yet combine to form a coherent historical bloc around a counter-hegemonic project. Rather, as Marie-Josée Massicotte suggests, ‘we are witnessing the emergence and re-making of political imaginaries…, which often lead to valuable localized actions as well as greater transborder solidarity’ (2009: 424). Indeed, Gramsci’s adage that while the line of development is international, the origin point is national, still has currency. Much of the energy of anti-capitalist politics is centred within what Raymond Williams (1989) called militant particularisms – localized struggles that, ‘left to themselves … are easily dominated by the power of capital to coordinate accumulation across universal but fragmented space’ (Harvey 1996: 32). Catharsis, in this context, takes on a spatial character. The scaling up of militant particularisms requires ‘alliances across interrelated scales to unite a diverse range of social groupings and thereby spatialize a Gramscian war of position to the global scale’ (Karriem 2009: 324).

**Localized resistance fails – only mass movements can generate the strength to defeat capitalism**

**Carroll 10** – founding director of the Social Justice Studies Program at
the University of Victoria\*
(William, “Crisis, movements, counter-hegemony: in search of the new,”
Interface 2:2, SW)

The coming-into-being of a collective will requires a process of catharsis in which ‘structure ceases to be an external force which crushes man, assimilates him to itself and makes him passive; and is transformed into a means of freedom, an instrument to create a new ethico-political form and a source of new initiatives’ (Gramsci 1971: 367). This remarkable passage describes the transition from an economic-corporate phase in which subordinates define their interests narrowly and in immediately instrumental terms, to an ethico-political project that can bring formerly disparate identities onto common ground. As Ives (2004: 107) and Sousa Santos (2006) have argued, this involves the work of translation across various cultural domains and contexts, involving organic intellectuals – activists, organizers, ‘permanent persuaders’ (Gramsci 1971: 10) whose practice is rooted in subordinate experiences and resistances.2 Importantly, a counter-hegemonic formation includes both class forces directly articulated with the process of accumulation and popular democratic currents -- movements and identities that arise through practices centred in civil society (Urry 1981).3 Without the former, and in particular, broad elements of the working class, a radical challenge to capitalism is strategically unsustainable; without the latter, the collective will fails to encompass the diversity of needs and aspirations that partially constitute Bloch’s ‘concrete forward dream’. The welding together of disparate class and popular-democratic interests is not a mechanical assemblage of convenience; rather, ‘the process of coming together to form a specifically hegemonic force involves each group being partly transformed’, as it takes on elements of the identity and agenda of other groups and comes to adopt the interest of others as its own (Purcell 2009: 296-7). The famous slogan from Seattle 1999, ‘Teamsters and turtles, united at last!’ exemplifies this reciprocal process in forming a counter-hegemonic collective will.

## \*\*CAP GOOD\*\*

### Solves envt

**Only capitalism can fuel the investments needed for creating a clean economy. Economic growth is essential to protecting the environment because it is the only way to build coalitions of support.**

**Nordhaus & Shellenberger, 07-**[Break Through: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Politics of Possibility, Ted & Michael, Managing Directors of American Environics, A social values research and strategy firm 15-17]

The politics we propose breaks with several widely accepted, largely unconscious distinctions, such as those between humans and nature, the community and the individual, and the government and the market. Few things have hampered environmentalism more than its longstanding position that limits to growth are the remedy for ecological crises. We argue for an explicitly pro-growth agenda that defines the kind of prosperity we believe is necessary to improve the quality of human life and to overcome ecological crises. One of the places where this politics of possibility takes concrete form is at the intersection of investment and innovation. There is simply no way we can achieve an 80 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions without creating breakthrough technologies that do not pollute. This is not just our opinion but also that of the United Nations International Panel on Climate Change, of Nicholas Stern, the former chief economist of the World Bank, and of top energy experts worldwide. Unfortunately, as a result of twenty years of cuts in funding research and development in energy, we are still a long way from even beginning to create these breakthroughs. The transition to a clean-energy economy should be modeled not on pollution control efforts, like the one on acid rain, but rather on past investments in infrastructure, such as railroads and highways, as well as on research and development - microchips, medi cines, and the Internet, among other areas. This innovation-centered framework makes sense not only for the long-term expansion of individual freedom, possibility, and choice that characterize modern democratic nations, but also for the cultural peculiarities of the United States. In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that "in the United States, there is no limit to the inventiveness of man to discover ways of increasing wealth and to satisfy the public's needs." Rather than *limiting* the aspirations of Americans, we believe that we should harness them in order to, in Tocqueville's words, "make new discoveries to increase the general prosperity, which, when made, they pass eagerly to the mass of people." The good news is that, at the very moment when we find ourselves facing new problems, from global warming to postmaterialist insecurity, new social and economic forces are emerging to overcome them. The new high-tech businesses and the new creative class may become a political force for a new, postindustrial social contract and a new clean-energy economy. One inspiring model for overcoming adversity can be found in the formation, after World War II, of what would later become the European Union. It was in the postwar years that the United States, France, Britain, and West Germany invested billions in the European Coal and Steel Community, which existed to rebuild war-torn nations and repair relations between former enemies, and which grew to become the greatest economic power the world has ever seen. Today's European Union wouldn't exist had it not been for a massive, shared global investment in energy. It's not hard to imagine what a similar approach to clean energy might do for countries like the United States, China, and India. But environmentalism has also saddled us with the albatross we call the politics of limits, which seeks to constrain human ambition, aspiration, and power rather than unleash and direct them.

### Solves warming

Capitalism is the only system that can solve warming

**Parenti 11**(Christian, PhD in Sociology from the London School of Economics, visiting fellow at CUNY's Center for Place, Culture and Politics, as well as a Soros Senior Justice Fellow, taught at the New College of California and at St. Mary's College, Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence, June 28, 2011)

There is one last imperative question. Several strands of green thinking maintain that capitalism is incapable of arriving at a sustainable relationship with nature because, as an economic system, capitalism must grow exponentially, while the earth is finite. You will find this argument in the literature of ecosocialism, deep ecology, and ecoanarchism. The same argument is often cast by liberal greens in deeply ahistorical and antitheoretical terms that, while critical of the economic system, often decline to name it. Back in the early 1970s, the Club of Rome’s book Limits to Growth fixated on the dangers of “growth" but largely avoided explaining why capitalism needs growth or how growth is linked to private ownership, profits, and interfirm competition. Whether these literatures describe the problem as “modern industrial society," “the growth cult," or the profit system, they often have a similar takeaway: we need a totally different economic system if we are to live in balance with nature. Some of the first to make such an argument were Marx and Engels. They came to their ecology through examining the local problem of relations between town and country—which was expressed simultaneously as urban pollution and rural soil depletion. In exploring this question they relied on the pioneering work of soil chemist Justus von Liebig. And from this small- scale problem, they developed the idea of capitalism’s overall “metabolic rift” with nature. Here is how Marx explained the dilemma: Capitalist production collects the population together in great centres, and causes the urban population to achieve an ever-growing preponderance. This has two results. On the one hand it concentrates the historical motive force of society; on the other hand, it disturbs the metabolic interaction between man and the earth, i.e. it prevents the return to the soil of its constituent elements consumed by man in the form of food and clothing; hence it hinders the operation of the eternal natural condition for the lasting fertility of the soil .... All progress in capitalist agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the worker, but of robbing the soil. From that grew the Marxist belief that capitalism, as a whole, is irreconcilably in contradiction with nature; that the economic system creates a rift in the balance of exchanges, or metabolism, connecting human society and natural systems. As with “soil robbing," so too with forests, fish stocks, water supplies, genetic inheritance, biodiversity, and atmospheric CO2 concentrations. The natural systems are out of sync; their elements are being rearranged and redistributed, ending up as garbage and pollution. As Mary Douglas, paraphrasing William James, put it, “Uncleanliness is matter out of place.”At a large enough scale, that disruption of elements threatens environmental catastrophe. It may be true: capitalism may be, ultimately, incapable of accommodating itself to the limits of the natural world. However, that is not the same question as whether capitalism can solve the climate crisis. Because of its magnitude, the climate crisis can appear as if it is the combination of all environmental crises—overexploitation of the seas, deforestation, overexploitation of freshwater, soil erosion, species and habitat loss, chemical contamination, and genetic contamination due to transgenic bioengineering. But halting greenhouse gas emissions is a much more specific problem; it is only one piece of the apocalyptic panorama. Though all these problems are connected, the most urgent and all encompassing of them is anthropogenic climate change. The fact of the matter is time has run out on the climate missue. Either capitalism solves the crisis or it destroys civilization. Capitalism begins to deal with the crisis now, or we face civilizational collapse beginning this century. We cannot wait for a socialist, or communist, or anarchist, or deep- ecology, neoprimitiverevolution; nor for a nostalgia-based localista conversion back to the mythical small-town economy of preindustrial America as some advocate. In short, we cannot wait to transform everything—including how we create energy. Instead, we must begin immediately transforming the energy economy. Other necessary changes can and will flow from that. Hopeless? No. If we put aside the question of capitalism’s limits and deal only with greenhouse gas emissions, the problem looks less daunting. While capitalism has not solved the environmental crisis—meaning the fundamental conflict between the infinite growth potential of the market and the finite parameters of the planet— it has, in the past, solved specific environmental crises. The sanitation movement of the Progressive Era is an example. By the 1830s, industrial cities had become perfect incubators of epidemic disease, particularly cholera and yellow fever. Like climate change today, these diseases hit the poor hardest, but they also sickened and killed the wealthy. Class privilege offered some protection, but it was not a guarantee of safety. And so it was that middle-class do-gooder goo-goos and mugwumps began a series of reforms that contained and eventually defeated the urban epidemics. First, the filthy garbage-eating hogs were banned from city streets, then public sanitation programs of refuse collection began, sewers were built, safe public water provided, housing codes were developed and enforced. And, eventually, the epidemics of cholera stopped. So, too, were other infectious diseases, like pulmonary tuberculosis, typhus, and typhoid, largely eliminated. Thus, at the scale of the urban, capitalist society solved an environmental crisis through planning and public investment. Climate change is a problem on an entirely different order of magnitude, but past solutions to smaller environmental crises offer lessons. Ultimately, solving the climate crisis—like the nineteenth- century victory over urban squalor and epidemic contagions—will require a relegitimation of the state’s role in the economy. We will need planning and downward redistribution of wealth. And, as I have sketched out above, there are readily available ways to address the crisis immediately—if we make the effort to force our political leaders to act. We owe such an effort to people like Ekaru Loruman, who are already suffering and dying on the front lines of the catastrophic convergence, and to the next generation, who will inherit the mess. And, we owe it to ourselves.

### Solves social change

**Prosperity and growth are essential to progressive social change—limits backfire.**

**Nordhaus & Shellenberger, 07**-[Break Through: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Politics of Possibility, Ted & Michael, Managing Directors of American Environics, A social values research and strategy firm 35-37]

Just as prosperity tends to bring out the best of human nature, poverty and collapse tend to bring out the worst. Not only are authoritarian values strongest in situations where our basic material and security needs aren't being met, they also become stronger in societies experiencing economic downturns. Economic collapse in Europe after World War I, in Yugoslavia after the fall of communism, and in Rwanda in the early 1990S triggered an authoritarian reflex that fed the growth of fascism and violence. The populations in those countries, feeling profoundly insecure at the physiological, psychological, and cultural levels, embraced authoritarianism and other lower-order materialist values. This is also what occurred in Iraq after the U.S. invasion. This shift away from fulfillment and toward survival values appears to be occurring in the United States, albeit far more gradually than in places like the former Communist-bloc countries. Survival values, including fatalism, ecological fatalism, sexism, everyday rage, and the acceptance of violence, are on the rise in the United States. The reasons for America’s gradual move away from fulfillment and toward survival values are complex. Part of it appears to be driven by increasing economic insecurity. This insecurity has several likely causes: the globalization of the economy; the absence of a new social contract for things like health care, child care and retirement appropriate for our postindustrial age; and status competitions driven by rising social inequality. Conservatives tend to believe that all Americans are getting richer while liberals tend to believe that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. In our discussion of security in chapter 7 we argue that what is happening is a little bit of both: homeownership and purchasing power have indeed been rising, but so have household and consumer debt and the amount of time Americans spend working. While cuts to the social safety net have not pushed millions of people onto the street, they have fed social insecurity and increased competition with the Joneses. It is not just environmentalists who misunderstand the prosperity-fulfillment connection. In private conversations, meetings and discussions, we often hear progressives lament public apathy and cynicism and make statements such as “Things are going to have to get a lot worse before they get better.” We emphatically disagree. In our view, things have to get better before they can get better. Immiseration theory—the view that increasing suffering leads to progressive social change—has been repeatedly discredited by history. Progressive social reforms, from the Civil Rights Act to the Clean Water Act, tend to occur during times of prosperity and rising expectations—not immiseration and declining expectations. Both the environmental movement and the civil rights movement emerged as a consequence of rising prosperity. It was the middle-class, young, and educated black Americans who were on the forefront of the civil rights movement. Poor blacks were active, but the movement was overwhelmingly led by educated, middle-class intellectuals and community leaders (preachers prominent among them). This was also the case with the white supporters of the civil rights movement, who tended to be more highly educated and more affluent than the general American population. In short, the civil rights movement no more emerged because African Americans were suddenly denied their freedom than the environmental movement emerged because American suddenly started polluting.

### Yes sustainable

**Capitalism is progressive, self-correcting, and wealth-generating – ensures sustainability**

**Goklany 7**-Julia Simon Fellow @ the Political Economy Research Center [Indur, Reason.com, “Now for the Good News,” 3/23/2007, <http://reason.com/archives/2007/03/23/now-for-the-good-news>]

Environmentalists and globalization foes are united in their fear that greater population and consumption of energy, materials, and chemicals accompanying economic growth, technological change and free trade—the mainstays of globalization—degrade human and environmental well-being. Indeed, the 20th century saw the United States’ population multiply by four, income by seven, carbon dioxide emissions by nine, use of materials by 27, and use of chemicals by more than 100. Yet life expectancy increased from 47 years to 77 years. Onset of major disease such as cancer, heart, and respiratory disease has been postponed between eight and eleven years in the past century. Heart disease and cancer rates have been in rapid decline over the last two decades, and total cancer deaths have actually declined the last two years, despite increases in population. Among the very young, infant mortality has declined from 100 deaths per 1,000 births in 1913 to just seven per 1,000 today. These improvements haven’t been restricted to the United States. It’s a global phenomenon. Worldwide, life expectancy has more than doubled, from 31 years in 1900 to 67 years today. India’s and China’s infant mortalities exceeded 190 per 1,000 births in the early 1950s; today they are 62 and 26, respectively. In the developing world, the proportion of the population suffering from chronic hunger declined from 37 percent to 17 percent between 1970 and 2001 despite a 83 percent increase in population. Globally average annual incomes in real dollars have tripled since 1950. Consequently, the proportion of the planet's developing-world population living in absolute poverty has halved since 1981, from 40 percent to 20 percent. Child labor in low income countries declined from 30 percent to 18 percent between 1960 and 2003. Equally important, the world is more literate and better educated than ever. People are freer politically, economically, and socially to pursue their well-being as they see fit. More people choose their own rulers, and have freedom of expression. They are more likely to live under rule of law, and less likely to be arbitrarily deprived of life, limb, and property. Social and professional mobility have also never been greater. It’s easier than ever for people across the world to transcend the bonds of caste, place, gender, and other accidents of birth. People today work fewer hours and have more money and better health to enjoy their leisure time than their ancestors. Man’s environmental record is more complex. The early stages of development can indeed cause some environmental deterioration as societies pursue first-order problems affecting human well-being. These include hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, and lack of education, basic public health services, safe water, sanitation, mobility, and ready sources of energy. Because greater wealth alleviates these problems while providing basic creature comforts, individuals and societies initially focus on economic development, often neglecting other aspects of environmental quality. In time, however, they recognize that environmental deterioration reduces their quality of life. Accordingly, they put more of their recently acquired wealth and human capital into developing and implementing cleaner technologies. This brings about an environmental transition via the twin forces of economic development and technological progress, which begin to provide solutions to environmental problems instead of creating those problems. All of which is why we today find that the richest countries are also the cleanest. And while many developing countries have yet to get past the “green ceiling,” they are nevertheless ahead of where today’s developed countries used to be when they were equally wealthy. The point of transition from "industrial period" to "environmental conscious" continues to fall. For example, the US introduced unleaded gasoline only after its GDP per capita exceeded $16,000. India and China did the same before they reached $3,000 per capita. This progress is a testament to the power of globalization and the transfer of ideas and knowledge (that lead is harmful, for example). It's also testament to the importance of trade in transferring technology from developed to developing countries—in this case, the technology needed to remove lead from gasoline. This hints at the answer to the question of why some parts of the world have been left behind while the rest of the world has thrived. Why have improvements in well-being stalled in areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab world? The proximate cause of improvements in well-being is a “cycle of progress” composed of the mutually reinforcing forces of economic development and technological progress. But that cycle itself is propelled by a web of essential institutions, particularly property rights, free markets, and rule of law. Other important institutions would include science- and technology-based problem-solving founded on skepticism and experimentation; receptiveness to new technologies and ideas; and freer trade in goods, services—most importantly in knowledge and ideas. In short, free and open societies prosper. Isolation, intolerance, and hostility to the free exchange of knowledge, technology, people, and goods breed stagnation or regression.

**Despite crises, capitalism is sustainable**

**Buchan 10** (James, April 26,  British novelist and journalist who graduated from Oxford University, Correspondent for the Financial Times, The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism, NewStatesman, http://www.newstatesman.com/books/2010/04/harvey-capital-class-nothing)

Harvey's Marxian language is as antiquated as heraldry, and there are such heraldic beasts here as "capital accumulation", "state-finance nexus" and "activity spheres". His chief interest, as one might expect from an urban geographer, is in cities. He argues that capital, in its relentless need to invest its surpluses, gave us such forms of habitation as the Paris of Haussmann, the US suburbs of the 1950s and the vertical cities of the Pearl River Delta. "Is the urbanisation of China," he asks somewhat unnecessarily, "the primary stabiliser of global capitalism?" His main argument is that capital, with its imperative requirement for a 3 per cent annual return (which is the return over the long run), exports itself and its crises all over the world, turning limits thought to be ultimate by our forefathers into riding-school jumps. In a vivid passage, Harvey sees capital swirling over ocean, plain and mountain like weather systems seen from space. Having suppressed wages in the west, capital was confronted with a failure of demand, and so supplied it with securitised sub-prime credit to the poorest people, who, from 2007 on, defaulted in droves. Fortunately for the "Party of Wall Street" (it has long infiltrated government, so that the two are now indistinguishable), the capital destroyed was made good by the public, and so the whole process will continue until at least the next crisis. Now that the societies of both east and west are driven by consumer fashion, such crises are ever more frequent. While an industrial behemoth such as US Steel can decline for more than a century, Bebo is worth $850m at bedtime and nothing at breakfast. What I missed, and not just in this book, is a philosophy of fashion. Kate Moss's "nothing tastes as good as skinny feels" only goes so far. Like many modern Marxists, Harvey is so anxious not to underestimate his adversary that he ends up writing panegyric. We are invited to admire the flexibility of capital, its mobility and wide horizons, its miraculous power to increase population and sustain it. He asks: "Can the capitalist class reproduce its power in the face of the raft of economic, social, political and geopolitical and environmental difficulties? Again, the answer is a resounding 'Yes it can.'"

### Inevitable

**Resistance to capital is futile and dangerous – natural hierarchies of power are inevitable and sustain peace**

**Wilkinson 5** – Academic Coordinator of the Social Change Project and the Global Prosperity Initiative at The [Mercatus Center](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercatus_Center) at [George Mason University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Mason_University)

Will, Capitalism and Human Nature, [Cato Policy Report](http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/pr-index.html) Vol. XXVII No. 1

Emory professor of economics and law Paul Rubin usefully distinguishes between "productive" and "allocative" hierarchies. Productive hierarchies are those that organize cooperative efforts to achieve otherwise unattainable mutually advantageous gains. Business organizations are a prime example. Allocative hierarchies, on the other hand, exist mainly to transfer resources to the top. Aristocracies and dictatorships are extreme examples. Although the nation-state can perform productive functions, there is the constant risk that it becomes dominated by allocative hierarchies. Rubin warns that our natural wariness of zero-sum allocative hierarchies, which helps us to guard against the concentration of power in too few hands, is often directed at modern positive-sum productive hierarchies, like corporations, thereby threatening the viability of enterprises that tend to make everyone better off**.** There is no way to stop dominance-seeking behavior. We may hope only to channel it to non-harmful uses. A free society therefore requires that positions of dominance and status be widely available in a multitude of productive hierarchies, and that opportunities for greater status and dominance through predation are limited by the constant vigilance of "the people"—the ultimate reverse dominance hierarchy. A flourishing civil society permits almost everyone to be the leader of something, whether the local Star Trek fan club or the city council, thereby somewhat satisfying the human taste for hierarchical status, but to no one's serious detriment.

### Space turn

**Capitalism is key to the formation of successful space programs**

**Martin 10** (Robert, Amerika, June 21, <http://www.amerika.org/politics/centrifuge-capitalism/>, accessed: 3 July 2011)

Centralization and capitalism are necessary for any intelligent civilization, yet in excess drains the base population of any sustenance whatsoever, leaving them unemployed, homeless and starving at worst. The answer to this event is not a swing on the pendulum all the way onto total equality fisted socialism out on a plate for everyone who isn’t rich, that would be devastating for organization, but is a more natural ecosystem type of financing of a near-barter economics with different values and currencies for localized entities and more buoyant monetary for inter-localities – only monetizing where absolutely necessary. Without the higher economics that goes beyond small barter communities, there could be no space programs, or planetary defences providing the technology or the organization necessary to survive extinction events or fund a military etc, it’s critical for the structure of the superorganism – yet too much and some individuals inside of it become so padded from outside reality that they completely ignore the world around them.

**Extinction - we have to go to space**

**Garan, 10** – Astronaut (Ron, 3/30/10, Speech published in an article by Nancy Atkinson, “The Importance of Returning to the Moon,” http://www.universetoday.com/61256/astronaut-explains-why-we-should-return-to-the-moon/, JMP)

Resources and Other Benefits: Since we live in a world of finite resources and the global population continues to grow, at some point the human race must utilize resources from space in order to survive. We are already constrained by our limited resources, and the decisions we make today will have a profound affect on the future of humanity. Using resources and energy from space will enable continued growth and the spread of prosperity to the developing world without destroying our planet. Our minimal investment in space exploration (less than 1 percent of the U.S. budget) reaps tremendous intangible benefits in almost every aspect of society, from technology development to high-tech jobs. When we reach the point of sustainable space operations we will be able to transform the world from a place where nations quarrel over scarce resources to one where the basic needs of all people are met and we unite in the common adventure of exploration. The first step is a sustainable permanent human lunar settlement.

### Solves war

**The expansion of capitalism makes war less likely**

**Griswold 5**- Director of the Cato institute center for trade policy studies (Daniel, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” 12/28/05, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5344)

First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France, and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable.

### Solves disease

**Capitalism solves disease**

**Norberg 3** – Fellow at Timbro and CATO[Johan Norberg, In Defense of Global Capitalism, pg. 186]

One common objection to the market economy is that it causes people and enterprises to produce for profit, not for needs. This means, for example, pharmaceutical companies devoting huge resources to research and medicines to do with obesity, baldness, and depression, things that westerners can afford to worry about and pay for, whereas only a fraction is devoted to attempting to cure tropical diseases afflicting the poorest of the world's inhabitants, such as malaria and tuberculosis. This criticism is understandable. The unfairness exists, but capitalism is not to blame for it. Without capitalism and the lure of profit, we shouldn't imagine that everyone would have obtained cures for their illnesses. In fact, far fewer would do so than is now the case. If wealthy people in the West demand help for their problems, their resources can be used to research and eventually solve those problems, which are not necessarily trivial to the people afflicted with them. Capitalism gives companies economic incentives to help us by developing medicines and vaccines. That westerners spend money this way does not make things worse for anyone. This is not money that would otherwise have gone to researching tropical diseases—the pharmaceutical companies simply would not have had these resources otherwise. And, as free trade and the market economy promote greater prosperity in poorer countries, their needs and desires will play a larger role in dictating the purposes of research and production.

**Extinction**

**Yu 9** - (5/22/09, Victoria, Dartmouth Undergraduate Journal of Science Writer, “Human Extinction: The Uncertainty of Our Fate,” http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate)

A pandemic will kill off all humans. In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system. However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).

### Solves VTL

**Capitalism best ensures value to life**

**Tracinski 8** – editor of the Intellectual Activist [Robert, The Moral and the Practical, http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm]

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceable value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity.

### Solves conflict

**Capitalism prevents conflict through information**

**Gartzke 7**- PhD- associate professor of political science at UC San Diego (Erik, “The Capitalist Peace,” 1/5/07, <http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/publications/gartzke_ajps_07.pdf>)

While policy differences or resource competition can generate conflict, they need not produce contests if states can resolve differences diplomatically. Liberal theory emphasizes the pacifying effect of cross-border economic linkages. Markets are arguably most relevant as mechanisms for revealing information, however, rather than for adding to the risks or costs of fighting (Gartzke and Li 2003; Gartzke, Li, and Boehmer 2001). Competition creates incentives to bluff, to exaggerate capabilities or resolve. Anarchy makes it difficult for states to compel honest answers from one another except through the threat or imposition of harm. Contests inform by being costly, forcing actors to choose between bearing the burden of competition and backing down. Of course, one can signal by “burning money,” expending valuable resources autonomously, but such acts create a relative as well as absolute loss. Tactics that impart costs only as a byproduct of imposing costs on an opponent can produce relative gains, while tactics such as burning money only harm the initiator. States with economies integrated into global markets face autonomous investors with incentives to reallocate capital away from risk. A leader’s threats against another state become costly when threats spark market repercussions. Participants learn from watching the reactions of leaders to the differential incentives of economic cost and political reward. Two economically integrated states can more often avoid military violence, since market integration combines mechanisms for revelation and coercion. An economically integrated target can be coerced by the threat of losing valuable exchange, but a nonintegrated initiator cannot make its threats credible or informative. Conversely, a globalized initiator can signal but has little incentive to hamper its own markets when a nonintegrated target does not suffer (Gartzke 2006b).

**The expansion of capitalism makes war less likely**

**Griswold 5**- Director of the Cato institute center for trade policy studies (Daniel, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” 12/28/05, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5344)

First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France, and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable.

**Capitalism prevents war and disincentivises conflict- precludes the impacts of the kritik**

**Bandow 5**- Former assistant to president Regan, Senior fellow @ the Cato institute (Doug, “Spreading Capitalism is good for Peace,” 11/10/05, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193/)

But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states. Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.

**The spread of capitalism alone solves wars and conflicts**

**Bandow 5**- Former assistant to president Regan, Senior fellow @ the Cato institute (Doug, “Spreading Capitalism is good for Peace,” 11/10/05, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5193/>)

Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other. Contends Gartzke, "liberal political systems, in and of themselves, have no impact on whether states fight." In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. He explains: "Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels." Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences. Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains. His conclusion hasn't gone unchallenged. Author R.J. Rummel, an avid proponent of the democratic peace theory, challenges Gartzke's methodology and worries that it "may well lead intelligent and policy-wise analysts and commentators to draw the wrong conclusions about the importance of democratization." Gartzke responds in detail, noting that he relied on the same data as most democratic peace theorists. If it is true that democratic states don't go to war, then it also is true that "states with advanced free market economies never go to war with each other, either." The point is not that democracy is valueless. Free political systems naturally entail free elections and are more likely to protect other forms of liberty - civil and economic, for instance. However, democracy alone doesn't yield peace. To believe is does is dangerous: There's no panacea for creating a conflict-free world. That doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets - that is, spreading capitalism - is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity.

### Solves equality

**Capitalism is better at promoting fairness and equality to the poor rather than any alternative—History proves**

**Bartholomew, 06**- Author of 'The Welfare State we’re In' he is also a writer and columnist for the Daily Telegraph (James Bartholomew, “We need a revision course on why capitalism is a good thing” May 24th, 2006, Lexis-Nexis Academic)

Capitalism has made us richer and given us the opportunity of vastly more diverse experiences. Even in my own lifetime, I have seen the normal length of holidays rise from one or two weeks to four or five weeks. Foreign travel that was unknown for most working people two centuries ago is now commonplace. Did government direction make this possible? Of course not. Most families now have cars. Read Thomas Hardy's novels and you find that people are always walking. Walking can be healthy and pleasant, but the average family of Hardy's time did not have a choice. Who invented cars? Who refined their design and manufacture to the point where they are affordable by millions of people? Not governments. The diverse, resourceful, determined power of capitalism. Why does the system work? Because it provides incentives and motivation. If you invent something, you may get fame and fortune. If you supply food or cars cheaper, you get more customers. Simple enough. Provide a good product or service at a low price and you have a business. That simple logic means capitalism tends to produce good products and services at better prices. What about the argument that capitalism promotes inequality? Let's remember, before even starting to answer, just how disastrous were the attempts in the 20th century to impose equality. Farmers in Leninist Russia were prosecuted and in many cases killed. Tens of millions died under communist rule in China. And after all the oppression and suffering, there was still no equality. There was the privileged ruling class with, in Russia's case, special dachas in the country and road lanes in town. Imposing equality is not an easy ride. It is oppressive and doomed to failure. Capitalism, meanwhile, has claims, at the least, to reducing inequality over time. The inequality was enormous when George III was sitting on his gilded throne in 1806, with thousands of servants and farm workers and other underlings at his beck and call, while elsewhere in the country were those who could barely find enough to eat and, in some cases, died of hunger. Nowadays, more than nine out of 10 young people have mobile phones, 99 per cent of households have colour televisions, most households have cars. Yes, the rich are still with us. But the contrast in financial wealth has been greatly reduced over the long term. That was not due to any government, let alone a deliberate attempt to promote equality. It was achieved by capitalism. Why is the system now taken for granted and despised? Perhaps it is because the collapse of the communist states has removed from our sight useful reminders of how vastly superior capitalism is to state control. We should be careful.

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)