## 1NC

#### First, the link:

#### Transportation infrastructure is the mechanism that allow the transfer of good and people for the economy to occur—it is critical for the expansion of capitalism

**MIZUOKA 09** [Fujio, PhD in Economics and Professor of Economic Geography at Hitotsubashi University,

“The Effects of Neo-Liberalism: Politics and Path Dependency in the Provision of Public Transportation,” [http://www.vref.se/download/18.1166db0f120540fe049800012720/Mizuoka+-+Effects+of+Neo+Liberalism.pdf](http://www.vref.se/download/18.1166db0f120540fe049800012720/Mizuoka%2B-%2BEffects%2Bof%2BNeo%2BLiberalism.pdf), spencer]

Public transportation constitutes an important part of a regulatory regime. This is because mobility across space is the fundamental prerequisite for sustainable society and economy: capital accumulation needs transporting goods from points of production to consumption; and social integration presupposes spatial integration for free social interaction among people. In the era of Fordism/Keynesianism, provision of public transportation aimed at supporting mass consumption and constituted a part of the general welfare, to keep people stay clear of revolutionary praxis. It also contributed to capital accumulation through more efficient mobility. To ensure these roles to be played, the transportation is normally placed under direct public control so that the government can see to it if these functions work more properly for the welfare of people and spatial homogenisation.

#### Second, the Impacts:

#### A. Cap causes eco-doom and extinction

Joel **Kovel**, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD, 20**02**, p. 5.

As the world, or to be more exact, the Western, industrial world, has leapt into a prosperity unimaginable to prior generations, it has prepared for itself a calamity far more unimaginable still. The present world system in effect has had three decades to limit its growth, and it has failed so abjectly that even the idea of limiting growth has been banished from official discourse. Further, it has been proved decisively that the internal logic of the present system translates ‘growth’ into increasing wealth for the few and increasing misery for the many. We must begin our inquiry therefore, with the chilling fact that ‘growth’ so conceived means the destruction of the natural foundation of civilization. If the world were a living organism, then any sensible observer would conclude that this ‘growth’ is a cancer that, if not somehow treated, means the destruction of human society, and even raises the question of the extinction of our species. A simple extrapolation tells us as much, once we learn that the growth is uncontrollable. The details are important and interesting, but less so than the chief conclusion — that irresistible growth, and the evident fact that this growth destabilizes and breaks down the natural ground necessary for human existence, means, in the plainest terms, that we are doomed under the present social order, and that we had better change it as soon as possible if we are to survive.

#### B. Cap causes the instrumentalization of all life—root cause of the 1ac impacts

DYER-WITHERFORD (professor of Library and Info. Sciences at the U of Western Ontario) 1999
[Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.]

For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control. Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. This priority—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.

#### Third, Our alternative is to not do the aff—capitalist structures need to be withdrawn from and rejected

Herod, 2007

[James, “Getting Free: Creating an Association of Democratic Neighborhoods.” Boston, 2007, Online, <http://jamesherod.info/?sec=book&id=1>] /Wyo-MB

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. At its most basic, this strategy calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image, then, is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning from them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system; it is an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus, capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist ones, and then continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing everything we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, nonhierarchical, noncommodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so‑called revolution or the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and how we want to live, what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live-and-let-live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (As mentioned earlier, there is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes war, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks; it is a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue to do so. Still, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, dismantling community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, gutting our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell our ability to work for a wage. It’s quite clear, then, how we can overthrow slavery: we must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage slaves (that is, we must free ourselves from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for totally replacing capitalism with a new civilization. This is an important distinction because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms as a system. We can sometimes, in some places, win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and some (usually short‑lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal. Hence, our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed, millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief system that is needed, like a religion, or like marxism or anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise, we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction. The content of this vision is actually not new at all. The long-term goal of communists, anarchists, and socialists has always been to restore community. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to free people from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the free development of each is a condition for the free development of all. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self‑managed cooperatives. The long-term goals have always been clear: to abolish wage slavery, eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world.

## \*\*\*Links

### Link – Airports

Airports are a biopolitical structure that thrive on the capitalist way of

Albert and Hahnel ’90 Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel, Hahnel is a Professor of Economics at Portland State University. He has traveled extensively advising on economic matters all over the world, <http://books.zcommunications.org/ParEcon/lookingforward/lf2_5.htm>

Obviously an airport involves flying, air -traffic control, fueling, procuring and storing fuel, and repairing and maintaining aircraft, as well as keeping track of and ordering new equipment. In addition, there is providing service on the planes, procuring and preparing food for flights, handling baggage, making seating assignments, providing ground transportation, caring for the premises, and serving food and providing magazines, candy, and gum at terminals. Other necessary tasks include scheduling work assignments, preparing timetables for flights, and assessing demand. How should all this be organized? A capitalist airport (each of whose units are to make maximum profit) will fragment tasks into roles that give a minimum number of people authority. Pilots fly. Air -traffic controllers control traffic. Cooks cook. Baggage handlers handle baggage. Custodians clean. Food servers serve. Each job fosters different skills and imparts different rewards. tremendous energy goes into coercing work from those at the bottom and competing for advancement at the top. At a large capitalist airport, a huge number of individuals have marginal assignments that diminish solidarity with most of their coworkers and provide threadbare income and little fulfillment. A smaller number of pilots, administrators, and managers do interesting work but feel ambivalent about having to adapt themselves in elitist ways owing to the power they necessarily exert over their less exalted airport coworkers.

### Link – Bikes

#### Bikes are a capitalist tool that marginalize their riders

Wehr ‘6 (Kevin, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at the California State University, “Bicycle Messengers and Fast Capitalism: An Old-School Solution to the Needs of Technocapitalism”, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/2\_1/wehr.html)

The concept of accelerated capitalism, for most, implies an abstract theoretical proposition: under various names (fast capitalism, late capitalism, hyper capitalism, or post-Fordism) the turnover rate, the recouping of profits, technology adoption, and information exchange all proceed at an increased and increasing speed. While this phenomenon is well established in many parts of the world, developing nations and regions may exhibit uneven tendencies. What is not always recognized, however, is the uneven development within the so-called advanced economies. Social change is rarely a unilinear process, and technology within fast capitalism is no different. Bicycle messengers employ a decidedly nineteenth century technology to solve some of the most basic problems of capitalism: how to get bits of information from one location to another as fast as possible. How do they do it? Why do they do it? By weaving in and out of street lanes, hopping curbs, using sidewalks, and passing the cars, cabs, and buses caught in the daily pulse of traffic, bike messengers use a small slice of the street to great effect. Carrying packages across town in the margins of the streets, though important to capitalism, nonetheless leaves bike messengers as a marginalized economic group. These riders, though they often desire to stand outside of mainstream capitalist society, end up reproducing the system: messengers support capitalism and representational government by delivering packages-for payment-faster than auto or truck delivery. When traffic gets bad in the city, especially when gridlock approaches, this marginal space becomes a niche for bicycle couriers. [1] Why do they do it? To the casual observer, messengers may seem like lunatics on wheels. They are often represented in the media and the broader culture as the antihero of the urban jungle: the dirty, smelly recurring figures in movies and commercials that symbolize the dark underside and accelerated pace of the city. If messengers ride like lunatics they do so largely because they have to: Ironically enough, the structure of the delivery industry marginalizes the messengers with low pay, slight job security, and almost never any health insurance or other benefits. Bicycle messengers are both marginal and liminal in many respects: they are liminal in the sense that they are somewhere in between cars and pedestrians; they are physically marginal in the space of the city; and they are further marginalized in and by the economic system. Yet this liminality and marginalization is what binds this unique community together: through rituals of working, racing, and partying messengers build and rebuild their community, in many cases taking pride in and attempting to defend their marginality (Kidder 2005).

### Link – Cars

#### Transportation and cars specifically are inherently capitalist

**Dawson ‘5** (Michael, sociology professor at Portland State University, August, 21, 2005, “Carmageddon and Karl Marx”, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2005/dawson210805.html)

It is precisely these two familiar questions that we Marxians ought to be asking with some rather serious energy. The stone cold fact is that, when viewed in historical materialist terms, **the age of the automobile has always been at least as much the product of corporate capital's ongoing elite shove affair as of any popular "love affair with the automobile."** If we don't elucidate this, who will? Indeed, **I have spent this summer watching the U.S. Chamber of Commerce roll out its routine "we need more roads and cars to boost our economy" lobbying campaign for new federal highway subsidies.** The Chamber, of course, continues to pursue this vital-to-its-members task as if none of the above crises were of any concern to anybody. Simultaneously, **I have watched the U.S. Congress pass the Chamber's desired massive new dose of highway subsidies by a combined vote of 506-20, with all but two of the nay votes coming from Republicans who were merely displaying their anti-spending credentials in a safe fashion**.1 How could anybody who's read Marx's magnum opus witness these stunning events and not reach back to Marx’s powerful diagnosis of capitalists’ pattern of social concern? "**Capital,**" wrote Marx, "**allows its actual movement to be determined as much and as little by the sight of the coming degradation and final depopulation of the human race as by the probable fall of the Earth into the sun."** Inside capitalist corporations, Marx argued, "everyone knows that some time or other the crash must come, but everyone hopes that it may fall on the head of his neighbor, after he himself has caught the shower of gold and placed it in secure hands." Like Madame de Pompadour, the pampered girlfriend of King Louis XV in the tumultuous years just before the French Revolution, "après moi, le deluge," Marx observed, "is the watchword of every capitalist and every capitalist nation. **Capital . . . takes no account of the health and the length of life of the worker, unless society forces it to do so. Its answer to . . . physical and mental degradation, premature death, and the torture of overwork is this: Should that pain trouble us, since it increases our pleasure (profit)?” Those of us who have access to this crucial piece of realism are now obliged to bring it into contact with the rapidly decaying realities of transportation in the United States**. As revisionist historian William Appleman Williams once predicted, our **failure to do so helps perpetuate our elite's "great evasion" of exactly what we need -- a "moral and intellectual confrontation with the thought of Karl Marx."** When it comes to autos-über-alles, history has proven Williams right: **This ongoing evasion is not just dangerous. "It might**," in Williams' words, "**prove to be fatal**."

### Link – Eco Crisis

#### Capitalism will use the ecological crisis to further its profits, and though it might be able to shift to more renewable, ecologically safe systems, it will not solve the problem of labour and class inequity.

#### Harris 10

[Jerry, professor of history at DeVry University, Chicago, “Going Green to Stay in the Black: Transnational Capitalism and Renewable Energy”, Race Class -2010-Harris-62-78.pdf //wyo-MU]

Actually, the environmental crisis offers an opportunity for capitalism to begin a new cycle of accumulation – a way to end the repeating failures of financial speculation, with a renewal of productive capital. As Muller and Passadakis explain, ‘the point about the ecological crisis … is that it is neither solved nor ignored in a green capitalist regime, but rather placed at the heart of its growth strategy’.4 By creating new systems of energy, transportation and architectural design, and reengineering productive processes, capitalism can greatly reduce its abuse of the environment. This would free capital from environmentally harmful industries for new areas of investment and create profitable opportunities in dynamic new markets. Such a strategic shift would not only solve the current crisis but legitimise a new political regime and lay the foundation for a hegemonic bloc with a global social base. Nonetheless, this transformation would not solve the contradiction between capital and labour and the TCC may lack the political resolve to move fast and far enough to avoid major environmental disasters. But if the transformation does occur over the coming decades, it may solve the most pressing problems between finite environmental resources and capitalism’s need to grow and profit.

### Link - Ethics

#### A new ethical or economic system is simply a mask for capitalism

ZIZEK 8[ Slavoj, PHILOSOPHER and CULTURAL CRITIC, “Violence”, 2008, Spencer]

And what if this is true in a much more radical way than may at first appear? What if the true evil of our societies is not their capitalist dynamics as such, but our attempts to extricate ourselves from them-all the while profiting-by carving out self-enclosed commu­nal spaces, from "gated communities" to exclusive ra­cial or religious groups? That is to say, is the point of *The Village* not precisely to demonstrate that today, a return to an authentic community in which speech still directly expresses true emotions-the village of the so­cialist Utopia-is a fake which can only be staged as a spectacle for the very rich? The exemplary figures of evil today are not ordinary consumers who pollute the environment and live in a violent world of disintegrat­ing social links, but those who, while fully engaged in creating conditions for such universal devastation and pollution, buy their way out of their own activity, living in gated communities, eating organic food, taking hol­idays in wildlife preserves, and so on.

### Link – Environmentalism

#### Contemporary environmentalism in transportation constructs a new bourgeoisie to impose its elite environmental preferences upon society and propose the demise of bourgeois environmental control signals the end of the world

Guy 2k (Baeten, professor of human geography at Lund university in Sweden, “The tragedy of the highway: empowerment, disempowerment and the politics of sustainability discourses and practices,” European planning studies, 2000, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=920131e5-c7ae-4bbc-9abe-9e050a96809c%40sessionmgr111&vid=1&hid=113&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=2969956)

[Middle class] predilection for green causes is rooted in ecology's anti-industrialism: it is anti the main actors in present society. By contrast, in the ecotopia which they desire, they--academics, scientists, teachers, carers, community activists and planners--would be the most influential people. This, then, is a new sub-class, struggling for the political-economic power to match its social position. (Pepper, 1993, p. 151) It is a conservative movement, in the sense that it does not challenge capitalism: it accepts consumerism as long as it is 'green' consumerism and it allows capitalism to adjust to its ecological contradictions. Such a stance, clearly, is highly compatible with sustainability rhetoric. Gare (1995), drawing upon Bourdieu, links the upswing of middle class environmental concerns with the cultural shifts towards post-modernism.Together with the demise of 'grand narrativism', Gare sees the breakdown of modernist class relations as partly explaining the nature of contemporary environmentalism. Previously powerful classes, i.e. the domestic bourgeoisies--those capitalists whose firms produce for the domestic market, as well as segments of the working class, farmers and the salaried--and the traditional working class, are gradually being subordinated to the influence of the 'new international bourgeoisie' and, in its wake, a new 'service sub-class' which now also dominates environmental discourses. While the domestic bourgeoisie and the working class failed to catch up with the internationalization of the economy and politics, it is the new international bourgeoisie--consisting of people working for various international institutions, organizations and corporations--which has come to dominate the transformation of the world system. They adhere to a modem version of social Darwinism, and the ideological spearhead of this class is post-Keynesian neo-classical economics, characterized by supply-side economics, dismantling social welfare provisions, the deregulation of markets, the reduction of trade barriers and the rapid expansion of econometrics and computer modelling. They easily fit into the rhetoric and politics of the New Right--into the age of Bush, Reagan and Thatcher. Gare accuses the new international bourgeoisie of being cynical opportunists who are able to exploit each situation as it comes.They have contributed nothing to human welfare, nor to the improvement of the global environment, although these people are in charge of global environmental politics. As a consequence, we are now confronted with the paradox of a large environmental movement and unabated environmental destruction existing side-by-side. The emergence and augmenting power of the new international bourgeoisie is taking place in close concert with the global rescaling of environmental politics. The new service sub-class, consisting of people engaged in presentation and representation, in providing symbolic goods and services (people in advertising and public relations, social workers, radio and television producers, presenters and journalists--Pepper's powerless sub-class of academics, consultants, etc. could be added), share the international consumer tastes and interests of the new bourgeoisie. The latter has promoted the habitus of the service sub-class through their control of television stations, newspapers and publishing companies. However, in sharp contrast with the international bourgeoisie, "[m]embers of the service sub-class have failed to gain any significant political power while having gained considerable symbolic power, the power of constructing reality which tends to establish the immediate meaning. They have acquired the power to impose their habitus upon others--so long as this serves the international bourgeoisie" (Gare, 1995, p. 31). In other words, the alliance between the international bourgeoisie and the new service sub-class has enabled them to impose their hierarchy of environmental preferences upon the rest of society--thereby, perhaps unconsciously, creating a new grand narrative, a new order of socio-environmental purity centred around the further purification of the city through emission controls, traffic restriction, restrictive land use planning, tough immigration policies, slum clearance, industrial plant closures, the reinforcement of police departments, neighbourhood watch schemes and tightened waste policies. Some authors descending from a leftist tradition hardly avoid being sarcastic about the 'bourgeois character' of contemporary environmentalism.Enzensberger (1974) for instance, discussing apocalyptism as ideology, sees the preoccupation with ecological crisis as an expression of the decadence of bourgeois society. The bourgeoisie can conceive of its own imminent collapse only as the end of the world (. . .) In its period of decadence the bourgeoisie therefore proclaims itself to be the protector of something it itself destroyed (. . .) [I]t would like to get rid of industrialization to which it owes its own power.(p. 17-18)

#### Bourgeois environmentalism is Malthusian, disguises environmental destruction as only industrial, neglects resource inequality, and preserves elite privileges like aesthetics over the needs of the poor

Guy 2k (Baeten, professor of human geography at Lund university in Sweden, “The tragedy of the highway: empowerment, disempowerment and the politics of sustainability discourses and practices,” European planning studies, 2000, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=920131e5-c7ae-4bbc-9abe-9e050a96809c%40sessionmgr111&vid=1&hid=113&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=2969956)

Enzensberger's seminal article is nevertheless a classical and still very readable socialist critique of green thought. Benton (1989), summarizing Enzensberger, sees five themes recurring in 'traditional' socialist readings of ecological politics. First, ecological thinking is criticized because it is often fuelled by a considerable dose of neo-Malthusianism (overpopulation will lead to overexploitation of the earth's resources) which is seen as 'natural limits' conservatism. Second, green thought deflects attention from the specifically capitalist character of environmental destruction by opposing industrialism and technology per se. Third, the universal human interest in environmental sustainability masks class inequalities in resource use and environmental destruction. Fourth, like all 'general interest' ideologies in class societies, it is a mask for particular interests: in this case an alliance of technocrats with affluent rural middle-class activists who have shared interests in ecological scare-mongering and in the defence of privileged minority life-styles. Finally, the leftist answer to bourgeois environmental concerns is that they give preference to matters of aesthetics and taste, imposing them upon the whole society, while assigning lower priority to the basic environmental needs of the poor (like food and shelter).

#### Environmentalist transportation suggesting there are “too many” people on the road marginalizes the mobility of those whose activities aren’t economically vital – that prices transportation and creates a “free market” for moral dues like breathable air. That enables Bourgeois power over transportation infrastructure and strips the poor of their right to mobility

Guy 2k (Baeten, professor of human geography at Lund university in Sweden, “The tragedy of the highway: empowerment, disempowerment and the politics of sustainability discourses and practices,” European planning studies, 2000, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=920131e5-c7ae-4bbc-9abe-9e050a96809c%40sessionmgr111&vid=1&hid=113&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=2969956)

Neo-classical transport economics has an elegant and seductive argument for explaining current transport problems. The starting point is that there are 'too many' of us on the road and that the total volume of road traffic is partly 'redundant' owing to 'incorrect' pricing policies. The tragedy of the congested highway is that 'others' ('additional road users' in neo-classical jargon), whose activities are considered to be less necessary than vital economic activities, can make unrestrained use of this scarce public good and therefore unashamedly hinder those who contribute more to society. If this vague category of 'additional road users' would be obliged to pay the full price for its mobility, then its road use would certainly decrease, resulting in a more fair journey distribution among members of society. 'Price', then, acts as the flawless referee separating road users into two rationally thinking groups, one of which shows 'willingness to pay' for its journey while the other does not, after weighing the full price of the journey with its importance. Further, road use is described as being heavily subsidized, since additional road users do not have to pay for their marginal external costs (e.g. congestion, pollution) which they impose instead on others. Therefore, road use cannot be a rational, price-led activity, and, consequently, excessive use results (see for instance ECMT, 1998). By bringing together neo-classical price theory and Malthusian environmentalism, neoclassical economists have produced a straightforward argument, although they do not claim that charging the 'right price' on transport is a panacea for current transport problems (see, for example, Proost & De Borger (1997). The idea to make road users pay for the additional cost they impose upon others, is in fact at least 80 years old. Pigou suggested in The Economics of Welfare (1920) that marginal congestion costs should be allocated to individual road users (see Neale, 1995). At that time, it must have been considered as a futuristic fantasy: there were hardly any congestion problems in the 1920s, except for some inner-city streets in big American cities like New York (Hall, 1988). The implementation of tolls as a means to finance road construction is not new (French motorways are a notable example) and it can take various forms. Road pricing, based on allocating marginal external costs to individual road users, was implemented for the first time in Singapore in 1975 and it was to be fully automated by 1997. Hong Kong experimented with road pricing between 1983 and 1985.Outside Asia, only Norway has recently implemented toll rings around the cities of Bergen (1986), Oslo (1990) and Trondheim (1991). These are not real road pricing schemes since these tolls are fixed and hence do not truly reflect marginal external costs, which should differ over time and space (Tretvik, 1995; Ramjerdi, 1995). Meanwhile, the implementation of road pricing schemes is being discussed in many cities in Europe, Asia and America.In the UK, for instance, as early as 1964, the Smeed Report recommended the implementation of road pricing in order to reduce traffic congestion (see Neale, 1995) and recent pilot projects in the city of Cambridge have proven that road pricing is technically feasible (Oldridge, 1995). The idea of road pricing has its roots in Garret Hardin's 1968 parable The Tragedy of the Commons which was in fact based upon an essay published by the mathematician William Lloyd in 1833. The Tragedy is about common land in a rural community, used by every shepherd to let his cattle graze as much as possible. While the benefits of this activity are appropriated by each shepherd separately (the benefits are 'internal' in neo-classical terms), the costs, namely the infertility of the land owing to its overuse, will be shared by all shepherds (the costs are 'externalized' to society in neo-classical jargon). Free access to common goods will lead to a tragedy for everyone. Hardin pleaded for an authoritarian solution, namely the exertion of government control to ensure that nobody would make irresponsible use of the common fields. Contemporary economists seized on the Tragedy to argue in favour of privatization and commodification of the commons. Individual property rights result in individual responsibilities which will ensure that common resources will not devaluate or deplete due to excessive use. The individual allocation of road use costs during peak hours or periods of excessive air pollution would make road users abandon irresponsible use of the commons. The idea to put a 'correct' price upon transport and the environment has gained considerable support among transport planners. A 'free market' has to be created for common goods such as 'access to cities', or 'clean air', so that consumers, by means of the price mechanism, can express their individual preferences. The result would be an equilibrium between transport demand and supply needed to fulfil that demand. According to neo-classical economists, consumers are willing to pay for common goods. Interventions in the price of transport (for instance, subsidized public transport or free access to highways) disturb the market mechanism and will, consequently, lead to 'suboptimal' prices. Suboptimally, goods will be undervalued (i.e. less than people are willing to pay for them) or overvalued (i.e. more than people are willing to pay for them). In both cases, the market fails. This neo-classical answer to transport problems is based upon assumptions which cast doubt on the policy proposals which are deduced from them.The cry for further commodification of transport facilities is rooted in so-called methodological individualism (Jacobs, 1994). Economic activity is seen by neo-classical economists as the total sum of economic activities of individual agents. Individuals consume economic goods according to their individual preferences, which are influenced by prices. Price changes, hence, have an effect upon individual consumer behaviour. Jacobs believes that this reasoning is probably valid for toothpaste or tomatoes, but less so for public goods such as 'accessibility' or 'breathable air'. In fact, Jacobs continues, neo-classical economists adopt a strange stance when analysing the allocation of public goods. In the case of markets for tomatoes or toothpaste, they analyse real transactions between producers and consumers. In the case of environmental or transport goods, however, they analyse what would happen if these goods were priced so that consumers could make market choices. Starting from such a strongly hypothetical framework, policy proposals derived from it are not based upon actual preferences but hypothetical preferences that would exist if there would be a market for them in the first place. The question that immediately comes to mind, then, is: why analyse something as if it were something else? The market is only one institution to allocate goods to people. Other criteria for goods allocation can be thought of, for instance, the distribution of goods between different social groups. Particular price settings, irrespective of the 'real' price which would internalize all external costs, can guarantee that some segments of society, for example low income groups, have access to transport facilities, irrespective of their 'willingness to pay'. However, 'willingness' suggests the possibility of choice, which is a rather irrelevant category in the case of low-income groups. For them, 'ability to pay' would perhaps be more relevant. In transport policy terms, taking 'distribution' instead of the 'market' as the prime institution for the allocation of goods would mean that everyone, regardless of his or her possibilities or preferences, would be guaranteed a basic level of transport opportunities. Another allocation criterion would be the right to a healthy environment or to sufficient transport facilities, whatever the price individuals want to pay for them. That would imply, in policy terms, that governing bodies would have the duty to secure these goods to the public, without monetarizing them.Sagoff (1988,quoted in Jacobs, 1994) doubts whether people actually have individual preferences towards the environment rather than attitudes.The valuation of 'clean air', 'access to cities' or 'open space', is for most people probably not a monetary but a moral consideration: people do not choose for those goods as a function of what their interests are as consumers, but, rather, what they think is right as citizens. To return to Hardin's The Tragedy of the Commons, the standard critique is that there is an abundance of empirical evidence showing that shepherds in rural communities do not selfishly consume and exploit common land but actually, as members of the community, cooperate and come to agreements to prevent its damage (Pepper, 1993). The need for a better environment is different from the need for toothpaste or tomatoes: it becomes a matter of moral and social debate rather than a calculation of costs and benefits. Sagoff argues that neo-classical economists simply do not understand how people actually value public environmental goods. However, a self-fulfilling prophecy could grow from the neo-classical dominance of the sustainability debate: people might actually start to think about environmental goods in monetary rather than in moral or social terms or in terms of just distribution or rights (Jacobs, 1994). Evidently, but most importantly, the market mechanism will only satisfy the needs of those who can participate in the market institution, i.e. those who can rely upon sufficient purchasing power. Hence, the introduction of road pricing would enhance the power the rich already exert over transport infrastructures and would disempower those groups which lack sufficient financial means to purchase monetarized accessibility to cities. Road pricing, then, acts as a subtle exclusionary mechanism which victimizes the less well-to-do parts of society and further empowers the affluent classes.The consequences of these twin processes of empowerment and disempowerment, according to Swyngedouw (1993,p. 322), are that: [g]iven the importance and power of mobility, those trapped in place, stripped of their capacity to move across space, will suffer in an age in which mobility has become an even more profitable and extremely powerful commodity itself.

### Link – Good Capitalists

#### There are no good capitalists- Justifications to help the economy and save people from fundamentalism are Backwards- they use the economy and terrorism as false excuses to make money

ZIZEK 8[ Slavoj, PHILOSOPHER and CULTURAL CRITIC, “Violence”, 2008, Spencer]

Liberal communists are big executives recuperating the spirit of contest, or, to put it the other way round, counter-cultural geeks who take over big corporations. Their dogma is a new, postmodernised version of Adam Smith's old invisible hand of the market. Market and so­cial responsibility here are not opposites. They can be re­united for mutual benefit. As Thomas Friedman, one of their gurus, puts it, nobody has to be vile in order to do business; collaboration with and participation of the em­ployees, dialogue with customers, respect for the environ­ment, transparency of deals, are nowadays the keys to success. In a perceptive account, Olivier Malnuit enumer­ates the ten commandments of the liberal communist: Give everything away for free (free access, no copyright...); just charge for the additional services, which will make you even richer. Change the world, don't just sell things: global revolution, a change of society will make things better. Be caring, sharing, and aware of social responsibility. Be creative: focus on design, new technologies, and sciences. Tell it all: there should be no secrets. Endorse and practise the cult of transparency, the free flow of information, all humanity should collaborate and interact. Don't work and take on a fixed nine-to-five job. Just engage in improvised smart, dynamic, flexible communications. Go back to school and engage in permanent education. Act as an enzyme: work not only for the market, but trigger new forms of social collaborations. Die poor: return your wealth to those who need it, since you have more than you can ever spend. 10. Stand in for the state: practise the partnership of companies with the state.7 Liberal communists are pragmatic. They hate a doc­trinaire approach. For them there is no single exploited working class today. There are only concrete problems to be solved: starvation in Africa, the plight of Muslim women, religious fundamentalist violence. When there is a humanitarian crisis in Africa-and liberal communists really love humanitarian crises, which bring out the best in them!-there is no point in engaging in old-style anti-imperialist rhetoric. Instead, all of us should just concentrate on what really does the work of solving the problem: engage people, governments, and business in a common enterprise; start moving things, instead of re­lying on centralised state help; approach the crisis in a creative and unconventional way, without fretting over labels. Liberal communists like examples such as the struggle against apartheid in South Africa. They point out that the decision of some large international cor­porations to ignore apartheid rules in their South Af­rican companies, abolishing all segregation, paying blacks and whites the same salary for the same job, and so on, was as important as the direct political struggle. Is this not an ideal case of the overlapping between the strug­gle for political freedom and business interests? The self-same companies can now thrive in post-apartheid South Africa. Liberal communists also love the student protests which shattered France in May 1968: what an explosion of youthful energy and creativity! How it shattered the confines of the rigid bureaucratic order! What new im­petus it gave to economic and social life, once the politi­cal illusions dropped away! After all, many of them were young then, protesting and fighting cops on the streets. If they've changed now, it's not because they resigned themselves to reality, but because they needed to change in order *really* to change the world, *really* to revolu­tionise our lives. Hadn't Marx already asked: what are political upheavals in comparison with the invention of the steam engine? Didn't this do more than all revolu­tions to change our lives? And would Marx not have said today, what are all the protests against global capitalism worth in comparison with the invention of the internet? Above all, liberal communists are true citizens of the world. They are good people who worry. They worry about populist fundamentalists *and* irresponsible, greedy capitalist corporations. They see the "deeper causes" of today's problems: it is mass poverty and hopelessness which breed fundamentalist terror. So their goal is not to earn money, but to change the world, though if this makes them more money as a by-product, who's to com­plain! Bill Gates is already the single greatest benefactor in the history of humanity, displaying his love for neigh­bours with hundreds of millions freely given to educa­tion, and the battles against hunger and malaria. The catch, of course, is that in order to give, first you have to take-or, as some would put it, create. The justification of liberal communists is that in order to really help peo­ple, you must have the means to do it, and as experience of the dismal failure of all centralised statist and collec-tivist approaches teaches, private initiative is the effi­cient way. So if the state wants to regulate their business, to tax them excessively, is it aware that in this way it is effectively undermining the stated goal of its activity-that is, to make life better for the large majority, to really help those in need?

### Link – Highways

#### Transportation has always had the capitalist drive (highway specific)

**Mohl ‘8** (Raymond A., is Distinguished Professor of History at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, “The Interstates and the Cities: The U.S. Department of Transportation and the Freeway Revolt, 1966–1973” November 2, 2008, Project muse)

**When construction began on the urban expressways of the new Interstate Highway System** in the late 1950s**, homes, businesses, schools, and churches began to fall before bulldozers and wrecking crews. Entire neighborhoods, as well as parks, historic districts, and environmentally sensitive areas, were slated for demolition to make way for new expressways. Highway builders leveled central city areas where few people had cars so that automobile owners from other places could drive to and through the city on the big, new roads**. As one analyst of postwar America put it**: "The desire of the car owner to take his car wherever he went no matter what the social cost drove the Interstate Highway System, with all the force and lethal ef ect of a dagger, into the heart of the American city."**1 In response, citizen activists in many cities challenged the routing decisions made by state and federal highway engineers. This Freeway Revolt found its first expression in San Francisco in the late 1950s, and eventually spread across urban America. By the late 1960s, freeway fighters began to win a few battles, as some urban expressways were postponed, cancelled, or shifted to alternative route corridors.

### Link – ID Politics

#### THE ABSENCE OF STRUCTURAL HISTORICISM IS NO MERE OVERSIGHT, NOR IS IT ENOUGH TO SIMPLY MENTION ECONOMICS IN A FEW OF YOUR CARDS-- THE RELIANCE OF INDENTY-BASED POLITICS IS NOT AN ACCIDENTAL INSTANCE OF IGNORING CLASS. THE DEMAND ARISES OUT OF THE CRISIS OF LIBERALISM—SUCH POLITICS PARTICULARIZES THE OPPRESSIONS OF CAPITALISM TO THE POINT THAT THE UNIVERSAL SYSTEM IS NATURALIZED. ATTAINING WHITE, MALE BOURGEOISSE PRIVILEGE BECOMES THE BENCH-MARK OF POLITICAL SUCCESS, RE-ENTRENCHING THE VERY FOUNDATION OF THE SYSTEM

BROWN (Professor & Genius) 1993

[Wendy, “Wounded Attachments”, Political Theory, Aug. p. 392-394//wyo-tjc]

Although this détente between universal and particular within liberalism is potted with volatile conceits, it is rather thoroughly unraveled by two features of late modernity, spurred by developments in what Marx and Foucault, respectively, reveal as liberalism's companion powers: capitalism and disciplinarity. On one side, the state loses even its guise of universality as it becomes ever more transparently invested in particular economic interests, political ends, and social formations. This occurs as it shifts from a relatively minimalist "night watchman" state to a heavily bureaucratized, managerial, fiscally complex, and highly interventionist welfare-warfare state, a transmogrification occasioned by the combined imperatives of capital and the autoproliferating characteristics of bureaucracy.6 On the other side, a range of economic and political forces increasingly disinter the liberal subject from substantive nation-state identification: deterritorializing demo- graphic flows; disintegration from within and invasion from without of family and community as (relatively) autonomous sites of social production and identification; consumer capitalism's marketing discourse in which individual (and subindividual) desires are produced, commodified, and mo- bilized as identities; and disciplinary productions of a fantastic array of behavior-based identities ranging from recovering alcoholic professionals to unrepentant crack mothers. These disciplinary productions work to conjure and regulate subjects through classificatory schemes, naming and normaliz- ing social behaviors as social positions. Operating through what Foucault calls "an anatomy of detail," "disciplinary power" produces social identifies (available for politicization because they are deployed for purposes of political regulation) that crosscut juridical identities based on abstract right. Thus, for example, the welfare state's production of welfare subjects-themselves subdi- vided through the socially regulated categories of motherhood, disability, race, age, and so forth-potentially produce political identity through these categories, produce identities as these categories. In this story, the always imminent but increasingly politically manifest failure of liberal universalism to be universal-the transparent fiction of state universality-combines with the increasing individuation of social subjects through capitalist disinternments and disciplinary productions. Together, they breed the emergence of politicized identity rooted in disciplinary pro- ductions but oriented by liberal discourse toward protest against exclusion from a discursive formation of universal justice. This production, however, is not linear or even but highly contradictory: although the terms of liberalism are part of the ground of production of a politicized identity that reiterates yet exceeds these terms, liberal discourse itself also continuously recolonizes political identity as political interest-a conversion that recasts politicized identity's substantive and often deconstructive cultural claims and critiques as generic claims of particularism endemic to universalist political culture. Similarly, disciplinary power manages liberalism's production of politicized subjectivity by neutralizing (re-depoliticizing) identity through normalizing practices.

As liberal discourse converts political identity into essentialized private interest, disciplinary power converts interest into normativized social identity manageable by regulatory regimes. Thus disciplinary power politi- cally neutralizes entitlement claims generated by liberal individuation, whereas liberalism politically neutralizes rights claims generated by disciplinary identities. In addition to the formations of identity that may be the complex effects of disciplinary and liberal modalities of power, I want to suggest one other historical strand relevant to the production of politicized identity, this one hewn more specifically to recent developments in political culture. Although sanguine to varying degrees about the phenomenon they are describing, many on the European and North American Left have argued that identity politics emerges from the demise of class politics consequent to post-Fordism or pursuant to May 1968. Without adjudicating the precise relationship between the breakup of class politics and the proliferation of other sites of political identification, I want to refigure this claim by suggesting that what we have come to call identity politics is partly dependent on the demise of a critique of capitalism and of bourgeois cultural and economic values. In a reading that links the new identity claims to a certain relegitimation of capitalism, identity politics concerned with race, sexuality, and gender will appear not as a supplement to class politics, not as an expansion of Left categories of oppression and emancipation, not as an enriching complexification of pro- gressive formulations of power and persons-all of which they also are-but as tethered to a formulation of justice which, ironically, reinscribes a bour- geois ideal as its measure. If it is this ideal that signifies educational and vocational opportunity, upward mobility, relative protection against arbitrary violence, and reward in proportion to effort, and if it is this ideal against which many of the exclusions and privations of people of color, gays and lesbians, and women are articulated, then the political purchase of contemporary American identity politics would seem to be achieved in part through a certain discursive renaturalization of capitalism that can be said to have marked progressive discourse since the 1970s. What this suggests is that identity politics may be partly configured by a peculiarly shaped and peculiarly disguised form of resentment-class resent- ment without class consciousness or class analysis. This resentment is displaced onto discourses of injustice other than class but, like all resent- ments, retains the real or imagined holdings of its reviled subject-in this case, bourgeois male privileges-as objects of desire. From this perspective, it would appear that the articulation of politicized identities through race, gender, and sexuality require, rather than incidentally produce, a relatively limited identification through class. They necessarily rather than incidentally abjure a critique of class power and class norms precisely because the injuries suffered by these identities are measured by bourgeois norms of social acceptance, legal protection, relative material comfort, and social indepen- dence. The problem is that when not only economic stratification but other injuries to body and psyche enacted by capitalism (alienation, cornmodifica- tion, exploitation, displacement, disintegration of sustaining, albeit contra- dictory, social forms such as families and neighborhoods) are discursively normalized and thus depoliticized, other markers of social difference may come to bear an inordinate weight. Absent an articulation of capitalism in the political discourse of identity, the marked identity bears all the weight of the sufferings produced by capitalism in addition to that bound to the explicitly politicized marking.

#### THE MOVE TO EXPRESS YOURSELF AS ONLY YOURSELF IS ULTIMATELY A MILITARY CAMPAIGN WAGED AGAINST THE INVISIBLE CONNECTIONS OF THE EVERYDAY – TAKEN UNCRITICALLY CAN ONLY LEAD TO INTERPASSIVITY AND THE PRESERVATION AND PERPETUATION OF CAPITALISM

The Invisible Committee (TIC is a collective & anonymous penname – reportedly of 9 anarchists from Tarnac, France) 2009

[The Coming Insurrection, Semiotext(e) & MIT Press, online @ http://tarnac9.wordpress.com/texts/the-coming-insurrection/, loghry]

“I AM WHAT I AM.” This is marketing’s latest offering to the world, the final stage in the development of advertising, far beyond all the exhortations to be different, to be oneself and drink Pepsi. Decades of concepts in order to get where we are, to arrive at pure tautology. I = I. He’s running on a treadmill in front of the mirror in his gym. She’s coming back from work, behind the wheel of her Smart car. Will they meet? “I AM WHAT I AM.” My body belongs to me. I am me, you are you, and something’s wrong. Mass personalization. Individualization of all conditions – life, work and misery. Diffuse schizophrenia. Rampant depression. Atomization into fine paranoiac particles. Hysterization of contact. The more I want to be me, the more I feel an emptiness. The more I express myself, the more I am drained. The more I run after myself, the more tired I get. We cling to our self like a coveted job title. We’ve become our own representatives in a strange commerce, guarantors of a personalization that feels, in the end, a lot more like an amputation. We insure our selves to the point of bankruptcy, with a more or less disguised clumsiness. Meanwhile, I manage. The quest for a self, my blog, my apartment, the latest fashionable crap, relationship dramas, who’s fucking who… whatever prosthesis it takes to hold onto an “I”! If “society” hadn’t become such a definitive abstraction, then it would denote all the existential crutches that allow me to keep dragging on, the ensemble of dependencies I’ve contracted as the price of my identity. The handicapped person is the model citizen of tomorrow. It’s not without foresight that the associations exploiting them today demand that they be granted a “subsistence income.” The injunction, everywhere, to “be someone” maintains the pathological state that makes this society necessary. The injunction to be strong produces the very weakness by which it maintains itself, so that everything seems to take on a therapeutic character, even working, even love. All those “how’s it goings?” that we exchange give the impression of a society composed of patients taking each other’s temperatures. Sociability is now made up of a thousand little niches, a thousand little refuges where you can take shelter. Where it’s always better than the bitter cold outside. Where everything’s false, since it’s all just a pretext for getting warmed up. Where nothing can happen since we’re all too busy shivering silently together. Soon this society will only be held together by the mere tension of all the social atoms straining towards an illusory cure. It’s a power plant that runs its turbines on a gigantic reservoir of unwept tears, always on the verge of spilling over. “I AM WHAT I AM.” Never has domination found such an innocent-sounding slogan. The maintenance of the self in a permanent state of deterioration, in a chronic state of near-collapse, is the best-kept secret of the present order of things. The weak, depressed, self-critical, virtual self is essentially that endlessly adaptable subject required by the ceaseless innovation of production, the accelerated obsolescence of technologies, the constant overturning of social norms, and generalized flexibility. It is at the same time the most voracious consumer and, paradoxically, the most productive self, the one that will most eagerly and energetically throw itself into the slightest project, only to return later to its original larval state.“WHAT AM I,” then? Since childhood, I’ve passed through a flow of milk, smells, stories, sounds, emotions, nursery rhymes, substances, gestures, ideas, impressions, gazes, songs, and foods. What am I? Tied in every way to places, sufferings, ancestors, friends, loves, events, languages, memories, to all kinds of things that obviously are not me. Everything that attaches me to the world, all the links that constitute me, all the forces that compose me don’t form an identity, a thing displayable on cue, but a singular, shared, living existence, from which emerges – at certain times and places – that being which says “I.” Our feeling of inconsistency is simply the consequence of this foolish belief in the permanence of the self and of the little care we give to what makes us what we are. It’s dizzying to see Reebok’s “I AM WHAT I AM” enthroned atop a Shanghai skyscraper. The West everywhere rolls out its favorite Trojan horse: the exasperating antimony between the self and the world, the individual and the group, between attachment and freedom. Freedom isn’t the act of shedding our attachments, but the practical capacity to work on them, to move around in their space, to form or dissolve them. The family only exists as a family, that is, as a hell, for those who’ve quit trying to alter its debilitating mechanisms, or don’t know how to. The freedom to
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uproot oneself has always been a phantasmic freedom. We can’t rid ourselves of what binds us without at the same time losing the very thing to which our forces would be applied. “I AM WHAT I AM,” then, is not simply a lie, a simple advertising campaign, but a military campaign, a war cry directed against everything that exists between beings, against everything that circulates indistinctly, everything that invisibly links them, everything that prevents complete desolation, against everything that makes us exist, and ensures that the whole world doesn’t everywhere have the look and feel of a highway, an amusement park or a new town: pure boredom, passionless but well-ordered, empty, frozen space, where nothing moves apart from registered bodies, molecular automobiles, and ideal commodities. France wouldn’t be the land of anxiety pills that it’s become, the paradise of anti-depressants, the Mecca of neurosis, if it weren’t also the European champion of hourly productivity. Sickness, fatigue, depression, can be seen as the individual symptoms of what needs to be cured. They contribute to the maintenance of the existing order, to my docile adjustment to idiotic norms, and to the modernization of my crutches. They specify the selection of my opportune, compliant, and productive tendencies, as well as those that must be gently discarded. “It’s never too late to change, you know.” But taken as facts, my failings can also lead to the dismantling of the hypothesis of the self. They then become acts of resistance in the current war. They become a rebellion and a force against everything that conspires to normalize us, to amputate us. The self is not some thing within us that is in a state of crisis; it is the form they mean to stamp upon us. They want to make our self something sharply defined, separate, assessable in terms of qualities, controllable, when in fact we are creatures among creatures, singularities among similars, living flesh weaving the flesh of the world. Contrary to what has been repeated to us since childhood, intelligence doesn’t mean knowing how to adapt – or if that is a kind of intelligence, it’s the intelligence of slaves. Our inadaptability, our fatigue, are only problems from the standpoint of what aims to subjugate us. They indicate rather a departure point, a meeting point, for new complicities. They reveal a landscape more damaged, but infinitely more sharable than all the fantasy lands this society maintains for its purposes.

### Link – Westernization

#### The westernization of labour production of matter and energy uses, have found its self in the economic markets of capitalism

#### Altvater ‘7

[Elmar, Professor of Political Science at the Otto-Suhr-Institute of the Free University of Berlin from 1971 until his retirement in 2004, The Social and Natural Environment of Fossil Capitalism, 2007, <http://socialistregister.com> WFI-KC]

The “westernisation” of the world has led to a pattern of production and consumption which builds intensively on the nearly limitless availability of matter and energy, sophisticated technology, and the existence of natural ‘sinks’ in which solids, liquids and gas-emissions can be dumped. The effects on the local, national and global natural environment are mostly negative. Global transportation is responsible for the consumption of large quantities of fossil energy and thus for an increase of CO2-emissions, thus aggravating the climate crisis. Labour-intensive production processs are located where labour is cheap, and environmentally harmful processes where environmental laws and regulations lag are least exacting, and so least expensive. At first glance it seems as if services and finance do not exert negative effects on the environment. However, the idea that we now live in a “virtual economy” of bits and bytes, and that economic growth is being decoupled from energy consumption, is nothing but “a myth”[[1]](#endnote-1) (or as Harry Frankfurt says, “bullshit”)[[2]](#endnote-2). Financial markets exert pressure on the real economy, enforcing the payment by borrowers of the financial claims of creditors (banks and funds) – payments that are only affordable if real growth rates remain high. This pressure has been seen as an efficient lever for securing increasing competitiveness, just as the absence of this pressure in formerly socialist countries has been seen as one of the main causes of their economic failure. Therefore finance indirectly enforces growth and, concomitantly, a rising consumption of energy as well as of material resources (although increasing efficiency in the use of matter and energy may partially offset this pressure). The financial instabilities and crises of recent decades have also jeopardized social stability, pushing large strata of the populations in the worse affected countries into precarious life conditions and poverty. Even the World Bank admits that these effects are responsible for ecological degradation in large parts of the world.

### Link – Economic Rationality

#### Economic decisions on the gross of national environmental products that include climate, biodiversity, and earths environmental problems and the economic process of mechanism of saving the environment leads to the discourse of capitalism

#### Altvater ‘7

[Elmar, Professor of Political Science at the Otto-Suhr-Institute of the Free University of Berlin from 1971 until his retirement in 2004, The Social and Natural Environment of Fossil Capitalism, 2007, <http://socialistregister.com> WFI-KC]

The reason for capitalism’s high economic impact on the environment is to be found in its double character. It has a value dimension (the monetary value of the gross national product, of world trade, of FDI, of financial flows, etc.) but is also a system of material and energy flows in production and consumption, transportation and distribution. Economic decisions concerning production first consider values and prices, profit margins and monetary returns, on capital invested. In this sphere the ruling principle is only the economic rationality of profit-maximizing decision-makers. But the decisions they take have important impacts on nature, due to the material and energy dimension of economic processes. Under capitalist conditions the environment is more and more transformed into a contested object of human greed. The exploitation of natural resources, and their degradation by a growing quantity of pollutants, results in a man-made scarcity, leading to conflicts over access to them. Access to nature (to resources and sinks) is uneven and unequal and the societal relation of man to nature therefore is conflict-prone. The “ecological footprints” of people in different countries and regions of the world are of very different sizes, reflecting severe inequalities of incomes and wealth. Ecological injustices therefore can only usefully be discussed if social class contradictions and the production of inequality in the course of capital accumulation are taken into account. The environment includes the energy system, climate, biodiversity, soils, water, woods, deserts, ice sheets, etc. – i.e. the different spheres of the planet Earth and their historical evolution. The complexity of nature, and the positive and negative feed-back mechanisms between the different dimensions of the environment in space and time, are only partly known. Therefore environmental policy has to be made in the shadow of a high degree of uncertainty. This is why one of the basic principles of environmental policy is that of *precaution*. The effects of human activities, particularly economic activities, on natural processes, and the feed-back mechanisms within the totality of the social, political and economic systems, constitute the so-called societal relation of man to nature. Only a *holistic* attempt to integrate environmental aspects into discourses of political economy, political science, sociology, cultural studies etc. can make possible a coherent understanding of environmental problems and yield adequate political responses to the challenges of the ongoing ecological crisis.

### Link – Ports

#### Capitalism has always been in our ports- empirics

**Salzmann ’12** (Joseph A., a visiting assistant professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago, June, 2012, “The Creative Destruction of the Chicago River Harbor: Spatial and Environmental Dimensions of Industrial Capitalism, 1881-1909”, Project muse)

On Friday the thirteenth of March 1896, **more than 120 businessmen gathered at Chicago's Great Northern Hotel to stop a "murder." The men feared that Congress would sever one of the busiest commercial** [End Page 235] **arteries in the world, the Chicago River Harbor.** At issue was a policy proposal. The chief of the Army Corps of Engineers' operations in Chicago, Major W. L. Marshall, had urged Congress to drive waterborne commerce from the Chicago River in the city's central business district to the Calumet River on its southeastern periphery. **One of the businessmen**, a leading dry goods merchant named John V. Farwell, **described the major's proposal: "We have an officer of the United States government report that the harbor that has made this city has got to be closed and that the Congress of the United States must do the murder and he will be the coroner."1 At the root of the tension between the businessmen and Marshall was a dispute over how to respond to the creative destruction of the Chicago River Harbor. Economist Joseph Schumpeter famously described capitalism as a process of ceaseless economic and technological innovation or "creative destruction."**2 Innovation often reshaped built environments like the Chicago River Harbor. For six decades, that stream had carried a fleet of wooden schooners laden with millions of tons of cargo to and from the foundries, grain elevators, lumberyards, and dry goods stores that lined its banks. The Chicago River reached its commercial peak in 1889 when it handled 10,994,036 tons of freight, helping to make the city the fourth largest port in the world behind New York, London, and Hamburg.3 **But just as the Chicago River reached its commercial peak, sweeping technological and economic changes rendered the port obsolete.** Driven by changes in marine technology and economic competition, Great Lakes shipping lines purged wooden sailboats from their fleets and replaced them with larger iron and steel-hulled steamships. **When larger ships began to call on the Chicago River Port, some of the very harbor infrastructure that had once facilitated travel began to stifle it.** Large ships often [End Page 236] had difficulty navigating the river channel narrowed by wharves and bulkheads and crossed with bridges and tunnels. The obsolescence of port infrastructure sparked a political and economic debate about whether or not the Chicago River Harbor should be retrofitted to accommodate larger ships. Major Marshall argued that Congress ought to develop the more commodious Calumet River as an alternative to the Chicago River Harbor. He reasoned that developing the Calumet would help relieve traffic congestion and pollution along the Chicago River, which ran right through the city's central business district.4 **The businessmen who had sunk millions into riverside property disagreed with Marshall. Hoping to save their riverside assets, they gathered at the Great Northern Hotel** in March 1896 **to plot their opposition to Marshall's proposal.** Under the auspices of their official organization, the Chicago River Improvement Association, **they lobbied Congress for appropriations to save the Chicago River Harbor.**5 **This essay examines the creative destruction of the Chicago River Harbor and some key spatial and environmental features of industrial capitalism**.6 It demonstrates that the replacement of wooden sailboats with ever larger iron and steel steamships rendered many of the built structures along the river channel obsolete. But that **technological transformation did not, in and of itself, destroy the port. The transition from sail to steam was a body blow to an industrial harbor already in decline. The banks of the river had ceased to be the most desirable location for many water-reliant manufacturing firms. Riverside land values were high. Downtown congestion and pollution caused costly** [End Page 237] **delays. As a result, many manufacturing firms, especially in the growing steel industry, began to create new industrial districts on the urban periphery, including the one on the banks of the Calumet River.**

#### Ports drive industrialization

**Salzmann ’12** (Joseph A., a visiting assistant professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago, June, 2012, “The Creative Destruction of the Chicago River Harbor: Spatial and Environmental Dimensions of Industrial Capitalism, 1881-1909”, Project muse)

**The Centurion incident showed that technological changes in shipping on the Great Lakes would soon render** the Chicago River **Harbor's infrastructure obsolete.** In this regard, Chicago was like many port cities throughout North America and Europe. From the 1870s to the 1910s, port cities on the Atlantic Ocean responded **to a process that historian Joseph Konvitz has dubbed the "industrialization of shipping." Merchant marine fleets employed ever larger vessels with the latest technological improvements in propulsion, hull design, and superstructure engineering to enable them to move larger cargoes at greater speeds and at lower unit cost.** **These developments caused what Konvitz calls the "crises of Atlantic port cities," as officials responsible for harbor development struggled to accommodate the larger, more technologically sophisticated ships.**25 Chicago's port officials were similarly challenged to respond to the industrialization of shipping on the Great Lakes. From the 1870s to the 1890s, **a combination of economic forces and federal government policies drove shippers on the Great Lakes to use ever-larger iron and steel steamships.** Prior to 1888, sailboats, not steamships, dominated the Great Lakes trade. Wooden schooners were, as historian Theodore Karamanski has shown, a critical technology driving the development of the Great Lakes region. But in the 1870s, **many vessel lines began to commission metal steamships instead of wooden schooners.** The transition from sail to steam was driven, [End Page 241] initially, by the depression of the 1870s. **Shipping rates had fallen, and some vessel lines compensated for the loss of income by using larger metal steamships that could haul greater cargos in fewer days.**

### Link – Racism

#### THE REDUCTION OF CLASS TO A NEUTRAL LEVEL AMONG A LONG LIST OF OTHER OPPRESSIONS SUCH AS RACE AND GENDER, DESTROYS THE EMANCIPATORY POTENTIAL OF CLASS TO REACH ACROSS ALL LINES OF INDENTITY AND FORGE POLITICAL ACTION. CLASS MUST BE RECOGNIZED AS QUALITATIVELY MORE IMPORTANT—OTHERWISE THE SYSTEM IS ABLE TO SATISFY DEMANDS ON GROUNDS OF FORMAL EQUALITY, DESTROYING ATTEMPTS TO OVERCOME CAPITALIST OPPRESSION\*\*\*

GIMENEZ (Prof. Sociology at UC Boulder) 2001

[Martha, “Marxism and Class; Gender and Race”, Race, Gender and Class, Vol. 8, p. online: http://www.colorado.edu/Sociology/gimenez/work/cgr.html //wyo-tjc]

There are many competing theories of race, gender, class, American society, political economy, power, etc. but no specific theory is invoked to define how the terms race, gender and class are used, or to identify how they are related to the rest of the social system. To some extent, race, gender and class and their intersections and interlockings have become a mantra to be invoked in any and all theoretical contexts, for a tacit agreement about their ubiquitousness and meaning seems to have developed among RGC studies advocates, so that all that remains to be dome is empirically to document their intersections everywhere, for everything that happens is, by definition, raced, classed, and gendered. This pragmatic acceptance of race, gender and class, as givens, results in the downplaying of theory, and the resort to experience as the source of knowledge. The emphasis on experience in the construction of knowledge is intended as a corrective to theories that, presumably, reflect only the experience of the powerful. RGC seems to offer a subjectivist understanding of theory as simply a reflection of the experience and consciousness of the individual theorist, rather than as a body of propositions which is collectively and systematically produced under historically specific conditions of possibility which grant them historical validity for as long as those conditions prevail. Instead, knowledge and theory are pragmatically conceived as the products or reflection of experience and, as such, unavoidably partial, so that greater accuracy and relative completeness can be approximated only through gathering the experiential accounts of all groups. Such is the importance given to the role of experience in the production of knowledge that in the eight page introduction to the first section of an RGC anthology, the word experience is repeated thirty six times (Andersen and Collins, 1995: 1-9). I agree with the importance of learning from the experience of all groups, especially those who have been silenced by oppression and exclusion and by the effects of ideologies that mystify their actual conditions of existence. To learn how people describe their understanding of their lives is very illuminating, for "ideas are the conscious expression -- real or illusory -- of (our) actual relations and activities" (Marx, 1994: 111), because "social existence determines consciousness" (Marx, 1994: 211). Given that our existence is shaped by the capitalist mode of production, experience, to be fully understood in its broader social and political implications, has to be situated in the context of the capitalist forces and relations that produce it. Experience in itself, however, is suspect because, dialectically, it is a unity of opposites; it is, at the same time, unique, personal, insightful and revealing and, at the same time, thoroughly social, partial, mystifying, itself the product of historical forces about which individuals may know little or nothing about (for a critical assessment of experience as a source of knowledge see Sherry Gorelick, "Contradictions of feminist methodology," in Chow, Wilkinson, and Baca Zinn, 1996; applicable to the role of experience in contemporary RGC and feminist research is Jacoby's critique of the 1960s politics of subjectivity: Jacoby, 1973: 37- 49). Given the emancipatory goals of the RGC perspective, it is through the analytical tools of Marxist theory that it can move forward, beyond the impasse revealed by the constant reiteration of variations on the "interlocking" metaphor. This would require, however, a) a rethinking and modification of the postulated relationships between race, class and gender, and b) a reconsideration of the notion that, because everyone is located at the intersection of these structures, all social relations and interactions are "raced," "classed," and "gendered." In the RGC perspective, race, gender and class are presented as equivalent systems of oppression with extremely negative consequences for the oppressed. It is also asserted that the theorization of the connections between these systems require "a working hypothesis of equivalency" (Collins, 1997:74). Whether or not it is possible to view class as just another system of oppression depends on the theoretical framework within class is defined. If defined within the traditional sociology of stratification perspective, in terms of a gradation perspective, class refers simply to strata or population aggregates ranked on the basis of standard SES indicators (income, occupation, and education) (for an excellent discussion of the difference between gradational and relational concepts of class, see Ossowski, 1963). Class in this non-relational, descriptive sense has no claims to being more fundamental than gender or racial oppression; it simply refers to the set of individual attributes that place individuals within an aggregate or strata arbitrarily defined by the researcher (i.e., depending on their data and research purposes, anywhere from three or four to twelve "classes" can be identified). From the standpoint of Marxist theory, however, class is qualitatively different from gender and race and cannot be considered just another system of oppression. As Eagleton points out, whereas racism and sexism are unremittingly bad, class is not entirely a "bad thing" even though socialists would like to abolish it. The bourgeoisie in its revolutionary stage was instrumental in ushering a new era in historical development, one which liberated the average person from the oppressions of feudalism and put forth the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. Today, however, it has an unquestionably negative role to play as it expands and deepens the rule of capital over the entire globe. The working class, on the other hand, is pivotally located to wage the final struggle against capital and, consequently, it is "an excellent thing" (Eagleton, 1996: 57). While racism and sexism have no redeeming feature, class relations are, dialectically, a unity of opposites; both a site of exploitation and, objectively, a site where the potential agents of social change are forged. To argue that the working class is the fundamental agent of change does not entail the notion that it is the only agent of change. The working class is of course composed of women and men who belong to different races, ethnicities, national origins, cultures, and so forth, so that gender and racial/ethnic struggles have the potential of fueling class struggles because, given the patterns of wealth ownership and income distribution in this and all capitalist countries, those who raise the banners of gender and racial struggles are overwhelmingly propertyless workers, technically members of the working class, people who need to work for economic survival whether it is for a wage or a salary, for whom racism, sexism and class exploitation matter. But this vision of a mobilized working class where gender and racial struggles are not subsumed but are nevertheless related requires a class conscious effort to link RGC studies to the Marxist analysis of historical change. In so far as the "class" in RGC remains a neutral concept, open to any and all theoretical meanings, just one oppression among others, intersectionality will not realize its revolutionary potential. Nevertheless, I want to argue against the notion that class should be considered equivalent to gender and race. I find the grounds for my argument not only on the crucial role class struggles play in processes of epochal change but also in the very assumptions of RGC studies and the ethnomethodological insights put forth by West and Fenstermaker (1994). The assumption of the simultaneity of experience (i.e., all interactions are raced, classed, gendered) together with the ambiguity inherent in the interactions themselves, so that while one person might think he or she is "doing gender," another might interpret those "doings" in terms of "doing class," highlight the basic issue that Collins accurately identifies when she argues that ethnomethodology ignores power relations. Power relations underlie all processes of social interaction and this is why social facts are constraining upon people. But the pervasiveness of power ought not to obfuscate the fact that some power relations are more important and consequential than others. For example, the power that physical attractiveness might confer a woman in her interactions with her less attractive female supervisor or employer does not match the economic power of the latter over the former. In my view, the flattening or erasure of the qualitative difference between class, race and gender in the RGC perspective is the foundation for the recognition that it is important to deal with "basic relations of domination and subordination" which now appear disembodied, outside class relations. In the effort to reject "class reductionism," by postulating the equivalence between class and other forms of oppression, the RGC perspective both negates the fundamental importance of class but it is forced to acknowledge its importance by postulating some other "basic" structures of domination. Class relations -- whether we are referring to the relations between capitalist and wage workers, or to the relations between workers (salaried and waged) and their managers and supervisors, those who are placed in "contradictory class locations," (Wright, 1978) -- are of paramount importance, for most people's economic survival is determined by them. Those in dominant class positions do exert power over their employees and subordinates and a crucial way in which that power is used is through their choosing the identity they impute their workers. Whatever identity workers might claim or "do," employers can, in turn, disregard their claims and "read" their "doings" differently as "raced" or "gendered" or both, rather than as "classed," thus downplaying their class location and the class nature of their grievances. To argue, then, that class is fundamental is not to "reduce" gender or racial oppression to class, but to acknowledge that the underlying basic and "nameless" power at the root of what happens in social interactions grounded in "intersectionality" is class power.

#### Their methodology homogenizes whiteness by collapsing structures of exploitation into a focus on white privilege that erases any historical connection between the ownership of production and racist exploitation—this disables materialist critique that is necessary to achieve emancipation

Cole 9

[Mike, Research Professor in Education and Equality, Head of Research and Director of the Centre for Education for Social Justice at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, Critical Race Theory in Education: A Marxist Response, 2009, Palgrave-McMillan, p. 25-28 //wyo-tjc]

While for Critical Race Theorists ‘white supremacy’ primarily describes the structural dimension of ‘white power’, ‘white privilege’ mainly refers to the day-to-day practices that arise directly or indirectly from ‘white supremacy’. However, both interact with each other (Delgado, personal correspondence, 2008), and both have structural and day-to-day practical implications. Thus immigration restrictions would be part of the structural dimension of the ‘white supremacist’ state (ibid.), but with obvious day-to-day practical manifestations. From a Marxist perspective, it is, of course, the poor and dispossessed rather than the rich and powerful, whose entry into other (richer) countries is restricted (although this exclusion is dependent on capitalists’ relative need for cheap labor). Delgado (ibid.) gives an example of the practical nature of ‘white privilege’ when ‘store clerks put change directly in the upraised palms of white customers but lay the coins down on the counter for blacks or Latinos/ Latinas’. For Critical Race Theorists, such practices are also enshrined structurally in ‘white supremacist’ societies. For Marxists, the class element is crucial. Rich people of color are less likely to get their change thrust on the counter. Moreover, well-off people of color will tend to shop in more ‘upmarket’ stores, and will be more disposed to the use of plastic as a form of payment. Critical Race Theorists believe that all white people are beneficiaries of ‘white supremacy’ and ‘white privilege’. Gillborn (2008, p. 34) states that while they are not all active in identical ways, and do not all draw similar advantages, ‘[a]ll White-identified people are implicated in . . . [relations of shared power and dominance]— . . . they do all benefit, whether they like it or not’. Sabina E. Vaught and Angelina E. Castagno (2008, p. 99) would appear to hold similar views and refer to ‘the ways in which power over others . . . benefits Whites individually and collectively’ (p. 99), and specifically emphasize white privilege’s ‘structural nature’ (p. 100). They argue (2008, p. 96) that ‘Whiteness as property is a concept that reflects the conflation of Whiteness with the exclusive rights to freedom, to the enjoyment of certain privileges, and to the ability to draw advantage from these rights’. Following Cheryl Harris (1993, p. 1721) they state that ‘to be identified as white’ was ‘to have the property of being white. Whiteness was the characteristic, the attribute, the property of free human beings’. ‘In this way’, Vaught and Castagno (2008, p. 96) continue, ‘individual White persons came to exercise, benefit from, and mutually create and recreate a larger structural system of collective, institutional White privilege’ (ibid.). Again, following Harris (1993, p. 1762), they refer to ‘the continued right to determine meaning’ (Vaught and Castagno, 2008, p. 101), and make reference to Peggy McIntosh’s (1988) notion of systemic ‘arbitrarily-awarded’ privilege (Vaught and Castagno, 2008, p. 99). They conclude that the societal systems ‘that sustain the reign of White race privilege are peopled and the concurrent, interactive acts of individuals and systems inexorably reinforce and entrench pervasive racial power across institutions, sites and events’ (p. 96). ‘White racial power’, they claim, ‘permeates every institution’ (p. 101). When Gillborn makes reference to McIntosh’s ‘famously listed 50 privileges’ (Gillborn, 2008, p. 35), and describes them as ‘privileges that accrue from being identified as White’, he has seriously misunderstood McIntosh’s list. In merely describing the privileges as accruing from being identified as white, he decontextualizes and dehistoricizes her analysis. In actual fact, McIntosh contextualizes white privilege with respect to her social class position as a white academic with respect to her ‘Afro-American co-workers, friends, and acquaintances’ with whom she comes into ‘daily or frequent contact in this particular time, place, and line of work’ (p. 293).4 Homogenizing the social relations of all white people ignores, of course, this crucial social class dimension of privilege and power. Mills (1997, p. 37) acknowledges that not ‘all whites are better off than all nonwhites, but [argues that] . . . as a statistical generalization, the objective life chances of whites are significantly better’. While this is, of course, true, we should not lose sight of the life chances of millions of working class white people. To take poverty as one example, in the United States, while it is the case that the number of black people living below the poverty line is some three times that of whites, this still leaves over 16 million ‘white but not Hispanic’ people living in poverty in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). This is indicative of a society predicated on racialized capitalism, *rather than indicative of a white supremacist society*. While the United States is witnessing the effects of the New Racial Domain (Marable, 2004—see below) with massively disproportionate effects on black people and other people of color, white people are also affected. In the United Kingdom, there are similar indicators of a society underpinned by rampant racism, with black people currently twice as poor as whites, and those of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin over three times as poor as whites (Platt, 2007).5 Once again, however, this still leaves some 12 million poor white people in the United Kingdom, who are, like their American counterparts, on the receiving end of global neoliberal capitalism. The devastating effects of social class exploitation and oppression are masked by CRT blanket assertions of ‘white supremacy’ and ‘white privilege’. There are further problems with the homogenization of all whites. First it masks essential power relations in capitalist societies. For Marxists, the ruling class are by definition those with power since it is they who own the means of production, and the working class, in having to sell their labor power in order to survive, are (also by definition) the class largely without power. The manifestations of this major power imbalance in the capital/ labor relation massively affects relative degrees of privilege in capitalist, the aforementioned rates of poverty being just one. Lack of power for the working class is particularly evident in countries like the United States and the United Kingdom where that class has been successfully interpellated (Althusser’s concept of interpellation, outlined in chapter 1 of this volume). Moreover, some of the very privileges that poor white people possess *are in a very real sense compensatory privileges*. For example, Delgado (2008, personal correspondence) has introduced the concept of ‘paltry privileges’ to describe those ‘privileges’ that whites enjoy that compensate for the fact that they are living in impoverished conditions with low paid jobs, unpaid bills and poor life chances. Alpesh Maisuria and I (Cole and Maisuria, 2008) made a similar point when referring to the success of soccer in keeping white workers in line: Ruling class success in maintaining hegemony in the light of the disparity of wealth and the imperial quest was displayed in England during the 2006 World Cup by the number of St. George flags signifying a solid patriotism in run-down (white) working class estates, on white vans, on dated cars exhibiting a ‘proud to be British’ display. In addition, as economically active migrant workers from Eastern Europe enter the UK (a great benefit for capital, and for the middle strata who want their homes cleaned or renovated cheaply), the (white) working class, who spontaneously resist neo-liberalism by resisting working for low wages that will increase their immiseration, need to be assured that they ‘still count’. Hence the ruse of capital is to open the markets, and the role of sections of the tabloid media is to racialize migrant workers to keep the (white) working class happy with their lot with the mindset that ‘at least we are not Polish or Asian or black, and we’ve got our flag and, despite everything, our brave boys in Iraq did us proud. In Althusser’s words, their response is: ‘That’s obvious! That’s right! That’s true!’ (Althusser, 1971, p. 173). In this case the homogenization of all whites obfuscates the ideological element of the capital/labor relation. While it is undoubtedly true that racism and xeno-racism (see below) have penetrated large sections of the white working class, resulting in racist practices that contribute to the hegemony of whites, and while it is clearly the case that members of the (predominantly though not exclusively) white ruling class are the beneficiaries of this, it is certainly not white people as a whole who hold such power (Cole and Maisuria, 2008). For example, sections of the white working class in England have voted for the fascist British National Party (BNP) at recent elections precisely because they feel that they are treated with less equality than others (Cruddas et al., 2005). There are thus a number of problems with homogenizing all white people. Attempts to do this ignore capitalist social relations, which are infused with the crucial dimensions of social class, power and ideology.

### Link – Rail

#### Rail history shows the link between business and railroads

**Churella ‘6** (Albert, Associate Professor Social and International Studies Southern Polytechnic State University, “Company, State, and Region: Three Approaches to Railroad History”, Project muse)

**The Tootin' Louie adheres to the most conventional conceptual framework and is most obviously targeted to the railfan market. It details the lackluster career of the Minneapolis and St Louis, initially promoted by Minneapolis entrepreneurs to increase their city's prominence as a commercial center, only to lose control to eastern financiers who ultimately presided over the decline of agricultural traffic on the northern Great Plains, followed by receivership and abandonment**. Such corporate histories are legion, and some describe the smallest of railroads in excruciating detail. Yet, **they possess a definite inherent value, serving as a reference for more thematic analyses and, in the best cases, introducing new interpretations of the railroads' role in business and society.** These internalist histories of a single railroad organization have always been popular within academic circles—witness books by John Stover and James Dilts on the Baltimore & Ohio, Richard Overton's analyses of the Burlington, Robert Athearn's Rebel of the Rockies, Ralph and Muriel Hidy's work on the Great Northern (to which Hofsommer also contributed), Hofsommer's own Southern Pacific, 1901–1985, Maury Klein's massive two-volume study of the Union Pacific, and numerous books by H. Roger Grant. **A similar approach uses key railroads as exemplars of empire, progress, and nation building.** Examples include a mediocre recent book by Stephen Ambrose and a far superior one from David Bain on the Transcontinental Railroad, matched in Canada by Pierre Berton's The Impossible Railway, The National Dream, and The Last Spike, and A. A. den Otter's The Philosophy of Railways.1 **These biographies of corporations are matched by biographies of the great men of railroading's golden age**, including Alfred [End Page 582] Chandler's study of Henry Varnum Poor, Maury Klein's analyses of Jay Gould and E. H. Harriman, and Albro Martin's portrayal of James Jerome Hill.2

### Link – Renewables

#### Capitalists are seizing on renewable energy and it could soon play a huge economic role, similar to the computer revolution- but capitalist tendencies will mean the concentration of any innovation in the hands of the few, and continued problems between capital and labour.

#### Harris 10

[Jerry, professor of history at DeVry University, Chicago, “Going Green to Stay in the Black: Transnational Capitalism and Renewable Energy”, Race Class -2010-Harris-62-78.pdf //wyo-MU]

With global warming widely accepted as an existential crisis, capitalists have seized upon alternative and sustainable energy as a major transformative technology. United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon has called for a worldwide ‘green new deal’ that would be a ‘wholesale reconfiguration of global industry’.5 A study published by Scientific American argues for a $100 trillion programme, projecting that ‘100 percent of the world’s energy, for all purposes, could be supplied by wind, water and solar resources by 2030’.6 That is a fair amount of money but Fatih Birol, chief economist at the International Energy Agency, points out that: ‘Each year without an international agreement adds $500 billion to the costs – estimated at $10 trillion annually – of cleaning up the Downloaded from rac.sagepub.com at University of Wyoming Libraries on July 25, 2011 64 Race & Class 52(2) power sector to help keep temperatures within a range that would avoid unstoppable climate changes.’7 Given the scale of the problem, $100 trillion over twenty years sounds feasible. But dedicating $5 trillion a year from a world GDP of $54 trillion (2007) seems impossible without a political revolution. Although still a very small part of energy consumption, wind and solar power are rapidly expanding. Total clean energy investments in 2008 were $155 billion and $145 billion in 2009.8 Eventually renewable energy may play an economic role similar to the digital, computer and telecommunications revolution of the past thirty years. These technologies laid the basis for globalisation and vastly expanded access to knowledge and information.9 Economically there was innovation, dynamic emerging corporations and new cycles of accumulation. The technologies were also used by progressive activists across the world for organising and education. Just as the digital revolution spearheaded a new era of capitalist globalisation, so too can green technology open the door to the next era of growth while promoting important progressive changes. While these possibilities exist, they will develop within historic capitalist patterns that continually reassert themselves. Digital technologies became centralised into a handful of transnational corporations, both old and new, which today dominate the market and consume innovations through constant buy-outs. That pattern is already appearing in the green energy field, except there will be no single leading location such as Silicon Valley. Solar and wind technologies are global and they are being consolidated by a small number of competitive TNCs. This does not necessarily undercut their environmental benefits. But it does undercut the democratic possibilities for a decentralised system of energy and fails to solve the problems between capital and labour. By examining, in the following sections, the major wind and solar TNCs, the character of the new green economy can begin to be uncovered.

### Link – Structural Violence

#### Violence is embodied by economic and political systems- it must be taken into account

ZIZEK 8[ Slavoj, PHILOSOPHER and CULTURAL CRITIC, “Violence”, 2008, Spencer]

If there is a unifying thesis that runs through the bric-a-brac of reflections on violence that follow, it is that a similar paradox holds true for violence. At the forefront of our minds, the obvious signals of violence are acts of crime and terror, civil unrest, international conflict. But we should learn to step back, to disentan­gle ourselves from the fascinating lure of this directly visible "subjective" violence, violence performed by a clearly identifiable agent. We need to perceive the con­tours of the background which generates such outbursts. A step back enables us to identify a violence that sus­tains our very efforts to fight violence and to promote tolerance. This is the starting point, perhaps even the axiom, of the present book: subjective violence is just the most vis­ible portion of a triumvirate that also includes two ob­jective kinds of violence. First, there is a "symbolic" violence embodied in language and its forms, what Heide­gger would call "our house of being." As we shall see later, this violence is not only at work in the obvious-and exten­sively studied-cases of incitement and of the relations of social domination reproduced in our habitual speech forms: there is a more fundamental form of violence still that pertains to language as such, to its imposition of a certain universe of meaning. Second, there is what I call "systemic" violence, or the often catastrophic conse­quences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems. The catch is that subjective and objective violence cannot be perceived from the same standpoint: subjective violence is experienced as such against the background of a non-violent zero level. It is seen as a perturbation of the "normal," peaceful state of things. However, objec­tive violence is precisely the violence inherent to this "normal" state of things. Objective violence is invisible since it sustains the very zero-level standard against which we perceive something as subjectively violent. Systemic violence is thus something like the notorious "dark matter" of physics, the counterpart to an all-too-visible subjective violence. It may be invisible, but it has to be taken into account if one is to make sense of what otherwise seem to be "irrational" explosions of subjec­tive violence.

### Link – Transportation Equity

#### Passing the plan under a capitalist regime will fail, only technologies that benefit the elite advance in the status quo

Albert and Hahnel ’90 Michael Albert and Robin Hahnel, Hahnel is a Professor of Economics at Portland State University. He has traveled extensively advising on economic matters all over the world, <http://books.zcommunications.org/ParEcon/lookingforward/lf2_5.htm>

Our society is full of technologies that were useful to people who were in a position to give those technologies an "evolutionary advantage": assembly lines, cars, power plants, radios, telephones, disposable razors, atomic bombs, guided missiles, personal computers -ad infinitum. But we can also think of a host of efficient technologies that were unsupported- effective public transport systems, efficient large-scale solar energy systems, cars that get superior gas mileage, quality inexpensive housing, and production techniques that empower workers. All these unsupported technologies have been invented and some prototyped, but they haven't succeeded in our economic environment because they were not advantageous to those who decided their fate. They didn't fit in the environment of capitalism or in the environment of centrally planned systems, for that matter.No technology evolves and spreads unless there are people who benefit from it and have sufficient means to disseminate it. In a capitalist society, technologies useful to the rich and powerful spread. But this doesn't imply that every technology developed in capitalism is useful only to capitalists or other elites.

### Link – Transportation Infrastructure

#### Investment in public transportation is critical to sustainable capitalism and the development of a stable economy only further facilitates the growth of capitalismPollin 2008 [Robert, Economist, professor of economics at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and founding co-director of its Political Economy Research Institute. “RESURRECTION OF THE RENTIER,” <http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/other_publication_types/NLR28008.pdf>, spencer]

In my view, the political challenges involved in constructing a renewed leashed capitalism would be at least as great as those of creating a greatly expanded welfare state within the context of an otherwise unleashed capitalism. But the important difference is, once a renewed leashed capitalism has been constructed, it should be sustainable for at least as long as the Golden Age was able to last. It would be crucial, for one thing, that private investment decisions under a renewed leashed capitalism would not be guided by global financiers. This would encourage productive activity to increase relative to destabilizing speculation. The expansion of public investment under leashed capitalism—in schools, health care, public transportation and solar power generators—would promote higher productivity and a clean environment as well as a more stable investment path than one dominated by Wall Street. It could also revivethe very idea of a major public presence in establishing the economy’s growth path. An economy operating at something close to full employment in decent jobs would also mean higher average incomes, more equality and, thereby, more buoyant domestic markets. Under some circumstances, a strong domestic market can stimulate private investment even when the share of total national income going to profits has fallen.

#### The state uses transportation as a mode of profit generationWright 2006 [Erik Olin, Prof. @ University of Wisconsin – Madison, “Taking the “Social” in Socialism Seriously,” March 2006, <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Taking%20the%20social.pdf>, spencer]

Today, few socialists believe that comprehensive statist central planning is a viable structure for realizing socialist goals. Nevertheless, statist socialism remains a component of any likely process of social empowerment. The state will remain central to the provision of a wide range of public goods, from health to education to public transportation, and in spite of the record of central planning in the authoritarian command economies, it could also be the case that efficient and democratic forms of central planning over certain kinds of goods production may also be viable at some point in the future under altered historical conditions. The central question for socialists, then, is the extent to which these aspects of state provision can be effectively under the control of a democratically empowered civil society. In capitalist societies, typically, public goods provision by the state are only weakly subordinated to social power through the institutions of representative democracy. Because of the enormous influence of capitalist economic power on state policies, often such public goods are more geared to the needs of capital accumulation than social needs. Deepening the democratic quality of the state is thus the pivotal problem for direct state provision

#### Elites are using transit to get people to work—in the process, they’re running over small business owners

**Sawers et al 72** [Larry, Prof. of Economics @ American, Raiph Ives, US Trade Representative and Economist and the Dept. of Commerce, and Gary W. Lloyd, Econ Prof. @ American, “Mass Transit and the Power Elite, “ Review of Radical Political Economics 1972 Volume 4 Issue 68, Sage, spencer]

The downtown elites In Washington and elsewhere have decided to make the CBD primarily an office employment center and the historical function of the CBD as a shopping district is relegated to backstage. The long heralded revival of the central city that is to be brought about by the new transit systems will be In office work not In trade. The new transit systems will allow still more of the middle class to move to the suburbs, and they will not return to the downtown for the bulk of their shopping. Countless studies have shown that persons will not travel far to shop and, if any alternative is available, will not use mass transit for shopping trips. The only source of growth in retail trade In the CBD to be expected will come from office workers shopping during their lunch hour and working class households who live near the CBD and whose access to the downtown is Improved by the new transit lines. The business elites need land In the downtown on which to build new office buildings, but downtown land Is already crowded with thousands of small shops and other businesses. Furthermore, the cites are offended by the run-down and obsolete appearance of much of the downtown, preferring Instead that the downtown become an imitation of the sterile regional shopping centers of the suburbs. This is not to argue that the business elites have any conscious vendetta against the small entrepreneur. In fact, the public pronouncements of the elites Indicate great solicitude for their junior competitors. More likely, the small shop owner Is seen as a nuisance and Irritation. The elites do what they want with the downtown and anyone In their wav--which includes the small businessman--is run over. During the later stages of the Industrial Revolution, the small manufacturer was destroyed by the corporate giants. Since World War II, the small merchant has similarly been subject to the onslaught of monopoly capital consolidating its power. It is instructive to observe how the business elites are using the new transit systems as well as other government instruments (especially urban renewal) to force the independent shopkeeper Into bankruptcy. On the other hand, the capitalist stage of consumerism typified by US capital in the post-World War II period, and marked by the production of consumer durables (typified by the automobile industry), represents a huge departure from the market equilibrating principles of capitalism captured in the TPCS or approximated by the entrepreneurial capitalism of nineteenth century Britain. To manage the capitalist mass-production of such a relatively complex use-value cluster, consumerist capital could only at its peril, leave accumulation to the techno-structure, strive to increasingly internalize business transactions, become deeply involved in demand management and cultivate varying types of class accords with organized labour to keep interruptions of production to a minimum. The internationalization of production and finance characterizing consumerism not only intensified such trends but also contributed to corporate capitals’ need to coordinate each and every arm of business activity. Paralleling the programming and planning activities of corporate capital was the rise of the consumerist state with a formidable policy arsenal at its disposal to support capital accumulation. The social wage, creation of effective demand (military, transportation infrastructure and so on), monetary, fiscal, labour and trade policy are just a few of the well-known initiatives. The upshot of the foregoing is that the augmentation of value and viable material reproduction of the economic community in the capitalist stage of consumerism becomes more and more dependent upon extra-market principles; a trend setting the course for a peculiar political-economic outcome.

#### Circulation of people is seen to be critical to markets and progress—the state is rampantly increasing transportation infrastructure to assist markets

**Goodwin 10** [Katherine J. , PhD Student @ American’s SAIS, “Reconstructing Automobility: The Making and Breaking of Modern Transportation,” Global Environmental Politics, Volume 10, Number 4, November 2010, pp. 60-78, MUSE, Spencer]
On a larger scale, Nigel Thrift points to the shifting symbolism of the era, where circulation became a prevalent metaphor and was understood to be “causally connected to progress” in the way that the circulation of blood is causally connected to life.59 This perceived connection to progress was heightened and intensified by the modern capitalist impetus towards accessing markets. Fundamental to capitalism is the idea that “the ability of workers and machines and financial capital to find their best employment is essential to well-functioning markets, to efficient markets . . . a productive society is a mobile society.”60 Beginning in the nineteenth century, urban planners with the light of progress in their eyes “produced elaborate plans to improve roadways, build canals, improve river navigation and so on, in order to improve the ‘circulation’ of goods and people.”61 The state became invested in mobility on an unprecedented scale.

#### Transportation is the foundation for a capitalist economy and state capital accumulation

Sheppard (E, 1990, "Transportation in a capitalist space-economy: transportation demand, circulation time, and transportation innovations" Environment and Planning A 22(8) 1007 – 1024, <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a221007> BDE)

Transportation, as the service of moving commodities between places, plays a unique role in a fully competitive capitalist space-economy. The commodity of transportation is consumed as a part of virtually every economic transaction, linking the production and consumption of a commodity; demand for transportation is derived from spatial configurations rather than being fixed by socially necessary techniques and real wages; and the circulation time taken in transportation is a deduction from capitalists' profits. The impact of circulation time on profits may be calculated precisely. The derived nature of the demand for transportation adds a level of uncertainty to the impact of cost-reducing technical change on profit rates. Given this, cost-reducing and time-reducing technical change in the transportation commodity is one of the few ways of ensuring an increased rate of profit for capitalists, ceteris paribus. The public nature of transportation improvements and the high investments in fixed capital that are required help to explain the central role of the state in capitalism in the improvement of transportation and thus in underwriting capital accumulation.

#### Transportation discourse widens economic gaps and immobilizes the poor – sociospatial polarization and road pricing enable the wealthy to control space and suppress poor classes – leads to stigmas that cause cycles of disempowerment

Guy 2k (Baeten, professor of human geography at Lund university in Sweden, “The tragedy of the highway: empowerment, disempowerment and the politics of sustainability discourses and practices,” European planning studies, 2000, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=920131e5-c7ae-4bbc-9abe-9e050a96809c%40sessionmgr111&vid=1&hid=113&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=2969956)

Transport inequalities, transport exclusion and transport poverty are social issues in transport planning which have been highly neglected and underestimated. Transport exclusion implies that the already disempowered segments of society are further disadvantaged by the lack of control they can exert over transport supply (irrespective of transport modes), so that they are deprived of basic levels of transport opportunities. The mobile wealthy, in contrast, see their control over moving across space--and therefore, by implication, their control over socioeconomic conditions in society--confirmed and reinforced by the current mobility system. Adams (1996,p. 13) describes the problem of transport inequality as follows: Even when they live in close physical proximity to each other, the mobile wealthy and the immobile poor live in different worlds. The poor are confined by their lack of mobility in prisons with invisible walls. They are continually tempted and taunted, in a way that prisoners confined to cells with opaque walls are not, by the freedom and conspicuous consumption of the affluent. The wealthy can be seen and heard flying overhead, or driving along motorways through the ghetto, or on television, enjoying privileges that remain tantalisingly out of reach. To the wealthy the poor are invisible; because of the height and speed at which they travel, the wealthy tend to see the world at a lower level of resolution. Neither economists nor spatial planners have seriously addressed the matter of socio-spatial polarization between the mobile wealthy and the immobile poor. On the contrary, current transport policy discourses and practices widen the gap between the mobile wealthy and the immobile poor, because they fail to take into account the socio-economic consequences of proposed policy measures. If the proposed restrictions and repressions (like the introduction of road pricing) are to be realized, then the most important consequence will probably be that moving across space will not only be privatized but also that the mobile wealthy will strengthen their grip on the future appearance of the mobility system. The mobile wealthy will be further privileged in their access to transport facilities, without any guarantee that either the congestion or pollution problems will be solved. Nobody will applaud this transport redistribution from poor to rich, but it is remarkable to see how the issue of growing transport inequalities is absent in dominant transport discourses. The mobile wealthy incessantly make their 'wish-list' known through the media, lobbying and scientific reports, demanding, for example, mitigation of traffic congestion, traffic calming in residential areas, more traffic safety in the vicinity of schools and impeccable international accessibility of large cities. Transport exclusion does not belong to this hegemonic hierarchy of transport issues. Through it, the immobile poor's travel behaviour is suppressed, stigmatized or downright forbidden, so that they end up in a disempowering spiral of transport exclusion. In Belgium, and probably in other countries too, the stigma of 'drinking and driving' has become so strongly associated with youngsters partying on weekend evenings, that it is difficult to imagine that adults equally drive under the influence of drugs and alcohol during the week. From time to time, the issue of health-tests for the car-driving elderly emerge in the media and in policy recommendations. Poor road safety has incrementally, but very effectively, brought about a so-called 'back-seat generation' of children whose independent mobility is systematically postponed. In this way, current mobility discourses and practices lead to a purification of the transport system, wherein the mobile wealthy increase the power they already exerted over transport infrastrnctures, while others, or them, are excluded through discursive practices, transport policies and subtle but effective financial mechanisms. The mobile wealthy have taken on a revanchist offensive to regain control over congested highways, subsidized transport and unrestrained use of public space and streets. Sustainable transport rhetoric does not address the deeply conflicting character of transport planning. Underneath the surface of planning practices, there is a continuous struggle between opposed interest groups which does not fit into the sustainability discourse trying to reconcile ecology and economy. The harmonizing, conflict-avoiding and soothing vocabulary of sustainability is seriously shattered when confronted with real conflict situations and the exertion of power, resulting in processes of inclusion and exclusion, of empowerment and disempowerment. In the Brundtland report, the introduction of more democratic procedures to address the basic needs of the poor was seen as a necessary condition for the realization of 'sustainable development'. In sharp contrast with this statement, planners, ecologists and economists alike have developed discourses and practices which contribute to the further exclusion of the already disempowered groups of society. It is time to re-insert these questions of inequality and poverty into transport planning, theory and practice. If questions of social justice in the debate and praxis of mobility are not again put high on the agenda, it may force itself on to the political platform very soon by means other than words. (Swyngedouw, 1993, p. 324)

Purmmm

### Link – Urban Transportation Projects

#### Re-structuring of urban cores through mega projects furthers the urbanization of neo-liberalism

Peters, (Deike, Urban planning academic Associated Faculty at Center for Metropolitan Studies, TU Berlin, Summer 2009, “The Renaissance of Inner-City Rail Station Areas: A Key Element in Contemporary Urban Restructuring Dynamics,” <https://www.geschundkunstgesch.tu-berlin.de/fileadmin/fg95/Hauptordner_Megaprojekte/literaturanhang/Peters_162_185.pdf> BDE)

The ongoing remaking of urban cores through urban redevelopment mega-projects is part and parcel of the “urbanization of neoliberalism” (Brenner and Theodore 2002) and post-Fordist restructuring. Large-scale manufacturing employment and production have given way to an urban economy dominated by service-, knowledge-, and consumption-based industries (Harvey 1989). The heightened competition for investments forces cities’ governing elites to search proactively for new opportunities of economic growth, leading to processes of disembedding (Castells 1996), the emergence of new “geographies of centrality” (Sassen 1991), and a shift from a “managerial” to an “entrepreneurial” governance approach (Harvey 1989; Dangschat 1992). Meanwhile, new logistics and distribution gateways and terminals are emerging at the edges of large metropolitan areas (Hesse 2008). Central cities are gaining ground as key locales for capitalist consumption and culture. Urban cores are (re-)gentrified as attractive tourist spaces (Judd and Fainstein 1999; Hoffman et al. 2003; Hannigan 1999) and as prime living and working spaces for the “creative class” (Florida 2002). An updated version of urban “growth machine politics” emerges (Molotch 1976; Logan and Molotch 1987; Savitch and Kantor 2002) which, in Europe, is strongly related to the EU Lisbon Agenda and corresponding national politics. The specifics of these processes need to be understood through solid macro- and micro-level analyses that feature in-depth comparative case studies of particular places and actors within particular cities. There is not one single dominant theory on contemporary urban restructuring, of course. Rather, there are several strands of literature vying for prominence, each contributing certain key insights to the complex subject matter and presenting sometimes-conflicting views on the same cities. 2 Nevertheless, there is wide agreement among urban scholars that postindustrial, post-Fordist, neoliberal restructuring represents a double-edged sword for cities. High-speed communication and transportation infrastructures enable corporations to avoid the high land costs and negative agglomeration externalities associated with high-profile central city locations and relocate elsewhere. However, for many key, high-profile economic activities, “place still matters” (Dreier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom 2004). Sassen (1991) first showed how advanced producer and financial services remain clustered in urban cores, and how certain centralizing tendencies in fact intensify in “global cities” that represent the most strategic command and control centers of the global economy. 3

**Transportation infrastructure was the birth of capitalism in America**

**Watson ‘7** (Harry, Professor of History and Director of the Center for the Study of the American South, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “From Capitalism to Sectionalism”, Project muse)

**American scholars had long recognized that a "Transportation Revolution" had been crucial to broader developments in the antebellum period**, employing a long-familiar label introduced by George Rogers Taylor in 1951. Building on the work of Clark and his peers, **scholars like** Sean **Wilentz began to argue that Taylor's concept had been sound but too limited**. In this view, **the revolutionary impact of nineteenth-century innovations like turnpikes, steamboats, and canals had been the creation or expansion of long-distance markets inside the United States, which led to fundamental changes in the production, sale, and** [End Page 191] **consumption of agricultural and manufactured goods, followed by far-reaching effects on the organization of work, social structure, class relations, culture, religion, and politics. Hence the term "Market Revolution,"** made widely visible by the title of Charles Sellers's massive synthesis, The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846.4 The work of Christopher Clark has thus been seminal to a major and extended development in American scholarship over the last generation, a consideration that will color any serious reading of his new, wide-ranging synthesis of the social history of the early republic, Social Change in America: From the Revolution Through the Civil War. **Clark originally argued that the basic unit of eighteenth-century society had not been the isolated individual of Lockean theory, but the independent household, especially the patriarchal family on its freehold farm. The household's objective was not to maximize return on its modest capital but to protect its independence and standard of living from one harvest to the next and to secure its children's future by transmitting the same opportunity for independence to a rising generation**. With these goals, the household practiced what Gavin Wright called "safety-first" farming.5 **Rather than risk their survival on commercial ventures that might enrich them—but could bankrupt them just as easily—ordinary farming families concentrated on the production of food crops for their own consumption and sold little more than what remained after their own needs were satisfied.** Without a large cash income, farm families obtained most of what they could not produce at home through a dense network of barter and shared favors with neighbors and kin. **But when the population pressure and the tradition of partible inheritance eventually made this "household economy" difficult to sustain, New England families had to change their strategies, adopting new expedients created by new opportunities to market their products at long distances.** As the eighteenth century waned, **they farmed more intensively and sold the produce.** At piecework wages, they took in outwork from manufacture's middlemen. **They eventually sent their daughters to Lowell and their sons to sea. As they did, capitalism, wage labor, and the cash-based market economy grew steadily, along with a new social structure dominated by large and small businessmen at the top and middle, and permanent wage-earners at the bottom. In time, the older household economy faded away, though not without protest from Jacksonian partisans who fought the leading instruments of the new economy, especially banks and paper money.**

## \*\*\*Impacts

### V2L

#### The capitalist drive leads to the commodification of everything

Collins and Graham, 2009

[Christy and Phil, both from Queensland University of Technology, (2009). Political Geographies of Mars: A history of Martian management. Management and Organisation History, 4(3), Online, Sage Publications, <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/21225/1/21225.pdf>, MB]

In order to understand the politics of Martian spatiality, it is also necessary to briefly contextualize them within capitalism. The trajectory of western political economieshas unquestionably been towards the monetization and commodification of everything imaginable. Behind this drive has been, first, the propertied classes of Europe and, latterly, a more universalized managerial class. What was to be owned, claimed, and commodified under capitalism was prefigured in the enclosures movement that began in the late 14th century. The shape of future capitalist commodification strategies became further evident in moves by early traders to ‘gather up’ and concentrate the efforts of Europe’s traditional craft workers in a piecework system that de‐localized the character of work (Weber 1930). Rather than being seen or experienced as an expression of accumulated history, tradition, and local knowledge, labour became oriented towards the future realization of a price, whether on the part of traders (as profits) or workers (as wages). The dominant tense of work thereby moved from past to future, from actual to potential, from a network of mutual obligations to motives of future personal gain (Graham 2001). By the late 20th century, the full expression of this movement came in the form of a massive debt bubble. Seen at its most abstract and general level, the current global financial crisis is nothing less than the commodification of future human life and energies. Thus the arc of capitalist commodification can be seen to stretch from heritage, culture, and tradition – broadly speaking, the Past – to the commodification of all future social relations (Graham 2002).We see this as an inherent and inevitable function of contemporary managerial discourse, which today begins all approaches to reality with a ‘strategic plan’: a technical device for defining, shaping, and controlling future environmental and factoral contingencies based on expectations of profit and personal gain, all of which is to be achieved through increased control and ‘efficiencies’. Here is NASA on the matter of management:

Due to the production of surplus under capitalism tropical rainforest risk ecological extinction and ecological extinction will lead to humanity’s extinction
John Bellamy Foster ‘2002
[a writer on just capitalism in the modern day, Capitalism and Ecology, [http://monthlyreview.org/20 02/09/01/capitalism-and-ecology](http://monthlyreview.org/20%2002/09/01/capitalism-and-ecology), June 15, 2002, WFI-KC]
There is no reason to believe that the damage inflicted on the environment is most serious where it principally affects the conditions of production, which by definition involve elements of the natural-physical environment that have been substantially incorporated into the system. The Amazon forest may have provided hardwood timber and other resources for capital, but most of it has until recently been outside what can be called the conditions of production of capitalism. The fifty percent of all species that are believed to reside in the tropical forests and are currently threatened with extinction in a matter of decades, are not only for the most part not incorporated into the global accumulation process, most of them remain undocumented, still unknown to science. If we take the case of the ozone layer, which has been thinned enormously, imperiling the very existence of life on earth, it would clearly be a mistake to try to squeeze this into an analysis of the conditions of production—as if it were simply a precondition of the economy and not a precondition of life as we know it. All of this suggests that an argument that focuses on conditions of production and the “second contradiction” of capitalism tends to downplay the full dimensions of the ecological crisis and even of capitalism’s impact on the environment in the process of trying to force everything into the locked box of a specific economic crisis theory. Capitalism’s tendency to displace environmental problems (the fact that it uses the whole biosphere as a giant trash can and at the same time is able to run to some extent from one ecosystem to another, operating, as Marx said, under the principle of “after me the deluge”), means that the earth remains in large part a “free gift to capital.” Nor is there any prospect that this will change fundamentally, since capitalism is in many ways a system of unpaid costs.

### Nukes / Prolif root cause

#### CAPITALISM IS THE ROOT CAUSE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

A World to Win News Service (a political and theoretical review inspired by the formation of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, the embryonic center of the world’s Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties and organizations) 8/3/2009

[“Hiroshima, Nagasaki and now” online @ http://revcom.us/a/173/AWTWNS-Hiroshima-en.html, loghry]

Obama's crusade against nuclear proliferation is a crusade against other countries getting in on this criminal game, and even that is subordinate to the interests of the American empire. Putting aside the question of North Korea (maybe two warheads), the two main nuclear newcomers, Pakistan (15 warheads) and India (75 so far), acquired this status with American complicity. No matter where it got the technology, Pakistan acquired nukes when it was a trusted ally of the United States, and now the U.S. is turbocharging India's nuclear program. (The U.S. supposedly is only helping India on the civilian power plant side, but the same arguments about the eventual dual uses of the technology in Iran are just as applicable here.) Could this be to contain China's ambitions? The U.S. is unlikely to give up its nukes. But consider what would happen even if it did: In the last several years, no less a gang of proven war criminals than former U.S. secretaries of state Henry Kissinger, George Shultz and William Perry (under presidents Nixon, Reagan and Clinton respectively) and the warmonger former Senator Sam Nunn have called for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. Why? "Because a world without nuclear weapons is one in which the United States would have complete dominance," a hydrogen bomb designer told a writer on this subject for the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists (May 13, 2008). Some imperialist war strategists consider nukes a "spoiler" in that they enable small countries to make big threats. Without them, the U.S could be in an even stronger position to exert its will because of the unchallengeable power, at this point, of a military whose size and advanced technology is based on the wealth attained by the very global exploitation it was organized to enforce and expand. The world has seen war after war since the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki signalled the U.S. drive toward world hegemony. The end of the "Cold War," a confrontation between rival imperialist blocs during which the U.S. and USSR waged local proxy wars against each other while threatening global nuclear winter, brought about very important changes, but not world peace. Instead, it prompted a new U.S. hegemonic offensive and a new round of direct imperialist invasions, marked by the "death from the skies" that has been the U.S.'s signature, along with heartbreaking wars in Yugoslavia, Rwanda (and its aftermath in Congo), Sudan and other places where big power rivalry has been at work aggravating other contradictions. The interrupted stream of horrendous violence even since the last world war should tell us something. The root cause lies not in any particular government but in the imperialist system in which a tiny handful of capitalists in a small number of countries control and clash over the wealth produced by the world's people in their billions.

### Warming root cause

#### CAPITALISM IS THE ROOT CAUSE OF WARMING – LEADS TO EXTINCTION

Phil Lee (Staff) 4/21/2010

[“Capitalism is root cause of climate change – President Evo Morales” online @ http://www.foei.org/en/blog/capitalism-is-root-cause-of-climate-change-2013-president-evo-morales, loghry]

President Evo Morales of Bolivia did not mince words yesterday when he diagnosed the root cause of climate change as being capitalism and all that it entails. The President was speaking at the formal opening of the first-ever World Peoples Climate Change Summit (CMPCC). The Tiquipaya stadium, venue of the event, was filled to capacity with about 10,000 people from the nations and continents of the world. Many more milled around the streets outside the stadium while thousands more queued in the town square waiting for accreditation to participate in the conference. Present on the platform with the President was the Vice President of Burundi, country ambassadors and representatives of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) secretariat. Seventeen thousand participants were expected at this conference but by the end of the second day up to 30,000 had registered. Victory in Copenhagen The opening ceremony was colourful in the literal sense with multicoloured flags waving, music by musicians from various countries and rituals carried out by leaders of indigenous peoples of the Americas. There was also poetry (written and read by this writer. See end of this report). To President Morales, the Copenhagen climate conference was not a failure but a victory. According to him, it was a failure of governments but a victory for the peoples of the world. "We are here today because the governments of the world could not reach an agreement in Copenhagen on cutting emissions and acting on climate change,” he said. "If they had reached a just agreement, this gathering would not have been necessary." According to Morales, capitalism and its pursuit of profits and limitless extraction of resources in a finite world is hastening the disappearance of species, the rise of hunger, melting of glaciers and small island nations may disappear. He added that in the last 100 years, developed countries with 20% of the world’s population have generated over 76% of carbon emissions responsible for climate change. "Capitalism merchandises everything. It seeks continual expansion. The system needs to be changed. We have to choose between change or death," President Morales warned, adding, "Capitalism is the number one enemy of mankind.”

### Environmental destruction root cause

#### CAPITALISM IS THE ROOT CAUSE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION – RESOURCE CONTROL, PRODUCTION AND TESTING OF WMDS, AND PROMOTION OF INDIVIDUALISM

MIM (Maoist Internationalist Movement) March 1996

[“On Capitalism and the Environment” online @ http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/mt/mt12capenv.html, loghry]

The root cause of environmental problems is capitalism, the private ownership of the means of production by a relative handful of people. This essence of capitalism is one reason why capitalism creates environmental problems: while the majority of the world's people have a material interest in maintaining a healthy planet, the small capitalist ruling class is not accountable to this majority, except in the indirect sense that the ruling class seeks to co-opt the demands of the majority in order to maintain the capitalist system. A second reason why capitalism creates environmental problems is that although the world's resources are controlled by a relative handful of people, planning is not centralized under capitalism. Instead, production is anarchic; it is centered around making profits, not around meeting basic human needs in the short or long runs. Much of what is produced by the capitalist system is unnecessary and wasteful, and the system is not fundamentally capable of incorporating long-term human survival as a need. Finally, the capitalist system does not distribute resources equitably. Under capitalism, many people do not have adequate resources for survival. Many environmental problems stem from this root problem. Furthermore, capitalism is not static. It has changed since Marx's day. Today, it has developed to its highest stage: imperialism.(1) Under imperialism, the capitalists carve and recarve the world. The unequal distribution of resources takes on a distinctly national flavor, with a division of the world into imperialist countries on the one hand and colonies and neocolonies on the other hand. Imperialism exploits both the natural and the human resources of its colonies and neocolonies. In their attempts to recarve the world, the imperialists invest heavily in ever-more-powerful weapons of mass destruction. The production, testing, and use of these weapons is yet another way in which capitalism wreaks havoc on the environment. Capitalism does not just dominate in the economic, military, and political spheres. It also propagates its own ideology and culture. Capitalism promotes individualism, an ideology that values individuals and small groups (romantic couples and nuclear families in particular) over larger collectives of people, let alone the majority of humanity. This ideology, too, is harmful to the environment. "Since the '70s, the imperialists and their retinue of bourgeois scientists, ideologues and publicists have adopted environmentalism to [accomplish various aims including] to make the people in the industrial capitalist countries think of clean air and clean water and good health in a self-indulgent way."(2)

### Terrorism root cause

#### CAPITALISM IS THE ROOT CAUSE OF TERRORISM

DSM (Democratic Socialist Movement of Nigeria) 9/11/2001

[“STOP THE WAR!” online @ http://www.socialistalternative.org/literature/911/dsm.html, loghry]

It is not ruled out that the US may succeed in overthrowing the Taliban regime and eliminate Osama bin Laden through the ongoing war. However, it is completely illusory to think that by such "success" terrorism will be eradicated or substantially reduced. This is because the root cause of terrorism and the growth of terrorist groups is the exploitative and oppressive economic, political and foreign policies of the imperialist capitalist countries like the US in many parts of the globe but especially in the "Third World." The growth in Islamic fundamentalism and spread of extremist Islamic group for instance is a product of the unresolved crisis in the Middle East. As we explained in the special bulletin of Socialist Democracy in September, 2001: "For over five decades, the US and other advanced capitalist countries like Britain, France and Germany have, for their own selfish economic and strategic calculations, connived with the Israeli ruling class to block the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for an independent Palestinian state. Over a million Palestinian masses are compelled to live in refugee camps in the West Bank and Gaza Strip under virtual Israeli military occupation and economic blockade. The Palestinian and Arab masses are aware that the US is the strongest political and military ally of the Israeli ruling class, subsidising the Israeli state machine to the tune of billions of dollars annually." "It is this barbaric and oppressive rule to which the Palestinians have been subjected for decades which has led to increase in mass support for Islamic fundamentalists and extremist Arab militant groups in the Middle East and elsewhere in the Muslim world. The frustration caused by decades of unrelenting mass poverty, unemployment, political repression and military occupation has led to the emergence of a generation of Palestinian and Arab youth who are ready to lay down their lives through suicide terrorist missions in the wrong belief that this is the only way to strike at their oppressors in Israel, US and elsewhere." "It is this situation that has unfortunately made innocent citizens of US, other western nations and Israel the primary targets of terrorist attacks. At the same time, it is what has turned Arab figures like Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden into heroes in the eyes of most Palestinian and Arab masses. Therefore, any plan or programme allegedly aimed at combating terrorism which fails to address the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian masses and the other national and social conflicts in the Middle East is irredeemably doomed to fail."

## \*\*\*Alternative

### Do Nothing (Zizek)

#### The alternative is to refuse action in the face of the crisis presented by the affirmative and do nothing

#### THAT WAS THE TEXT. NOW, SO THERE’S NO CONFUSION, HERE’S THE EVIDENCE THAT SAYS THAT SOLVES:

ZIZEK 2004

[Slavoj, Serbian Nationalist and Historical Revisionist, Revolution at the Gates, p. 169-171 //wyo-tjc]

Indeed, since the “normal” functioning of capitalism involves some kind of disavowal of the basic principle of its functioning (today’s model capitalist is someone who, after ruthlessly generating profit, then generously shares parts of it, giving large donations to churches, victims of ethnic or sexual abuse, etc., posing as a humanitarian), the ultimate act of transgression is to assert this principle directly, depriving it of its humanitarian mask. I am therefore tempted to reverse Marx’s Thesis 11: the first task today is precisely not to succumb to the temptation to act, to intervene directly and change things {which then inevitably ends in a cul-de-sac of debilitating impossibility: “What can we do against global capital?”), but to question the hegemonic ideological co-ordinates. In short, our historical moment is still that of Adorno: to the Question “What should we do?” I can most often truly answer with “I don’t know.” I can only try to analyse rigorously what there is. Here people reproach me: When you practice criticism, you are also obliged to say how one should make it better. To my mind, this is incontrovertibly a bourgeois prejudice. Many times in history it so happened that the very works which pursued purely theoretical goals transformed consciousness and thereby also social reality. If, today, we follow a direct call to act, this act will not be performed in an empty space—it will be an act within the hegemonic ideological cooridinates: those who “really want to do something to help people” get involved in {undoubtedly honourable} exploits like *Medecins sans frontiers*, Greenpeace, feminist and anti-racist campaigns, which are all not only tolerated but even supported by the media, even if they seemingly encroach on economic territory (for example, denouncing and boycotting companies which do not respect ecological conditions, or use child labour) – they are tolerated and supported as long as they do not get too close to a certain limit. This kind of activity provides the perfect example of interpassivity? Of doing things not in order to achieve something, but to prevent something from really happening, really changing. All this frenetic humanitarian, politically correct, etc. activity fits the formula of “Let’s go on changing something all the time so that, globally, things will remain the same!” If standard cultural studies criticize capitalism, they do so in the coded way that exemplifies Hollywood liberal paranoia: the enemy is “the system”, the hidden “organization”, the anti-democratic “conspiracy” not simply capitalism and state apparatuses. The problem with this critical stance is not only that it replaces concrete social analysis with a struggle against abstract paranoic fantasies, but that – in a typical paranoic gesture – it unnecessarily redoubles social reality, as if there were a secret Organization behind the “visible” capitalist and state organs. What we should accept is that there is no need for a secret “organization-within-an-organization”: the “conspiracy” is already in the “visible” organization as such, in the capitalist system, in the way the political space and state apparatuses work.

#### The alternative is to reject the affirmative and do nothing when pressed with the affirmatives urgent sense of time- A critical analysis of the situation is the only way to attempt to solve

ZIZEK 8[ Slavoj, PHILOSOPHER and CULTURAL CRITIC, “Violence”, 2008, Spencer]

The key question, of course, is what kind of descrip­tion is intended here? Surely it is not a realistic descrip­tion of the situation, but what Wallace Stevens called "description without place," which is what is proper to art. This is not a description which locates its content in a historical space and time, but a description which creates, as the background of the phenomena it describes, an inexistent (virtual) space of its own, so that what appears in it is not an appearance sustained by the depth of reality behind it, but a decontextualised appearance, an appearance which fully coincides with real being. To quote Stevens again: "What it seems it is and in such seeming all things are." Such an artistic description "is not a sign for something that lies outside its form."5 Rather, it extracts from the confused reality its own in­ner form in the same way that Schoenberg "extracted" the inner form of totalitarian terror. He evoked the way this terror affects subjectivity. Does this recourse to artistic description imply that we are in danger of regressing to a contemplative atti­tude that somehow betrays the urgency to "do some­thing" about the depicted horrors? Let's think about the fake sense of urgency that per­vades the left-liberal humanitarian discourse on violence: in it, abstraction and graphic (pseudo)concreteness co­exist in the staging of the scene of violence-against women, blacks, the homeless, gays... "A woman is raped every six seconds in this country" and "In the time it takes you to read this paragraph, ten children will die of hunger" are just two examples. Underlying all this is a hypocritical sentiment of moral outrage. Just this kind of pseudo-urgency was exploited by Starbucks a couple of years ago when, at store entrances, posters greeting customers pointed out that a portion of the chain's prof­its went into health-care for the children of Guatemala, the source of their coffee, the inference being that with every cup you drink, you save a child's life. There is a fundamental anti-theoretical edge to these urgent injunctions. There is no time to reflect: we have to *act now.* Through this fake sense of urgency, the post-industrial rich, living in their secluded virtual world, not only do not deny or ignore the harsh reality outside their area-they actively refer to it all the time. As Bill Gates recently put it: "What do computers mat­ter when millions are still unnecessarily dying of dys­entery?" Against this fake urgency, we might want to place Marx's wonderful letter to Engels of 1870, when, for a brief moment, it seemed that a European revolution was again at the gates. Marx's letter conveys his sheer panic: can't the revolutionaries wait for a couple of years? He hasn't yet finished his *Capital.* A critical analysis of the present global constella­tion-one which offers no clear solution, no "practical" advice on what to do, and provides no light at the end of the tunnel, since one is well aware that this light might belong to a train crashing towards us-usually meets with reproach: "Do you mean we should do *nothing?* Just sit and wait?" One should gather the courage to answer: "YES, precisely that!" There are situations when the only truly "practical" thing to do is to resist the temptation to engage immediately and to "wait and see" by means of a patient, critical analysis. Engagement seems to exert its pressure on us from all directions. In a well-known passage from his *Existentialism and Hu­manism,* Sartre deployed the dilemma of a young man in France in 1942, torn between the duty to help his lone, ill mother and the duty to enter the Resistance and fight the Germans; Sartre's point is, of course, that there is no a priori answer to this dilemma. The young man needs to make a decision grounded only in his own abyssal freedom and assume full responsibility for it.6

### Alt – Historical Materialism (Tumino)

#### Third is the Alternative is to Vote Negative to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.

#### THIS IS NOT THE ALTERNATIVE, BUT IN TRUTH THE ONLY OPTION— METHOD IS THE FOREMOST POLITICAL QUESTION BECAUSE ONE MUST UNDERSTAND THE EXISTING SOCIAL TOTALITY BEFORE ONE CAN ACT ON IT—GROUNDING THE SITES OF POLITICAL CONTESTATION OR KNOWLEDGE OUTSIDE OF LABOR AND SURPLUS VALUE MERELY SERVE TO HUMANIZE CAPITAL AND PREVENT A TRANSITION TO A SOCIETY BEYOND OPPRESSION

TUMINO (Prof. English @ Pitt) 2001 [Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online //wyo-tjc]

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity.

I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

### AT: Cap Good – Not Sustainable

#### Capitalism is not sustainable by its nature- and, by nature, it needs infinitely expanding markets and resources- this is not ecologically sound on a finite planet.

#### Newman 06

[Robert, writer for The Guardian, “It’s Capitalism or a Habitable Planet- You Can’t Have Both”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2006/feb/02/energy.comment> //wyo-MU]
There is no meaningful response to climate change without massive social change. A cap on this and a quota on the other won't do it. Tinker at the edges as we may, we cannot sustain earth's life-support systems within the present economic system. Capitalism is not sustainable by its very nature. It is predicated on infinitely expanding markets, faster consumption and bigger production in a finite planet. And yet this ideological model remains the central organising principle of our lives, and as long as it continues to be so it will automatically undo (with its invisible hand) every single green initiative anybody cares to come up with. Much discussion of energy, with never a word about power, leads to the fallacy of a low-impact, green capitalism somehow put at the service of environmentalism. In reality, power concentrates around wealth. Private ownership of trade and industry means that the decisive political force in the world is private power. The corporation will outflank every puny law and regulation that seeks to constrain its profitability. It therefore stands in the way of the functioning democracy needed to tackle climate change. Only by breaking up corporate power and bringing it under social control will we be able to overcome the global environmental crisis. On these pages we have been called on to admire capital's ability to take robust action while governments dither. All hail Wal-Mart for imposing a 20% reduction in its own carbon emissions. But the point is that supermarkets are over. We cannot have such long supply lines between us and our food. Not any more. The very model of the supermarket is unsustainable, what with the packaging, food miles and destruction of British farming. Small, independent suppliers, processors and retailers or community-owned shops selling locally produced food provide a social glue and reduce carbon emissions. The same is true of food co-ops such as Manchester's bulk-distribution scheme serving former "food deserts". All hail BP and Shell for having got beyond petroleum to become non-profit eco-networks supplying green energy. But fail to cheer the Fortune 500 corporations that will save us all and ecologists are denounced as anti-business. Many career environmentalists fear that an anti-capitalist position is what's alienating the mainstream from their irresistible arguments. But is it not more likely that people are stunned into inaction by the bizarre discrepancy between how extreme the crisis described and how insipid the solutions proposed? Go on a march to the House of Commons. Write a letter to your MP. And what system does your MP hold with? Name one that isn't pro-capitalist. Oh, all right then, smartarse. But name five. We are caught between the Scylla and Charybdis of climate change and peak oil. Once we pass the planetary oil production spike (when oil begins rapidly to deplete and demand outstrips supply), there will be less and less net energy available to humankind. Petroleum geologists reckon we will pass the world oil spike sometime between 2006 and 2010. It will take, argues peak-oil expert Richard Heinberg, a second world war effort if many of us are to come through this epoch. Not least because modern agribusiness puts hundreds of calories of fossil-fuel energy into the fields for each calorie of food energy produced. Catch-22, of course, is that the very worst fate that could befall our species is the discovery of huge new reserves of oil, or even the burning into the sky of all the oil that's already known about, because the climate chaos that would unleash would make the mere collapse of industrial society a sideshow bagatelle. Therefore, since we've got to make the switch from oil anyway, why not do it now? Solutions need to come from people themselves. But once set up, local autonomous groups need to be supported by technology transfers from state to community level. Otherwise it's too expensive to get solar panels on your roof, let alone set up a local energy grid. Far from utopian, this has a precedent: back in the 1920s the London boroughs of Wandsworth and Battersea had their own electricity-generating grid for their residents. So long as energy corporations exist, however, they will fight tooth and nail to stop whole postal districts seceding from the national grid. Nor will the banks and the CBI be neutral bystanders, happy to observe the inroads participatory democracy makes in reducing carbon emissions, or a trade union striking for carbon quotas. There are many organisational projects we can learn from. The Just Transition Alliance, for example, was set up by black and Latino groups in the US working with labour unions to negotiate alliances between "frontline workers and fenceline communities", that is to say between union members who work in polluting industries and stand to lose their jobs if the plant is shut down, and those who live next to the same plant and stand to lose their health if it's not. We have to start planning seriously not just a system of personal carbon rationing but at what limit to set our national carbon ration. Given a fixed UK carbon allowance, what do we spend it on? What kinds of infrastructure do we wish to build, retool or demolish? What kinds of organisational structures will work as climate change makes pretty much all communities more or less "fenceline" and almost all jobs more or less "frontline"? (Most of our carbon emissions come when we're at work). To get from here to there we must talk about climate chaos in terms of what needs to be done for the survival of the species rather than where the debate is at now or what people are likely to countenance tomorrow morning. If we are all still in denial about the radical changes coming - and all of us still are - there are sound geological reasons for our denial. We have lived in an era of cheap, abundant energy. There never has and never will again be consumption like we have known. The petroleum interval, this one-off historical blip, this freakish bonanza, has led us to believe that the impossible is possible, that people in northern industrial cities can have suntans in winter and eat apples in summer. But much as the petroleum bubble has got us out of the habit of accepting the existence of zero-sum physical realities, it's wise to remember that they never went away. You can either have capitalism or a habitable planet. One or the other, not both.

#### Capitalism will inevitably fail

Jim Blair No Date Provided, Mr. Blair has more than 35 years' experience with venture and emerging growth companies. In the course of this experience, he has been involved in the creation and successful development at the Board level of more than 40 life sciences ventures: "The Future Of Capitalism"<http://www.bigissueground.com>

/politics/blair-futureofcapitalism.shtml

The last point in the book is probably the most important, and I don't know if he is right or not. He claims that Capitalism has no mechanism to insure investment for the long range future, and this will lead to stagnation. The rate of economic growth has been falling since at least the 1950's (and maybe since the last century). As the average age increases, people have ever less interest in long term investments. Before Social Security and welfare there was an incentive to save for retirement and for the "rainy day". But now people have less need to. US tax laws reward consumption but penalize saving. The saving rate is falling. And of course, it is money saved and invested (rather than consumed) which provides the capital for future progress. In the last century, private investment built the railroads and canals. But more recently, the government has provided the capital for major projects like the interstate highways, the internet and space exploration. John Kenneth Galbraith's 1962 book American Capitalism claimed that the US corporation was the ideal institution to promote technological development. Individual people may have a "short term" outlook, but a corporation can live forever, and can take a long view. Back in the 1960's big companies like Du Pont hired PhD chemists, even though it had no specific job for them to do. They were just put in a lab (like in Wilmington Delaware) and told to look for things that might pay off in the future. (I know. I was one of them). Bell Labs (the telephone company!) found the leftover heat from the original "Big Bang", and developed the transistor. But since anti-trust breakup of the giant companies, and more intense foreign competition, they can't afford that sort of "luxury" any more. Some say that government sponsored research has displaced corporate R&D. As the government withdraws, companies will get more involved. The space program will be an important test case for this idea. The potential profit from space is big (how much is the universe worth?). But the investment is also big and the payoff could be decades away.

### AT: Cap Good (epistemology)

#### THEIR TRUTH CLAIMS ARE TRAPPED IN THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF CAPITALISM – ESPECIALLY WITHIN THE ACADEMY – CAPITALISM USES THESE TRUTHS TO JUSTIFY ITS OWN EXISTENCE

Freya Schiwy & (PhD candidate @ Duke University) Michael Ennis (PhD candidate @ Duke University) 2002

[“Knowledges and the Known: Andean Perspectives on Capitalism and Epistemology” Nepantla: Views from South 3.1, loghry]

The essays gathered in this dossier respond to issues raised during the workshop “Knowledges and the Known: Capitalism and the Geopolitics of Knowledge,” held at Duke University in November 2000. They address concerns about the possibilities for critical knowledge production at a moment when national state structures are reconfiguring into global institutions and when technologies (like gene prospecting) and epistemic regimes (like property rights and human rights) are installing the particular as a new universal, following the legacy of Enlightenment philosophy and Western political theory. They ask how knowledge production is linked to location and subjectivity and what the importance of these critical perspectives can be when neoliberal capitalism increasingly instrumentalizes and commodifies knowledge, reinforcing the growing dependence of universities around the world on corporate money. It is precisely within this context that Oscar Guardiola-Rivera engages current critical theory from the perspective of coloniality. Although the essays by Catherine Walsh and Javier Sanjinés address contemporary indigenous uprisings in the Andes, these movements are not their object of study. Instead of being about knowledge production in the Andes, all three of these articles are efforts to think about epistemology from the Andes.1 The Duke workshop was conceived as the continuation of a conversation begun in Bogotá in October 1999 during the international [End Page 1] conference “La reestructuración de las ciencias sociales en los paises andinos” and as the second part of a joint project between the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana's Instituto Pensar and Duke University's Global Studies and the Humanities program. The goal of the Duke seminar was to think about epistemology and capitalism in multiple locations while taking advantage of the Andean perspective on the structural positioning of knowledge production. Our initial reference point was a series of publications: the Gulbenkian Commission report on the opening of the social sciences (Wallerstein et al. 1996); Orin Starn's (1992) critique of area studies; a similar critique from the perspective of internal colonialism articulated by Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui (1990); and two approaches to combining issues in coloniality with those of gender, one by Rivera Cusicanqui (1997) and the other by Chandra Mohanty (1988). We suggested that participants reflect on what it would mean to “open the social sciences” at a planetary level if these social sciences remained tied to their origins as described in the Gulbenkian Commission report, which sees the expansion of the social sciences as complicit with capitalism. We also asked them to consider what alternative forms of knowledge production might exist in the absence of social sciences or disciplinary formations in general. Rather than answering these questions in a disembodied manner where social sciences and humanities correspond to disciplinary formations and regard seemingly universal cognitive structures (i.e., knowledge/the known), we suggested insisting on the role of bodies, institutions, and socioeconomic structures in the production of knowledge. This perspective would allow the particularities of place to inform our thinking and at the same time help us acknowledge that all thinking (even that which aspires to universality and disregards its own embodiment) is rooted in places and follows particular interests (i.e., knowledges). Instead of reflecting theoretically about the relationships between knowledge and capitalism from perspectives that seem to arise out of nowhere but entail exclusively Eurocentric genealogies and perspectives, participants would be taking advantage of the Andean experiences of the relationship between capitalism and knowledge and asking about the ideological parameters that have configured the region as a region (i.e., knowledge). In this sense we could contribute to breaking “the power of coloniality” that binds capitalism, knowledge production, and Eurocentrism (Quijano 2000).

### AT: Perm w/ extreme prejudice

#### THERE IS ZERO POTENTIAL FOR PERM SOLVENCY – VOTING NEGATIVE FUNCTIONS AS A PROTEST TO THE AFFIRMATIVES ATTEMPT TO COOPT POLITICS IN THE NAME OF SAVING US. THEIR STATE REFORM ONLY SERVES TO REFINE CAPITALISM’S NATURALIZATION OF CONTROL

The Invisible Committee (TIC is a collective & anonymous penname – reportedly of 9 anarchists from Tarnac, France) 2009

 [The Coming Insurrection, Semiotext(e) & MIT Press, online @ http://tarnac9.wordpress.com/texts/the-coming-insurrection/, loghry]

From whatever angle you approach it, the present offers no way out. This is not the least of its virtues. From those who seek hope above all, it tears away every firm ground. Those who claim to have solutions are contradicted almost immediately. Everyone agrees that things can only get worse. “The future has no future” is the wisdom of an age that, for all its appearance of perfect normalcy, has reached the level of consciousness of the first punks. The sphere of political representation has come to a close. From left to right, it’s the same nothingness striking the pose of an emperor or a savior, the same sales assistants adjusting their discourse according to the findings of the latest surveys. Those who still vote seem to have no other intention than to desecrate the ballot box by voting as a pure act of protest. We’re beginning to suspect that it’s only against voting itself that people continue to vote. Nothing we’re being shown is adequate to the situation, not by far. In its very silence, the populace seems infinitely more mature than all these puppets bickering amongst themselves about how to govern it. The ramblings of any Belleville chibani contain more wisdom than all the declarations of our so-called leaders. The lid on the social kettle is shut triple-tight, and the pressure inside continues to build. From out of Argentina, the specter of Que Se Vayan Todos is beginning to seriously haunt the ruling class. The flames of November 2005 still flicker in everyone’s minds. Those first joyous fires were the baptism of a decade full of promise. The media fable of “banlieue vs. the Republic” may work, but what it gains in effectiveness it loses in truth. Fires were lit in the city centers, but this news was methodically suppressed. Whole streets in Barcelona burned in solidarity, but no one knew about it apart from the people living there. And it’s not even true that the country has stopped burning. Many different profiles can be found among the arrested, with little that unites them besides a hatred for existing society – not class, race, or even neighborhood. What was new wasn’t the “banlieue revolt,” since that was already going on in the 80s, but the break with its established forms. These assailants no longer listen to anybody, neither to their Big Brothers and Big Sisters, nor to the community organizations charged with overseeing the return to normal. No “SOS Racism” could sink its cancerous roots into this event, whose apparent conclusion can be credited only to fatigue, falsification and the media omertà. This whole series of nocturnal vandalisms and anonymous attacks, this wordless destruction, has widened the breach between politics and the political. No one can honestly deny the obvious: this was an assault that made no demands, a threat without a message, and it had nothing to do with “politics.” One would have to be oblivious to the autonomous youth movements of the last 30 years not to see the purely political character of this resolute negation of politics. Like lost children we trashed the prized trinkets of a society that deserves no more respect than the monuments of Paris at the end of the Bloody Week- and knows it. There will be no social solution to the present situation. First, because the vague aggregate of social milieus, institutions, and individualized bubbles that is called, with a touch of antiphrasis, “society,” has no consistency. Second, because there’s no longer any language for common experience. And we cannot share wealth if we do not share a language. It took half a century of struggle around the Enlightenment to make the French Revolution possible, and a century of struggle around work to give birth to the fearsome “welfare state.” Struggles create the language in which a new order expresses itself. But there is nothing like that today. Europe is now a continent gone broke that shops secretly at discount stores and has to fly budget airlines if it wants to travel at all. No “problems” framed in social terms admit of a solution. The questions of “pensions,” of “job security,” of “young people” and their “violence” can only be held in suspense while the situation these words serve to cover up is continually policed for signs of further unrest. Nothing can make it an attractive prospect to wipe the asses of pensioners for minimum wage. Those who have found less humiliation and more advantage in a life of crime than in sweeping floors will not turn in their weapons, and prison won’t teach them to love society. Cuts to their monthly pensions will undermine the desperate pleasure-seeking of hordes of retirees, making them stew and splutter about the refusal to work among an ever larger section of youth. And finally, no guaranteed income granted the day after a quasi-uprising will be able to lay the foundation of a new New Deal, a new pact, a new peace. The social feeling has already evaporated too much for that. As an attempted solution, the pressure to ensure that nothing happens, together with police surveillance of the territory, will only intensify. The unmanned drone that flew over Seine-Saint-Denis last July 14th – as the police later confirmed – presents a much more vivid image of the future than all the fuzzy humanistic projections. That they were careful to assure us that the drone was unarmed gives us a clear indication of the road we’re headed down. The territory will be partitioned into ever more restricted zones. Highways built around the borders of “problem neighborhoods” already form invisible walls closing off those areas off from the middle-class subdivisions. Whatever defenders of the Republic may think, the control of neighborhoods “by the community” is manifestly the most effective means available. The purely metropolitan sections of the country, the main city centers, will go about their opulent lives in an ever more crafty, ever more sophisticated, ever more shimmering deconstruction. They will illuminate the whole planet with their glaring neon lights, as the patrols of the BAC and private security companies (i.e. paramilitary units) proliferate under the umbrella of an increasingly shameless judicial protection.

### AT: Perm

#### THE PERM IS THE ULTIMATE FORM OF COOPTION –

#### BY ATTEMPTING TO ENGAGE THE STATE WHILE CLAIMING NON-INVOLVEMENT THE PERM ONLY SERVES TO TRANSFER MORE POWER TO STATIST ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITALISM. NOT ONLY DOES THIS PROVE OUR INTERPASSIVITY ARGUMENTS, IT ILLUSTRATES THAT DOING NOTHING IS THE ONLY FORM OF ACTION THAT CANNOT BE COOPTED

Paolo Virno (Italian philosopher, semiologist and a figurhead for the Italian Marxist movement) 2004

[A Grammar of the Multitude, Semiotext(e) & MIT Press, online @ http://www.generation-online.org/c/fcmultitude3.htm, loghry]

How is non-servile virtuosity possible? How do we move, hypothetically, from a servile virtuosity to a "republican" virtuosity (understanding "republic of the multitude" to mean a sphere of common affairs which is no longer state-run)? How do we conceive, in principle, of political action based on the general intellect? We must tread this terrain carefully. All we can do is to point to the logical form of something that is still lacking a solid empirical experience. I am proposing two key-terms: civil disobedience and exit. "Civil disobedience" represents, perhaps, the fundamental form of political action of the multitude, provided that the multitude is emancipated from the liberal tradition within which it is encapsulated. It is not a matter of ignoring a specific law because it appears incoherent or contradictory to other fundamental norms, for example to the constitutional charter. In such case, in fact, reluctance would signal only a deeper loyalty to state control. Conversely, the radical disobedience which concerns us here casts doubt on the State's actual ability to control. Let us digress for a moment in order to understand this better. According to Hobbes, with the institution of the "body politic," we force ourselves to obey before we even know what we will be ordered to do: "our obligation to civil obedience, by vertue whereof the civill Lawes are valid, is before all civill Lawe" (De Cive, Chap. XIV Section XXI). For this reason we shall not find a particular law which explicitly dictates that people should not revolt. If the unconditional acceptance of the controlling power were not already presupposed, the concrete legislative presuppositions (including, obviously, that which states "thou shalt not rebell") would have no validity whatsoever. Hobbes maintains that the initial bond of obedience derives from "Lawes of nature," that is from a common interest in self-preservation and security. Still, he quickly adds that this "natural law," the Super-law which compels people to observe all of the orders of the sovereign, effectively becomes law only when we have left the state of nature, thus when the State has already been instituted. Thus, a real paradox takes shape: the duty to obey is both the cause and the effect of the existence of the State; this duty is supported by the very State which depends upon it for the constitution of its own foundation; it precedes and follows, at the same time, the development of a "supreme empire." So then, the multitude aims precisely at this preliminary form of obedience without content, which is the foundation solely of the gloomy dialectic between acquiescence and "transgression." By breaking a particular law meant for dismantling socialized medicine or for stopping immigration, the multitude goes back to the covert presupposition hidden behind every act of mandating law and taints its ability to remain in force. Radical disobedience also "precedes civil laws," since it is not limited to the breaking of these laws but also calls into question the very foundation of their validity. And now let us move on to the second key word: exit. The breeding ground of disobedience does not lie exclusively in the social conflicts which express protest, but, and above all, in those which express defection (as Albert O. Hirschman has explained [Hirschman, Exit]: not as voice but as exit). Nothing is less passive than the act of fleeing, of exiting. Defection modifies the conditions within which the struggle takes place, rather than presupposing those conditions to be an unalterable horizon; it modifies the context within which a problem has arisen, rather than facing this problem by opting for one or the other of the provided alternatives. In short, exit consists of unrestrained invention which alters the rules of the game and throws the adversary completely off balance. While remembering what was discussed on this subject during the first day of our seminar, we need only think of the mass exodus from the regime of the factory, carried out by American workers in the middle of the nineteenth century. By venturing into the "frontier" to colonize inexpensive land, they seized upon the opportunity to reverse their own initial condition. Something similar took place in the late Seventies in Italy, when the young laborpower, challenging all expectations, chose temporary and part-time work over full-time employment in big corporations. Though it lasted only for a brief period, professional mobility functioned as a political resource, giving rise to the eclipse of industrial discipline and allowing for the establishing of a certain degree of self-determination. Exit, or defection, is the polar opposite of the desperate cry "there is nothing to lose but one's own chains:" on the contrary, exit hinges on a latent kind of wealth, on an exuberance of possibilities, in short, on the principle of the tertium datur. But for the contemporary multitude, what this virtual abundance which presses for the flee-option at the expense of resistance-option? What is at stake, obviously, is not a spatial "frontier," but the surplus of knowledge, communication, virtuosic acting in concert, all presupposed by the publicness of the general intellect. Defection allows for a dramatic, autonomous, and affirmative expression of this surplus; and in this way it impedes the "transfer" of this surplus into the power of state administration, impedes its configuration as productive resource of the capitalistic enterprise.

## \*\*\*Aff answers

An end to scarcity is a path the communism
SCHWARTZMAN 96 [David, Graduate Prof at Harvard Ph.D. 1971. Brown University ,”Solar Communism”, Fall 1996, Spencer]

Human needs, nature’s needs. The relevance of the preceding discussion to a rethinking of the Marxist concept of communism will now be examined. According to the classical tradition, the communist socioeconomic formation can only be reached with an end to scarcity, presupposing an abundant and continuous source of energy. Is this concept now imaginable in any plausible sense that could motivate an effective political practice? In what follows, and despite anticipated derision from the postmodernist camp, I will argue for such a vision, one of a future that also necessarily entails the utilization of the full potential of the information revolution and a radical modification of present society nature relations. We begin with a consideration of human needs, since the promise of their satisfaction is central to Marx’s concept of communism (“from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs”). Utopian thinkers historically have always postulated that human needs could be met at existing technological levels, but for class exploitation and oppression. The technology of every age has its utopia (e.g., Kropotkin, 1989, at the beginning of this century). Of course, each age, particularly contemporary capitalism has expanded the realm of perceived human need. Human needs are of course problematic, generated by political struggle and cultural history. Beyond physiological necessities (as the number of calories, vitamins etc. needed for optimal health, itself not entirely without uncertainty) and the other conditions for healthful life such as an unpolluted environment, adequate shelter, and loving relationships, our needs, both material and spiritual, are largely social constructs. Of course even the prospect of substantially extending the human life span will be a social construct, while becoming an arguably new entitlement for all human beings. Doyal and Gough (1991) have eloquently argued 9 for an objective basis underlying common human needs worldwide. Nevertheless, many “needs” under capitalism are obvious creations of consumerism, itself a direct outcome of the unfettered reproduction of capital, and must be the terrain of political struggle since these “needs” in turn reproduce unhealthful conditions for both humans and the biosphere (e.g., polluting cars, wasteful packaging, high fat diets etc.). Further, both the ability and needs of a healthy biosphere are not without some uncertainty: for example, what constitutes sustainable yields of wood, fish, how much of the biosphere should be left relatively pristine in “biosphere reserves”?; etc. An end to scarcity, at least in respect to objectively defined needs, could arguably only occur in a planetary civilization, given the great disparity in the human condition at present. Here again we can anticipate the continual creation of new human needs, with the elimination of old ones (e.g., with the extension of human life span, new possibilities for travel, like vacations on Mars!). However, all this speculation surely appears as escapist fantasy in face of the colossal challenges facing humankind today, with millions barely surviving even in the cities of the industrial world. With the new level of anthropogenic impacts of capitalism on the biosphere, the “second contradiction” of capitalism as theorized by James O’Connor (1988; see also numerous articles since then in same journal), between the forces/relations and conditions of production (above all nature, but also the artificial environment, which of course includes the workplace and urban communities), has now emerged with global consequence. The second contradiction of capitalism forces a reexamination of the very principle proposed to guide a communist society: “From each according to her ability, to each according to her needs”. Should not “each” and “her” now refer to both human beings and nature (ecosystems)? Further, if “socialism” as a transition to communism is to be viable, this new principle must arguably be progressively applied to this mixed social formation, between two modes of production. Indeed, the convergence of the green and socialist movements may be for the same reason a necessary condition for the very possibility of opening a path to communism via socialism.

### Cap not root cause of terrorism

#### TERRORISM IS NOT CAUSED BY CAPITALISM – THE REAL TERRORISTS ARE THE ANTI-CAPITALISTS DETERMINED ON THE DESTRUCTION OF EVERYTHING CAPITALISM HAS CREATED

Alex Epstein (Ayn Rand institute) 7/25/2005

[“Fight the Root of Terrorism With Bombs, Not Bread” online @ http://www.capitalismmagazine.com/war-peace/terrorism/4330-fight-the-root-of-terrorism-with-bombs-not-bread.html, loghry]

In light of the recent suicide bombings in London, and the general inability of the West to prevent terrorist attacks, there is much talk about fighting the "root cause" of terrorism. The most popular argument is that terrorism is caused by poverty. The United Nations and our European and Arab "allies" repeatedly tell us to minimize our military operations and instead dole out more foreign aid to poor countries--to put down our guns and pick up our checkbook. Only by fighting poverty, the refrain goes, can we address the "root cause" of terrorism. The pernicious idea that poverty causes terrorism has been a popular claim since the attacks of September 11. U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan has repeatedly asked wealthy nations to double their foreign aid, naming as a cause of terrorism "that far too many people are condemned to lives of extreme poverty and degradation." Former Secretary of State Colin Powell agrees: "We have to put hope back in the hearts of people. We have to show people who might move in the direction of terrorism that there is a better way." Businessman Ted Turner also concurs: "The reason that the World Trade Center got hit is because there are a lot of people living in abject poverty out there who don't have any hope for a better life." Indeed, the argument that poverty causes terrorism has been central to America's botched war in Iraq--which has focused, not on quickly ending any threat the country posed and moving on to other crucial targets, but on bringing the good life to the Iraqi people. Eliminating the root of terrorism is indeed a valid goal--but properly targeted military action, not welfare handouts, is the means of doing so. Terrorism is not caused by poverty. The terrorists of September 11 did not attack America in order to make the Middle East richer. To the contrary, their stated goal was to repel any penetration of the prosperous culture of the industrialized "infidels" into their world. The wealthy Osama bin Laden was not using his millions to build electric power plants or irrigation canals. If he and his terrorist minions wanted prosperity, they would seek to emulate the United States--not to destroy it. More fundamental, poverty as such cannot determine anyone's code of morality. It is the ideas that individuals choose to adopt which make them pursue certain goals and values. A desire to destroy wealth and to slaughter innocent, productive human beings cannot be explained by a lack of money or a poor quality of life--only by anti-wealth, anti-life ideas. These terrorists are motivated by the ideology of Islamic Fundamentalism. This other-worldly, authoritarian doctrine views America's freedom, prosperity, and pursuit of worldly pleasures as the height of depravity. Its adherents resent America's success, along with the appeal its culture has to many Middle Eastern youths. To the fundamentalists, Americans are "infidels" who should be killed. As a former Taliban official said, "The Americans are fighting so they can live and enjoy the material things in life. But we are fighting so we can die in the cause of God."

### Cede the Political

#### The critique embraces anti-government – this decimates their alternative, creates atrocity, and cedes politics to the Right.

Boggs 97 [Carl, Professor of Social Sciences at National University in Los Angeles, “The great retreat: Decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America,” *Theory and Society*, December 1997, SpringerLink, p. 773-774, spencer]

The decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America poses a series of great dilemmas and challenges. Many ideological currents scrutinized here—localism, metaphysics, spontaneism, post-modernism, Deep Ecology—intersect with and reinforce each other. While these currents have deep origins in popular movements of the 1960s and 1970s, they remain very much alive in the 1990s. Despite their different outlooks and trajectories, they all share one thing in common: a depoliticized expression of struggles to combat and overcome alienation. [end page 773] The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved—perhaps even unrecognized—only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or sidestep these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites—an already familiar dynamic in many lesser-developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise—or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.75

#### Alt goes to the Right. Even if they’re right, the alt won’t go anywhere – the perm sparks successful radicalism

Gitlin 5 [Todd, professor at Berkeley, professor of culture, at New York University. He is now a professor of journalism and sociology and chair of the Ph.D. program in Communications at Columbia University., CIAO Books, http://www.ciaonet.org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/book/git01/git01\_02.pdfm, spencer]

This book assumes that political thinking matters to the fate of American democracy and therefore to the prospect for decency in the world. It also has a more specific objective: to contribute to a new start for intellectual life on the left. But surely this sounds presumptuous. Why should political intellectuals of the left need a new start? It is hard—perhaps impossible—to disentangle the practical from the philosophical reasons, for they are intertwined. All in all, the criticism of established arrangements—which is the left’s specialty—does not convince a critical mass of the populace to put the critics in charge*.* Even if the critics are right to chastise the authorities as they see fit, many people do not see the critics as responsible, reliable, or competent to govern. They see them as another upper crust: a “new class” of “limousine liberals” and “cultural elitists.” Those of the left’s political-intellectual traditions that have flourished in recent decades, however worthy at times for moral self-definition, have led us into a wilderness. For all the intense emphasis in recent years on identity politics, political thought has purposes that reach far beyond self-definition. It has to make itself felt. It has to be useful. This might, on the face of it, be a healthy time for an intellectual renaissance. The nation is deeply troubled, and for all the cant about optimism and faith, much of the nation knows it is troubled. Intellectuals in particular despair of public discourse—reasonably so—and despair might prove, this time, to be the birth mother of invention. What resources, then, do Americans have for thinking freshly? Surprisingly few. The Marxism and postmodernism of the left are exhausted. Conservative thought has collapsed into market grandiosity and nationalist bombast. Surely, for more reasons than one, these are times that try men’s souls—in terms that Tom Paine would have found sometimes familiar (the urgency, certainly) and sometimes strange. This nation (as well as others) is besieged by murderous enemies, yet beneath the repetition of stock phrases—“war on terror,” “axis of evil,” “root causes”—is precious little public discussion of how this state of affairs came to pass and what can be done about it. Rarely does a fair, thorough, intelligible public debate take place on any significant political subject. But that is not to say that the country is inert. To the contrary, the attentive populace is highly charged and intensely polarized. Eventually, even the ostrich side of the left had to recognize that since the mid-1970s it had been outfought by a disciplined alliance of plutocrats and right-wing fundamentalist Christians: that a political bloc equipped with big (if crude) ideas and ready for sledgehammer combat had seized the country’s commanding heights. But many on the left do not recognize quite how they lost or understand how to recover. During this period the hallmark of left-wing thought has been negation—resistance is the more glamorous word. Intellectuals of the left have been playing defense. It is as if history were a tank dispatched by the wrong army, and all that was left to do was to stand in its way and try to block it. If we had a manual, it would be called, What Is Not to Be Done. We are the critics—it is for others to imagine a desirable world and a way to achieve it. The left has gotten comfortable on the margins of political life, and for intellectuals it has been no different. The left speaks of “resistance” and “speaking truth to power.” But resistance presupposes that power has the initiative—resistance is its negative pole.

### GIBSON-GRAHAM CAP AS MONOLITH SHELL

#### NO MATTER WHAT YOU CALL IT, YOUR REPRESENTATIONS OF CAPITALISM RELY ON AN UNCRITICAL AWE AND RELIANCE ON CAPITALISM TO SOLVE/CAUSE ALL YOUR PROBLEMS

J.K. Gibson-Graham (pen name of Julie Graham [Prof. of Geography @ UMass & Ph.D. Clark Univ.] and Katherine Gibson [Prof. and head Dept. of Human Geography @ Australian National University & Ph.D. Clark Univ.]) 1996

[The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) p. 252-253, maurer]

In the context of poststructuralist theory both the political subject and the social totality have been rent apart and retheorized as open, continually under construction, decentered, constituted by antagonisms, fragmented, plural, multivocal, discursively as well as socially constructed. But Capitalism has been relatively immune to radical reconceptualization. Its recent development has been duly charted and tracked within the confines of traditional modernist conceptions (for example, regulation theory) that have remained largely unchallenged by postmodern critical thought. Indeed, rather than being subjected to destabilization and deconstruction, Capitalism is more likely to be addressed with honorifics that evoke its powerful and entrenched position. It appears unnamed but nevertheless unmistakable as a "societal macrostructure" (Fraser and Nicholson 1990: 34), a "large-scale structure of domination" (Deutsche 1991: 19), "the global economy" or "flexible accumulation" (Harvey 1989), "post-Fordism" or even "consumer society." Often associated with an adjective that evokes its protean capacities, it emerges as "monopoly capitalism," "global capitalism," "postindustrial capitalism," "late capitalism." Like other terms of respect, these terms are seldom defined by their immediate users. Rather they function to express and constitute a shared state of admiration and subjection. For no matter how diverse we might be, how Marxist or postMarxist, how essentialist or antiessentialist, how modernist or postmodernist, most of ,us somewhere acknowledge that we live within something large that shows us to be small — a Capitalism, whether global or national, in the face of which all our transformative acts are ultimately inconsequential.

#### AND, VIEWING CAPITALISM AS MONOLITHIC FORECLOSES ON THE ABILITY FOR ANY SOCIAL MOVEMENTS TO CARVE OUT NONCAPITALIST SPACE – THE IMPACT IS THAT YOU CAN’T SOLVE THE CASE AT THE EXPENSE OF SUBJECTING YOUR ALTERNATIVE TO THE DOMINANCE YOU ATTEMPT TO CRITIQUE

J.K. Gibson-Graham (pen name of Julie Graham [Prof. of Geography @ UMass & Ph.D. Clark Univ.] and Katherine Gibson [Prof. and head Dept. of Human Geography @ Australian National University & Ph.D. Clark Univ.]) 1996

[The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) p. 255-257, maurer]

What is important here, for my purposes, are not the different metaphors and images of economy and society but the fact that they all confer integrity upon Capitalism. Through its architectural or organismic depiction as an edifice or body, Capitalism becomes not an uncentered aggregate of practices but a structural and systemic unity, potentially co-extensive with the national or global economy as a whole.11 As a large, durable, and self-sustaining formation, it is relatively impervious to ordinary political and cultural interventions. It can be resisted and reformed but it cannot be replaced, except through some herculean and coordinated struggle. Understood as a unified system or structure, Capitalism is not ultimately vulnerable to local and partial efforts at transformation. Any such efforts can always be subverted by Capitalism at another scale or in another dimension. Attempts to transform production may be seen as hopeless without control of the financial system. Socialisms in one city or in one country may be seen as undermined by Capitalism at the international scale. Capitalism cannot be chipped away at, gradually replaced or removed piecemeal. It must be transformed in its entirety or not at all. Thus one of the effects of the unity of Capitalism is to present the left with the task of systemic transformation. Singularity If the unity of Capitalism confronts us with the mammoth task of systemic transformation, it is the singularity and totality of Capitalism that make the task so hopeless. Capitalism presents itself as a singularity in the sense of having no peer or equivalent, of existing in a category by itself; and also in the sense that when it appears fully realized within a particular social formation, it tends to be dominant or alone. As a sui generis economic form, Capitalism has no true analogues. Slavery, independent commodity production, feudalism, socialism, primitive communism and other forms of economy all lack the systemic properties of Capitalism and the ability to reproduce and expand themselves according to internal laws.12 Unlike socialism, for example, which is always struggling to be born, which needs the protection and fostering of the state, which is fragile and easily deformed, Capitalism takes on its full form as a natural outcome of an internally driven growth process. Its organic unity gives capitalism the peculiar power to regenerate itself, and even to subsume its moments of crisis as requirements of its continued growth and development. Socialism has never been endowed with that mythic capability of feeding on its own crises; its reproduction was never driven from within by a life force but always from without; it could never reproduce itself but always had to be reproduced, often an arduous if not impossible process.13

### MONOLITH INTERNALS

#### REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ECONOMY AS ESSENTIALLY CAPITALIST SUPPRESSES “EXCLUDED OTHERS” WHO ARE ALREADY CONSTRUCTING ALTERNATIVES – YOU CAN’T SOLVE

J.K. Gibson-Graham (pen name of Julie Graham [Prof. of Geography @ UMass & Ph.D. Clark Univ.] and Katherine Gibson [Prof. and head Dept. of Human Geography @ Australian National University & Ph.D. Clark Univ.]) 11/21/2005

[“A diverse economy: rethinking economy and economic representation” online @ http://www.communityeconomies.org/papers/rethink/rethink7diverse.pdf, loghry]

The iceberg diagram is an explicitly pedagogical version of what we have called our diverse economy framework (see below), a representation that has emerged from more academically oriented conversations with theorists of economic difference. In these academic interactions, what’s at stake for us is capitalocentrism, the hegemonic representation of all economic activities in terms of their relationship to capitalism—as the same as, the opposite of, a complement to, or contained within capitalism. Our attempts to destabilize capitalocentrism have included a number of theoretical strategies: 1) deconstruction of familiar economic representations, 2) production of different representations of economic identity, and 3) development of different narratives of economic development. Our deconstructive project is engaged in unhinging economic thinking from the singular law of value inscribed in capitalocentric discourse. As with any deconstruction, our first step has been to show how a representation of the ECONOMY as essentially CAPITALIST is dependent on the exclusion or suppression of many types of economic activity. Interestingly, the ‘excluded others’ upon which the seeming coherence of capitalism is based include a range of activities that have been the subject of inquiry by non-economists or non-mainstream economic analysts. We might say that these theorists are constructing an alternative common sense of the economy, one that is growing in influence worldwide. Those we have engaged with include feminist economists who have problematized the household and voluntary sectors, theorists of the informal sector in both the ‘third’ and ‘first’ worlds, economic anthropologists who have focused upon indigenous kin-based and ‘gift’ economies, economic sociologists who have problematized the cultural and social embeddedness of enterprises, those interested in the social economy and its ‘alternative’ social entrepreneurs, economic networks and organizations, and marxist political economists who have pursued a surplus-oriented economic analysis of different (non-capitalist) enterprises and households, including worker cooperatives and other communal forms. Marshalling work on the ways in which social value is produced, transacted and distributed other than those traditionally associated with capitalism has transformed the subordinate term of the CAPITALISM / NON-CAPITALISM binary, rendering it a positive multiplicity. But we have also attempted to deconstruct the dominant term, making capitalism different from itself. In particular we have been interested in mapping the multiple logics and registers of value that vie for preeminence within capitalist corporations. This work on capitalist difference parallels the rich literature on culturally embedded forms of capitalist enterprise.

### MONOLITH INTERNALS

#### THEY CANNOT ANSWER THE QUESTION OF “WHAT IS CAPITALISM” PRECISELY BECAUSE CAPITALISM, THE WAY THEY UNDERSTAND IT, *DOES NOT EXIST* – A LARGE PORTION OF CONTEMPORARY ECONOMICS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH CAPITALIST WORK RELATIONS – PRISON AND SLAVE LABOR ARE GOOD EXAMPLES OF THIS – BY ASSERTING THAT “CAPITALISM” SUBSUMES ALL ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, THE NEGATIVE ERASES WHOLE COMPLEXITIES FROM THE ECONOMY, IGNORING A WHOLE HISTORY OF VIOLENCE – THIS TURNS THE ALTERNATIVE AND IS A METHODOLOGICAL GATEWAY FOR ANY OF THEIR LINK ARGUMENTS

J.K. Gibson-Graham (pen name of Julie Graham [Prof. of Geography @ UMass & Ph.D. Clark Univ.] and Katherine Gibson [Prof. and head Dept. of Human Geography @ Australian National University & Ph.D. Clark Univ.]) May 2001

[“An Ethics of the Local” online @ http://www.communityeconomies.org/papers/rethink/rethinkp1.pdf, loghry]

The research projects I will describe are focused on transforming ourselves as local economic subjects, who are acted upon and subsumed by the global economy, into subjects with economic capacities, who enact and create a diverse economy through daily practices both habitual (and thus unconscious) and consciously intentional. But these practices of selftransformation rely on an initial and somewhat difficult move. If we are to cultivate a new range of capacities in the domain of economy, we need first to be able to see noncapitalist activities and subjects (including ones we admire) as visible and viable in the economic terrain. This involves supplanting representations of economic sameness and replication with images of economic difference and diversification. Feminist economic theorists have bolstered our confidence that such a representation is both possible and productive. Based on a variety of empirical undertakings, they argue that the noncommodity sector (in which unpaid labor produces goods and services for nonmarket circulation) accounts for 30-50 percent of total output in both rich and poor countries (Ironmonger 1996). According to the familiar definition of capitalism as a type of commodity production, this means that a large portion of social wealth is noncapitalist in origin. And even the commodity sector is not necessarily capitalist—commodities are just goods and services produced for a market. Slaves in the antebellum U.S. south produced cotton and other commodities, and in the contemporary U.S. worker-owned collectives, selfemployed people, and slaves in the prison industry all produce goods and services for the market, but not under capitalist relations of production.8 Arguably, then, less than half of the total product of the U.S. economy is produced under capitalism. From this perspective, referring to the U.S. or any economy as capitalist is a violent act of naming that erases from view the heterogeneous complexity of the economy. Working against this process of erasure, our research is trying to produce a discourse of economic difference as a contribution to the ethical and political practice of cultivating a diverse economy. In projects underway in Australia, Asia, the Pacific, and the United States, we are attempting to generate and circulate an alternative language of economy, one in which capitalism is not the master signifier, the dominant or only identity in economic space. This eclectic language, emerging from conversations both academic and popular, provides the conceptual infrastructure for re-presenting economic subjects and multiplying economic identities (Gibson-Graham 2001).

### A2: “WE SOLVE POVERTY”

#### ATTEMPTS TO “SOLVE” POVERTY AND DISADVANTAGE RELY ON A BINARY BETWEEN PEOPLE AND AREAS THAT ARE NORMAL AND DEVIANT. THIS WAY OF EXPLAINING THE WORLD PERPETUATES CONTINUED EXPLOITATION AND DEHUMANIZATION OF THE SO CALLED “PITIED, WRETCHED POOR”

Katherine Gibson & Jenny Cameron {(Prof. and head Dept. of Human Geography @ Australian National University & Ph.D. Clark Univ.]) & (Dept. of Human Geography@ Australian National University)} December 2005

[“Representing Marginalisation: Finding New Avenues for Economic and Social Intervention” Paper presented at the State of Australian Cities Conference online @ http://www.communityeconomies.org/papers/policy/policy\_Marginalisation.pdf, loghry]

The binary between normal and deviant areas (and people) implies that only certain ways of explaining disadvantage are thinkable. One common approach is to blame those who are in the problem category. For example, in the neoliberal account poor policies of the past have produced a welfare mentality and cultural pathology which erodes people’s ability and motivation to find a route out of disadvantage (e.g. Saunders and Tsumori, 2002). Another approach is to place the blame with processes external to the binary. For example, in the structural or political economic approach the economic process of globalisation and the political process of neoliberalism are the prime suspects producing disadvantage (e.g. Fincher & Saunders, 2001). By identifying two distinct categories and problematising only one, it is difficult to imagine that perhaps the apparently neutral category might be implicated in the deviant category, that perhaps advantage produces disadvantage. As Lakshman Yapa (2002) has argued in relation to studies of poverty in the Third World: by partitioning the world’s people into two sectors—those who are poor and non-poor, we are prevented from seeing the role the non-poor play in creating conditions of material scarcity for the poor. (p. 36) Similarly programs and studies on marginalisation in First World nations like Australia tend not to address the role played by social and economic advantage in creating disadvantage. One exception in the Australian context is the work of Clive Hamilton and Richard Denniss (2005). They contend that in a world preoccupied by consumption and ‘self-centred gratification’ (p. 178) the sense of material deprivation felt by even the wealthiest has contributed to governments providing more and more welfare payments and tax concessions for the wealthy (e.g. rebates for private health cover, family tax benefits, and tax concessions for superannuation)(p. 139-142); while at the same time programs and services for those who face genuine deprivation are cut or threatened. Spending on the non-poor has been at the expense of the poor. Identifying marginalised places as “other” and disconnected from the rest of the nation or state means that those who live there are homogenised into a stereotypical image of disadvantage. The picture is of bleak public housing areas populated by single parents, the unemployed and school drop-outs, whose lives are on a downward spiral of welfare dependence, poverty and crime (either as perpetrators or victims). As John Kretzmann and John McKnight (1993) argue the various indicators of disadvantage all cohere into an all too familiar picture of needs, problems and deficiencies. Building on the efforts of nineteenth century reformers and nascent planners to transform conditions in urban slums, this is the focus of information that is regularly collected and disseminated by government agencies and analysed in academic studies (e.g. Vinson 1999 & 2004). Other types of information that might provide a very different and varied picture of these areas are simply not readily available. For instance, what do we know of the social and economic health of these areas, of, for example, the innovative practices that people use to survive on low incomes, the informal social and neighbourhood networks that are prevalent, and people’s propensity to support and contribute to community activities. The portrait by Mark Peel (2003) of Inala, Mt Druitt and Broadmeadows offers some insights into the diversity of experiences of people in marginalised areas. And Lois Bryson and Ian Winter highlight how the values and personal characteristics of the unemployed in a marginalised area of Melbourne are no different from those who are employed (2002, p. 171). But these examples are the exception; on the whole little is known of the diverse and positive sides of life in marginalised areas. Yapa notes a similar process in the context of poverty programs in the Third World. The object of study, policy formulation, resource allocation and program intervention—the people of the Third World—are reduced to ‘the pitied “wretched of the earth”’; ‘[w]hatever else they may be—children, sisters, mothers, farmers, dancers, artists, care-givers, and nature-lovers—is banished into oblivion’ (2002, p. 43). Exclusion and marginalisation are not just a social reality, but are created by the very programs meant to address the problems. Identifying areas as exceptional and deviating from the norm and then stereotyping them in a familiar picture of disadvantage are discursive manifestations of what is often a physical separation between disadvantaged areas and other parts of the urban environment (Hastings & Dean 2003, pp. 180-8). We only know these areas (and people) as “the other”, as distinct from the mainstream.

### CAP DISCO TURNS. GET DOWN!

#### CAPITALISM IS A DISCOURSE – ASSUMING THAT CAPITALISM IS A UNIFIED STRUCTURE, SINGLY SUBSUMING ALL ECONOMIC FORCES IS A METHOD OF DOMINANCE WHICH FORECLOSES ON THE POSSIBILITY FOR ANY PRODUCTIVE STRUGGLE – SIMPLY READING THE CAP K IS ENOUGH FOR THEM TO LOSE

Lisa Disch (associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota) 1999

[“Deconstructing "Capitalism"” Theory & Event 3:1, loghry]

 The End of Capitalism develops a theoretical justification for this kind of reasoning. The author, J.K. Gibson-Graham (actually two academics, Katherine Gibson and Julie Graham, who write as one voice) argues that those who would transform capitalism have a pressing need to render such sites of economic difference visible, and to understand them--independently of capitalism-- as practices of resistance rather than as marginal, anachronistic, or otherwise inferior economic forms. The project started with what used to be called a `Click!'--the author's recognition that "my feminism reshapes the terrain of my social existence on a daily basis. Why can't my marxism have as its object something that I am involved in (re)constructing everyday?" (p. 250). She answers that the difference lies not in capitalism but in the way we know it. The central argument of the book is that our predominant understanding of capitalism as a structure or social totality prevents us from recognizing the quotidian practices in which we are already engaged to transform and to resist it. Capitalism, in short, is a discourse (p. 5). Propositions such as this one inevitably meet with material objections: "But surely you don't mean to deny that capitalism is real?" "It may be all well and good to change how we speak of capitalism but that won't make it any less of an institution that enriches a few while exploiting the many." One of the merits of this lively and clearly-written book is that it exemplifies how to answer these kinds of objections. Gibson-Graham does not claim that we can think our way out of capitalism. Her point, rather, is to demonstrate how Marxists and market economists alike have theorized capitalism in ways that represent "dominance as a natural and inevitable feature of its being" (p. 5). She delineates three discursive features of capitalism that sustain it as incontestable: unity, singularity, and totality. First, capitalism is understood "as a structural and systemic unity" that is able to "reproduce and expand...according to internal laws," as if independently of political intervention (p. 256). Second, this systemic cohesiveness and capacity for lawlike self-reproduction render capitalism a "singularity," a form of social order that is like no other in its capacity to feed on its own crises. By contrast, socialism "was never driven from within by a life force but always from without; it could never reproduce itself but always had to be reproduced, often an arduous if not impossible process" (p. 257). Third, capitalism is a "totality" that absorbs and subsumes all forms of economic activity, constituting us as subjects of capitalism, even when we are not engaged in commodity production for the market (p. 258). Together, these three discursive features work to denigrate and discredit everyday resistance against capitalism by rendering it "a unified system...that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement" (p. 263).

 The dominant conception of capitalism determines, in turn, our understanding of class as a social grouping that is determined "in the last instance" by capitalism. Gibson-Graham proposes to reconceptualize class "as an overdetermined social process," and, thereby, to lend credibility to noncapitalist economic practice (p. 55). She argues that the class process involves the production and appropriation of surplus labor, and its accompanying distribution. Class struggles, then, occur whenever there is an effort to transform production, appropriation, and distribution, wherever that effort takes place. This reconceptualization of class is one of aspect of this book that makes it, as its subtitle proclaims, "a feminist critique of political economy." For, as greater numbers of women are employed in wage work, as technology and credit policies open up new possibilities for independent production, and as these changes open gender to contestation, class processes are taking place in the household. It is a premier site of what Gibson-Graham wants to make visible as non-capitalist "economic difference" (p. 5).

### Perm Solvency

#### PERM SOLVES:

#### THE FACT WE CAN HAVE A COMPETING DISCUSSION OVER THE LINKS ENABLES US TO GENERATE NEW STRATEGIES FOR ECONOMIC ACTIVISM

J.K. Gibson-Graham (pen name of Julie Graham [Prof. of Geography @ UMass & Ph.D. Clark Univ.] and Katherine Gibson [Prof. and head Dept. of Human Geography @ Australian National University & Ph.D. Clark Univ.]) 11/21/2005

[“A diverse economy: rethinking economy and economic representation” online @ http://www.communityeconomies.org/papers/rethink/rethink7diverse.pdf, loghry]

The iceberg is an economic representation we use in our action research projects to stimulate conversations about ‘the economy.’ This image is one way of illustrating that what is usually regarded as ‘the economy’—wage labor, market exchange of commodities and capitalist enterprise—comprises but a small subset of the activities by which we produce, exchange and distribute values. It honors and prompts into expression our common knowledge of the multifarious ways in which all of us are engaged in economic activity. It opens up conceptions of economy and places the reputation of economics as a comprehensive and scientific body of knowledge under critical suspicion for its narrow focus and mystifying effects. Everyday people in everyday places (which really just means anyone who is not an economic theorist or researcher) are the principal co-conversants we are engaged with in rethinking economy through action research. What’s at stake in these conversations is who and what is seen to 1) constitute the economy and 2) contribute to economic development. In the submerged part of the iceberg we see a grab bag of activities, sites and people. The chaotic, laundry list aspect has an inclusive effect—it suggests an open-ended and ultimately arbitrary process of categorization. Conversations we’ve had around what to include in an expanded representation of the economy range from a discussion of putting on makeup in the morning (seen as necessary for the performance of a worker identity and thus as ‘work’) to considerations of the community-building effect of giving. The very process of discussing what’s in and what’s out of the conception of economy is democratizing, involving people in the practice of ‘making the economy’ (a politics of discursivity). The discussions help to generate new economic imaginaries and strategies for ourselves, local economic activists, economic development agencies and NGOs interested in economic activism.

#### Perm solves- on transportation the government does take the right steps

**Mohl ‘8** (Raymond A., is Distinguished Professor of History at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, “The Interstates and the Cities: The U.S. Department of Transportation and the Freeway Revolt, 1966–1973” November 2, 2008, Project muse)

**The modest success of the Freeway Revolt** of the 1960s **is generally attributed to the persistence of grassroots, neighborhood opposition movements around the nation. Those movements no doubt had significant impact**. However, **the anti-expressway movement also must be located and interpreted within the wider context of the shifting political, legislative, and** [End Page 193] **bureaucratic environment in Washington**, D.C., during the 1960s and early 1970s. **Transportation policymaking at the congressional level**, and especially in the House and Senate public works committees, **responded to opposition movements**, but also to many special-interest groups with much at stake. **The executive branch also engaged in policymaking, as presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon sent key transportation bills to the Congress or vetted others through the Bureau of the Budget. Executive and legislative action had important consequences**, but this article argues that **the crucial response** to the Freeway Revolt **took place at the level of policy implementation**. Beginning in 1966, the new U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), through its constituent agencies—the Federal Highway Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads—had responsibility for getting the interstates completed. But DOT leadership balanced that objective against the demonstrated negative impacts of building expressways in built-up urban areas. **The first two secretaries of the DOT**, Alan S. Boyd and John A. Volpe, **along with high-level federal highway administrators, mediated highway disputes, promoted alternative methods of urban transit, advocated diversion of highway trust funds for other transportation uses, and made crucial shutdown decisions on several controversial urban expressways. Through policy and procedure manuals, federal highway agencies imposed new rules and regulations that curbed many of the excesses of state highway engineers.** Many executive branch transportation bills were first written in the DOT. This article, then, focuses primarily on how the federal highway bureaucracy responded to the Freeway Revolt and charted new directions on controversial highway matters.

### Cap good

#### Capitalism has saved and improved the lives of millions of people

#### Gates ‘08 [Bill, an American business magnate, philanthropist, author and chairman of Microsoft, Time Magazine, “Making Capitalism More Creative”, 7.31.2008, (http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1828417,00.html)//wfi-hdm]

Capitalism has improved the lives of billions of people — something that's easy to forget at a time of great economic uncertainty. But it has left out billions more. They have great needs, but they can't express those needs in ways that matter to markets. So they are stuck in poverty, suffer from preventable diseases and never have a chance to make the most of their lives. Governments and nonprofit groups have an irreplaceable role in helping them, but it will take too long if they try to do it alone. It is mainly corporations that have the skills to make technological innovations work for the poor. To make the most of those skills, we need a more creative capitalism: an attempt to stretch the reach of market forces so that more companies can benefit from doing work that makes more people better off. We need new ways to bring far more people into the system — capitalism — that has done so much good in the world. There's much still to be done, but the good news is that creative capitalism is already with us. Some corporations have identified brand-new markets among the poor for life-changing technologies like cell phones. Others — sometimes with a nudge from activists — have seen how they can do good and do well at the same time. To take a real-world example, a few years ago I was sitting in a bar with Bono, and frankly, I thought he was a little nuts. It was late, we'd had a few drinks, and Bono was all fired up over a scheme to get companies to help tackle global poverty and disease. He kept dialing the private numbers of top executives and thrusting his cell phone at me to hear their sleepy yet enthusiastic replies. As crazy as it seemed that night, Bono's persistence soon gave birth to the (RED) campaign. Today companies like Gap, Hallmark and Dell sell (RED)-branded products and donate a portion of their profits to fight AIDS. (Microsoft recently signed up too.) It's a great thing: the companies make a difference while adding to their bottom line, consumers get to show their support for a good cause, and — most important — lives are saved. In the past year and a half, (RED) has generated $100 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, helping put nearly 80,000 people in poor countries on lifesaving drugs and helping more than 1.6 million get tested for HIV. That's creative capitalism at work.

#### Extinction—key to shift us to a macro-industrial era, solving all threats to human survival

Michael G. Zey, sociologist, “The Macroindustrial Era: A New Age of Abundance and Prosperity,” THE FUTURIST v. 31 n. 2, March 13, 1997, p. 9+.

We are not moving into an Information Age, but rather a Macroindustrial Age of turbocharged economic and technological growth. We are entering a time in which humankind will develop an enhanced ability to solve the majority of economic, social, and technological problems that have heretofore plagued our species. I label this period the Macroindustrial Era. This exciting new stage of societal development has already begun; developments in fields such as manufacturing, space, and medicine, as well as a general improvement in the human condition on a global scale, attest to the birth of a new age that will afford us a greater ability to control our future.

### GROWTH STOPS ETHNIC WAR, GENOCIDE, MILITARISM, PROLIF, SOLVES AIDS, DEMOCRACY AND POLLUTION

Leonard Silk, Professor, Economics, Pace University, “Dangers of Slow Growth,” FOREIGN AFFAIRS v. 72 n. 1, Winter 1993, p. 173-174.

In the absence of such shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there are strong economic pressures on arms-producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons, both conventional and dual-use nuclear technology, wherever buyers can be found. Without a revival of national economies and the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons will continue, creating more Iraqs, Yuugoslavias, Somalias and Cambodias - or worse. Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all those problems by itself But economic growth - and growth alone - creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

#### -- Recessions harm the environment-- four reasons:

#### - Green investment cut

#### - Increase in chemical use

#### - Harms eco- businesses

#### - Voter support declines

Michael Graham Richard, 02/06/08, Huffington Post, Counter-Point: 4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment, http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/02/4\_reasons\_recession\_bad\_environment.php

As a counter-point to Lloyd's tongue-in-cheek post about 10 Ways the Recession Can Help the Environment, here are some eco-reasons why we should wish a speedy recovery (we won't get into non-green reasons here): Firstly, when squeezed, companies will reduce their investments into research & development and green programs. These are usually not short-term profit centers, so that is what's axed first. Some progress has been made in the past few years, it would be sad to lose ground now.

Secondly, average people, when money is tight, will look for less expensive products (duh). Right now, that usually means that greener products won't make it. Maybe someday if we start taxing "bads" instead of "goods" (pollution, carbon, toxins instead of labor, income, capital gains) the least expensive products will also be the greenest, but right now that's not the case.

Thirdly, there's less money going into the stock markets and bank loans are harder to get, which means that many small firms and startups working on the breakthrough green technologies of tomorrow can have trouble getting funds or can even go bankrupt, especially if their clients or backers decide to make cuts.

Fourthly, during economic crises, voters want the government to appear to be doing something about the economy (even if it's government that screwed things up in the first place). They'll accept all kinds of measures and laws, including those that aren't good for the environment. Massive corn subsidies anyone? Don't even think about progress on global warming...

#### Hegemony— cements US global leadership

Zbigniew Brzezinski, former National Security Advisor, THE GRAND CHESSBOARD, 1997. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://book-case.kroupnov.ru/pages/library/Grand/part_1.htm>, accessed 5/18/06.

America’s economic dynamism provides the necessary precondition for the exercise of global primacy. Initially, immediately after World War II, America’s economy stood apart from all others, accounting alone for more than 50 percent of the world’s GNP. The economic recovery of Western Europe and Japan, followed by the wider phenomenon of Asia’s economic dynamism, meant that the American share of global GNP eventually had to shrink from the disproportionately high livels of the immediate postwar era. Nonetheless, by the time the subsequent Cold War had ended, America’s share of global GNP, and more specifically its share of the world’s manufacturing output, had stabilized at about 30 percent, a level that had been the norm for most of this century, apart from those exceptional years immediately after World War II. More important, America has maintained and has even widened its lead in exploiting the latest scientific breakthroughs for military purposes, thereby creating a technologically peerless military establishment, the only one with effective global reach. All the while, is has maintained its strong competitive advantage in the economically decisive information technologies. American mastery in the cutting-edge sectors of tomorrow’s economy suggests that American technological domination is not likely to be undone soon, especially given that in the economically decisive fields, Americans are maintaining or even widening their advantage in productivity over their Western European and Japanese rivals.

#### Poverty— raises living standards and allows more access to global economy

Gregg Easterbrook, Visiting Fellow, Brookings Institution, “The Capitalist Manifesto,” Review of The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth by Benjamin M. Friedman, THE NEW YORK TIMES, November 27, 2005, p. 16.

Though ''The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth'' may not quite succeed in showing an iron law of growth and liberalization, Friedman is surely correct when he contends that economic expansion must remain the world's goal, at least for the next few generations. Growth, he notes, has already placed mankind on a course toward the elimination of destitution. Despite the popular misconception of worsening developing-world misery, the fraction of people in poverty is in steady decline. Thirty years ago 20 percent of the planet lived on $1 or less a day; today, even adjusting for inflation, only 5 percent does, despite a much larger global population. Probably one reason democracy is taking hold is that living standards are rising, putting men and women in a position to demand liberty. And with democracy spreading and rising wages giving ever more people a stake in the global economic system, it could be expected that war would decline. It has. Even taking Iraq into account, a study by the Center for International Development and Conflict Management, at the University of Maryland, found that the extent and intensity of combat in the world is only about half what it was 15 years ago.

#### Inevitability

Uninvited or not business will inevitably find its way and into space  - capitalism will inevirtably be in space
Parker ‘9
[ Martin, ethics organization professor, Capitalists in space, j,1467-954X.2009.01818.x1[1].pdf, 2009, WFI-KC]

Uninvited or not, business interests will continue to find their way into space. A year before the Armstrongs were watching TV, Stanley Kubrick had placed a rotating Hilton hotel and a Pam Am shuttle plane in *2001: A Space Odyssey*. The brands may change, and the future will not happen as quickly as we think, but unless we imagine massive state interventionism on a Soviet scale, capitalism will go into space. Dickens and Ormrod claim that it already has, at least in terms of near earth orbit, and that the key issue is to engineer ‘a relationship with the universe
that does not further empower the already powerful’ (2007: 190). In other words, a Marxist political economy of space would suggest that the militaryindustrial complex has already empowered the powerful, but would presumably
be equally sceptical about the space libertarians’ claims to be representing the ordinary citizen. Of course we might conclude from this that the answer is simply to turn away from space. The whole programme has not been without
its critics, whether of capitalism, imperialism, patriarchy, techno-fetishism, bad science, bad policy making or even new world order conspiracy (Etzioni, 1964; DeGroot, 2007). Even at the height of space euphoria, in the summer of 1969, we find dissenting voices. ‘The moon is an escape from our earthy responsibilities, and like other escapes, it leaves a troubled conscience’ said Anthony Lewis in the *New York Times*. An *Ebony* opinion leader, asking what we will say to extra-terrestrials, suggested ‘We have millions of people starving to death back home so we thought we’d drop by to see how you’re faring’. Kurt Vonnegut, in the New York Times Magazine, put it with characteristic élan.

From past  until now, new and advanced weaponry would be accumulating capital and finding itself as capitalism and find itself navigating the markets around the globe

Hoffer ‘07

[Crystal, a writer on past weaponry, The weapons of capitalism,  <https://www.tacomacc.edu/> upload/files/artsh umanitiesandsocialsciences/publications/unavoce/una%20voce2006-07.pdf#page=60, spring of 2007, WFI-KC]

In addition to the technologies borrowed mostly from the Chinese to successfully navigate the globe, the use of gunpowder in creating new forms of weaponry also contributed to the build-up
of the West as the most powerful economic structure. The reason for the technological
advances of weaponry in Europe can be found in the very instability and lack of central control over all of Europe. War was nearly a constant element in the formation of Europe into nation-states as “no ruler wanted to see another state dominate all the others [;] thus, when any particular state began to wax strong, others formed coalitions against it” (648). Because of this constant competition between European states, they all “sought to develop the most expert military leadership and the most effective weapons for their arsenals” (648). result of technologies that had been incorporated from China and elsewhere. These technological advances included the use of advanced nautical equipment in exploring the world’s oceans and the use of gun powder to form more advanced weaponry than the world had yet seen.
Harman states that “a few countries in western Europe had acquired by 1500 small but critical advantages in gunnery and shipping, which permitted the conquest of the Americas and growing domination over the maritime commerce of the Indian Ocean so accelerating capital accumulation and technical change in the leading maritime countries of Europe.” There were
other prerequisites, however, that led to European dominance in these areas, including many external factors.

### A2 Not Sustainable (1/2)

#### GROWTH IS QUALITATIVE—DOESN’T INCREASE RESOURCE CONSUMPTION

Martin Lewis, Professor, School of the Environment, Duke University, GREEN DELUSIONS, 1992, p. 184-185.

The notion that economic growth may benefit the environment is anathema to the radical greens. Their foundational belief—that expan­sion will ultimately destroy the planet—is, however, growing more untenable year by year. Recent economic history demonstrates that an economy can expand while significantly reducing its consumption of both energy and key resources. “Since the oil embargo of 1973, energy intensity—the amount of energy required to produce a dollar of U.S. (GNP)gross national product—has fallen by 28 percent” (Fickett, Gellings, and Lovins 1990:65). Similarly the growing American economy has been continually reducing its dependency on numerous mineral resources. Some two decades ago, the Club of Rome (Meadows et al. 1972) predicted that copper shortages could soon spell the end of civilization, a view that now appears quaint as copper telecommunications lines yield to fiber optic cables made ultimately from sand. As Piers Blaikie (1989:130) tersely writes, the limits-to-growth thesis has been subjected to a “num­ber of thorough debunkings.” In fact, as early as 1973 a group of environmentally concerned econo­mists demonstrated clearly that the imperative was to reform rather than to end economic growth (Olson and Landsberg 1973). Several of these writers discerningly pointed to the dangers present in a no-growth economy notably including a loss of freedom (McKean 1973) and the possibility that in “the stationary economy unfortunately investment in exploitation may pay better than in progress” (Boulding 1973:95). It is not at all coincidental that American liberals have consistently advo­cated economic expansion, whereas traditional conservatives have been far more concerned with stability (Kuttner 1991). As a fitting epitaph to the exhausted idea of economic limits, one might inscribe the terms and the outcome of the Ehrlich-Simon wager of 1980 (Tierney 1990). In that year the ecologist Ehrlich bet that the prices of five key minerals would increase over the following decade as natural deposits were consumed; the economist Simon countered that prices would drop as substitutes were developed and new deposits discovered. When the price trends were tallied in 1990, not only did Simon come out ahead, but he would have triumphed even if the terms had not been indexed for inflation. In light of this and other evidence, I believe that we can now safely conclude that the future of advanced technology and of capitalism does not ride on the continued availability of tungsten or tin. The “limits to growth” hypothesis is ultimately similar to Jeremy Rif kin’s notion that we should expend as little energy as possible in order to forestall the eventual heat-death of the universe. Limits do exist for specific resources, but in the most important cases they are so remote as to be virtually meaningless. Using the same logic one could declare all human endeavors futile, seeing that the sun will eventually go supernova and consume everything. More importantly environmentalists must come to understand that economic growth increasingly entails not the ever mounting consumption of energy and raw materials, but rather ever increasing value added—which as often as not is accomplished through miniaturization, partial dematerialization, and the breakdown of the very distinction between goods and services (The Economist, “Survey of Industry and the Environment,” September 8, 1990, p. 25; see also Reich 1991).

#### ECONOMY IS BECOMING DEMATERIALIZED, SOLVING RESOURCE LIMITS

Ronald Bailey, journalist, “Dematerializing the Economy,” REASON ONLINE, September 5, 2001. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://reason.com/rb/rb090501.shtml>, accessed 5/10/06.

Since 1977 the value of the U.S. economy has doubled, yet the amount of physical stuff it took to supply all the needs and wants of Americans fell from 1.18 trillion pounds to 1.08 trillion pounds. Even more astonishing: the "weight" of the economy fell while U.S. population grew by some 55 million people. This is no small matter. Economic growth using less physical resources was not supposed to be possible, according to the infamous 1972 Club of Rome report, The Limits To Growth. That document, still referenced in all sorts of economic and environmentalist debates, saw economic growth as dependent upon ever greater amounts of material resources. The production of those resources, went the argument, would eventually lead to a depleted planet and then a massive population die-off. The report concluded that humanity must accept "a state of global equilibrium" in which there was no economic growth. Kate Kane and her colleagues at the Cap Gemini Ernst and Young Center for Business Innovation, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, weighed the economy by estimating the cost per pound of finished product for 500 different Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC) codes in agriculture, mining, construction, and manufacturing. For a first estimate, Kane divided the annual gross output within each of these SIC categories by her cost-per-pound estimates. Since many industries produce inputs for other industries, this first estimate involves some double counting, which Kane handled by taking the gross weight of output for each SIC code and multiplying it by the proportion of real Gross Domestic Product produced by that industry. Based on these rough calculations, Kane estimates that the value of GDP per pound rose from $3.64 in 1977 to $7.96 in 2000. Kane’s work confirms former Vice-President Al Gore’s claim made at the 1999 annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science: "Throughout our economy, skills, intelligence, and creativity are replacing mass and money -- which is why, in the past 50 years, the value of our economy has tripled, while the physical weight of our economy as a whole has barely increased at all." In other words, we got richer not just by using more stuff, but by being smarter about the stuff use.

### A2 Not Sustainable (2/2)

#### MARKETS SOLVE POVERTY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

Stephen Moore, President, Club for Growth, “Surer Way to Sustain the Planet,” THE WASHINGTON TIMES, August 30, 2002, p. A21.

What has been the driving force behind this miraculous progress. Three words: free market capitalism. If only the intellectual elite and the power-holders around the world in South Africa this week would go home and deregulate their economies, cut tax rates, expand democracy, and cut government rules and bureaucracies, we could blaze a path to alleviating world poverty in a generation or two. If only markets, not governments, controlled the price and usage of natural resources, we would see a further abundance of food, minerals and energy - enough for the entire world to share in the bounty. The U.N. Earth Summit is based on a cancerous and discredited creed of limits to growth. It is insane to hope that people who believe in limits to growth will create the conditions that nurture growth. Even the term "sustainable development" is offensive and suggests that economic development and improving the environment are somehow incompatible - which is precisely the opposite of the historical record. Where there is economic development and capitalism, there is clean air and clean water and well-educated citizens and abundant resources and low disease rates. Where there is no capitalism, there is an abundance of these maladies.

#### TECHNOLOGY OVERCOMES ANY RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS

Michael G. Zey, sociologist, “The Macroindustrial Era: A New Age of Abundance and Prosperity,” THE FUTURIST v. 31 n. 2, March 13, 1997, p. 9+

In the Macroindustrial Era, we will overcome limits in the area of quantity. A variety of sophisticated and advanced technologies will create food, resources, and products in such quantities that we will move into a new age of abundance. In the next era, the only "quantity" problem facing business will be that of overproduction, not scarcity. A number of mind-boggling innovations will make what I label macro-manufacturing possible. One of these, the cybernetic factory, combines computers and robotics to turn out high quantities of goods, from radios to surgical equipment. Another innovation, magnetic machinery, involves devices whose parts never touch as they float in electromagnetic fields. This lack of friction allows them to operate at ultrahigh speeds with almost no wear and tear. The production of a higher quantity of goods depends on the availability of a powerful and reliable energy source. The macromanufacturing machines will use fusion energy systems, which will dwarf the output of oil and coal generating plants.

#### REPORTED CLAIMS OF OVERSHOOT ARE WRONG--FIVE REASONS

Jerry Taylor, Director of Natural Resource Studies, Cato Institute, “Sustainable Development: A Dubious Solution in Search of a Problem,” POLICY ANALYSIS n. 449, August 26, 2002. Available from the World Wide Web at: [www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa449.pdf](http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa449.pdf), accessed 4/14/06.

If resources are growing more abundant while the concentration of pollutants in air sheds and watersheds continues to decline, how can we explain the proliferation of various stylized sustainability indices that point to a deterioration of the planet’s resource base? There are five common weaknesses with such reports. First, they are almost always built upon a selective but fundamentally arbitrary or irrelevant set of indicators. Second, they are often built not upon actual resource data but upon hypotheses or theories about resource health that do not comport with the data or that rest upon highly suspect data fundamentally inconsistent with the larger data sets available to analysts. Third, they ignore the well-documented propensity of capitalist societies to create and invent new resources when old resources become relatively more scarce (that is, they assume that resources are fixed and finite when they are not). Fourth, they are highly aggregated and often subjective calculations of data sets that lack common denominators. Finally, they are frequently heavily biased by ideological assumptions about politics and government action. Accordingly, they provide little help to policy analysts or political leaders.

### Keynesian Economic Good

#### Keynesian models of capitalism solve – work is a human inclination but changing our desire to accumulate wealth for its own sake resets capitalist morals and enables us to rethink distribution of wealth

Keynes ’63 (John Maynard, economist, “Economic possibilities for our grandchildren,” 1963)

It is a fearful problem for the ordinary person, with no special talents, to occupy himself (sic), especially if he (sic) no longer has roots in the soil or in custom or in the beloved conventions of a traditional society. To judge from the behaviour and the achievements of the wealthy classes to-day in any quarter of the world, the outlook is very depressing! For these are, so to speak, our advance guard – those who are spying out the promised land for the rest of us and pitching their camp there. For they have most of them failed disastrously, so it seems to me – those who have an independent income but no associations or duties or ties – to solve the problem which has been set them. I feel sure that with a little more experience we shall use the new-found bounty of nature quite differently from the way in which the rich use it to-day, and will map out for ourselves a plan of life quite otherwise than theirs. For many ages to come the old Adam (sic) will be so strong in us that everybody will need to do some work if he (sic) is to be contented. We shall do more things for ourselves than is usual with the rich to-day, only too glad to have small duties and tasks and routines. But beyond this, we shall endeavour to spread the bread thin on the butter – to make what work there is still to be done to be as widely shared as possible. Three-hour shifts or a fifteen-hour week may put off the problem for a great while. For three hours a day is quite enough to satisfy the old Adam (sic) in most of us! There are changes in other spheres too which we must expect to come. When the accumulation of wealth is no longer of high social importance, there will be great changes in the code of morals. We shall be able to rid ourselves of many of the pseudo-moral principles which have hag-ridden us for two hundred years, by which we have exalted some of the most distasteful of human qualities into the position of the highest virtues. We shall be able to afford to dare to assess the money-motive at its true value. The love of money as a possession – as distinguished from the love of money as a means to the enjoyments and realities of life – will be recognised for what it is, a somewhat disgusting morbidity, one of those semi-criminal, semi-pathological propensities which one hands over with a shudder to the specialists in mental disease. All kinds of social customs and economic practices, affecting the distribution of wealth and of economic rewards and penalties, which we now maintain at all costs, however distasteful and unjust they may be in themselves, because they are tremendously useful in promoting the accumulation of capital, we shall then be free, at last, to discard. Of course there will still be many people with intense, unsatisfied purposiveness who will blindly pursue wealth – unless they can find some plausible substitute. But the rest of us will no longer be under any obligation to applaud and encourage them. For we shall inquire more curiously than is safe to-day into the true character of this “purposiveness” with which in varying degrees Nature has endowed almost all of us. For purposiveness means that we are more concerned with the remote future results of our actions than with their own quality or their immediate effects on our own environment. The “purposive” man is always trying to secure a spurious and delusive immortality for his (sic) acts by pushing his (sic) interest in them forward into time. He (sic) does not love his (sic) cat, but his (sic) cat’s kittens; nor, in truth, the kittens, but only the kittens’ kittens, and so on forward forever to the end of cat-dom. For him (sic) jam is not jam unless it is a case of jam to-morrow and never jam to-day. Thus by pushing his (sic) jam always forward into the future, he (sic) strives to secure for his (sic) act of boiling it an immortality.

1. Have fun everyone! [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)