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\*\*\*The Capitalism K – Starter KIT

# 1nc Shell Capitalism K

**Link---Capitalism is dependent upon new forms of transportation.**

**Cox and Alm 2008**

 (W. Michael and Richard; Library of Economics and Liberty, “Creative Destruction,” Conscience Encyclopedia of Economic <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/CreativeDestruction.html> accessed ac)

**The fundamental impulse that sets and keeps the capitalist engine in motion comes from the new consumers’ goods**, the **new methods** **of** production or **transportation**, the **new markets, the new forms of industrial organization that capitalist enterprise creates**. (p. 83) **Entrepreneurs introduce new products and technologies with an eye toward making themselves better off**—the profit motive. New goods and services, new firms, and new industries compete with existing ones in the marketplace, taking customers by **offering lower prices, better performance, new features**, catchier styling**, faster service, more convenient locations**, higher status, more aggressive marketing, or more attractive packaging. In another seemingly contradictory aspect of creative destruction, the pursuit of self-interest ignites the progress that makesothers better off. **Producers survive** by streamlining production **with newer and better tools that make workers more productive**. Companies that no longer deliver what consumers want at competitive prices lose customers, and eventually wither and die. The market’s “invisible hand”—a phrase owing not to Schumpeter but to [Adam Smith](http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/bios/Smith.html)—shifts resources from declining sectors to more valuable uses as workers, inputs, and financial capital seek their highest returns. **Through this constant roiling of the status quo, creative destruction provides a powerful force for making societies wealthier. It does so by making scarce resources more productive.**

# 1nc Shell Capitalism K

**Impact ---Capitalism causes extinction and multiple forms of oppression**

**Brown** **2005** , professor of economics and research scientist at the University of Michigan(Charles Brown, http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.html, UNT accessed ac)

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. **This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class.**  Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or exacerbates all major social ills of our times. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. The threat of nuclear war, which can destroy all humanity, grows with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. **These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to spiral, threatening all life on our planet**. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of stagnant real wages, while health and education costs soar. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries**.** Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work of comparable value. All workers receive lower wages when racism succeeds in dividing and disorganizing them. In every aspect of economic and social life, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian a nd Pacific Islanders, Arabs and Middle Eastern peoples, and other nationally and racially oppressed people experience conditions inferior to that of whites. Racist violence and the poison of racist ideas victimize all people of color no matter which economic class they belong to. The attempts to suppress and undercount the vote of the African American and other racially oppressed people are part of racism in the electoral process. Racism permeates the police, judicial and prison systems, perpetuating unequal sentencing, racial profiling, discriminatory enforcement, and police brutality. The democratic, civil and human rights of all working people are continually under attack. These attacks range from increasingly difficult procedures for union recognition and attempts to prevent full union participation in elections, to the absence of the right to strike for many public workers. They range from undercounting minority communities in the census to making it difficult for working people to run for office because of the domination of corporate campaign funding and the high cost of advertising. These attacks also include growing censorship and domination of the media by the ultra-right; growing restrictions and surveillance of activist social movements and the Left; open denial of basic rights to immigrants; and, violations of the Geneva Conventions up to and including torture for prisoners. These abuses all serve to maintain the grip of the capitalists on government power. They use this power to ensure the economic and political dominance of their class. Women still face a considerable differential in wages for work of equal or comparable value. They also confront barriers to promotion, physical and sexual abuse, continuing unequal workload in home and family life, and male supremacist ideology perpetuating unequal and often unsafe conditions. The constant attacks on social welfare programs severely impact single women, single mothers, nationally and racially oppressed women, and all working class women. The reproductive rights of all women are continually under attack ideologically and politically. Violence against women in the home and in society at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

# 1nc Shell Capitalism K

**Alternative--Our alternative is to not do the affirmative—capitalist relations should be withdrawn from and rejected—we must stop participating in activities that constitute a limited rescue operation for capital**

**Herod 2004**—James, Faculty at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, <http://www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/index.htm>

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, 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 out of 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, but 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 relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. **In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified 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 during 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 know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know 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. (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, but 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 doing so. Nevertheless, 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, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. 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 get free 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 *replacing* capitalism, totally, 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 win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus 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, but quite old. 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 get free 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, to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world.

# Link - transportation

**Globalized capitalism is driven by new transport expansion**

t . r . **l a k s h m a n a n a n d** l a t a r . **c h a t t e r j e e** **2005**,

 p r o f e s s o r s o f g e o g r a p h y a n d e n v i r o n m e n t a t t h e C e n t e r f o r Tr a n s p o r t a t i o n S t u d i e s a t B o s t o n U n i v e r s i t y. “Economic Consequences of Transport Improvements” A C C E S S, N U M B E R 2 6 , S P R I N G 2 0 0 5 [http://Www.Uctc.Net/Access/26/Access%2026%20-%2006%20-20Economic%20Consequences%20of%20Transport%20Improvements.Pdf](http://www.uctc.net/access/26/Access%2026%20-%2006%20-20Economic%20Consequences%20of%20Transport%20Improvements.pdf)

accessed ac)

Contemporary globalization is driven by a combination of new transport and communication technologies, knowledge-intensive production technologies, new open-trade institutions, neo-liberal ideologies, and logistical innovations facilitating ﬂows of goods, services, capital, and knowledge. Global network corporations—the major agents of globalization—simultaneously exploit economies of scale in widening markets and economies of scope in information, ﬁnancial, and marketing networks, while maintaining production units in urban regions around the world to take advantage of lower costs. Global capital thus uses urban regions as organizational structures to enhance returns, while also seeking infrastructure investments that improve accessibility and knowledge sharing. This explains the rapid growth of multinational ﬁrms in large metropolitan corridors surrounding such global cities as London, New York, Tokyo, and Los Angeles. Smaller urban areas, less endowed with global accessibility and knowledge, fare differently in the competition for global production locations. The ability of a smaller urban region to participate in the global division of labor depends on what cost advantages it can offer or what growth strategies it can develop that allow it to export to global markets. The evolution of globally competitive urban centers shifts important aspects of economic policy to the urban level, with an increasing role for urban economic policy. CO N C L U S I O N S This essay advances two ideas. First, the economic effects of transport improvements are dependent on the context in which the improvements are made. Economic outcomes vary according to the state of the preexisting transportation network, the state of economic development, and the nature of competition in the regions. This suggests that economic assessments of transport improvements must incorporate a broader range of interrelationships and data than are typically reviewed in transportation analyses. Second, economic history teaches that sustained improvements in transportation, going hand in hand with parallel improvements in information and production technologies and institutional structures, cause structural and developmental transformations— suggesting that very long-term transport effects are joint consequences of the evolution of transport, information, production, and institutional structures.

**The plan text is the necessary prerequisite to maintaining capitalist exploitation.**

**Sarkar 88** (Prabhat, Capitalism, Prabhat, 6 November 1988, Calcutta, *ElEdit 7, Prout in a Nutshell Part 16*, Decentralized Economy – 2 <http://evolutionnews.co.nz/capitalism/> accessed ac)

This arrangement is not possible under **capitalism**. **Capitalism will never support decentralization, because capitalist production exists to maximize profits**. Centralization means industry for profit, while decentralization means industry for consumption. PROUT’s approach, which will be supported by all rational people, is production for consumption. PROUT’s maxim is, “**Production for consumption, not production for profiteering.”** **Capitalists want to produce commodities at the lowest costs and sell them at the highest prices. To produce commodities cheaply, there must be efficient transportation, cheap raw materials, cheap labour, cheap energy, adequate water supply, etc. No matter what form****capitalism takes – individual****capitalism, group****capitalism or state****capitalism – capitalists will always prefer centralized production. All these forms of****capitalism are essentially the same.**

# Link – cost of transportation internal links to advantages

**Their focus on transportation infrastructure historically is a capitalist form of oppression of the worker, plan continues this exploitation**

**Worker’s Bush Telegraph 3-22-11**

(“Railways and Capitalism”<http://workersbushtelegraph.com.au/2011/03/22/railways-and-capitalism/> accessed ac)

At all times, the capitalist class strives to reduce their costs of transportation. They do this by increasing the amount of exploitation of the workers in the transport industry. Every innovation introduced into the railways is aimed at increasing the efficiency and productivity of each worker, and to reduce the number of workers. The introduction of diesels, electrification, Centralised Traffic Control signaling systems, standardisation of rail gauge, faster rolling stock and hump-shunting have all been used by the railway administrations to increase exploitation and raise productivity. As part of this process, passenger services, which require a greater number of workers for their operations, are being allowed to decline. Less work than ever is now available for Guards, conductors, ticket-collectors, refreshment-room attendants and other station staff. Major work-shops at Newport, Spotswood, Ballarat an Bendigo have been passed over in favour of awarding contracts to private firms. Skilled workers are not replaced on retirement, and the livelihood of the other workers remains threatened. The elimination of steam engines meant fewer engines, fewer men, less maintenance and much less costs altogether. Diesel-powered locomotives require comparatively little maintenance and do not need to stop frequently for coal and water as did the steam engines. Similarly, machines operated by a couple of men have replaced the hundreds of track repairers who were necessary to build and maintain the track. Centralised signaling is rapidly replacing the signalmen who were previously needed at each junction, siding or crossing loop. RAILWAYS SERVE MONOPOLIES Capital is always available for the expansion of freight services and the introduction of new equipment for specialised handling, e.g., road-rail terminals, and new wagons for the transport of containers, bulk grains, cement, steel and ore traffic. These top priority trains carry the goods of the larger monopoly capitalists – in Australia they are quite often the goods of U.S., British and Japanese monopolies – cars for Ford, G.M.-H., petroleum products for Exxon, B.P. Mobil, steel products and ore-trains for Comalco, Hammerlsey and B.H.P. They pay low freight charges and use for their own ends the entire railway facilities, dictating the scale of operations and demanding all sorts of concessions. Ordinary people, on the other hand, pay high fares and get uncomfortable, infrequent and unpleasant travelling conditions. In some situations, monopolies have been allowed to build their own modern railways, such as the Hammersley line, B.H.P.’s lines at Port Kembla, Silverton Tramways’ lines at Broken Hill and the Emu Bay line in Tasmania.

# Link – transport work/jobs advantage internal links

**Transportation industry is direct alienation of the worker from their labor, it is intrinsically capitalist**

**Worker’s Bush Telegraph 3-22-11**

(“Railways and Capitalism”<http://workersbushtelegraph.com.au/2011/03/22/railways-and-capitalism/> accessed ac)

Just like workers in other industries, workers in the transport industry take part in the production of commodities. We produce what Marx calls a ‘useful effect’. The ‘useful effect’ of the transport industry is the actual moving of goods and people from one place to another. Raw materials move from the mines to the ports and factories, finished products are transported to and from the markets, workers are brought from their homes to the work-places. The movement of commodities (the result of the work of transport workers) adds value to the various commodities being moved – the greater the distance, the greater the value added: … the use-value of things has no existence except in consumption, and this may necessitate a change of place on the part of the product, in other words, it may require the additional process of production of the transportation industry. The productive capital invested in this industry adds value to the transported products, partly by transferring value to the transported products from the means of transportation [i.e., the using-up and 'wear and tear' of rails, roads, engines etc.], partly by adding value through labour-power used in transportation [i.e., the using-up and 'wear and tear' of shunters, drivers, signalmen, etc]. This last-named addition of value consists, as it does in all capitalist production, of a reproduction of wages and of surplus-value. Look at the production of a Ford motor car. It is the product of the collective labour of thousands of men and women. They work on the production lines and in the offices of factories at Broadmeadows and Geelong, in the rubber mills and glass-works, and also in the transport industry – carrying raw materials, components and finished parts from one plant to another. However, both the car and the profits from its future sales are owned by a small group of share-holders in the U.S.A. This is the contradiction of capitalism – production is carried out collectively by thousands of workers who do not own what they produce. They are paid a wage which represents the amount necessary to keep the worker and the family from week to week, but no more than that. The products, like the factories, are owned by a small handful of people. In Australia, these people are mainly U.S., British and Japanese monopoly capitalists.

# Link –High Speed railways

**Railway expansion is the expansion of capitalist markets**

**Simon Clarke, 11-25-2010**

(“The Crisis of Fordism and the Crisis of Capitalism”, Department of Sociology, University of Warwick, <http://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/~syrbe/pubs/telos.pdf>)

The impact of the development of commercial road transport was at least as signi cant as the development of the private motor car. The growth of the railways had been an enormously powerful and pervasive lever of the concentration and centralisation of capital, not only in railways and the directly associated industries, but also in industries as varied as banking and nance, steel and coal, commodity dealing and wholesale and retail trade. This was not only an e ect of the concentration and centralisation of railway capital, but also because of the rigidity of the railway system. The railways had opened the mass market, but had enormously narrowed and concentrated the channels of access to that market. The concentration and centralisation of capital in a whole range of consumer goods industries had led to competition based on the di erentiation of homogeneous products and on the industrial processing of raw materials to provide a rapidly widening range of consumer goods, but at the same time the rigidity of railway transport con ned such opportunities to the largest corporations, while restricting the distribution of their products. The development of road transport overcame this barriers, both extending the distribution of the new range of consumption goods, and providing smaller producers with access to the new mass markets

# Link – Reforms

**The affirmative’s participation in the process of reforming capital without changing its basic structure allows everyone to feel as though they are ‘doing something’ when in fact, nothing structural is ever changing at all – only specific manifestations. Actions that seem like ‘a step in the right direction’ are nothing more than a placebo.**

Marc **Weeks, and** Frederic **Maurel**,

(“Voyages Across the Web of Time; Angkarn, Nietzsche and Temporal Colonization, Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, September 1st, 19**99** )

Angkarn is referring here to a repetition of sounds, a cyclicity which may or may not impede progression. When this structural metaphor is transferred to contemporary social, political and economic domains, it is readily conceptualized as an inertia or resistance to change, particularly in a culture such as Thailand's, acutely conscious of its dramatic shift from rural cycles to the linearity of "progressive" urban development. However, while we would not defend the kind of nostalgia Angkarn does indeed occasionally indulge in, it appears that the question of time and its relationship to progress has, like everything else, become peculiarly complex in the context of a globalizing free market that imposes a seemingly ineluctable momentum. [11] Recent problematics of time and movement in the West, which has undergone the transition from agrarian to technological free market more gradually and yet no less profoundly, increasingly force analysis outside the dichotomy of present versus past tense, the dynamic versus the static. Ben Agger, for example, in elaborating his theory of "fast capitalism" observes that an obsession, an intoxication with rapid movement and transformation for its own sake may actually undermine progress by rendering considered resistance impossible: "My problem is how the world stays the same. It does so by changing -- deepening ideology, moronizing everyday life, suppressing critique." [12] The French philosopher of postmodemity Jean Baudrillard has likewise discerned a paradoxically conservative effect in the culture of speed, of "movement for movement's sake".

**Reformism is a failure: Liberal democracy and capitalism work together. The freedoms that are protected directly correlate with the needs and desires of globalized consumerism. It’s a rigged game**

Samuel **Bowles** **and** Herbert **Gintis**, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, 19**76**

The reformers’ optimism has not been rewarded: the problem of inequality is not solved. Rather, its form is changed. But the reform strategy can hardly be considered a failure from the standpoint of the capitalist class. The displacement of social problems into the state sector plays a central role in the reproduction of the capitalist order. The form in which a social problem manifests itself and the arena in which the resulting conflicts are fought out are matters of no small importance. Conflicts within the state sector, even if bitter and enduring, appear to be much less threatening to capital and less disruptive to profits than those which take place on the shop floor or in the office. The class nature of social problems is often obscured when the manifestations of the underlying contradictions are displaced into the state sector.

# Link – Sustainable economic reforms-“we benefit the environment”

Any reform or attempt at making growth sustainable is bound to fail – the point of their type of counter-measure to the ecological crisis is not to fundamentally change growth’s relation to ecology, but to pave the way for more growth in the future. That strategy ensures that collapse is inevitable.

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002,

(The Enemy of Nature, p. 22-24)

Since Plato at least, people have been observing the potential for delet­erious environmental effects, and since the publication of George Perkins Marsh’s Man and Nature in 1864, the possibility of systemic ecological damage has been raised. Marsh, however, was a visionary, and it took another century for the grim possibility of global ecosystemic decay to enter the general consciousness and become a concern of elites. In 1970, the notion of the ‘limits to growth’ entered the collective vocabulary, to be joined as time went on by other buzzwords such as ‘sustainability’ and ‘throughput’ .7 For a time it seemed as if humanity had awakened to its own harm­fulness. But then something strange happened. Even as the vocabulary of ecological concern proliferated, along with a large bureaucratic apparatus, non-governmental as well as governmental, for putting it into effect, a shift occurred and the notion of ‘limits to growth’ became passé. Where once not so very long ago there was substantial concern that some combination of rising population and industrial expansion would overwhelm the earth with catastrophic consequences for civilization, today thoughts of the kind are distinctly unfashionable, even if not entirely extinguished. What is odd is that, as we have already seen, ‘growth’, whether of population or industrial output, certainly did not slacken in this period. The latter is especially troubling, inasmuch as population, however unacceptably large it may be, shows signs of levelling across most of the world (even reaching zero or slightly negative levels in Japan and some Western Euro­pean countries, and rather precipitous declines in the former Soviet bloc). Nothing of the sort can be said about the other kind of growth, that pertaining to industrial output or production in general, however this may be measured.8 According to the Worldwatch Institute, a mainstream organ­ization charged with monitoring the world’s ecology, the global economy increased from $2.3 trillion in 1900, to $20 trillion in 8990 and an astounding $39 trillion in 1998. To quote, the ‘growth in economic output in just three years — from 1995 to 1998 — exceeded that during the 10,000 years from the beginning of agriculture until 1990. And growth of the global economy in i997 alone easily exceeded that during the seventeenth century’9 This is consistent with the fact that world trade has increased by a factor of 15 over the past four decades, all of which lends support to the prediction, made in 1997, that gross world product will double within the next 20 years, that is, to some $80 trillion dollars. The Malthusian principle that population will increase exponentially —a crude reduction of conscious creatures to machines obeying the rules of elementary algebra — has now been empirically as well as theoretically demolished. If there is to be a fatally destabilizing exponential increase of load, it will come in the economic sphere. This is certified by the figures just given, and, more significantly, by the value accorded them in established channels of opinion. We can easily imagine the horror and outrage with which an announcement that population would double in the next 20 years would be greeted. A similar claim made for economic activity however, not only evades criticism but is greeted as though a sign of the Second Coming. Predictions of growth may or may not turn out to be on schedule. In fact, they got slowed a bit by the Asian financial meltdowns that began even as they were announced, and all the vagaries of the global economy will play a role in their realization. What matters, however, is that the world is run by those who see limits to growth as anathema. The scenario of ecological collapse holds, in essence, that the cumulative effects of growth eventually overwhelm the integrity of ecosystems on a world scale, leading to a cascading series of shocks. Just how the blows will fall is impossible to tell with any precision, although a number of useful computer models have been assembled. In general terms, we would anticipate interacting calamities that invade and rupture the core material substrata of civilization — food, water, air, habitat, bodily health. Already each of these physical substrata is under stress, and the logic of the crisis dictates that these stresses will increase. Other shocks and perturbations are likely to ensue as resource depletion supervenes for example, in the supply of petroleum, which is expected to begin levelling off and then decline after the next ten years.’2 Or some unforeseen economic shock will topple the balance: perhaps climatic catastrophes will trigger a collapse of the $2 trillion global insurance industry, with, as Jeremy Leggett has noted, ‘knock-on economic consequences which are completely ignored in most analyses of climate change’.’3 Perhaps famines will incite wars in which rogue nuclear powers will launch their reign of terror. Perhaps a similar fate will come through the eruption of as yet unforeseen global pandemics, such as the return of smallpox, currently considered to be within the range of possibilities open to terrorist groups. Or perhaps a sudden break-up of the Antarctic ice shelf will cause seas to suddenly rise by several metres, displacing hundreds of millions and precipitating yet more violent climatic changes. Or perhaps nothing so dramatic will take place, but only a slow and steady deterioration in ecosystems, associated with a rise in authorit­arianism. The apocalyptic scenarios now so commonly making the rounds of films, best-selling novels, comic books, computer games and television are not so much harbingers of the future as inchoate renderings of the present ecological crisis. With terror in the air, these mass fantasies can become the logos of a new order of fascism — a fascism that, in the name of making the planet habitable, only aggravates the crisis as it further disintegrates human ecologies. Or maybe things will work out and we will all muddle through somehow. The notion of limits to growth may have been shelved, but the system has not been sleeping. A vast complex of recuperative measures has been installed in its place, remedies that seek to restore ecological balance without threatening the main economic engines. Given the skill and resources devoted to the project, there is bound to be some good news to report. What is at issue, however, is adequacy: whether all the pollution controls, efficiencies, trading of credits, resource substitutions, information-rich com­modities, engineered biological products, ‘green business’ and the like can compensate for retaining a system whose very heartbeat is growth without boundaries. Remember, the point of all these counter-measures is not just to protect against ecological breakdown, but to bring on line new sources of growth. This raises the spectre of a world like a gigantic Potemkin village, where a green and orderly facade conceals and reassures, while accelerated breakdown takes place behind its walls.

# Link – single issue movements

**It is the type of movement you participate in that is the problem. Single-issue movements are easily appropriated by the political system, failing to cause any institutional change. By depriving the harms of their Universal aspect, you doom your protest to impotence.**

Slavoj **Zizek,** Senior Researcher at Ljubjana, 19**97**,

(“Repeating Lenin”, [www.lacan.com/replenin](http://www.lacan.com/replenin))

Today, we already can discern the signs of a kind of general unease - recall the series of events usually listed under the name of "Seattle." The 10 years honeymoon of the triumphant global capitalism is over, the long-overdue "seven years itch" is here - witness the panicky reactions of the big media, which - from the Time magazine to CNN - all of a sudden started to warn about the Marxists manipulating the crowd of the "honest" protesters. The problem is now the strictly Leninist one - how to ACTUALIZE the media's accusations: how to invent the organizational structure which will confer on this unrest the FORM of the universal political demand. Otherwise, the momentum will be lost, and what will remain is the marginal disturbance, perhaps organized as a new Greenpeace, with certain efficiency, but also strictly limited goals, marketing strategy, etc. In other words, the key "Leninist" lesson today is: politics without the organizational FORM of the party is politics without politics, so the answer to those who want just the (quite adequately named) "New SOCIAL Movements" is the same as the answer of the Jacobins to the Girondin compromisers: "You want revolution without a revolution!" Today's blockade is that there are two ways open for the socio-political engagement: either play the game of the system, engage in the "long march through the institutions," or get active in new social movements, from feminism through ecology to anti-racism. And, again, the limit of these movements is that they are not POLITICAL in the sense of the Universal Singular: they are "one issue movements" which lack the dimension of the universality, i.e. they do not relate to the social TOTALITY. Here, Lenin's reproach to liberals is crucial: they only EXPLOIT the working classes' discontent to strengthen their position vis-a-vis the conservatives, instead of identifying with it to the end.[52](http://www.lacan.com/replenin%22%20%5Cl%20%2252#52) Is this also not the case with today's Left liberals? They like to evoke racism, ecology, workers' grievances, etc., to score points over the conservatives WITHOUT ENDANGERING THE SYSTEM. Recall how, in Seattle, Bill Clinton himself deftly referred to the protesters on the streets outside, reminding the gathered leaders inside the guarded palaces that they should listen to the message of the demonstrators (the message which, of course, Clinton interpreted, depriving it of its subversive sting attributed to the dangerous extremists introducing chaos and violence into the majority of peaceful protesters). It's the same with all New Social Movements, up to the Zapatistas in Chiapas: the systemic politics is always ready to "listen to their demands," depriving them of their proper political sting. The system is by definition ecumenical, open, tolerant, ready to "listen" to all - even if one insist on one's demands, they are deprived of their universal political sting by the very form of negotiation. The true Third Way we have to look for is this third way between the institutionalized parliamentary politics and the new social movements.

**PROTEST OF SINGLE ISSUES WILL BE ABSORBED BY THE SYSTEM – DEMOBILIZING ANTI-CAPITALIST EFFORTS**

**HEROD 2004** [James, getting free, 7th edition, <http://jamesherod.info/?sec=book&id=1>

**We cannot destroy capitalism with single-issue campaigns**, yet the great bulk of radicals’ energy is spent on these campaigns. There are dozens of them: campaigns to defend abortion rights, maintain rent control, halt whaling, prohibit toxic dumping, stop the war on drugs, stop police brutality, stop union busting, abolish the death penalty, stop the logging of redwoods, outlaw the baby seal kill, ban genetically modified foods, stop the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, stop global warming, and on and on. **What we are doing is spending our lives trying to fix a system that generates evils faster than we can ever eradicate them**. Although some of these campaigns use direct action (e.g., spikes in the trees to stop the chain saws or Greenpeace boats in front of the whaling ships to block the harpoons), for the most part the **campaigns are aimed at passing legislation in Congress to correct the problem. Unfortunately, reforms that are won in one decade, after endless agitation, can be easily wiped off the books the following decade, after the protesters have gone home** or a new administration comes to power.These struggles all have value and are needed. Could anyone think that the campaigns against global warming, to free Leonard Peltier, or to aid the East Timorese ought to be abandoned? Single-issue campaigns keep us aware of what's wrong and sometimes even win gains. But **in and of themselves, they cannot destroy capitalism, and thus cannot really fix things. It is utopian to believe that we can reform capitalism. Most of these evils can only be eradicated for good if we destroy capitalism itself and create a new civilization. We cannot afford to aim for anything less. Our very survival is at stake. There is one single-issue campaign I can wholeheartedly endorse: the total and permanent eradication of capitalism.**

# Link – climate policy/K turns case

**The plan is a reaffirmation of capitalist logic – its attempt at controlling climate change through the markets will fail and recreate the problems that create climate change**

[**Tanur**](http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?auteur54) ***2010*** [Daniel , IV Online magazine : IV422 - March 2010, Climate change/16th World Congress Mobilization for the climate and anti-capitalist strategy <http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article1837> accessed tm)

Capitalist climate policy reinforces the capitalists who are destroying the climate. Thus we can see in action the power of the fossil energy lobbies and the sectors which are linked to them, such as cars, shipbuilding, aeronautics, petrochemicals and others. This confirms the Marxist analysis according to which monopolies have the power to slow down the equalization of rates of profit. In the case of fossil fuels, this power is all the stronger in that it is anchored in the ownership of deposits, mines etc, therefore in ground rent. The result is laid out before our eyes: in all countries, climate plans do not represent even half of what would be necessary in terms of reduction of greenhouse gases emissions. Moreover, these plans are deepening social inequality and are accompanied by a headlong flight into dangerous technologies: nuclear energy, the massive production of biofuels and the capture and geological sequestration of CO2 (supposed to make coal “clean”). It is within this general framework that we have to look at the farce of Copenhagen: the ultra-mediatised conference supposed to lead to a new constraining and ambitious international treaty to take over from the Kyoto Protocol ended in a rout: without targets in hard figures, without deadlines, without even a reference year from which to measure reductions in emissions. Moreover, Copenhagen could well mark a turn towards a policy even more dangerous than that of the Protocol. By the agreement they concluded, in fact, the 25 big polluting countries were largely freed from the scientific pressure of the IPCC and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. It was a horse-traders’ agreement between imperialism and the new rising capitalist powers, who shared out the atmosphere on the backs of the peoples, the workers and the poor of the entire world. It is very much to be feared that the Cancun Conference in December will confirm this turn. In that case, on the basis of current national climate plans, we can project a rise in the average surface temperature between 3.2 and 4.9°C in 2100 (compared to the eighteenth century). We should be wary of falling into a catastrophism with eschatological undertones. Some apocalyptic discourses, indeed, only invoke urgency in order to argue for sacrifices and to conjure away the responsibility of capitalism. But there is no doubt that a rise in temperature of 4°C would lead to real social and ecological catastrophes. It is a question here of taking the exact measure of the threat. It is not the future of the planet which is at stake, nor life on Earth, nor even the survival of mankind. Apart from an asteroid dropping on us, a large-scale nuclear accident is probably the only thing that can threaten the survival of our species. Climate change, in any case, does not threaten it. But it threatens to seriously worsen the conditions of existence of the 3 billion men and women who already lack the essentials of life. And it threatens the physical survival of a few hundred millions of them, those who are the least responsible for global warming.

# Link – economic collapse

**Rhetoric of economic collapse snowballs into a politics of crisis in which capitalism is the only hope for survival**

**Zizek 97**

 [Slavoj, “Multiculturalism, or, the cultural logic of multinational capitalism,” New Left Review # 224 p. 34-35)

So, back to the recent Labour victory, one can see how it not only involved a hegemonic reappropriation of a series of motifs which were usually inscribed into the Conservative field—family values, law and order, individual responsibility; the Labour ideological offensive also separated these motifs from the obscene phantasmatic subtext which sustained them in the Conservative field—in which ‘toughness on crime’ and ‘individual responsibility’ subtly referred to brutal egotism, to the disdain for victims, and other ‘basic instincts’. The problem, however, is that the New Labour strategy involved its own ‘message between the lines’: we fully accept the logic of Capital, we will not mess about with it. Today, financial crisis is a permanent state of things the reference to which legitimizes the demands to cut social spending, health care, support of culture and scientific research, in short, the dismantling of the welfare state. Is, however, this permanent crisis really an objective feature of our socio-economic life? Is it not rather one of the effects of the shift of balance in the ‘class struggle’ towards Capital, resulting from the growing role of new technologies as well as from the direct internationalization of Capital and the co-dependent diminished role of the Nation-State which was further able to impose certain minimal requirements and limitations to exploitation? In other words, the crisis is an ‘objective fact’ if and only if one accepts in advance as an unquestionable premise the inherent logic of Capital—as more and more left-wing or liberal parties have done. We are thus witnessing the uncanny spectacle of social-democratic parties which came to power with the between-the-lines message to Capital ‘we will do the necessary job for you in an even more efficient and painless way than the conservatives’. The problem, of course, is that, in today’s global socio-political circumstances, it is practically impossible effectively to call into question the logic of Capital: even a modest social-democratic attempt to redistribute wealth beyond the limit acceptable to the Capital ‘effectively’ **leads to economic crisis, inflation, a fall in revenues and so on**. Nevertheless, one should always bear in mind how the connection between ‘cause’ (rising social expenditure) and ‘effect’ (economic crisis) is not a direct objective causal one: it is always-already embedded in a situation of social antagonism and struggle. The fact that, **if one does not obey the limits set by Capital, a crisis ‘really follows’, in no way ‘proves’ that the necessity of these limits is an objective necessity of economic life**. It should rather be conceived as a proof of the privileged position Capital holds in the economic and political struggle, as in the situation where a stronger partner threatens that if you do X, you will be punished by Y, and then, upon your doing X, Y effectively ensues.

# Link – hegemony impacts

US hegemony is an attempt to forestall the collapse of international capitalism. Because it’s rooted in the crisis of capitalist accumulation it can never solve their impacts.

Nick Beams, member of International Editorial Board and National Secretary of Australian Socialist Equality Party, 2003

(“The Political Economy of American Militarism, part 2” July 2, <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2003/jul2003/nb-j10.shtml> accessed ac)

The immediate impetus for the drive to global domination by the US is rooted in the crisis of capitalist accumulation, expressed in the persistent downward pressure on the rate of profit and the failure of the most strenuous efforts over the past 25 years to overcome it. But it is more than this. At the most fundamental level, the eruption of US imperialism represents a desperate attempt to overcome, albeit in a reactionary manner, the central contradiction that has bedeviled the capitalist system for the best part of the last century.The US came to economic and political ascendancy as World War I exploded. The war, as Trotsky analysed, was rooted in the contradiction between the development of the productive forces on a global scale and the division of the world among competing great powers. Each of these powers sought to resolve the contradiction by establishing its own ascendancy, thereby coming into collision with its rivals. The Russian Revolution, conceived of and carried forward as the first step in the international socialist revolution, was the first attempt of a detachment of the working class to resolve the contradiction between world economy and the outmoded nation-state framework on a progressive basis. Ultimately, the forces of capitalism proved too strong and the working class, as a result of a tragic combination of missed opportunities and outright betrayals, was unable to carry this program forward. But the historical problem that had erupted with such volcanic force—the necessity to reorganise the globally developed productive forces of mankind on a new and higher foundation, to free them from the destructive fetters of private property and the nation-state system—did not disappear. It was able to be suppressed for a period. But the very development of capitalist production itself ensured that it would come to the surface once again, even more explosively than in the past. The US conquest of Iraq must be placed within this historical and political context. The drive for global domination represents the attempt by American imperialism to resolve the central contradiction of world capitalism by creating a kind of global American empire, operating according to the rules of the “free market” interpreted in accordance with the economic needs and interests of US capital, and policed by its military and the military forces of its allies. This deranged vision of global order was set out by Bush in his address to West Point graduates on June 1, 2002. The US, he said, now had the best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the seventeenth century to “build a world where great powers compete in peace instead of prepare for war.” Competition between great nations was inevitable, but war was not. That was because “America has, and intends to keep, military strengths beyond challenge thereby making the destabilising arms races of other eras pointless and limiting rivalries to trade and other pursuits of peace.” This proposal to reorganise the world is even more reactionary than when it was first advanced in 1914. The US push for global domination, driven on as it is by the crisis in the very heart of the profit system, cannot bring peace, much less prosperity, but only deepening attacks on the world’s people, enforced by military and dictatorial forms of rule.

# Answers to “we link turn the cap K”

**First, we must recognize that the 1AC harms are based on the capitalist system. Any attempt at radicalized action from within the state and the domain of capital is powerless**

**Meszaros 1995** (Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex) [Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition] P. 65

The modern state as the comprehensive political command structure of capital — is both the necessary prerequisite for the transformation of capital’s at first fragmented units into a viable system, and the overall framework for the full articulation and maintenance of the latter as a global system. In this fundamental sense the state on account of its constitutive and permanently sustaining role must be understood as an integral part of capital’s material ground itself. Or it contributes in a substantive way not only to the formation and consolidation of all of the major reproductive structures of society but also to their continued functioning. However, the close interrelationship holds also when viewed from the other side. For the modern state itself is quite inconceivable without capital as its social metabolic foundation. This makes the material reproductive structures of the capital system the necessary condition not only for the original constitution but also for the continued survival (and appropriate historical transformations) of the modern state in all its dimensions. These reproductive structures extend their Impact over everything, from the strictly material/repressive instruments cid juridical institutions of the state all the way to the most mediated ideological and political theorizations of its raison d’être and claimed legitimacy. It is on account of this reciprocal determination that we must speak of a close match between the social metabolic ground of the capital system on the one hand, and the modern state as the totalizing political command structure of the established productive and reproductive order on the other. For socialists this is a most uncomfortable and challenging reciprocity. It puts into relief the sobering fact that any intervention in the political domain — even when it envisages the radical overthrow of the capitalist state — can have only a very limited impact in the realization of the socialist project. And the other way round, the corollary of the same sobering fact is that, precisely because socialists have to confront the power of capital’s self-sustaining reciprocity under its fundamental dimensions, it should be never forgotten or ignored - although the tragedy of seventy years (if Soviet experience is that it had been willfully ignored — that there can be no chance of overcoming the power of capital without remaining faithful to the Marxian concern with the ‘withering away’ of the state.

# Answer to “we stop economic collapse and that’s good”

**Stabilization is irrelevant – capitalist intervention may stabilize the markets but can not recover them**

**Geier 2010** [Joel, ISR Issue 71, May–June 2010 Contradictions of the recovery One phase of the crisis may be over, but there is more economic trouble ahead, says Joel Geier , http://www.isreview.org/issues/71/rep-economy.shtml

Instead, there was the reintroduction of Keynesian economics, and the rapid response of massive fiscal and monetary stimulus on an international, coordinated basis. The United States led Japan, the European Union, and BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China) in an unprecedented international fiscal and monetary stimulus. Interest rates were reduced to their lowest level ever. The Federal Reserve continues to provide free money to the banking system, holding interest rates close to zero. Capitalist governments transferred private capitalist debt from banks and corporations to the state—losses were socialized for the public to pay for. State intervention provided credit, demand, and infrastructure investment. The Bush-Obama administrations saved the banking system, the auto industry, and the housing industry. Their failure would have brought down the rest of the capitalist economy and likely created a 1930s-style depression. The capitalist state, not the market, produced stabilization, the end of the free-fall, and the start of a recovery. However, the fundamentals of the capitalist economy are so weak that there is no confidence that if the state were to withdraw stimulus that recovery could be sustained. The fear is that if the “free market” was left to its own solutions, and government stimulus sharply curtailed, demand would collapse, renewing recession. All of this has to be subtly presented so that faith in “free enterprise” is not excessively undermined. In housing and construction, for example, stabilization is problematic and recovery still distant. Four million additional foreclosures are expected in 2010. A quarter of mortgage-holders are under water, their homes valued at less than their mortgages, while a further decline of 10-15 percent in housing prices could double that number. Today there is no housing industry—robust or weak—without the state. Eighty percent of all mortgages are made or guaranteed by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, government agencies with state subsidies and guarantees. Their combined losses could cost the government $400 billion. In addition the state has in the last year bought $1.25 trillion of mortgage-backed securities from the banks, including toxic assets to keep the mortgage market functioning. The banks—despite the apparent “profitability” that is used to justify mega bonuses for their meritorious, hard working, deserving executives—also would be bankrupt without continued state support. The state guarantees their deposits and their loans. The restoration of banking profits has come through three sources: revaluing toxic assets upward (called “mark to make-believe” in the capital markets), government capital to invest in higher paying assets, and speculating with the free money the government provides. The eighteen largest banks, which the government guaranteed after “stress tests” as too big to fail, now borrow money at on average 29 basis points cheaper than banks without government support. This came to a total of $3.4 billion, half of bank profits last quarter. The banks profit from the steep yield curve by borrowing money from the government at almost zero interest, or taking deposits at pathetically low rates, and recycling them by buying government debt in the form of treasury bonds at three and a half or four percent, with minimal risk. The banks have also used the free money to speculate in commodities, stocks, and international real estate, creating new bubbles internationally. Goldman Sachs, which converted itself into a bank holding company so as to be eligible for Fed money, made 11 percent of its 2009 profits from traditional banking, and 72 percent from speculation—courtesy of the taxpayers. Despite this government welfare, the banking system continues to bleed in terms of non-performing loans from housing, commercial real estate, auto, credit card, and business loans. The banks have disguised many losses from non-performing loans by rolling them over in what Wall Street insiders call “extend and pretend.” Wall Street’s crisis has not been solved—its losses have been absorbed by the government.

# 2nc links—use of technology bad

**The drive to technology of the affirmative is a self-defeating form of mastery that will end in the suicide of humanity**

Greg **Siegel 2005** [A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Communication Studies. Chapel Hill 2005, TECHNOLOGIES OF ACCIDENT: FORENSIC MEDIA, CRASH ANALYSIS, AND THE REDEFINITION OF PROGRESS <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=26&ved=0CFgQFjAFOBQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fcdr.lib.unc.edu%2Findexablecontent%3Fid%3Duuid%3Ab5fb4148-2843-438e-8e93-468c9932c97f%26ds%3DDATA_FILE%26dl%3Dtrue&ei=nSXST7vuH6He2QWpxOiqDw&usg=AFQjCNE8WL-e4BN0q3QRD3iyZy2S76EBnQ&sig2=2yI32oOfDYxf7eSPin7LaA>

Significantly, what distinguished the “progress” of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from historically prior definitions of progress was its inextricable intertwining with a widespread and seemingly unshakeable faith in modern science and technology. In Leo Marx’s view, “the full-blown modern concept of Progress” derived from the pervasive perception of man’s double domination of nature: first by means of Enlightenment science (knowledge about nature), then by means of Industrial Age technology (power over nature).22 Along these same lines, Siegfried Giedion states: “Eighteenth-century faith in progress as formulated by Condorcet started from science; that of the nineteenth century, from mechanization. Industry, which brought about this mechanization with its unceasing flow of inventions, had something of the miracle that roused the fantasy of the masses.”23 Indeed, by the second half of the nineteenth century, with the “miracle” of mechanization in full swing in Western Europe and the United States, moral and social progress had become powerfully identified with — or, as Lewis Mumford implies, tragically reduced to — technological progress: The notion that the machine by reason of its rationality of design and its austere perfection of performance was now a moral force, indeed the moral force, one that set new standards of achievement for man, made it easier to equate the new technology, even in its most sordid manifestations, with human improvement.24 This was especially the case in America, where the visible, audible, and palpable presence of mechanical marvels — the railroad and the telegraph chief among them — seemed to leave little doubt as to the superiority of the present to the past. “During the nineteenth century,” Marx writes, “no one needs to spell out the idea of progress to Americans. They can see it, hear it, and, in a manner of speaking, feel it as the idea of history most nearly analogous to the rising tempo of life.”25 According to every major commentator on the subject, including the ones mentioned above, the concept of technological progress confronted new and formidable challenges in the twentieth century. World War I constituted one such challenge. Michael Adas has shown how scientific and technological gauges of human worth and potential dominated European thought, expression, and political practice (especially colonialist policy) in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.26 The atrocities of the Great War — the suicidal standoff in the trenches, the homicidal efficiency of the new machinery of warfare — strongly suggested that those gauges were in need of radical recalibration, that the West’s evaluation of its own moral and material preeminence was dangerously delusional, even self-defeating. The conflict’s mechanization of slaughter evidenced not so much man’s mastery of nature as his brutal subjugation to the techniques and technologies that were supposed to enable that mastery. In the eyes of many Europeans, the dream of technological progress had turned into a nightmare. Henry James’s poignant expression of the sense of betrayal that Europeans felt in the early months of the war, when they realized that technical advance could lead to massive slaughter as readily as to social betterment, was elaborated upon in the years after the war by such thinkers as William Inge, who declared that the conflict had exposed the “law of inevitable progress” as a mere superstition. . . . Science had produced perhaps the ugliest of civilizations; technological marvels had been responsible for unimaginable destruction. Never again, he concluded, would there be “an opportunity for gloating over this kind of improvement.” The belief in progress, the “working faith” of the West for 150 years, had been forever discredited.27 Most critics and historians of “progress” do not go so far as to say that the First World War “forever discredited” the faith in technological progress, though most do acknowledge how drastically it diminished it. Mazlish and Marx point to a number of other events and forces that undermined techno-progressivist optimism during the twentieth century, including the Holocaust (and the industrialization of death it realized), the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (and the apocalyptic imaginings “the bomb” excited thereafter), growing skepticism about the objectivity and validity of scientific knowledge, and postmodernist critiques of modernity, modernization, and metanarratives.28 Writing in reference to train wrecks and derailments, Schivelbusch observes that in the nineteenth century, “The accident was seen as a negative indicator of technological progress.”29 Mary Ann Doane puts it this way: The time of technological progress is always felt as linear and fundamentally irreversible — technological change is almost by definition an “advance,” and it is extremely difficult to conceive of any movement backward, any regression. Hence, technological evolution is perceived as unflinching progress toward a total state of control over nature. If some notion of pure Progress is the utopian element in this theory of technological development, catastrophe is its dystopia, the always unexpected interruption of this forward movement.30 Following Schivelbusch and Doane, we need to add another entry to Mazlish and Marx’s list of twentieth-century challenges to the faith in technological progress: namely, technological accidents, starting with the sinking of the Royal Mail Steamer Titanic in 1912.31 As has been said many times, the Titanic disaster — the sinking of an “unsinkable” ocean liner — called into question widely accepted claims of technological progress, and did so, incidentally, two years prior to the outbreak of World War I.

# Cap K Impact – Ethics (answers utilitarianism)

We have an ethical obligation to reject global capitalism because of the suffering it imposes upon millions across the globe and because of the way it circumscribes the very field of political possibilities.

Slavoj **Zizek and** Glyn Daly, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, 2004, Conversations With Zizek, p. 14-16

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord­ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subju­gated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties con­cerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of im­plicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibi­tion conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a uni­versal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its out­comes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diver­sity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and name­less (viz, the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’. And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is mag­nified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differ­ential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sus­tained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par­ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

**AND, THERE’S NO VALUE TO LIFE IN THEIR FRAMEWORK**

Michael **Dillon,** Professor of Poly Sci @ University of Lancaster**, 99** (“Another Justice” *Political Theory* Vol. 27 No. 2 April pg. 165,)

**Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability**.35 Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. **Once rendered calculable**, however, **units of account are necessarily submissible** not only to valuation but also, of course, **to devaluation. Devaluation**, logi­cally, **can extend to the point of counting as nothing.** Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. **There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of holocaust.** **How­ever liberating and emancipating systems of value**—rights—**may claim to be**, for example, **they run the risk of counting out the invaluable**. **Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life.** Herewith, then, the neces­sity of championing the invaluable itself. For we must never forget that, “we are dealing always with whatever exceeds measure.”36 But how does that necessity present itself? Another Justice answers: as the surplus of the duty to answer to the claim of Justice over rights. That duty, as with the advent of another Justice, is integral to the lack constitutive of the human way of being.

# Impact – capitalism causes warming

**Capitalism is the root cause of Warming; Alternative key to avoiding extinction.**

James **Herod 2009** (Capitalists, Global Warming, and the Climate Justice Movement: Reflections on COP15; http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/james-herod-capitalists-global-warming-and-the-climate-justice-movement-reflections-on-cop15)

Gore’s presence at this crucial conference is significant. He had been for some time closely involved with Wall Street’s efforts to create a market for carbon trading. In a brilliantly researched essay[[1]](http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/james-herod-capitalists-global-warming-and-the-climate-justice-movement-reflections-on-cop15%22%20%5Cl%20%22fn1) **David Noble persuasively argues that there had been a split in the capitalist ruling class with regard to global warming**. Its original response (and its propaganda) was to deny it. But then **the financial elite realized that a lot of money could be made if carbon emissions could be commoditized** and traded on the market. **They launched a massive propaganda campaign to convince the world that global warming was real**, that it was being caused by humans (by burning fossil fuels), **and that capitalists could solve the problem through their normal market mechanisms. Global warming moved into the mainstream**. The purpose of the Kyoto Protocol was to reduce carbon emissions and thus cool the earth. The purpose of Wall Street is to make money. So far, **Wall Street has prevailed**, as was demonstrated again this December in Copenhagen. Twelve years after the Kyoto Protocol was signed in 1997 it is clear that the market approach, insisted on by the United States, has not worked. **Carbon emissions** have not declined in most countries. They **have increased**. Most climate justice activists totally reject Wall Street’s scheme. They have produced detailed, empirical studies to prove that it hasn’t worked.[[2]](http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/james-herod-capitalists-global-warming-and-the-climate-justice-movement-reflections-on-cop15#fn2) Yet we are in an extremely harsh time frame on this problem. If the science is correct, very **substantial reductions in carbon emissions** worldwide **must be achieved** in the next ten years, with the nearly total elimination of fossil fuels within the next twenty to thirty years. If the 2020 goals are not met, **there is the danger that a tipping point will be reached**, setting in motion irreversible warming trends, with the release of billions of tons of methane gas presently trapped in the frozen tundra stretching across northern Canada and Siberia, and billions more tons trapped in nodules deep in the oceans, the loss of the oceans as a carbon sink as they become acidified, and the loss of reflected heat with the melting of the polar ice caps, glaciers, and Greenland’s ice. **The earth will become unrecognizable, and all life on it will be threatened.** **What are the chances that the United States will change its policy anytime soon, in time to help stave off the tipping point? Virtually zero. Corporate control, especially by Wall Street and Big Oil, over the United States government is now nearly total, and is irreversible within existing institutional structures. The 40-year-old counter-revolution by neoconservative free market ideologues to make sure that corporate control was never threatened again**, as it had been in the sixties, has been completely successful. It would take a revolution to reverse this, and there is no sign anywhere of that happening, certainly not in time.

# Cap K turns case—economic crisis inevitable

**And, cap Turns the Case- Overproduction will occur. Plan will structurally cause job loss and economic crisis.**

Fred **Goldstein 2009**  (“Capitalist bosses plan permanent job loss” http://www.workers.org/2009/us/permanent\_job\_loss\_0319/)

The market for autos is not shrinking because people need fewer autos. On the contrary, tens of millions of workers without cars or with cars that are broken down, who live in rural areas or in areas with poor or no mass transportation, desperately need autos. **U.S. capitalism has built its transit system based upon highways and roads. The public transportation system has been starved at the behest of the auto bosses and the oil and tire industries.** Consequently, **in most areas of the U.S. an automobile is essential to get and keep a job**, to shop, to visit, etc. But tens of millions of people earning low wages or who are jobless cannot afford to buy cars at a price that will give the auto barons a profit. **Capitalism is now suffering from a crisis of overproduction—not overproduction of what people need but of what can be sold at a profit.** This is not only in the auto industry but in housing, commercial real estate, electronics, appliances and so on. **While there has been little talk about the growth in the permanent army of unemployed planned by the capitalist class, it is implied by their own predictions**. In fact, as noted in Workers World of March 12, the Obama administration’s most optimistic scenario for a recovery of the economy—growth of 3.4 percent by 2010—still calculates that there would be 7.9 percent unemployment. **In other words, the recovery would be a recovery for the capitalists but the workers will still be facing mass unemployment, approximately at the level it is today.**

# Alternative Sovlency--Alt is key to resisting cap

**Our alternative is resistance, we must gather ourselves and put pressure on the state and economics. We as people have the power to challenge the system.**

**McLaren 2009** Prof. of Education @ UCLA, 2-19 “Being, Becoming and Breaking-Free: Peter McLaren and the Pedagogy of Liberation”(Peter, <http://radicalnotes.com/content/view/88/39/>)

I think there is some truth to this criticism.  But there are several ways to look at this dilemma. First and foremost, if there are no other critical educators addressing neo-liberal capitalism and imperialism, specifically from a Marxist perspective, or dealing systematically with what Anibal Quijano and Ramon Grosfoguel call the "coloniality of power" then it is obvious revolutionary critical educators need to be up to this task.  Clearly, the copious offerings of the postmodern left have remained regnant in the education literature, Hardt and Negri's work on the immateriality of labour, the multitude, and Foucault's work on the archaeology of power, etc. Joining these are neo-Weberian approaches to class.  There are, in my mind, too few Marxist analyses available for students to engage within the educational field, although perhaps it is different in India, and I know that it is different in England with the work of Dave Hill, Mike Cole, Glenn Rikowski, Paula Allman, and others gaining worldwide visibility. So in terms of my own work, I have been trying to address issues that you and colleagues in England and elsewhere have been addressing for a much longer time.  My task, along with other North American critical educators, has been to try to give the anti-capitalist movement relevance for North American educators.  One theme that has dominated my work has been a Marxist critique of global capitalism. The sociologist Willian I. Robinson argues that we have a global capitalist system that has entered a new phase during the last two decades – what we have come to call neo-liberal capitalism. Obviously we need to mount a politics of resistance. Social and political forces are still needed to challenge state power at the national level. It is wrong to think that there is no more need to talk about state power or the need for political organisations that can cooperate in civil society as well as in political society. We have two extremes at the current historical juncture:  the old model of the vanguard party overthrowing the state (the vertical model) and the civil societarian position about changing the world without taking state power. Enrique Dussel points out that asking whether or not it is possible "to change the world without taking power" is the wrong question.  Power, notes Dussel, can't be "taken" as it were a "thing". Power belongs to the political community, to the people, as it were.  Power can be exercised institutionally by representative delegates of the community but the question remains – in whose interests do these institutions serve?  Dussel argues, “The package of State institutions (potestas) needs to be untied and changed as a whole by conserving what is sustainable and eliminating what is unjust – thereby creating the new.  Power (as potestas) is not "taken" en bloc.  It is reconstituted and exercised critically in view of the material satisfaction of needs, in fulfilment of the normative demands of democratic legitimacy, and within empirical political possibility.  But to be clear, without the obediential exercise of delegated institutional power the world cannot feasibly be changed. To attempt to do so is little more than abstract and apolitical moralism and idealism, which clearly results from practical and theoretical confusions.”And Robinson is correct in positing a crucial remaining question: What types of political vehicles will “interface” between popular forces and state structures? What’s the relationship between the social movements of the left, the state, and political organisations?  Previously the relationship was vertical (cultivating a top-down hierarchy), now it’s horizontal (cultivating democratic social relations from the ground up). So what will eventually replace the neo-liberal model?  Market capitalist models?  Reformist models that will sustain the rule of capital? What are the forms of organisation we need to resist the rule of capital?  At the level of the state as well as the public sphere.  What political vehicles can the popular majorities create that can interface between popular forces and state structures?  How can popular forces utilise state power in order to transform the state and bring about a socialist alternative to the capitalist law of value?  According to Robinson, previously there was a vertical model. In the last 15 or 20 years, the emphasis has been on horizontal relations, networking among different social groups, and bringing about democratic relations from the ground up via participatory democratic forms of organisation. Here, indigenous organisations have taken the lead. We need countervailing forces from below – popular forces and movements of popular majorities from below that can put pressure on the state (where global forces pressure even revolutionary governments to moderate structural change), even when the state is working towards socialist ideals such as the case of Venezuela. What are the pedagogical implications in all of this?  How can we look at critical pedagogy as a social movement, as a broad coalition of groups?  How do we define pedagogy in this context? How is critical pedagogy a force for change that exists as much outside of schools as within them? These are questions that need exploring. And there are too few of us in the field of education engaging these questions.

# Alternative solvency---solves national transportation

**Only anticapitalism can effectively resolve and utilize national transportation**

Joel **Bergman** Friday, 16 January **2009**, [The Financial Crisis and the Auto Sector](http://www.marxist.com/financial-crisis-and-auto-sector.htm) <http://www.marxist.com/financial-crisis-and-auto-sector.htm> accessed ac

There is no band-aid solution to all of these problems. There is no solution that can save both the capitalist system and our standard of living. The capitalist system has miraculously failed. With unparalleled advances in technology and science, there opens up the possibility for the liberation of the entire planet from poverty, hunger, illness and deprivation. The demands of the system now stand in bare, glaring contradiction to material conditions. Workers all over the world are now being asked to take a hit because somehow this magic force of "the free market" demands it. The auto crisis is just the latest example of this. *Demonstration of IG Metall auto workers in Germany* Capitalism is destroying our jobs and our communities. It is immoral and insane. It is shutting down the most productive auto manufacturing plants on the face of the planet. If these factories are allowed to be shut down, whole communities will be destroyed, families torn apart and millions of people forced into poverty. This would be a mortal blow to the CAW/UAW and the trade union movement as a whole in North America. The CAW workers have already shown the way forward with their actions in occupying factories being shut down. These disconnected, instinctual efforts of the workers must be brought together with a clear national trade union leadership. Any productive factory that is shut down must be occupied to save jobs. We must demand that any occupied factory, must then be nationalized and all nationalized plants be brought together in a socialized plan of production. Nationalization is part and parcel with worker's democracy. In the words of Leon Trotsky, "Democracy is to socialism, as oxygen is to the human body." We demand that the nationalization of these factories must come with the direct control and democratic planning by the workers and society as a whole. But even a nationalized factory or a whole nationalized industry cannot continue to produce for a non-existent capitalist market. The solution is not to try and re-establish the equilibrium of the past and build more cars. The only solution lies with the socialization of transportation as a whole. Capitalism is utterly incapable of organizing transportation. Any logical society wouldn't place such reliance on private automobiles, but would rely mainly on a massive public transit system. In any major city, the majority of people using private vehicles are all going to the same places. There are thousands of kilometers of roads and billions of dollars worth of vehicles, most of which are sitting idle for the majority of the day. We must grasp the massive capabilities present in our society and organize a socialist plan of production and transportation. All of these factories being shut down should be re-opened and converted into public production facilities for subway systems, environmentally friendly buses, tram lines and trains. The nationalization and planning of transportation and production goes hand in hand with the nationalization of the whole capitalist economy. We must end this anarchic system once and for all and use our vast knowledge and resources to organize our society along rational, socialist lines. Treating the transportation of workers to their jobs as an integral part of the productive process is a socialist solution that can save our jobs, C

# Alternative solvency--Alt solves warming

The alternative is the only way to solve for warming.

James **Herod 2009** (Capitalists, Global Warming, and the Climate Justice Movement: Reflections on COP15; http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/james-herod-capitalists-global-warming-and-the-climate-justice-movement-reflections-on-cop15)

It’s true that a small minority of capitalists are trying to make profit off global warming. They are building vast wind and solar installations, inventing hydrogen powered cars, converting millions of acres of farm land to the production of biomass, trying to create a market for carbon trading, and starting to build vast new power grids. When **corporations and government**s do get involved in trying to stop global warming, this is the direction they go in. **They try to solve the crisis within the framework of capitalism**. Even many of the most outspoken climate activists do this; that is, they are not anti-capitalist — James Hansen, George Monbiot, Bill McKibben, Al Gore, or Ross Gelbspan. **Those few climate theorists who are anti-capitalist**, mostly from a Marxist perspective, nevertheless **think that the crisis can be solved** with the aid of governments — Joel Kovel, John Bellamy Foster, Charles Derber. That is, they are anti-capitalist, but not anti-state. This is just to say that an anarchist perspective on the crisis is hardly in the discussion at all (but see Recommended Essays below). At least one head of state, Evo **Morales, president of Bolivia**, has clearly **identified capitalism as the enemy,** when he said “Either capitalism dies or Mother Earth dies.” But as the head of a government he naturally doesn’t think of attacking the state too, or representative government per se. According to one participant in April’s climate justice conference in Tiquipaya, Bolivia, many of those attending (roughly 30,000 from 140 countries, with 40 governmental delegations) were anti-capitalists, but few were anti-state. Besides, Evo Morales is merely president of one of the poorest nations on earth. How much power does he have? Where are the voices of the great European labor unions, the big UN agencies like the World Health Organization or the Food and Agriculture Organization, the global NGOs, the leaders of the world’s Social Democratic parties? At this point a conceptual clarification is necessary in order to grasp the scope of the problem and to begin to perceive the necessary solution. **Capitalism is the name for an entire social order. It is not just an “economy.”** **Thus, the international nation-state system is an integral part of capitalism, and has been from the very beginning. Capitalists took over the pre-existing state forms and turned them to their own ends, integrating them into their project of accumulating capital.** The ability to make profit from privately owned productive properties would be impossible without the legal framework provided by governments, backed by police and military violence. Businesses and governments are in bed together, and have been for the past five hundred years (profit takers + politicians = capitalism). Yet even when a few climate justice activists do admit that **capitalism has to be destroyed in order to stop global warming**, they fail to note that states do too. Except for anarchists.

# Capitalism unsustainable

**Capitalistic societies aren’t successful**

**Istvan Meszaros** 08 (Challenge and Burden of Historical Time, University Sussex professor Emeritus) page 60

We live in an age of unprecedented historical crisis. Its severity can be gauged by the fact that we are not facing a more or less extensive cyclic crisis of capitalism, as experienced in the past, but the deepening struc­tural crisis of the capital system itself. As such, this crisis affects-for the first time ever in history-the whole of humankind, and demands fundamental changes to the way in which the social metabolism is controlled if humanity is to survive. It must be kept in mind that the new forces of production and relations of production do not develop out of nothing, nor drop from the sky, nor from the womb of the self-positing Idea; but from within and in antithesis to the existing development of production and the inherited, traditional relations of property. While in the completed bourgeois system every economic rela- tion

**Revolution inevitable because of structural contradictions within capitalism**

Stephen Tumino 01 (Writer for the Red Critique) “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before” THE ABSENT CENTRE OF POLITICAL ONTOLOGY http://redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm

It is only Orthodox Marxism that explains socialism as an historical inevitability that is tied to the development of social production itself and its requirements. Orthodox Marxism makes socialism scientific because it explains how in the capitalist system, based on the private consumption of labor-power (competition), the objective tendency is to reduce the amount of time labor spends in reproducing itself (necessary labor) while expanding the amount of time labor is engaged in producing surplus-value (surplus-labor) for the capitalist through the introduction of machinery into the production process by the capitalists themselves to lower their own labor costs. Because of the competitive drive for profits under capitalism it is historically inevitable that a point is reached when the technical mastery—the amount of time socially necessary on average to meet the needs of society through the processing of natural resources—is such that the conditions of the workers worsen relative to the owners and becomes an unbearable global social contradiction in the midst of the ever greater mass of wealth produced. It is therefore just as inevitable that at such a moment it obviously makes more sense to socialize production and meet the needs of all to avoid the explosive social conflicts perpetually generated by private property than to maintain the system at the risk of total social collapse on a world scale. "Socialism or barbarism" (Luxemburg) is the inevitable choice faced by humanity because of capitalism. Either maintain private property and the exploitation of labor in production, in which case more and more social resources will go into policing the growingly desperate surplus-population generated by the technical efficiency of social production, or socialize production and inaugurate a society whose founding principle is "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, *Selected Works*, 325) and "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*, *Selected Works*, 53).

**Capitalism is unsustainable- oil shocks caused by capitalism make it so.**

Alex **Knight 2009** (Is This the End of Capitalism? http://endofcapitalism.com/about/1-is-this-the-end-of-capitalism/)

Luckily for Earth and all those who call it home, **there are limits constraining capitalism from further growth. These limits are** both **ecological and social** because they originate both from the planet and communities of people. **The ecological limits include shrinking supplies of water, soil, uranium, and fossil fuels like oil, natural gas, and coal. The most important limiting factor is oil, which fuels much of the capitalist economy, including 95% of current transportation**. **Global capitalism today could not exist without oil**, but worldwide oil production appears to be near its ultimate maximum, or “peak.” Peak oil doesn’t mean that there is no more oil, just that the oil remaining underground is deeper, heavier, more remote, and more expensive – so it cannot continue to be pumped at the same rate as before. As demand for oil continues to grow, this supply limit is creating a shortage that cannot be overcome by existing alternative fuels, which has sent oil prices soaring. **And without the cheap and plentiful fuel it needs to grow, capitalism as a way of organizing society will become obsolete.**

# Affirmative Answers

# Affirmative Answer—No link to mass transportation

**No impact - Focus on transportation mitigates the harms of the capitalist system.**

Fred **Goldstein 2009**(“ GM restructuring will deepen capitalist crisis” http://www.workers.org/2009/us/gm\_restructuring\_0507/)

**The GM formula for its own profitability is to destroy perfectly good factories that cost billions of dollars**. However, **they could be converted to produce vehicles for mass transportation like light rail, high-speed rail, buses, and other conveyances that could service cities and rural areas alike.** **This would reduce pollution, reduce the cost of transportation, and make it accessible to tens of millions who have no access to affordable mass transit now.** **The road to profitability**, as seen separately by GM, Ford and Chrysler in their struggle against each other, **is the road to disaster for the workers**, both in the auto industry and outside it. **That is the logic of the profit system. Unemployment in the auto industry leads to unemployment in industries such as steel and other metals, rubber, glass, plastic, paint, microchips and computers, fabric, and all the parts supplying industries**. In addition, layoffs will take place in all the communities surrounding the plants where stores and services have been supported by auto workers’ wages. The layoffs at the dealerships will also affect workers in the surrounding businesses. **Roots deep in capitalism** **Despite all the explanations in the big business press of the causes of this crisis, the fact is that the hardship and suffering behind these statistics is caused by capitalist exploitation and the profit system.**

# Affirmative Answer—Reform within the system key

only using capitalism to fight capitalism can be effective

Monthly Review, March 1990, v. 41, no. 10, p 38

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

# Cap Sustainable - Environment

To maintain a hi-tech, environmentally sustainable country a capitalist system is the only possible system

Martin W. Lewis, Director of International Relations, Stanford University, “Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism,”1992 pg. 19

Only a capitalist economy can generate the resources necessary for the development of a technologically sophisticated, ecologically sustainable global economy. In embracing capitalism I do not thereby advocate the laissez-faire approach of the Republican right. To say that the market plays an essential role is not to say that it should be given full sway. As Robert Kuttner ( 1991) persuasively argues, the laissez-faire ideology has actually placed shackles on the American economy; it has rather been the "social market" economies, like that of Germany, that have shown the greatest dynamism in the postwar period. Moreover, if the example of Japan teaches us anything, it should be that economic success stems rather from "combining free markets and individual initiative with social organization"

# Impact Turn--Cap Good - General Ev Indict

Prefer our evidence: The negative’s arguments are written by hacks that are only attempting to make their place in the capitalist society they kritik.

Saunders in 7

Peter Saunders,professor emeritus at the [Centre for Independent Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Centre_for_Independent_Studies) and Adjunct Professor at the [Australian Graduate School of Management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Graduate_School_of_Management). He was previously of [University of Sussex](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Sussex) in England, WHY CAPITALISM IS GOOD FOR THE SOUL, 2007, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html

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

# Impact Turn--Cap Good - Prevents War

Capitalism prevents war

Bandow in 5

Doug Bandow, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, REASON ONLINE, “A Capitalist Peace?”, October 26, 2005 (<http://www.reason.com/news/show/32985.html> accessed: June 26, 2009)

There are a number of reasons why economics appears to trump politics. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict, because the political destabilization resulting from war deters profitable investment and trade. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.

Capitalism is key to peace.

Bandow in 5

Doug Bandow, he is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. He served as a special assistant to President Reagan, CATO.ORG, “Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace”, 11-12-05, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193

**That** doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets - that is, spreading capitalism - is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity. Notes Gartzke: "Warfare among developing nations will remain unaffected by the capitalist peace as long as the economies of many developing countries remain fettered by governmental control." Freeing those economies is critical. It's a particularly important lesson for the anti-capitalist left. For the most part, the enemies of economic liberty also most stridently denounce war, often in near-pacifist terms. Yet they oppose the very economic policies most likely to encourage peace. If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war. Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

# Answers to “Cap Kills Environment”

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IMPROVING NOW UNDER CAP- DISPROVES INTERNAL LINK BETWEEN THE TWO

Anderson in 4

Terry L. Anderson, executive director of the Property and Environment Research Center, a think tank focusing on market solutions to environmental problems, HOOVER PRESS, “You Have to Admit It's Getting Better: From Economic Prosperity to Environmental Quality”, 2004

Bjørn Lomborg, determined to prove Julian Simon wrong and to verify the doomsday-visions of the kind that permeated *The Global 2000 Report*, enlisted ten of his “sharpest students” to comb through the empirical data (Lomborg 2001, xix) on long-term temporal trends in human and environmental well-being. Much to his surprise, they found that although the population continues to grow, albeit at a decelerating pace, the state of humanity has never been better, that the average person on the globe has never been less hungry, better educated, richer, healthier, and longer-lived than today.1 No less important, not only is human well-being advancing but, in many cases, so seems to be the state of the environment, especially in the rich countries of the world.

# Answers to “Cap Unethical/hurts value to life”

Capitalism is both moral and just.

Thompson ‘93

C. Bradley Thompson, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Ashland University, ON PRINCIPLE v1n3, “Socialism vs. Capitalism: Which is the Moral System”, October 1993

Despite the intellectuals’ psychotic hatred of capitalism, it is the only moral and just social system. Capitalism is the only moral system because it requires human beings to deal with one another as traders--that is, as free moral agents trading and selling goods and services on the basis of mutual consent. Capitalism is the only just system because the sole criterion that determines the value of thing exchanged is the free, voluntary, universal judgement of the consumer. Coercion and fraud are anathema to the free-market system. It is both moral and just because the degree to which man rises or falls in society is determined by the degree to which he uses his mind. Capitalism is the only social system that rewards merit, ability and achievement, regardless of one’s birth or station in life.