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Public Transportation will be implemented to serve capitalist interests and widen inequality

Farmer 11

Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf,KB

Public transportation policy is one dimension of spatial restructuring deployed by entrepreneurial governments to create place-based competitive advantages for global capital. Transportation represents a fixed, place-based geographic element where the local and the global interact; where global processes shape local geographies and where local politics shape global networks. As Keil and Young (2008) suggest, transportation should now be considered in relation to globalized trade and economic networks and consumption-oriented patterns of everyday life. Growth demands in cities experiencing gentrification, the development of luxury consumption spaces, and a surge of tourism have placed pressure on local agencies to expand airports, roads, 1156 S Farmerand rail and public transit capacities. Large-scale urban redevelopment plans have made a comeback as city planners conceive of megaprojects that concentrate new public transit investment in the revalorized core (Fainstein, 2008; Keil and Young, 2008; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). Air transportation has become the leading form of global connectivity, influencing the decisions of global, national, and regional elites to create air-transportation infra-structure (Cidell, 2006; Erie, 2004; Keil and Young, 2008; Phang, 2007). For instance, there is a growing network of world-class cities (Shanghai, London, and Tokyo) that enables air travelers to connect seamlessly from one global city core to the next, with direct express train service from the downtown business core to the city's international airports (Graham and Marvin, 2001). These specialized public transit systems more closely integrate a city into global markets, thereby making the city more attractive for business activities (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Graham, 2000). The resulting ``premium network spaces'' are ``geared to the logistical and exchange demands of foreign direct investors, tourist spaces or socioeconomically affluent groups'' (Graham and Marvin, 2001, page 100). Interactions with the surrounding residential districts are carefully managed by filtering `proper' users through nonstop services or prohibitively expensive fares. In addition, premium transport services tend to be bundled with upscale shopping centers, entertainment spectacles, hotels, or office spaces to form a giant, integrated bubble of luxury. Subsequently, sociospatial relations are reconfigured as premium infrastructure bypasses devalorized places and exclude economically disadvantaged users from accessing the transit service. The neoliberal trend towards premium public transportation deployed for the purposes of constructing competitive advantages in the global capitalist system privileges profit making for capital, or exchange-value purposes, and not necessarily for everyday use, or use-value purposes (Keil and Young, 2008; Logan and Molotch, 1987). In order to finance new urban transit projects, cash-strapped entrepreneurial governments are increasingly entering into long-term partnerships with the private sector, or public ^ private partnerships (PPPs), in which the public sector pays for services and infrastructure delivered by the private sector (Phang, 2007; Siemiatycki, 2006; Solino and Vassallo, 2009). In studies of PPPs used both for large-scale urban redevelopment projects and urban rail projects, scholars have noticed that planning agencies are increasingly favoring infrastructure projects favoring affluent segments of the population that have greater potential for profitability rather than delivering the largest public benefit (Fainstein, 2008; Siemiatycki, 2006; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). By privileging market-based metrics of efficiency, entrepreneurial administrations have profoundly changed the function of public transportation. In the Fordist era, public transportation involved a modicum of centralized planning aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs and alleviating the effects of uneven development produced by the highly subsidized highway system (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). Neo-liberal statecraft abandons the Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups' access to the city. In its place, socially regressive neoliberal practices favor market-oriented growth and elite consumption patterns (Boschken, 2002; Grengs, 2004; Young and Keil, 2010). Thus, public transportation service has become a battleground in the global city growth machine's revanchist claims to the city (Smith, 1996).

Capitalism creates multiple structural trends towards extinction

Szentes (a Professor Emeritus at the Corvinus University of Budapest) 8

(Tamás, “Globalisation and prospects of the world society”, 4/22 [http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/-Events/exco/Glob.\_\_\_prospects\_-\_jav..pdf](http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/Events/exco/Glob.___prospects_-_jav..pdf))

It’ s a common place that human society can survive and develop only in a lasting real peace. Without peace countries cannot develop. Although since 1945 there has been no world war, but --numerous local wars took place, --terrorism has spread all over the world, undermining security even in the most developed and powerful countries, --arms race and militarisation have not ended with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, but escalated and continued, extending also to weapons of mass destruction and misusing enormous resources badly needed for development, --many “invisible wars” are suffered by the poor and oppressed people, manifested in mass misery, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, starvation and malnutrition, epidemics and poor health conditions, exploitation and oppression, racial and other discrimination, physical terror, organised injustice, disguised forms of violence, the denial or regular infringement of the democratic rights of citizens, women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities, etc., and last but not least, in the degradation of human environment, which means that --the “war against Nature”, i.e. the disturbance of ecological balance, wasteful management of natural resources, and large-scale pollution of our environment, is still going on, causing also losses and fatal dangers for human life. Behind global terrorism and “invisible wars” we find striking international and intrasociety inequities and distorted development patterns , which tend to generate social as well as international tensions, thus paving the way for unrest and “visible” wars. It is a commonplace now that peace is not merely the absence of war. The prerequisites of a lasting peace between and within societies involve not only - though, of course, necessarily - demilitarisation, but also a systematic and gradual elimination of the roots of violence, of the causes of “invisible wars”, of the structural and institutional bases of large-scale international and intra-society inequalities, exploitation and oppression. Peace requires a process of social and national emancipation, a progressive, democratic transformation of societies and the world bringing about equal rights and opportunities for all people, sovereign participation and mutually advantageous co-operation among nations. It further requires a pluralistic democracy on global level with an appropriate system of proportional representation of the world society, articulation of diverse interests and their peaceful reconciliation, by non-violent conflict management, and thus also a global governance with a really global institutional system. Under the contemporary conditions of accelerating globalisation and deepening global interdependencies in our world, peace is indivisible in both time and space. It cannot exist if reduced to a period only after or before war, and cannot be safeguarded in one part of the world when some others suffer visible or invisible wars. Thus, peace requires, indeed, a new, demilitarised and democratic world order, which can provide equal opportunities for sustainable development. “Sustainability of development” (both on national and world level) is often interpreted as an issue of environmental protection only and reduced to the need for preserving the ecological balance and delivering the next generations not a destroyed Nature with overexhausted resources and polluted environment. However, no ecological balance can be ensured, unless the deep international development gap and intra-society inequalities are substantially reduced. Owing to global interdependencies there may exist hardly any “zero-sum-games”, in which one can gain at the expense of others, but, instead, the “negative-sum-games” tend to predominate, in which everybody must suffer, later or sooner, directly or indirectly, losses. Therefore, the actual question is not about “sustainability of development” but rather about the “sustainability of human life”, i.e. survival of mankind – because of ecological imbalance and globalised terrorism. When Professor Louk de la Rive Box was the president of EADI, one day we had an exchange of views on the state and future of development studies. We agreed that development studies are not any more restricted to the case of underdeveloped countries, as the developed ones (as well as the former “socialist” countries) are also facing development problems, such as those of structural and institutional (and even system-) transformation, requirements of changes in development patterns, and concerns about natural environment. While all these are true, today I would dare say that besides (or even instead of) “development studies” we must speak about and make “survival studies”. While the monetary, financial, and debt crises are cyclical, we live in an almost permanent crisis of the world society, which is multidimensional in nature, involving not only economic but also socio-psychological, behavioural, cultural and political aspects. The narrow-minded, election-oriented, selfish behaviour motivated by thirst for power and wealth, which still characterise the political leadership almost all over the world, paves the way for the final, last catastrophe. One cannot doubt, of course, that great many positive historical changes have also taken place in the world in the last century. Such as decolonisation, transformation of socio-economic systems, democratisation of political life in some former fascist or authoritarian states, institutionalisation of welfare policies in several countries, rise of international organisations and new forums for negotiations, conflict management and cooperation, institutionalisation of international assistance programmes by multilateral agencies, codification of human rights, and rights of sovereignty and democracy also on international level, collapse of the militarised Soviet bloc and system-change3 in the countries concerned, the end of cold war, etc., to mention only a few. Nevertheless, the crisis of the world society has extended and deepened, approaching to a point of bifurcation that necessarily puts an end to the present tendencies, either by the final catastrophe or a common solution. Under the circumstances provided by rapidly progressing science and technological revolutions, human society cannot survive unless such profound intra-society and international inequalities prevailing today are soon eliminated. Like a single spacecraft, the Earth can no longer afford to have a 'crew' divided into two parts: the rich, privileged, wellfed, well-educated, on the one hand, and the poor, deprived, starving, sick and uneducated, on the other. Dangerous 'zero-sum-games' (which mostly prove to be “negative-sum-games”) can hardly be played any more by visible or invisible wars in the world society. Because of global interdependencies, the apparent winner becomes also a loser. The real choice for the world society is between negative- and positive-sum-games: i.e. between, on the one hand, continuation of visible and “invisible wars”, as long as this is possible at all, and, on the other, transformation of the world order by demilitarisation and democratization. No ideological or terminological camouflage can conceal this real dilemma any more, which is to be faced not in the distant future, by the next generations, but in the coming years, because of global terrorism soon having nuclear and other mass destructive weapons, and also due to irreversible changes in natural environment.

**Our alternative is to reject the Aff’s capitalist model of development**

Reforms within capitalism always fail -- only blatant rejection of capitalism and refusal to participate within its policies can destroy it

Herod, 04

(James, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm>, Getting Free, 4th Edition A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004)

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.

FW

Our framework is to weigh the value of the aff versus the consequences of its methodology of capitalism

Their framework is only and manifestation of capitalism attempting to legitimize itself. Under a framework of capitalism, capitalism will always emerge the victor. Capitalism is a disad to their framework as they block any possibility of change.

**Meszaros 8**

(Istvan, Chair of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time, p323-328)

**The unreality of postulating the sustainable solution of the grave problems of our social order within the formal** and legal **framework** and corresponding constraints **of** parliamentary **politics arises from the fundamental misconception of the structural determinations of capital’s rule**, as represented in all varieties that assert the dualism of civil society and the political state**. The difficulty, insurmountable within the** parliamentary **framework is** this that **since capital is actually in control of all vital aspects of the social metabolism, it can afford to define the separately constituted sphere of political legitimation as a strictly formal and legal matter, thereby necessarily excluding the possibility of being legitimately challenged in its substantive sphere of socioeconomic reproductive operation. Directly or indirectly, capital controls everything, including the** parliamentary **legislative process,** even if the latter is supposed to be fully independent from capital in many theories that fictitiously hypostatize the “democratic equality” of all political forces participating in the legislative process. To envisage a very different relationship to the powers of decision making in our societies, now completely dominated by the forces of capital in every domain, **it is necessary to radically challenge capital itself as the overall controller of social metabolic reproduction**. What makes this problem worse for all those who are looking for significant change on the margins of the established **political system is that the latter can claim for itself genuine constitutional legitimacy in its present mode of functioning**, based on the historically constituted inversion of the actual state of the material reproductive affairs. For inasmuch as the capital is not only the “personification of capital” but simultaneously functions also “as the personification of the social character of labor, of the total workshop as such**,” the system can claim to represent the vitally necessary productive power of society vis-à-vis the individuals as the basis of their continued existence, incorporating the interest of all. In this way capital asserts itself not only as the de facto but also the de jure power of society**, in its capacity as the objectively given necessary condition of societal reproduction, and thereby as the constitutional foundation to its own political order. The fact that the constitutional legitimacy of capital is historically founded on the ruthless expropriation of the conditions of social metabolic reproduction- the means and material of labor-from the producers, and therefore capital’s claimed “constitutionality” (like the origin of all constitutions) is unconstitutional, is an unpalatable truth which fades away in the mist of a remote past. The “social productive powers of labor, or productive power or social labor, first develop historically with the specifically capitalist mode of production, **hence appear as something immanent in the capital-relation and inseparable from it. This is how capital’s mode of social metabolic reproduction becomes eternalized and legitimated as a lawfully unchallengeable system**. Legitimate contest is admissible only in relation to some minor aspects of the unalterable overall structure. The real state of affairs on thee plane of socioeconomic reproduction-i.e., the actually exercised productive power of labor and its absolute necessity for securing capital’s own reproduction- disappears from sight. Partly because of the ignorance of the very far from legitimate historical origin of capital’s “primitive accumulation” and the concomitant, frequently violent, expropriation of property as the precondition of the system’s present mode of functioning; and partly because of the mystifying nature of the established productive and distributive relations. As Marx notesThe objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker; rather, he appears as subsumed under them. Capital employs Labor. Even this relation is in its simplicity is a personification of things and a reification of persons. None of this can be challenged and remedied within the framework of parliamentary political reform. It would be quite absurd to expect the abolition of the “personification of things and the reification of persons” by political decree, and just as absurd to expect the proclamation of such an intended reform within the framework of capital’s political institutions. For the capital system cannot function without the perverse overturning of the relationship between persons and things: capital’s alienated and reified powers dominate the masses of the people. **Similarly it would be a miracle if the workers who confront capital in the labor process as “isolated workers” could reacquire mastery over the social productive powers of their labor by some political decree,** or even by a whole series of parliamentary reforms enacted under capital’s order of social metabolic control. For in these matters there can be no way of avoiding the irreconcilable conflict over the material stakes of “either/or” Capital can neither abdicate its-usurped-social productive powers in favor of labor, nor can I share them with labor, thanks to some wishful but utterly fictitious “political compromise.” For they constitute the overall controlling power of societal reproduction in the form of “the rule of wealth over society.” Thus it is impossible to escape, in the domain of the fundamental social metabolism, the severe logic of either/or. For either wealth, in the shape of capital, continues to rule over human society, taking it to the brink of self-destruction, or the society of associated producers learns to rule over alienated and reified wealth, with productive powers arising from the self-determinated social labor of its individual-but not longer isolated-members. Capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence. It cannot possibly be politically constrained by parliament in its power of social metabolic control. This is why the only mode of political representation compatible with capital’s mode of functioning is one that effectively denies the possibility of contesting its material power. And precisely because **capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence, it has nothing to fear from the reforms that can be enacted within its parliamentary political framework**. Since the vital issue on which everything else hinges is that “the objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker” buy, on the contrary, “he appears as subsumed under them,” no meaningful change is feasible without addressing the issue both in a form of politics capable of matching capital’s extra-parliamentary powers and modes of action, and in the domain of material reproduction. Thus the only challenge that could affect the power of capital, in a sustainable manner, is one which would simultaneously aim at assuming the system’s key productive functions, and at acquiring control over the corresponding political decision making processes in all spheres, instead of being hopelessly constrained by the circular confinement of institutionally legitimated political action to parliamentary legislation. There is a great deal of critique of formerly leftwing political figures and of their now fully accommodating parties in the political debates of the last decades. However, what is problematic about such debates is that by overemphasizing the role of personal ambition and failure, they often continue to envisage remedying the situation with in the same political institutional framework that, in fact, greatly favors the criticized “personal betrayals” and the painful “party derailments.” Unfortunately, though the advocated and hoped for personal and government changes tend to reproduce the same deplorable results. All this could not be very surprising. The reason why the now established political institutions successfully resist significant change for the better is because they are themselves part of the problem and not of the solution. For in their immanent nature they are the embodiment of the underlying structural determinations and contradictions through which the modern capitalist state- with its ubiquitous network of bureaucratic constituents- has been articulated and stabilized in the course of the last four hundred years. Naturally, the state was formed not as a one-sided mechanical result but through its necessary reciprocal interrelationship to the material ground of capital’s historical unfolding, as not only being shaped by the latter but also actively shaping it as much as historically feasible under the prevailing- and precisely through the interrelationship also changing- circumstances. Given the insuperably centrifugal determination of capital’s productive microcosms, even at the level of the giant quasi-monopolistic transnational corporations, only the modern state could assume and fulfill the required function of being the overall command structure of the capital system. Inevitably, that meant the complete alienation of the power of overall decision making from the producers. Even the “particular personifications of capital” were strictly mandated to act in accord with the structural imperatives of their system. Indeed the modern state, as constituted on the material ground of the capital system, is the paradigm of alienation as regards the power of comprehensive decision making. It would be therefore extremely naïve to imagine that the capitalist state could willingly hand over the alienated power of systemic decision making to any rival actor who operates within the legislative framework of parliament. Thus, **in order to envisage a meaningful and historically sustainable societal change, it is necessary to submit to a radical critique both the material reproductive and the political inter-determinations of the entire system, and not simply some of the contingent and limited political practices.** The combined totality of the material reproductive determinations and the all-embracing political command structure of the state together constitutes the overpowering reality of the capital system. In this sense, in view of the unavoidable question arising from the challenge of systemic determinations, with regard to both socioeconomic reproduction and the state, the need for a comprehensive political transformation-in close conjunction to the meaningful exercise of society’s vital productive functions without which far-reaching and lasting political change is inconceivable-becomes inseparable from the problem characterized as the withering away of the state. Accordingly, in the historic task of accomplishing “the withering away of the state,” self-management through full participation, and the permanently sustainable overcoming of parliamentarism by a positive form of substantive decision-making are inseparable. This is a vital concern and not “romantic faithfulness to Marx’s unrealizable dream,” as some people try to discredit and dismiss it. In truth, the “withering away of the state” refers to nothing mysterious or remote but to a perfectly tangible process that must be initiated right in our own historical time. It means, in plain language, the progressive reacquisition of the alienated power of political decision making by the individuals in their enterprise of moving toward a genuine socialist society. Without the reacquisition of this power- to which not only the capitalist state but also the paralyzing inertia of the structurally well-entrenched material reproductive practices are fundamentally opposed- neither the new mode of political control of society as a whole by its individuals is conceivable, nor indeed the nonadversarial and thereby cohesive and plannable everyday operation of the particular productive and distributive units by the self-managing freely associated producers. Radically superseding adversariality, and thereby securing the material and political ground of globally viable planning- an absolute must for the very survival of humanity, not to mention the potentially enriched self realization- of its individual members- is synonymous with the withering away of the state as an ongoing historical enterprise.

Alt Solves

The act of rejection a small break that makes room for the creation of more resistance

**Holloway 05** (John, 8-16, Ph.D Political Science-University of Edinburgh , “Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?”, <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>)

**On the question of fissures. We often feel helpless because capitalism weighs so heavily on us. But when we say No we start off with an appreciation of our own strength. When we rebel we are in fact tearing a little hole in capitalism**. It is very contradictory. **By rebelling we are already saying no to the command of capital. We are creating temporary spaces. Within that crack, that fissure, it is important that we fight for other social relations** that don't point towards the state, but that they point towards the sort of society we want to create. At the core of these fissures is the drive to self-determination. And then it is a question of working out what does this mean, and how to be organised for self-determination. It means being against and beyond the society that exists. Of expanding the fissures, how to push these fissures forward structurally. The people who say we should take control of the state are also talking about cracks. There is no choice but to start with interstices**.** The question is how we think of them, because the state is not the whole world. There are 200 states. If you seize control of one, it is still only a crack in capitalism. It is a question of how we think about those cracks, those fissures. And if we start off from ourselves, why on earth should we adopt capitalist, bourgeois forms for developing our struggle? Why should we accept the template of the concept of the state?

As an intellectual your rejection of capitalism has emancipatory results- relentless criticism allows capitalism to be challenged.

**Kovel 2**  Professor of Social Studies at Bard

(Joel, The Enemy of Nature, p224)

**Relentless criticism can delegitimate the system and release people into struggle. And as struggle develops, victories that are no more than incremental by their own terms**- stopping a meeting stopping the IMF, the hopes stirred forth by a campaign such as Ralph Nader’s in 2000 – **can have a symbolic effect far greater than their external result, and constitute points of rupture with capital. This rupture is** not a set of facts added to our knowledge of the world, but **a change in our relation to the world. Its effects are dynamic**, not incremental, **and** like all genuine insights it changes the balance of forces and **can propagate very swiftly. Thus the release from inertia can trigger a rapid cascade of changes, so that it could be said that the forces pressing towards radical change need not be linear and incremental, but can be exponential in character. In this way, conscientious and radical criticism of the given, even in advance of having blueprints for an alternative, can be a material force, because it can seize the mind of the masses of people. There is no greater responsibility for intellectuals**

AT Perm

Extend Herod moving beyond capitalism requires a totalizing rejection of all things capitalist. The perm works within and supports the system while claiming to reject it- this hypocrisy makes resistance impossible and ensures co-option.

#### Perm fails – acting in a system where profit is the only goal makes getting outside of capitalism impossible.

Fred Magdoff, professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont, 2011, What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know about Capitalism: A Citizen's Guide to Capitalism and the Environment. New York: Monthly Review, 2011.

But there is one box from which it is impossible to escape without confronting it directly: the capitalist economic system. Many, if not most, influential environmental thinkers in the world’s rich countries still shy away from such a direct confrontation. Even the increasing numbers of green thinkers who criticize capitalism and its market failures, frequently set in the end for what they regard as practical solutions directed at creating a tightly controlled humane, green, and non-corporate capitalism, instead of actually getting outside the box of capitalism. Some call for reinventing “the purpose and design of business,” or using tax policy to better direct investment and consumption to green ends, or for trade policies that might promote the goods of more Sustainable economies.5 Others suggest eliminating the myriad government subsithe s to businesses and taking into account social and ecological consequences of production (“extemali ties”) so as to give rise to “honest prices” that reflect the real costs including those to the environment« The contradictions and complexities of actually implementing a new way to price Commodities, in a system in which the profit is the only goal, and power rests in the hands of people who have no interest in doing this, makes all of this an insurmountable task. As David Harvey has said: “If capitalism is forced to internalize” all of the social and environmental costs it generates “it will go out of business. This is the simple truth.’\*7

Any reason they further capitalist goals is a reason the perm would fail.

We have an ethical obligation to reject every instance of capitalism

Jenson 7

Robert Jenson, Professor at the School of Journalism at the University of Texas, Austin, 4/30/07, “Anti-Capitalism in 5 Minutes,” <http://www.counterpunch.org/2007/04/30/anti-capitalism-in-five-minutes/>, KB

One of the common responses I hear when I critique capitalism is, "Well, that may all be true, but we have to be realistic and do what’s possible." By that logic, to be realistic is to accept a system that is inhuman, anti-democratic, and unsustainable. To be realistic we are told we must capitulate to a system that steals our souls, enslaves us to concentrated power, and will someday destroy the planet. But rejecting and resisting a predatory corporate capitalism is not crazy. It is an eminently sane position. Holding onto our humanity is not crazy. Defending democracy is not crazy. And struggling for a sustainable future is not crazy. What is truly crazy is falling for the con that an inhuman, anti-democratic, and unsustainable system — one that leaves half the world’s people in abject poverty — is all that there is, all that there ever can be, all that there ever will be. If that were true, then soon there will be nothing left, for anyone. I do not believe it is realistic to accept such a fate. If that’s being realistic, I’ll take crazy any day of the week, every Sunday of the month.

AT Cap sustainable

#### Cap is unsustainable – laundry list

Fred Magdoff, professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont, 2011, What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know about Capitalism: A Citizen's Guide to Capitalism and the Environment. New York: Monthly Review, 2011.

The analysis in earlier chapters, if correct, points to the fact that the ecological crisis cannot be solved within the logic of the present economic/political/social system. The various suggestions for doing so have no hope of success. The system of world capitalism is clearly unsustainable in: (1) its quest for never-ending accumulation of capital leading to production that must constantly expand to provide profits; (2) its agriculture and food system that pollutes the environment and still does not allow' universal access to a sufficient quantity and quality of food; (3) its rampant destruction of the environment; (4) its continual enhancing of the inequality of income and wealth within and between countries; (5) its search for technological magic bullets as a way of avoiding the growing social and ecological problems arising from the system’s own functioning and operations; and (6) its promotion and rewarding of personality characteristics that lead to loss of connection with fellow humans, with communities, and with nature.

Capitalism unsustainable – 4 reasons

Peck and Tickell 94 – Econ prof @ UBC and Chair of Research at the University of Birmingham (Jamie and Adam, December, “Jungle Law Breaks out: Neoliberalism and Global-Local Disorder,” Vol. 26, No. 4 (Dec., 1994), pp. 317-326, jstor)

By implication, neoliberalism is qualitatively different to other contemporary regulatory experiments because it represents that which is left if a compromise cannot be reached, if the parties cannot agree. This has important implications for other regulatory experiments, all of which are in competition with neoliberalism first, and with other experiments second. Given the grip that neoliberalism has on global economic institutions and given the regulatory vacuum which (even following the new GATT agreement) continues to surround international finance, trade and commerce, neoliberalism has the capacity to erode experiments being developed at or below the level of the nation-state. Taking this a step further, neoliberalism can perhaps at the present time be seen to have the power of veto over other regulatory experiments. While there are alternatives to neoliberalism at the local level, ranging from long-established models such as Swedish social democracy or the Third Italy to locally-based alternative financial infrastructures, these run the constant risk of being undermined by the corrosive effects of neoliberalism and its ally, unfettered global competition. Accordingly, a new institutional fix must be established in the face of the prevailing winds of neoliberalism, and it must be an anti-liberal one. Such an anti-liberal position is not simply a moral but also an economic one. Neoliberalism, crucially, seems unable to sustain growth. On the contrary, it tends to fuel further instability. Lipietz (1992) has argued that the neoliberal model is internally crisis-prone for four reasons. First, it is associated with a tendency for social polarisation with the attendant possibility of either disruptive collective action or social breakdown. Secondly, neoliberalism does not resolve the contradictions of the Fordist labour process, namely, progressive alienation from the production process and the collapse of the social framework around which productivity gains could be shared. Third, it tends to exacerbate, rather than contain, swings in the business cycle, with the result that macro-economic crashes (and unsustainable booms) are a constant threat. Fourth, the neoliberal deregulation of international trade does not lead unproblematically to structural adjustment, but to structural imbalances and to forced deflations, as nation-states respond to global competition by adopting beggar-thy-neighbour policies. These pressures, of course, affect rich and poor countries alike, as so vividly demonstrated by the humiliating withdrawal of sterling from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism in 1992 (see Leyshon 1993).

AT Gibson-Graham

Treating Capitalism as a monolithic system is the only way to truly move away from capitalism. Otherwise the state is able to co-opt and use supposedly anti-capitalist actions to pacify and reintegrate dissidents into the system of capitalism prevent revolution. The only way to challenge capitalism is to reject in every form however benign.- that’s our Herod evidence

If we win a link it proves that the plan is not a local challenge against capitalism, but rather a way of maintaining it.

Cross apply Jenson 7- Ethical obligation to reject every instance

**Gibson-Graham’s method surrenders to capitalism and allows the alt to become co-opted**

**Poitevin 1** (Rene, sociology@NYU, Socialist Reivew, indarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3952/is\_200101/ai\_n8932891/?tag=mantle\_skin;content)

**I begin with** the postmodern (mis)appropriation of Althusser's notion of "overdetermination," namely **the intuition that reality is so complex that it is better understood as a multicausal process rather than as a** "structural" or **systemic mechanism**, as in the traditional Marxist explanation of capitalism. Then, **through** a close **reading** of J.K. **Gibson-Graham's** (which is the professional name of scholars Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson**), The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It),**2 I show that **despite its intuitive analytical appeal and theoretical sophistication, their book espouses an unconvincing and** ultimately **reactionary postmodern/post-Marxist politics - one that is ultimately predicated around how to make capitalism more user friendly**. I will show that **to practice** or "perform" **postmodern Marxist politics** in our present situation **is not to engage in** what the Amherst School of postmodern Marxism describes as **a "politics of opportunity and attainment**,"3 **but to practice the politics of surrender** instead. I will make clear that **what ultimately gives internal consistency to many of the critiques of** postmodern and **post-Marxist theorists is a profound distortion and co-optation** of the most critical, unique, and politically mobilizing features of Marxist theory, on one hand, combined with a renaturalization of a capitalism predicated on liberal notions of social and economic reform, on the other.4

Reframed Impacts

Econ

Economic decline is a symptom of the consumptive drive of a capitalist market. 35 economic declines in the history of America prove that the myth of unsustainable growth is as much of a lie as the American dream.

Economic decline is only problematic in a capitalist system that initiates wars in the pursuit of military Keynesian stimulus and renewed growth from resources gathered through imperialism.

**Economic decline is a conjunctural crises an inevitably recurring feature of the fundamental structural crisis of capital**

**Meszaros 6** (Istvan, Monthly Review, September, “The Structural Crisis of Politics”)

2. The Nature of Capital’s Structural Crisis

In this respect **it is necessary to clarify the** relevant **differences between types** or modalities **of crisis**. It is not a matter of indifference whether a crisis in the social sphere can be considered a periodic/con-junctural crisis, or something much more fundamental than that. For, obviously, the way of dealing with a fundamental crisis cannot be con-ceptualized in terms of the the categories of periodic or conjunctural crises. To anticipate a main point of this lecture, as far as politics is con-cerned the crucial difference between the two sharply contrasting types of crises in question is that the **periodic or conjunctural crises unfold and are more or less successfully resolved within a given framework of politics, whereas the fundamental crisis affects that framework itself in its entirety**. In other words, **in relation to a given socioeconomic and political system we are talking about the vital difference between the more or less frequent crises in politics, as against the crisis of the estab-lished modality of politics itself, with qualitatively different require-ments for its possible solution.** It is the latter that we are concerned with today. In general terms, this distinction **is not simply a question of the apparent severity of the contrasting types of crises**. **For a periodic** or conjunctural **crisis can be dramatically severe—as the “Great World Economic Crisis of 1929**–1933” happened to be—**yet capable of a solution within the parameters of the given system**. Misinterpreting the severity of a given conjunctural crisis as if it was a fundamental systemic crisis, as Stalin and his advisers did in the midst of the “Great World Economic Crisis of 1929–1933,” is bound to lead to mistaken and indeed volun-taristic strategies, like declaring social democracy to be the “main enemy” in the early 1930s, which could only strengthen, as in fact it trag-ically did strengthen, Hitler’s forces. And **in the same way, but in the opposite sense, the “non-explosive” character of a prolonged structural crisis, in contrast to the “thunderstorms**” (Marx) **through which periodic conjunctural crises can discharge and resolve themselves, may also lead to fundamentally misconceived strategies, as a result of the misin-terpretation of the absence of “thunderstorms” as if their absence was the overwhelming evidence for the indefinite stability of “organized capitalism**” and of the “integration of the working class.” **This kind of misinterpretation**, to be sure **heavily promoted by the ruling ideological interests under the pretenses of “scientific objectivity,” tends to rein-force the position of those who represent the self-justifying acceptance of the reformist accommodationist approaches in institutionalized**—for-merly genuinely oppositional—**working–class parties** and trade unions (now, however, “Her Majesty’s Official Opposition,” as the saying goes). But **even among the deeply committed critics of the capital system, the same misconception regarding the indefinitely crisis-free perspective of the established order can result in the adoption of a self-paralyzing defensive posture**, as we witnessed in the socialist movement in the last few decades. **It cannot be stressed enough, the crisis of politics in our time is not intelligible without being referred to the broad overall social framework of which politics is an integral part**. **This means** that in order to clarify the nature of the persistent and deepening crisis of politics all over the world today **we must focus attention on the crisis of the capital system itself.** **For the crisis of capital we are experiencing**—at least since the very beginning of the 1970s—**is an all-embracing structural crisis**.18 Let us see, summed up as briefly as possible, the defining characteristics of the structural crisis we are concerned with. The historical novelty of today’s crisis is manifest under four main aspects: ♦ (1) its character is universal, rather than restricted to one particular sphere (e.g., financial, or commercial, or affecting this or that particu-lar branch of production, or applying to this rather than that type of labour, with its specific range of skills and degrees of productivity, etc.); ♦ (2) its scope is truly global (in the most threateningly literal sense of the term), rather than confined to a particular set of countries (as all major crises have been in the past); ♦ (3) its time scale is extended, continuous—if you like: permanent— rather than limited and cyclic, as all former crises of capital happened to be. ♦ (4) its mode of unfolding might be called creeping—in contrast to the more spectacular and dramatic eruptions and collapses of the past— while adding the proviso that even the most vehement or violent con-vulsions cannot be excluded as far as the future is concerned: i.e, when the complex machinery now actively engaged in “crisis-management” and in the more or less temporary “displacement” of the growing con-tradictions runs out of steam.... [Here] it is necessary to make some general points about the criteria of a structural crisis, as well as about the forms in which its solution may be envisaged. To put it in the simplest and most general terms, a structural crisis affects the totality of a social complex, in all its relations with its con-stituent parts or sub-complexes, as well as with other complexes to which it is linked. By contrast, a non-structural crisis affects only some parts of the complex in question, and thus no matter how severe it might be with regard to the affected parts, it cannot endanger the continued survival of the overall structure. Accordingly, the displacement of contradictions is feasible only while the crisis is partial, relative and internally manageable by the system, requiring no more than shifts—even if major ones—within the relatively autonomous system itself. By the same token, a structural crisis calls into question the very existence of the overall complex concerned, postulat-ing its transcendence and replacement by some alternative complex. The same contrast may be expressed in terms of the limits any particular social complex happens to have in its immediacy, at any given time, as compared to those beyond which it cannot conceivably go. Thus, a structural crisis is not concerned with the immediate limits but with the ultimate limits of a global structure....19  Thus, in a fairly obvious sense **nothing could be more serious than the structural crisis of capital’s mode of social metabolic reproduction which defines the ultimate limits of the established order.** But even though profoundly serious in its all-important general parameters, **on the face of it the structural crisis may not appear to be of such a decid-ing importance when compared to the dramatic vicissitudes of a major conjunctural crisis. For the “thunderstorms” through which the con-junctural crises discharge themselves are rather paradoxical in the sense that in their mode of unfolding they not only discharge** (and impose) **but also resolve themselves**, to the degree to which that is feasible under the circumstances. **This they can do precisely because of their partial char-acter which does not call into question the ultimate limits of the estab-lished global structure. At the same time, however, and for the same reason, they can only “resolve” the underlying deep-seated structural problems—which necessarily assert themselves again and again in the form of the specific conjunctural crises—in a strictly partial and tempo-rally also most limited way. Until, that is, the next conjunctural crisis appears on society’s horizon**. By contrast, in view of the inescapably complex and prolonged nature of the structural crisis, unfolding in historical time in an epochal and not episodic/instantaneous sense, it is the cumulative interrelationship of the whole that decides the issue, even under the false appearance of “normality.” This is because in the structural crisis everything is at stake, involving the all-embracing ultimate limits of the given order of which there cannot possibly be a “symbolic/paradigmatic” particular instance. **Without understanding the overall systemic connections and implications of the particular events and developments we lose sight of the really significant changes and of the corresponding levers of poten-tial strategic intervention positively to affect them**, in the interest of the necessary systemic transformation. **Our social responsibility therefore calls for an uncompromising critical awareness of the emerging cumulative interrelationship, instead of looking for comforting reassurances in the world of illusory normality until the house collapses over our head**.

Economic crashes are inevitable under a system of capitalism

(Robert Pollin, professor of economics and co-director of the Political Economy Research Institute (PERI), 2010, http://monthlyreview.org/2010/09/01/the-wall-street-collapse-and-return-of-reality-based-economics)

Over the past generation, the U.S. economy as well as most of the rest of the global economy have been dominated by the idea that free market capitalism produces dynamic growth, financial stability, and as close as we are likely to come to a fair society. Supporters of this pro-market framework hold that government interventions to encourage growth, stability, or even fairness will almost always produce more harm than good. This mode of thinking has been the intellectual foundation for the era of financial deregulation in the United States—the dismantling of the Glass-Steagall regulatory system that was built amid the rubble of the 1929 stock market crash and ensuing 1930s Depression. The Clinton administration provided the final nails in the coffin of financial regulation with the passage of the Financial Services Modernization Act in 1999. Writing in July 2010, in the recent aftermath of the most profound financial market crisis since the 1930s, it is clear that the case in behalf of unregulated financial markets has collapsed as decisively as did the markets themselves. The crisis would have been far worse still, if not for the massive government bailout operations that propped up both the financial system and total spending in the economy. Moreover, the 2008-09 collapse was no mere aberration. Financial crises have been a regular feature of the United States and global economic landscape since the push to deregulate began in earnest in the late 1970s. Consider the scorecard over the twenty years prior to the 2008-09 disaster: a stock market crash in 1987; the Savings and Loan crisis and bailout in 1989-90; the “emerging markets” crisis of 1997-98—which brought down, among others, Long-Term Capital Management, the super hedge fund led by two economics Nobel laureates specializing in finance—and the bursting of the dot-com stock market bubble in 2001. Each of these crises could have produced a 1930s-style collapse in the absence of full-scale government bailout operations. Moreover, as Charles Kindleberger makes abundantly clear in his classic study Manias, Panics, and Crashes, such crises had been part of the regular rhythms of capitalist economies prior to establishment of the Glass-Steagall regulatory system in the United States and comparable regimes in other advanced economies.

Competitiveness

The quest for economic competitiveness makes fascism and war inevitable

Kienle ‘10

(Lecturer in Middle East Politics at University of London and Chair of its Center for Near and Middle Eastern Studies)

(Eberhard, Global competitiveness, the erosion of checks and balances, and the demise of liberal democracy, 10 May, http://www.opendemocracy.net/global-competitiveness-erosion-of-checks-and-balances-and-demise-of-liberal-democracy)

Ultimately, therefore, the search for competitiveness challenges liberal democracy in two analytically separate ways that in practice of course may reinforce each other. First, as a totalitarian principle that subjugates all other values and by definition erodes a variety of liberties and the checks and balances that are co-terminus with liberal democracy; second, as a principle that, whilst it holds the promise for a better life, simultaneously threatens the prosperity and survival of the weaker competitors; it fuels ideologies and practices that are authoritarian and even totalitarian in the classical sense. As a matter of course, these practices and ideologies are no less hostile to checks and balances. Numerous authoritarian regimes around the world, today and in the past, have been the result of attempts to catch up and compete with economically more successful states. Nineteenth century Prussia, the bureaucratic authoritarian regimes in mid Twentieth century Latin America and more recently Iraq under Saddam Hussein are telling examples, even though they differ widely as far as restrictions to liberties are concerned. The European fascisms of the 1920s, 30s and 40s were partly moved by the same perception of comparative weakness, though combined with and transformed into extreme projects of domination, subjugation and annihilation.

Impacts

At impact turns

**Even if they win that cap is good for some, 5/6ths of humanity can’t benefit from it**

**DeSoto 0** (Hernando, president of the institute for liberty and democracy, “The Mystery of Capital: why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else” Pg. 5-8 JF)

In this book I intend to demonstrate that **the major stumbling block that keeps the rest of the world from benefitting from capitalism is its inability to produce capital**. Capital is the force that raises the productivity of labor and creates the wealth of nations. It is the lifeblood of the capitalist system, the foundation of progress, and the one thing that the poor countries of the world cannot seem to produce for themselves, no matter how eagerly their people engage in all the other activities that characterize a capitalist economy. I will also show, with the help of facts and figures that my research team and I have collected, block by block and farm by farm in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, that most of the poor already possess the assets they need to make a success of capitalism. **Even in the poorest countries, the poor save. The value of savings among the poor is,** in fact, immense—**forty times all the foreign aid received throughout the world since 1945. In Egypt,** for instance, **the wealth that the poor have accumulated is worth fifty-five times as much as the sum of all direct foreign investment ever recorded there**, including the Suez Canal and the Aswan Dam. **In Haiti, the poorest nation in Latin America, the total assets of the poor are more than one hundred fifty times greater than all foreign investment received since Haiti’s independence from France in 1804**. If the United States were to hike its foreign-aid budget to the level recommended by the United Nations—0.7 percent of national income—it would take the richest country on earth more than 150 years to transfer the world’s poor resources equal to those they already possess. But **they hold these resources in defective forms: houses built on whose ownership rights are not adequately recorded, unincorporated business with undefined liability, industries located where financiers and investors cannot see them. Because the rights to these possessions are not adequately** **documented, these assets cannot readily be turned into capital, cannot be traded outside of narrow local circles** where people know and trust each other, cannot be used as collateral for a loan, and cannot be used as a share against an investment. **In the West, by contrast, every parcel of land, every building, every piece of equipment**, or store of inventories **is represented in a property document that is the visible sign of a vast hidden process that connects all these assets to the rest of the economy. Thanks to this representational process, assets can lead an invisible, parallel life alongside their material existence**. They can be used as collateral for credit. The single most important source of funds for new businesses in the United States is a mortgage on the entrepreneur’s house. These assets can also provide a link to the owner’s credit history, an accountable address for the collection of debt and taxes, the basis for the creation of reliable and universal public utilities, and a foundation for the creation of securities (like mortgage-backed bonds) that can then be rediscounted and sod in secondary markets. **By this process the West injects life into assets and makes them generate capital. Third world and former communist nations do not have this representational process.** **As a result, most of them are undercapitalized, in the same way that a firm is undercapitalized when it issues fewer securities than its income and assets would justify.** The enterprises of the poor are very much like corporations that cannot issue shares or bonds to obtain new investment and finance. **Without representations, their assets are dead capital.** The poor inhabitants of these nations—**five-sixths of humanity—do have things, but they lack the process to represent their property and create capital. They have houses but not titles; crops but not deeds; business but not statutes of incorporation. It is the unavailability of these essential representations that explains why people who have adapted every other Western invention**, from the paper clip to the nuclear reactor, **have not been able to produce sufficient capital to make their domestic capitalism work.** This is the mystery of capital. Solving it requires an understanding of why Westerners, by representing assets with titles, are able to see and draw out capital from them. One of the greatest challenges to the human mind is to comprehend and to gain access to those things we know exist but cannot see. Not everything that is real and useful is tangible and visible. Time, for example, is real, but it can only be efficiently managed when it is represented by a clock or a calendar. Throughout history, human beings have invented

representational systems—writing, musical notation, double-entry bookkeeping—to grasp with the mind what human hands could never touch. In the same way, the great practitioners of capitalism, from the creators of integrated title systems and corporate stock to Michael Milken, were able to reveal and extract capital where others saw only junk by devising new ways to represent the invisible potential that is locked up in the assets we accumulate. **The absence of this process in the poorer regions of the world—where two-thirds of humanity lives—is not the consequence of some Western monopolistic conspiracy. It is rather that Westerners take the mechanism so completely for granted that they have lost all awareness of its existence.** Although it is huge, nobody sees it, including the Americans, Europeans, and Japanese who owe all their wealth to their ability to use it**. It is an implicit legal infrastructure hidden deep within their property systems**—of which ownership is but the tip of the iceberg. The rest of the iceberg is an intricate man-made process that can transform assets and labor into capital. This process was not created from a blue-print and is not described in a glossy brochure. Its origins are obscure and its significance buried in the economic subconscious of Western capitalist nations.

**Capitalism causes incalculable deaths—nothing can outweigh**

**Herod 7** (James, Columbia U graduate and political activist, “Getting Free” Pg. 22-23 JF)

We must never forget that **we are at war,** however, and that we have been for five hundred years. We are involved in class warfare. This defines our situation historically and sets limits to what we can do. **It would be nice to think of peace,** for example, **but this is out of the question**. It is excluded as an option by historical conditions**. Peace can be achieved only by destroying capitalism**. **The casualties from this war**, on our side, **long ago reached astronomical sums**. It is estimated that **thirty million people perished during the first century of the capitalist invasion of the Americas, including millions of Africans** who were worked to death as slaves. **Thousands** of peasants **died in the great revolts in France and Germany** in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During the enclosures movement in England and the first wave of industrialization, hundreds of thousands of people died needlessly. **African slaves died by the millions** (an estimated fifteen million) during the Atlantic crossing. **Hundreds of poor people were hanged in London in the early nineteenth century to enforce the new property laws**. During the Paris uprising of 1871, thirty thousand communards were slaughtered. **Twenty million were lost in Joseph Stalin’s gulag**, and millions more perished during the 1930s when the Soviet state expropriated the land and forced the collectivization of agriculture an event historically comparable to the enclosures in England (and thus the Bolsheviks destroyed one of the greatest peasant revolutions of all time). **Thousands of militants were murdered by the German police** during the near revolution in Germany and Austria in 1919. Thousands of workers and peasants were killed during the Spanish Civil War. **Adolf Hitler killed ten million people in concentration camps** (including six million Jews in the gas chambers**).** An estimated **two hundred thousand labor leaders, activists, and citizens have been murdered in Guatemala** since the coup engineered by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1954. Thousands were lost in the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. **Half a million communists were massacred in Indonesia in 1975.** **Millions of Vietnamese were killed by French and U.S. capitalists during decades of colonialism and war**. And how many were killed during British capital’s subjugation of India, and during capitalist Europe’s colonization of Asia and Africa? **A major weapon of capitalists has always been to simply murder those who are threatening their rule.** Thousands were killed by the contras and death squads in Nicaragua and El Salvador. Thousands were murdered in Chile by Augusto Pinochet during his counterrevolution, after the assassination of Salvador Allende. Speaking of assassinations, there is a long list: Patrice Lumumba, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci (died in prison), Ricardo Flores Magon (died in prison), Che Guevara, Gustav Landauer, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King Jr., Fred Hampton, George Jackson, the Haymarket anarchists, Amilcar Cabral, Steve Biko, Karl Liebnicht, Nat Turner, and thousands more. Thousands are being murdered every year now in Colombia. **Thousands die every year in the workplace in the United States alone.** Eighty thousand die needlessly in hospitals annually in the United States due to malpractice and negligence. Fifty thousand die each year in automobile accidents in the United States, deaths directly due to intentional capitalist decisions to scuttle mass transit in favor of an economy based on oil, roads, and cars (and unsafe cars to boot). **Thousands have died in mines since capitalism began. Millions of people are dying right now, every year, from famines directly attributable to capitalists and from diseases easily prevented but for capitalists**. **Nearly all poverty-related deaths are because of capitalists. We cannot begin to estimate the stunted, wasted, and shortened lives caused by capitalists, not to mention the millions who have died fighting their stupid little world wars and equally stupid colonial wars. (**This enumeration is very far from complete.) **Capitalists** (generically speaking) **are not merely thieves; they are murderers. Their theft and murder is on a scale never seen before in history a scale so vast it boggles the mind**. **Capitalists make Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Genghis Khan, and Attila the Hun look like boy scouts.** This is a terrible enemy we face.

**The AFF is concerned with solving fleeting, conjunctural crises, which are inevitably recurring features of the fundamental structural crisis of capital. Error replication is inevitable, and our impacts outweigh**

**Meszaros 2006** (Istvan, Monthly Review, September, “The Structural Crisis of Politics”)

2. The Nature of Capital’s Structural Crisis

In this respect **it is necessary to clarify the** relevant **differences between types** or modalities **of crisis**. It is not a matter of indifference whether a crisis in the social sphere can be considered a periodic/con-junctural crisis, or something much more fundamental than that. For, obviously, the way of dealing with a fundamental crisis cannot be con-ceptualized in terms of the the categories of periodic or conjunctural crises. To anticipate a main point of this lecture, as far as politics is con-cerned the crucial difference between the two sharply contrasting types of crises in question is that the **periodic or conjunctural crises unfold and are more or less successfully resolved within a given framework of politics, whereas the fundamental crisis affects that framework itself in its entirety**. In other words, **in relation to a given socioeconomic and political system we are talking about the vital difference between the more or less frequent crises in politics, as against the crisis of the estab-lished modality of politics itself, with qualitatively different require-ments for its possible solution.** It is the latter that we are concerned with today. In general terms, this distinction **is not simply a question of the apparent severity of the contrasting types of crises**. **For a periodic** or conjunctural **crisis can be dramatically severe—as the “Great World Economic Crisis of 1929**–1933” happened to be—**yet capable of a solution within the parameters of the given system**. Misinterpreting the severity of a given conjunctural crisis as if it was a fundamental systemic crisis, as Stalin and his advisers did in the midst of the “Great World Economic Crisis of 1929–1933,” is bound to lead to mistaken and indeed volun-taristic strategies, like declaring social democracy to be the “main enemy” in the early 1930s, which could only strengthen, as in fact it trag-ically did strengthen, Hitler’s forces. And **in the same way, but in the opposite sense, the “non-explosive” character of a prolonged structural crisis, in contrast to the “thunderstorms**” (Marx) **through which periodic conjunctural crises can discharge and resolve themselves, may also lead to fundamentally misconceived strategies, as a result of the misin-terpretation of the absence of “thunderstorms” as if their absence was the overwhelming evidence for the indefinite stability of “organized capitalism**” and of the “integration of the working class.” **This kind of misinterpretation**, to be sure **heavily promoted by the ruling ideological interests under the pretenses of “scientific objectivity,” tends to rein-force the position of those who represent the self-justifying acceptance of the reformist accommodationist approaches in institutionalized**—for-merly genuinely oppositional—**working–class parties** and trade unions (now, however, “Her Majesty’s Official Opposition,” as the saying goes). But **even among the deeply committed critics of the capital system, the same misconception regarding the indefinitely crisis-free perspective of the established order can result in the adoption of a self-paralyzing defensive posture**, as we witnessed in the socialist movement in the last few decades. **It cannot be stressed enough, the crisis of politics in our time is not intelligible without being referred to the broad overall social framework of which politics is an integral part**. **This means** that in order to clarify the nature of the persistent and deepening crisis of politics all over the world today **we must focus attention on the crisis of the capital system itself.** **For the crisis of capital we are experiencing**—at least since the very beginning of the 1970s—**is an all-embracing structural crisis**.18 Let us see, summed up as briefly as possible, the defining characteristics of the structural crisis we are concerned with. The historical novelty of today’s crisis is manifest under four main aspects: ♦ (1) its character is universal, rather than restricted to one particular sphere (e.g., financial, or commercial, or affecting this or that particu-lar branch of production, or applying to this rather than that type of labour, with its specific range of skills and degrees of productivity, etc.); ♦ (2) its scope is truly global (in the most threateningly literal sense of the term), rather than confined to a particular set of countries (as all major crises have been in the past); ♦ (3) its time scale is extended, continuous—if you like: permanent— rather than limited and cyclic, as all former crises of capital happened to be. ♦ (4) its mode of unfolding might be called creeping—in contrast to the more spectacular and dramatic eruptions and collapses of the past— while adding the proviso that even the most vehement or violent con-vulsions cannot be excluded as far as the future is concerned: i.e, when the complex machinery now actively engaged in “crisis-management” and in the more or less temporary “displacement” of the growing con-tradictions runs out of steam.... [Here] it is necessary to make some general points about the criteria of a structural crisis, as well as about the forms in which its solution may be envisaged. To put it in the simplest and most general terms, a structural crisis affects the totality of a social complex, in all its relations with its con-stituent parts or sub-complexes, as well as with other complexes to which it is linked. By contrast, a non-structural crisis affects only some parts of the complex in question, and thus no matter how severe it might be with regard to the affected parts, it cannot endanger the continued survival of the overall structure. Accordingly, the displacement of contradictions is feasible only while the crisis is partial, relative and internally manageable by the system, requiring no more than shifts—even if major ones—within the relatively autonomous system itself. By the same token, a structural crisis calls into question the very existence of the overall complex concerned, postulat-ing its transcendence and replacement by some alternative complex. The same contrast may be expressed in terms of the limits any particular social complex happens to have in its immediacy, at any given time, as compared to those beyond which it cannot conceivably go. Thus, a structural crisis is not concerned with the immediate limits but with the ultimate limits of a global structure....19  Thus, in a fairly obvious sense **nothing could be more serious than the structural crisis of capital’s mode of social metabolic reproduction which defines the ultimate limits of the established order.** But even though profoundly serious in its all-important general parameters, **on the face of it the structural crisis may not appear to be of such a decid-ing importance when compared to the dramatic vicissitudes of a major conjunctural crisis. For the “thunderstorms” through which the con-junctural crises discharge themselves are rather paradoxical in the sense that in their mode of unfolding they not only discharge** (and impose) **but also resolve themselves**, to the degree to which that is feasible under the circumstances. **This they can do precisely because of their partial char-acter which does not call into question the ultimate limits of the estab-lished global structure. At the same time, however, and for the same reason, they can only “resolve” the underlying deep-seated structural problems—which necessarily assert themselves again and again in the form of the specific conjunctural crises—in a strictly partial and tempo-rally also most limited way. Until, that is, the next conjunctural crisis appears on society’s horizon**. By contrast, in view of the inescapably complex and prolonged nature of the structural crisis, unfolding in historical time in an epochal and not episodic/instantaneous sense, it is the cumulative interrelationship of the whole that decides the issue, even under the false appearance of “normality.” This is because in the structural crisis everything is at stake, involving the all-embracing ultimate limits of the given order of which there cannot possibly be a “symbolic/paradigmatic” particular instance. **Without understanding the overall systemic connections and implications of the particular events and developments we lose sight of the really significant changes and of the corresponding levers of poten-tial strategic intervention positively to affect them**, in the interest of the necessary systemic transformation. **Our social responsibility therefore calls for an uncompromising critical awareness of the emerging cumulative interrelationship, instead of looking for comforting reassurances in the world of illusory normality until the house collapses over our head**.

Environment

Capitalist drive for profit neglects environmental concerns

**Magdoff and Magdoff 5** (Approaching Socialism [Fred](http://monthlyreview.org/author/harrymagdoff) is a professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont in Burlington and a director of the Monthly Review Foundation; Harry worked for the [United States Department of Commerce](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Department_of_Commerce) <http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism>)

Ecological degradation occurred in numerous precapitalist societies. But with capitalism there is a new dimension to the problem, even as we have better understood the ecological harm that human activity can create. The drive for profits and capital accumulation as the overriding objective of economic activity, the control that economic interests exert over political life, and the many technologies developed in capitalist societies that allow humans rapidly to change their environment—near and wide, intentionally or not—mean that adverse effects on the environment are inevitable. Pollution of water, air, and soil are natural byproducts of production systems organized for the single goal of making profits. Under the logic of capitalist production and exchange there is no inherent mechanism to encourage or force industry to find methods that have minimal impact on the environment. For example, new chemicals that are found useful to produce manufactured goods are routinely introduced into the environmen0074—without the adequate assessment of whether or not they cause harm to humans or other species. The mercury given off into the air by coal-burning power plants pollutes lakes hundreds of miles away as well as the ocean. The routine misuse of antibiotics, added to feeds of animals that are being maintained in the overcrowded and unhealthy conditions of factory farms, has caused the development of antibiotic resistant strains of disease organisms. It is a technique that is inconsistent with any sound ecological approach to raising animals, but it is important to capital because profits are enhanced. In addition, the development of an automobile-centered society in the United States has had huge environmental consequences. Vast areas of suburbs, sometimes merging into a “megatropolis,” partially erase the boundaries between communities. The waste of fuel by commuting to work by car is only part of the story of suburbanization, as some people work in the city while others work in different suburbs. Shopping in malls reachable only by cars and taking children to school and play require transportation over significant distances. Climate change resulting from global warming, not completely predictable, but with mostly negative consequences, is another repercussion of unfettered capitalist exploitation of resources. As fossil fuels are burned in large quantities by factories, electrical generation plants, and automobiles and trucks, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere have increased. There is some concern that the gradual warming could actually lead to a fairly rapid change, with such factors as the melting of polar ice, changes in precipitation and river flow, and a cessation of the thermohaline conveyor (of which the Gulf Stream is a part) that brings warm water to the north Atlantic and helps keep North America and Europe warm (see “[The Pentagon and Climate Change](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/05/01/the-pentagon-and-climate-change),” *Monthly Review*, May 2004).

**Capitalism destroys the environment – can’t prioritize sustainability over short term profit**

**Altvater 7** (Elmar, Former Prof. of Political Science @ University of Berlin, “The Social and Natural Environment of Fossil Capitalism,” http://www.globallabour.info/en/Altvater-Fossilism-SR-2007%20(rev.).doc, JM)

**The reason for capitalism’s high economic impact on the environment is to be found in its double character**. It has a value dimension (the monetary value of the gross national product, of world trade, of FDI, of financial flows, etc.) but is also a system of material and energy flows in production and consumption, transportation and distribution. **Economic decisions concerning production first consider values and prices, profit margins and monetary returns, on capital invested. In this sphere the ruling principle is only the economic rationality of profit-maximizing decision-makers. But the decisions they take have important impacts on nature**, due to the material and energy dimension of economic processes. **Under capitalist conditions the environment is more and more transformed into a contested object of human greed**. **The exploitation of natural resources, and their degradation by a growing quantity of pollutants, results in a** man-made **scarcity, leading to conflicts over access** to them. Access to nature (to resources and sinks) is uneven and unequal and the societal relation of man to nature therefore is conflict-prone. **The “ecological footprints” of people in different countries and regions of the world are of very different sizes, reflecting severe inequalities of incomes and wealth. Ecological injustices therefore can only usefully be discussed if social class contradictions and the production of inequality in the course of capital accumulation are taken into account.**

VTL

Capitalism reduces everything to market abstractions—negates value to life and makes extinction inevitable

**Kovel 2**(Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard , “The Enemy of Nature,” p140-141)

**The precondition of an ecologically rational attitude** toward nature **is the recognition that nature far surpasses us and has its own intrinsic value, irreducible to our practice**. Thus we achieve differentiation from nature. It is in this light that we would approach the question of transforming practice ecologically — or, as we now recognize to be the same thing, dialectically. **The monster that now bestrides the world was born of the conjugation of value and dominated labour. From the former arose the quantification of reality, and,** with this, **the loss of the differentiated recognition essential for ecosystemic integrity; from the latter emerged a kind of selfhood that could swim in these icy waters**. From this standpoint one might call capitalism a ‘regime of the ego’, meaning that under its auspices a kind of estranged self emerges as the mode of capital’s reproduction. This self is not merely prideful the ordinary connotation of ‘egotistical’ — more fully, it is the ensemble of those relations that embody the domination of nature from one side, and, from the other, ensure the reproduction of capital. This ego is the latest version of the purified male principle, emerging aeons after the initial gendered domination became absorbed and rationalized as profitability and self-maximization (allowing suitable ‘power-women’ to join the dance). It is a pure culture of splitting and non-recognition: of itself, of the otherness of nature and of the nature of others. In terms of the preceding discussion, it is the elevation of the merely individual and isolated mind-as-ego into a reigning principle. ‘~ **Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or** may **have the role thrust upon them**. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that **the** almighty **dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience**: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. **Because money is all that ‘counts’, a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a** tough-minded and **cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents** (viz. Africa) **or inconvenient sub-sets of the population** (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way. The **presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally**.

No value to life under capitalism

**Dillon 99**

(Michael Dillon, University of Lancaster, “Another Justice” Political Theory Vol. 27, No. 2, Aprill 1999, JSTOR)

Otherness is born(e) within the self as an integral part of itself and in such a way that it always remains an inherent stranger to itself." It derives from the lack, absence, or ineradicable incompleteness which comes from having no security of tenure within or over that of which the self is a particular hermeneutical manifestation; namely, being itself. The point about the human, betrayed by this absence, is precisely that it is not sovereignly self-possessed and complete, enjoying undisputed tenure in and of itself. Modes of justice therefore reliant upon such a subject lack the very foundations in the self that they most violently insist upon seeing inscribed there. This does not, however, mean that the dissolution of the subject also entails the dissolution of Justice. Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ultimately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economies of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. **The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism**. They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. **Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability**. 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. 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.

War

#### Capitalism makes war inevitable

Mark Harrison, Research fellow at the Hoover Institution and Professor of Economics at the University of Warwick, October 19, 2011, Capitalism at War [http://ssrn.com/abstract=1992623](http://ssrn.com/abstract%3D1992623)

There is a persistent view that, without wars, capitalism would fall into depression (e.g. Steindl 1952; Baran and Sweezy 1966). The philosophy of “military Keynesianism” maintains that capitalist economies tend to suffer from a deficiency of demand, and will stagnate without frequent injections of demand into the circular flow of income. The deficiency can be made up by debt-financed military spending combined with the Keynesian multiplier. If so, it does not follow that “capitalism means war.” Rather, it implies one more way in which capitalism has reduced the costs of war. In this case, it is suggested that capitalism can supply war free of charge. If the weapons and armies were not bought up by the government, the resources they represent would be unused; this would make war a free lunch. The lunch will then be eaten, not because we are hungry, but because it is free.

Capitalism leads to War

Chossudovsky on a synopsis of his new book. (Professor of Economics at the University of Ottawa), 11 (Michel, author of *The Globalization of Poverty and The New World Order* (2003), *America's "War on Terrorism"* (2005) and *Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War* (2011); "Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War." 06/30/11. http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=25185.)

The US has embarked on a military adventure, “a long war”, which threatens the future of humanity. The first two chapters of this E-book focus on the "Cult of Death and Destruction" underlying this global military agenda. US-NATO weapons of mass destruction are portrayed as instruments of peace. Mini-nukes are said to be "harmless to the surrounding civilian population". Pre-emptive nuclear war is portrayed as a "humanitarian undertaking". Nuclear war has become a multibillion dollar undertaking, which fills the pockets of US defense contractors. What is at stake is the outright "privatization of nuclear war". US nuclear doctrine is intimately related to "America's War on Terrorism" and the alleged threat of Al Qaeda, which in a bitter irony is considered as an upcoming nuclear power. Under the Obama administration, Islamic terrorists are said to be preparing to attack US cities. Proliferation is tacitly equated with “nuclear terrorism”. Obama's nuclear doctrine puts particular emphasis on “nuclear terrorism” and on the alleged plans by Al Qaeda to develop and use nuclear weapons. Chapter III focusses on America's Holy Crusade and the Battle for Oil. The “Global War on Terrorism” requires going after the terrorists, using advanced weapons systems. US foreign policy upholds a pre-emptive religious-like crusade against evil, which serves to obscure the real objectives of military action. In the inner consciousness of Americans, the attacks of September 11, 2001 justify acts of war and conquest against evil-doers. The Global War on Terrorism is presented as a “clash of civilizations”, a war between competing values and religions, when in reality it is an outright war of conquest, guided by strategic and economic objectives. The lies behind 9/11 are known and documented. The American people’s acceptance of this crusade against evil is not based on any rational understanding or analysis of the facts. "The American inquisition" purports to extend Washington’s sphere of influence. Military intervention is justified as part of an international campaign against “Islamic terrorists”. Its ultimate intention, which is never mentioned in press reports, is territorial conquest and control over strategic resources. Ironically, under the Global War on Terrorism, these plans of conquest are instrumented by covertly supporting Islamic paramilitary armies, which are then used to destabilize non-compliant governments and impose Western standards of "governance" and "democracy". World War III Scenario The contours of a World War III scenario are discussed in Chapter IV. The Pentagon’s global military design is one of world conquest. The military deployment of US-NATO forces is occurring in several regions of the World simultaneously. Militarization at the global level is instrumented through the US military's Unified Command structure: the entire planet is divided up into geographic Combatant Commands under the control of the Pentagon. According to (former) NATO Commander General Wesley Clark, the Pentagon’s military road-map consists of a sequence of war theaters: “[The] five-year campaign plan [includes]... a total of seven countries, beginning with Iraq, then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Iran, Somalia and Sudan.” Chapter V focusses on war preparations pertaining to Iran, including the launching of a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the Islamic Republic. While Iran remains on the Pentagon's drawing board, a fundamental shift in the sequencing of military operations has occurred. The US-NATO-Israel alliance realizes that Iran has significant capabilities to respond and retaliate. With the onset of the US-NATO led war in North Africa, Washington and its allies have chosen to wage war on countries with lesser military capabilities. This factor in itself has been crucial in the decision by the US and its allies to put "the Iran operation" on hold, while launching a "humanitarian war" on Libya. How to Reverse the Tide of War Chapter VI focusses on antiwar actions directed against this diabolical military agenda. Central to an understanding of war, is the media campaign which grants it legitimacy in the eyes of public opinion. A good versus evil dichotomy prevails. The perpetrators of war are presented as the victims. Public opinion is misled: “We must fight against evil in all its forms as a means to preserving the Western way of life.” Breaking the "big lie" which upholds war as a humanitarian undertaking, means breaking a criminal project of global destruction, in which the quest for profit is the overriding force. This profit-driven military agenda destroys human values and transforms people into unconscious zombies. The holding of mass demonstrations and antiwar protests is not enough. What is required is the development of a broad and well organized grassroots antiwar network, across the land, nationally and internationally, which challenges the structures of power and authority. People must mobilize not only against the military agenda, the authority of the state and its officials must also be challenged. This war can be prevented if people forcefully confront their governments, pressure their elected representatives, organize at the local level in towns, villages and municipalities, spread the word, inform their fellow citizens as to the implications of a nuclear war, initiate debate and discussion within the armed forces. The object of this E-Book is to forcefully reverse the tide of war, challenge the war criminals in high office and the powerful corporate lobby groups which support them. Break the American Inquisition. Undermine the US-NATO-Israel military crusade. Close down the weapons factories and the military bases. Members of the armed forces should disobey orders and refuse to participate in a criminal war. Bring home the troops.

Warming

#### **Arguments that capitalism can solve warming are incorrect and unsubstantiated**

Liodakis and Vlachou 04 (George Liodakis and Andriana Vlachou, Professor at the Technical Institute of Crete, Associate Professor of Economics at the Athens University of Economics and Business, Winter 2004 *Science & Society*, Vol. 67, No. 4 pp.465 http://www.jstor.org.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/stable/40404112)

Here we have clear indications of an agnostic approach to the prospects for ecological and social crisis. But apart from this, Vlachou is certainly right that capitalism has a great potential to push back (postpone) crisis, and that there is not any immediate threat of ecological collapse. And this can be ensured either through institutional and state regulation, or through the operation of the market and the law of value. However, Vlachou is completely wrong, and it is greatly misleading, to implicitly assume that this potential of capitalism is unlimited, and that ultimately capitalism is ecologically sus- tainable. Indeed, it is the thrust of Vlachou' s analysis that the "greening" of capitalism could ensure its ecological sustainability: "'greening of capital- ism' may well be the capitalist response to ecological problems. . . . When and if natural constraints do result in crises, the latter can help the rapid restructuring of the capitalist appropriation of nature so that 'doomsday' never comes" (192). It is argued, even more explicitly, that "increases in prices and rents and the resulting class conflicts may in turn help in shap- ing the 'greening' of capitalism, without it having to go through a full-fledged crisis in order to reorganize its interchange with nature" (194). But will eco- regulation (or internalizing externalities in the standard neoclassical ap- proach) be sufficient in facing up to the problem of environmental degra- dation? While it is my view and assessment that it will not, it seems that Vlachou answers this question in the affirmative. And this appears to be the case, even without the need for state intervention and regulation, but merely through the market mechanism and the operation of the law of value. This overoptimistic implication, however, cannot be seriously substantiated, ei- ther theoretically or empirically

#### Neoliberalism is fundamentally incapable of addressing environmental concerns

Cooley 09 (Dennis Cooley, Associate Director of the Northern Plains Ethics Institute and Associate Professor of Philosophy and Ethics at North Dakota State University, Journal of Business Ethics, Oct 2009, “Understanding Social Welfare Capitalism, Private Property, and the Government’s Duty to Create a Sustainable Environment,” http://ehis.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/detail?sid=1de6a503-259f-437a-a449-c01a962475c9%40sessionmgr104&vid=3&hid=2&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=bth&AN=44645386)

However, assuming that perfectly competitive free markets can adequately solve real world ethical situations is irrational. First, the cost-benefit/economic analysis underlying perfectly competitive free markets is incapable of determining moral values and duties. One of the major problems is the category mistake created when trying to use economics to determine the value of nature and other objects not existing entirely within the market system, much like using meters to measure liquids. At the very least, to view the natural environment solely in terms of profit maximization shows a lack of ‘‘proper humility, self-acceptance, gratitude and appreciation of the good of others’’ (Hill, 2002, p. 189). That is, there is a defect in the evaluator’s character because he negligently, at the very least, uses artificial and incomplete worth to make decisions affecting others. Another error is that cost/benefit economics ‘‘has not shown that economic value is objectively superior to other, more traditional values; it has merely ignored those values’’ (Hargrove, 1996, p. 210; Sagoff, 2004, 2006). Health’s value, among other features of a life worth living, cannot be understood through free market cost/benefit analysis (Shaw and Barry, 2007). In addition, it is clear that businesses will not internalize environmental costs unless outside powers ensure compliance. Based on cost-benefit economic analysis and the notion that the natural world is a free and unlimited good, each business pursues a selfi sh– not self-interested – goal of trying to maximize its net profit, thereby destroying the commons (Ibid.). This economic system’s results, then, are self-inflicted harm to individual characters caused by the myopic valuing process, and a great deal of damage to other worthy objects including but not limited to current and future generations’ potential to achieve flourishing lives and the environment (Birch and Cobb, 1990). Although individuals competing against each other has its place in a properly functioning society, markets incorporating it require more centralized guidance to achieve long-term social goals. Believing that an ‘‘invisible hand’’ will serve the same purpose might even be irrational given the actual actions of consumers who make decisions not in their best interests, such as overeating, smoking, not saving for retirement, going deeply into debt for luxuries, and other destructive behavior. In order to fulfill its promotion of sustainability and flourishing duties, the government needs to control business and the environment in a way proscribed by perfectly competitive free or similar markets (Sagoff, 2004). In fact, ‘‘we need to secure the link between environmental and economic policies at all levels of government and in all sections of the economy’’ (Reilly, 1994, p. 87).8 In other words, we are obligated to adopt a social welfare capitalism as many developed nations have already done in which the environment plays a central role.

Capitalism ensures unsustainable consumption and prevents a meaningful and complete solution to global warming

Kovel 07

Joel Kovel Professor, Saybrook Institute, San Francisco, CA, 2007 The Enemy of Nature: The End of Capitalism Or the End of the World? Pg 262, KB

As Kyoto is discredited, the possibility of a socialist alternative emerges, and, with it, the second theme enters. The deciding matter is the question of sustainability. Capitalism is unsustainable as a total system, not simply because it overproduces, but because the whole world it makes is incompatible with ecological balance. As we have seen, capital generates a society of addiction, as an overweening ego reproduces itself along the fault lines of destabilized ecosystems. As a result, an immense degree of self-deception and denial is built into the debate on climate, which tends to minimize the degree of damage to come, along with the degree of change necessary to build a world that no longer spews intolerable amounts of carbon in the air. Hence the craving for the technological fix that will enable continuing lives of reckless consumerism with the cocoon provide by capital. Trusting blindly in its innovative powers, people defend themselves against the “really inconvenient truth,” that capitalism led us into this nightmare and does not have the least clue as to how to free us from it

Corporations prevent action on climate change

(Anup Shah, Writer, 5/5/12, http://www.globalissues.org/article/179/reactions-to-climate-change-negotiations-and-action)

Largely due to US resistance and the need to get them on board for any meaningful action, various trade-offs were made to the text of the Kyoto Protocol. Critics argue that business interests have been a driving factor, while proponents argue that private innovation is needed and that some of these things have to be looked at because otherwise the costs to the US economy is so great, that emission reductions would not be carried out. As well as the United States, Japan, Australia, Canada, Russia and Norway formed part of a consensus known as the Umbrella Group that wanted things like the flexibility mechanisms to have no limits, unlimited use of carbon sinks, all technologies to be counted in Clean Development Mechanism projects (not just known clean energy projects), etc. Many of these positions are similar to industry lobby positions too. Business interests have historically played an important part and had a large influence in the climate negotiations. (This site’s section on flexibility mechanisms has additional information.) Particularly active during the Kyoto Protocol, the misleadingly named US-based Global Climate Coalition formed to actively oppose measures on climate change for fear of economic repercussions. As PR Watch (see previous link) noted, the coalition had been the most “outspoken and confrontational industry group in the United States battling reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.” This coalition contained many big oil, energy and automobile companies. The coalition was effective at the time, but also extreme. As PR Watch continues, “Prior to its disbanding in early 2002, it collaborated extensively with a network that included industry trade associations, ‘property rights’ groups affiliated with the anti-environmental Wise Use movement, and fringe groups such as Sovereignty International, which believes that global warming is a plot to enslave the world under a United Nations-led ‘world government.’” As evidence of climate change mounted, major corporations had to pull out of the Climate Change Coalition, as it was bad PR for them to be associated with the coalition, and some accepted the evidence and began to invest in cleaner technologies. But much damage had already been done, and the influence on the Bush Administration, for example, has resulted in continued anti-international cooperation on this, as is discussed further below. But some organizations may still be at it. At the beginning of 2007, the British Royal Society, and separately, the Union of Concerned Scientists reported on ExxonMobil waging a campaign of disinformation on global warming between 1998 and 2005, funding right wing think-tanks and journals such as the American Enterprise Institute, the George C. Marshall Institute, and the Competitive Enterprise Institute. And “with the help of right-wing media, such as the Wall Street Journal, … columnists deliberately spread disinformation about climate change.” As The Guardian reported (September 29, 2009), the largest American business federation, the US Chamber of Commerce, suffered a rash of high-profile walkouts as multinational companies became uncomfortable with the organzation’s hard-line opposition to measures tackling climate change. Big names include Nike and Johnson & Johnson amongst others. This old federation, a lobby group, also called for a public trial on both the US policy decision to regulate CO2 emissions and the science behind climate change concerns. As science and technology site Ars Technica argues, putting climate change on trial is a terrible idea because, “The sort of arguments that make for good courtroom statements tend to obscure the details of science, and the specific example proposed by the Chamber clearly indicates that they do nothing for the public’s understanding of science.”

Corporate lobbies prevent legislation on global warming

(Sharon Beder, Professor in the School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication at the University of Wollongong 'Casting Doubt and Undermining Action', Pacific Ecologist 1, March 2002, pp. 42-49).

When the US withdrew from the Kyoto agreement on climate change in March 2001, the world was shocked. Kyoto represented the only mechanism obliging developed nations to reduce their greenhouse-gas emissions. White House spokesman Ari Fleischer told the press that: "The president has been unequivocal … He does not support the Kyoto treaty. It is not in the United States' economic best interest." The announcement was not surprising considering the funding Bush’s campaign received from the fossil-fuel industry. For example, one Democratic Congressional representative estimated that during the 2000 election campaign the coal industry contributed $US3.8 million, nearly 90 percent going to the Republicans. The oil industry is estimated by the Center for Responsive Politics to have contributed $US14million with $10million going to Republicans. The Seattle Times noted: "Bush began his business career in the West Texas oil fields, and he has received substantial support from the industry since entering politics in 1994." The US withdrawal has been widely viewed as a disaster, but how much hope does the Kyoto Protocol really offer for preventing global warming, with or without US participation? The outcomes of the 1997 Third Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), embodied in the text of the Kyoto Protocol, were disappointing but not surprising given the strength of industry opposition to an effective treaty. Although the European Union had been pushing for average reductions of 15 per cent below 1990 levels by 2012, the average reduction finally agreed upon turned out to be little more than 5 per cent, and three countries were, in fact, granted approval to increase their emissions, including Australia (by 8 per cent). Targets for developing nations remained voluntary. No enforcement measures were decided upon.

Corporate information production prevents political action on global warming

(Sharon Beder, Professor in the School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication at the University of Wollongong 'Casting Doubt and Undermining Action', Pacific Ecologist 1, March 2002, pp. 42-49).

SEPP is just one of the many conservative think tanks in various parts of the world that seek to undermine the case for global warming preventative measures. Think tanks are generally private, tax-exempt, research institutes that present themselves as providing impartial disinterested expertise. However think tanks generally tailor their studies to suit their clients or donors. Corporate-funded think tanks have played a key role in providing credible "experts" who dispute scientific claims of existing or impending environmental degradation and therefore provide enough doubts to ensure governments "lack motivation" to act. These dissident scientists, usually not atmospheric scientists, argue there is "widespread disagreement within the scientific community" about global warming (see below). Most conservative think tanks have argued that global warming is not happening and that any possible future warming will be slight and may have beneficial effects. The Heritage Foundation is one of the largest and wealthiest think tanks in the US. It gets massive media coverage in the US and is very influential in politics, particularly amongst the Republicans who dominate the US Congress. In October 1998 it published a backgrounder entitled. "The Road to Kyoto: How the Global Climate Treaty Fosters Economic Impoverishment and Endangers US Security." It began: Chicken Little is back and the sky is falling. Or so suggests the Clinton Administration . . . By championing the global warming treaty, the Administration seeks to pacify a vociferous lobby which frequently has made unsubstantiated predictions of environmental doom. In the 1999 edition of its Environmental Briefing Book for Congressional Candidates, the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) argues that "the Kyoto Protocol is a costly, unworkable, and inappropriate policy to suppress energy use around the world" and that the US Senate should reject it. It argues that the "scientific case for an international climate treaty has collapsed" and anyway, "no one should worry about a modest warming, should it occur" as it is likely to result in beneficial impacts. One of CEI’s publications, The True State of the Planet, was partially funded by the Olin Foundation, created by Olin Chemical. In it Robert Balling claims that: (the) scientific evidence argues against the existence of a greenhouse crisis, against the notion that realistic policies could achieve any meaningful climatic impact, and against the claim that we must act now if we are to reduce the greenhouse threat. CEI is an active member of the Cooler Heads Coalition. The Cooler Heads coalition was founded by the corporate front group Consumer Alert and distributes a bi-weekly newsletter, published by CEI. Its object is clear: "The Cooler Heads Coalition focuses on the consumer impact of global warming policies that would drastically restrict energy use and raise costs for consumers." Think tanks in other parts of the world are also seeking to cast doubt upon global warming predictions. The Australian Institute of Public Affairs (IPA), which gets almost one-third of its budget from mining and manufacturing companies, has also produced articles and media statements challenging the greenhouse consensus. In IPA Review, has accused Australia’s public broadcaster, the ABC, of bias because "ABC reporters made the assumption that global warming is real, some even making assertions to that end." He complains that ABC reporting therefore "represents a pernicious mixture of science and environmentalism." However the ABC has given air time to IPA Senior Fellow, Brian Tucker, previously chief of the CSIRO division of atmospheric research. In 1996 in a talk on the ABC’s Ockham’s Razor he stated that "unchallenged climatic disaster hyperbole has induced something akin to a panic reaction from policy makers, both national and international." In the talk he ignored the scientific consensus represented by the IPCC 1995 statement and argued that global warming predictions are politically and emotionally generated:[T]here is little evidence to support the notion of net deleterious climate change despite recent Cassandra-like trepidation in the Australian Medical Association and exaggerations from Greenpeace. Why then has so much alarm been generated? The answer is complicated. In my opinion, it is due partly to the use and abuse of science to forment [sic] fear by those seeking to support ideological positions, and partly due to the negative and fearful perspective that seems to characterise some environmental prejudices. Tucker’s article, "The Greenhouse Panic," was reprinted in Engineering World, a magazine aimed at engineers. The article, introduced by the magazine editor as "a balanced assessment," argues that "alarmist prejudices of insecure people have been boosted by those who have something to gain from widespread public concern." This article, which would have been more easily dismissed as an IPA publication, has been quoted by Australian engineers at conferences as if it were an authoritative source. Think tanks have been so successful at clouding the scientific picture of greenhouse warming and providing an excuse for corporations and the politicians they support that they have, to date, managed to thwart effective greenhouse reduction strategies being implemented by governments in the English-speaking world.

Racism

#### Capitalism forms the foundation of racism

Taylor 11 (Keeanga-Yamahtta, doctoral candidate in the department of African American Studies at Northwestern U, Jan 4, wwww.socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism)

Marxists argue that capitalism is a system that is based on the exploitation of the many by the few. Because it is a system based on gross inequality, it requires various tools to divide the majority--racism and all oppressions under capitalism serve this purpose. Moreover, oppression is used to justify and "explain" unequal relationships in society that enrich the minority that live off the majority's labor. Thus, racism developed initially to explain and justify the enslavement of Africans--because they were less than human and undeserving of liberty and freedom. Everyone accepts the idea that the oppression of slaves was rooted in the class relations of exploitation under that system. Fewer recognize that under capitalism, wage slavery is the pivot around which all other inequalities and oppressions turn. Capitalism used racism to justify plunder, conquest and slavery, but as Karl Marx pointed out, it also used racism to divide and rule--to pit one section of the working class against another and thereby blunt class consciousness. To claim, as Marxists do, that racism is a product of capitalism is not to deny or diminish its importance or impact in American society. It is simply to explain its origins and the reasons for its perpetuation. Many on the left today talk about class as if it is one of many oppressions, often describing it as "classism." What people are really referring to as "classism" is elitism or snobbery, and not the fundamental organization of society under capitalism. Moreover, it is popular today to talk about various oppressions, including class, as intersecting. While it is true that oppressions can reinforce and compound each other, they are born out of the material relations shaped by capitalism and the economic exploitation that is at the heart of capitalist society. In other words, it is the material and economic structure of society that gave rise to a range of ideas and ideologies to justify, explain and help perpetuate that order. In the United States, racism is the most important of those ideologies.

#### It’s reverse causal – must eradicate capitalism before we can fight racism

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

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

#### Capitalism is the root cause of sprawl

B.B. 95 (author for the Socialist Labor Party publication “The People”, “Away with the garbage of capitalism!”, <http://www.deleonism.org/text/95061002.htm>)

When Karl Marx and Frederick Engels called for the end to the conflict between town and country, between the antagonisms of rural and city life, they were referring to a historical process set on foot with the advent of private property and the growth of class-ruled societies. Although these arose as the necessary development of the productive forces of society, they have become a monumental hindrance to human development, just as has capitalism. Marx and Engels perceived enormous squandering of society's resources, a fact that caused Engels to observe: "When one observes how here in London alone a greater quantity of manure than is produced by the whole kingdom of Saxony is poured away every day into the sea with an expenditure of enormous sums, and what colossal structures are necessary in order to prevent this manure from poisoning the whole of London, then the utopia of abolishing the distinction between town and country is given a remarkably practical basis." (THE HOUSING QUESTION.) Marx's and Engels' perspective was consonant with the thinking of the most advanced scientists of their day such as Justus von Liebig (1803-1873), who in his writings on the chemistry of agriculture, in which his first demand was that humanity shall give back to the land what it receives from it, and in which he proves that only the existence of the towns, and in particular the big towns, prevents this. Indeed, if one were to seek that form of class-ruled society that most effectively squanders and devours resources, one need go no further than capitalism's urban agglomerations. Contrariwise, if one were to discover that system of human habitation most conserving of natural resources, socialism would be that form. Consider satellite photographs of the planet Earth at night. The entire globe is laced with glowing agglomerations -- of illuminated cities, from pole to pole. The purpose? Illuminating uninhabited buildings and vacant streets, except for stray cats and vermin. This is but one aspect of urban sprawl and real estate anarchy. The energy consumed to keep lights fruitlessly glowing is immeasurable and totally irrational. It comprises light pollution. Urban sprawl is an organic component of capitalism driven by the mechanization of agriculture and the exodus of large populations from the countryside. In the process, productive farmland is despoiled as housing and commercial development surges into the countryside surrounding historical towns. The market stimulus such development induces is a part of the massive waste-stimulating growth in appliances, building components, steel, wood, concrete and a myriad of other commodities, not the least of which is automobile production.

Automobility

Capitalism is the root cause of automobility

(Nicole Shukin, Professor Department of English @ Victoria, Director of Cultural, Social, and Political Thought (CSPT), 18 SEP 2006 “The mimetics of mobile capital”, The Sociological Review Volume 54, pages 150–174)

 Late capitalism has been associated with a shrinking, swirling mise en abîme of mobiles inside of mobiles, mimetic media inside of mimetic media. Zooming in from the ‘globe-mobile’ where few sites, if any, remain immune from the effects of capital, one narrows in on arteries coursing with automobiles, and inside the automobiles, mobile phones, whose digitized human subjects can dial the globe-mobile and call up screens on which they spiral back out to the worldwide web. Rather than constitutive of the ‘regime of automobility’ theorized in the introduction to this volume, the car is just one of its metaphorical and material technologies. A regime of automobility is increasingly driven by new technologies of capital which, in different yet familiar ways, articulate a discourse of mobility and neoliberal cultural and economic autonomy to and through animal signs. ‘Telemobility’ is what I call this rearticulated regime of automobility. Post-Fordist technologies of ‘electronic connectivity’, in Timothy Luke’s words, again recharge and retool capital’s mimetic productivity (2002).15 Telemobility revamps what J. Hillis Miller calls, in this volume, ‘old dreams of magic communication’ by invoking a talismanic discourse of animal telepathy – mesmerizing, hypnotic, magical. A fetish for what Akira Mizuta Lippit calls the ‘electric animal’– ie, the ‘communicative powers of animal magnetism’– reappears in telecommunications culture to provide a figure for the immediacy of exchange promised by electronic and digital technologies, and spiriting away their material means (2000: 101). Exchange is increasingly configured in terms of an instantaneous, telepathic communication pitched, like an animal signal, either above or below a human radar. Telecommunications media pose as otherworldly mediums by staging communication as an ‘animalséance’, to borrow from Derrida, in which coded messages travel transferentially across sending and receiving poles (2002: 372).16 If the technological mobility promised by cars is metaphorized as a biological animal drive, in telecommunications culture the ‘act of communication’ is aestheticized under the sign of animal affect to assume the appearance of an immaterial, effortless bolt of code (Debray, 1996: 45).17

Capitalism reproduces the duality and disconnection of the automobile

(Nicole Shukin, Professor Department of English @ Victoria, Director of Cultural, Social, and Political Thought (CSPT), 18 SEP 2006 “The mimetics of mobile capital”, The Sociological Review Volume 54, pages 150–174)

What looms with the mise en abîme of mobiles inside of mobiles in automobility discourse is a convoluted folding of capitalist culture in upon itself, and the spawning of unpredictable and disturbing forms of mimetic excess in its linked symbolic and material economies. As the ability to distinguish between nature and capital dwindles within the globe-mobile of market culture – that is, as nature increasingly ceases to be produced in any form able to contend meaningfully with capital’s dual rendering of nature as empty signifier and as material resource – capital rushes to produce a semblance of non-capitalized wild life. Market cultures increasingly speculate in signs of non-capitalized nature even as they accelerate machinations to convert all nature into capital. In this, capitalism enacts in macro the paradox that the automobile enacts in micro: capitalizing away the difference of nature that is in part its ‘destination’, its discursive conditions of future surplus. Even when ‘nature is gone for good’, then, capitalism cannibalizes itself to ensure a future (Jameson, 1992: x). Through its recycling of nature signs and re-renderings of already capitalized material resources, a perennially undead nature can be kept, as Derrida puts it, in ‘interminable survival’ (2002: 394). While cannibalism of its symbolic economy gives rise to simulacra and an endless reprocessing of aesthetic effects (accentuated by the ability of new digital renderers to mimic painterly, photographic, and filmic effects), cannibalism of its material conditions makes all of capitalism into a giant rendering industry, into the sorting and reconstitution no longer of any so-called ‘first nature’ but of nature as post-consumer product, capitalized in advance. Global outbreaks of mad cow disease in livestock over the past two decades in Europe and North America, attributed to the practice of recycling the remains of ruminants back into the capitalist food chain (feeding rendered material back to livestock to speed protein to market), have recently brought attention to capitalism’s specific economy of ‘animal cannibalism’. Yet politicization of the harrowing, increasingly involuted conditions of capitalism’s existence is diverted by managing its aesthetic and material economies in a relation of disavowed supplementarity. The gap or illogic patrolled between its symbolic and carnal conditions and effects is superbly productive for capital. It is the illogic of automobility discourse itself, which drives the sign of culture in strict disavowal of its material conditions and effects. A politics of rendering counters by forcing into antagonistic proximity symbolic and carnal economies normally staggered in differential relation to each other, with the aim of collapsing one of the discursive conditions of capital. Moreover, a politics of rendering resists dreams of alterity still riding upon mimesis by showing how the mimetic faculty, so fetishistically formulated as an animal sign, is immanent to cultures of capital. Caught in the double bind of rendering, there seem few modes of political intervention capable of breaking capitalism’s mimetic loops to produce other animal signs. Irregularities and excesses of rendering – pathological products of the closed loop itself, such as mad cow disease – have thrown the harrowing involutions of capital’s mimetic productivity into exposure, but they are not (yet?) a formulation of political struggle. The politics of rendering remains, at this point, a question asked from within a double bind, haunting representation from the ‘infernal’ other side of mimetic management (Derrida, 2002: 394).26

SANTOS

#### Neoliberalism creates a “kill to save” mentality in which people are sacrificed under the false justification of saving the greater good- this collective suicide inevitably causes extinction

Santos 03, Director of Social Studies at University of Coimbra (Boaventura de Sousa, April, “Collective Suicide?”, Bad Subjects, Issue # 63)

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was under Stalinism, with the Gulag, and under Nazism, with the Holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the Western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality, and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to reproduce infinitely the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the state and international institutions in their favor. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction. In opposition to this, there is the ongoing movement of globalization from below, the global struggle for social justice, led by social movements and NGOs, of which the World Social Forum (WSF) has been an eloquent manifestation. The WSF has been a remarkable affirmation of life, in its widest and most inclusive sense, embracing human beings and nature. What challenges does it face before the increasingly intimate interpenetration of the globalization of the economy and that of war? I am convinced that this new situation forces the globalization from below to re-think itself, and to reshape its priorities. It is well-known that the WSF, at its second meeting, in 2002, identified the relationship between economic neoliberalism and imperial warmongering, which is why it organized the World Peace Forum, the second edition of which took place in 2003. But this is not enough. A strategic shift is required. Social movements, no matter what their spheres of struggle, must give priority to the fight for peace, as a necessary condition for the success of all the other struggles. This means that they must be in the frontline of the fight for peace, and not simply leave this space to be occupied solely by peace movements. All the movements against neoliberal globalization are, from now on, peace movements. We are now in the midst of the fourth world war (the third being the Cold War) and the spiral of war will go on and on. The principle of non-violence that is contained in the WSF Charter of Principles must no longer be a demand made on the movements; now it must be a global demand made by the movements. This emphasis is necessary so that, in current circumstances, the celebration of life can be set against this vertiginous collective suicide. The peace to be fought for is not a mere absence of war or of terrorism. It is rather a peace based upon the elimination of the conditions that foster war and terrorism: global injustice, social exclusion, cultural and political discrimination and oppression and imperialist greed. A new, cosmopolitan humanism can be built above and beyond Western illuminist abstractions, a humanism of real people based on the concrete resistance to the actual human suffering imposed by the real axis of evil: neoliberalism plus war.

Democracy

Capitalism is anti-democratic because it puts the power in ruling elites

Jenson 7

Robert Jenson, Professor at the School of Journalism at the University of Texas, Austin, 4/30/07, “Anti-Capitalism in 5 Minutes,” <http://www.counterpunch.org/2007/04/30/anti-capitalism-in-five-minutes/>, KB

Capitalism is anti-democratic. This one is easy. Capitalism is a wealth-concentrating system. If you concentrate wealth in a society, you concentrate power. Is there any historical example to the contrary? For all the trappings of formal democracy in the contemporary United States, everyone understands that the wealthy dictates the basic outlines of the public policies that are acceptable to the vast majority of elected officials. People can and do resist, and an occasional politician joins the fight, but such resistance takes extraordinary effort. Those who resist win victories, some of them inspiring, but to date concentrated wealth continues to dominate. Is this any way to run a democracy? If we understand democracy as a system that gives ordinary people a meaningful way to participate in the formation of public policy, rather than just a role in ratifying decisions made by the powerful, then it’s clear that capitalism and democracy are mutually exclusive. Let’s make this concrete. In our system, we believe that regular elections with the one-person/one-vote rule, along with protections for freedom of speech and association, guarantee political equality. When I go to the polls, I have one vote. When Bill Gates goes the polls, he has one vote. Bill and I both can speak freely and associate with others for political purposes. Therefore, as equal citizens in our fine democracy, Bill and I have equal opportunities for political power. Right?

Capitalism destroys democratic values

(Giroux 11, Henry A, currently holds the Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department <http://www.truthout.org/american-democracy-beyond-casino-capitalism-and-torture-state/1305143581>)

At the same time, amid all of the despair and foolishness on the part of right-wing politicians and conservative and corporate interests, it is not entirely clear that a spring of hope is beyond reach. In spite of the ferociousness of the right-wing assault on democratic institutions, values and relations of power, workers and young people are marching and demonstrating all over the globe against the dictates, values and policies of a market-driven economy that has corrupted politics, pushed democracy to its vanishing point and undermined public values. Unions, public schoolteachers, higher education and all of those public spheres necessary to keep civic values alive are being challenged in a way that both baffles and shocks anyone who believes in the ideals and promises of a substantive democracy. In the United States, union-busting politicians such as Govs. Scott Walker (Wisconsin) and Chris Christie (New Jersey) not only want to gut social services and sell them off to the highest bidder, they are also symptomatic of a political fringe movement that wants to destroy the critical culture, dedicated public servants and institutions that offer any sense of vitality, substance and hope to public and higher education in the United States. As the meaning of democracy is betrayed by its transformation into a market society, corporate power and money appear unchecked in their ability to privatize, deregulate and destroy all vestiges of public life. America's military wars abroad are now matched by the war at home; that is, the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya have found their counterpart in the war against the poor, immigrants, young people, unions, public-sector workers, the welfare state and schoolteachers. The call for shared sacrifices on the part of conservatives and Tea Party extremists becomes code for destroying the social state, preserving and increasing the power of mega-rich corporations and securing the wealth of the top 1 percent of the population with massive tax breaks, while placing the burden of the current global economic meltdown on the shoulders of working people and the poor. Deficit reductions and austerity policies that allegedly address the global economic meltdown caused by the financial hawks running Wall Street now do the real work of stripping teachers of their collective bargaining rights, dismantling programs long associated with social services and relegating young people to mind-deadening schools and a debt-ridden future. Deficit politics is really just another term for defunding the social state and dismantling social programs and protections while providing tax breaks for the rich. Rarely addressed are the costs of policies designed primarily to move massive amounts of wealth and income into the hands of corporations and the financial elite. How else to explain the attempt on the part of Michigan lawmakers to close a $1.4 billion deficit by enacting legislation "by cutting disability assistance, indigent burial expenses and requiring foster children to spend their $79 clothing allowance only at second-hand stores"?(1) The latter will save the state $200,000, a paltry sum compared to the $1.8 billion in business tax cuts that are driving the collapse in revenue and the Michigan deficit and debt crisis. As the economist James Crotty points out, within a neoliberal culture of cruelty and inequality, politics purposely generates deficits by cutting taxes on the rich and corporations in order to put pressure on politicians "to cut government expenditures, cut social spending, cut the social safety network, cut the things that people need in the country" - in other words, cut all forms of spending associated with the New Deal, the Great Society and other forms of legislation that enforce elements of the social contract.(2) The real deficit plaguing American politics is ethical, not economic. When matters of equity are removed from the discourse surrounding the ballooning deficit, there is no way of recognizing how the deficit becomes code for pushing an authoritarian ideology that puts up all public goods for sale, dismantles any viable notion of the commons and places the future in the hands of the billionaires' club. Deficit politics as it is being framed allows Republican Gov. Rick Snyder to unapologetically address the University of Michigan Class of 2011 on the virtue of leadership while, at the same time, pushing through legislation that would cut more than $200 million from the budget for higher education in order to pay for a $1.8 billion tax break for corporations. The lesson here is that leadership has nothing to do with improving the lives of young people and everything to do with feeding the coffers of the rich and powerful. In this scenario, leadership is equated with a flight from moral and social responsibility.

Capitalism destroys democratic institutions as a method of self preservation

(Costas Panayotakis 5/17/12, Associate Professor of Sociology, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2012/panayotakis170512.html)

Recent developments in Greece provide an acute illustration of the long-standing contradiction between capitalism and democracy. This contradiction has also been felt in Greece in the past, including in the history of military coups aimed at the repression of popular movements and at ensuring the country's subordination to the wishes of the United States during the Cold War. Just as this earlier history illustrated the hypocritical incongruity of the United States' support of brutal fascist dictatorships in the name of defending democracy and the free world, so does the present moment refute the long-standing myth on which the European project was built. Indeed, far from advancing a democratic project designed to bring together the different peoples inhabiting the European continent, the political and economic elites both in Europe as a whole and in individual countries, such as Greece, have made it clear that, at a time of economic crisis, the trappings of democracy are a nuisance. In this sense, the Greek political crisis does not simply revolve around the continuation or not of brutal and socially catastrophic austerity policies. The question increasingly facing Greek people is whether even the trappings of political democracy are allowed to be swept aside by a dictatorship of capital over people that is ever more blatant and ever more brutal in the human toll it exacts.

Food Prices

Capitalist economies ensure that food is kept out of reach of the poor

(Fred Magdoff, professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont, January 2012, “food as a commodity”, The Monthly Review, Volume 63, Issue 08)

There are a number of important implications of the commodity nature of food production, processing, and consumption. In capitalist economies, as noted, nearly all enterprise is for the sake of producing commodities for sale—whether the “product” is an absolute necessity such as food and health care, or a luxury such as a private jet plane or a huge house. More and more of the natural world, including water supplies and the very genes of life, are being brought under private control with the aim of making profits, rather than to supply the needs of people. However, there is a critical contradiction when any basic human need is produced and sold as a commodity, whether we are considering food, health care, drinking water, or shelter. Capitalism naturally produces a stratification of wealth that includes the unemployed, the working poor, a better-off working class, a middle class, and a relatively small group of very rich individuals. The bottom strata of society—encompassing the members of what Marx called the reserve army of labor—are absolutely essential to the smooth working of the system. It allows easy access to labor when the economy expands and helps keep wages down, as workers are aware that they can easily be replaced.1 Even in a wealthy country such as the United States the numerous unemployed and those in low-paying jobs cannot afford all of their basic living costs—rent, electricity, transportation (irrational patterns of development plus inadequate public transportation means that cars are frequently needed to get to work), clothes, medical care, food, etc. Given that poverty in the United States is not absolute destitution, the poor sometimes have options: they may purchase more or less food of higher or lower nutritional value, skip meals, get food stamps (now called SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition and Assistance Program), or receive food assistance from charities. The poor commonly have little money left for food after rent and utilities are paid. In the summer of 2011, approximately 46 million people were receiving food assistance through Federal programs, inadequate as it is. Still, despite the abundance of food, a high average per capita income, and various forms of assistance available, some 50 million people in the United States are considered to be “food insecure.” Of these, over 12 million adults and 5 million children have “very low” food security, with one or more members of their households lowering their food intake. In some parts of the global South, of course, conditions are far worse. The commodity nature of food results in food price levels far above many people’s meager means, producing a lack of adequate nutrition. The United Nations estimates that there are close to one billion people worldwide who suffer from malnutrition. This leads to severe health problems and death for millions. Food deprivation, though falling short of severe malnutrition, is still a very serious condition. Hence, a sense of injustice associated with rising food prices and unequal access to food was a major factor spurring revolts in the Arab world over the last year. Because food products are commodities, and the whole point of the food/agriculture system is to sell more and make more profits, there is massive advertising surrounding food, especially the most profitable sector—processed foods. High caloric but low nutritional-value foods, such as sugary breakfast cereals, are pushed on children. And because these processed foods are relatively inexpensive and available at local convenience stores that often do not carry higher quality food like fruits and vegetables, the commodity nature of food is part of the explanation for the surge in obesity, especially among the poor.

Capitalism prevents the development of small scale farming and outprices the needs of the poor in return for the purpose of profit. Speculation and trade ensure rapid price swings even in normal conditions.

(Fred Magdoff, professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont, January 2012, “food as a commodity”, The Monthly Review, Volume 63, Issue 08)

In the United States and Europe, there are governmental mandates and subsidies encouraging production of both food and non-food crops, which are then used for biofuel feedstocks. This is an important part of the explanation for the tight markets and high prices for corn and oil crops. A UN Food and Agriculture Organization report says: “By generating a new demand for food commodities that can outbid poor countries and food-insecure populations, industrial biofuels highlight the tension between a potentially unlimited demand (in this case for energy) and the constraints of a world with finite resources.”2 It was the search for another market for corn that induced Dwayne Andreas, CEO of the grain purchaser/processor and feed grain conglomerate Archer Daniels Midland (ADM), to gain influence over politicians and spend lavishly on both Democrats and Republicans. ADM was the main backer for the corn-to-ethanol industry and might be considered the grandfather of the current mandate to mix a certain percent of ethanol with gasoline (in the process of increasing from 10 to 15 percent). The commodity nature of food by itself limits access by the poor. Market pressures and incentives contribute to the interchangeability of key food crops that can also be used for animals or fuel production; the possibility to grow crops for strictly industrial use instead of food, if the price is right; and huge amounts of hoarding and speculation on agricultural commodities (see below). Land can be used to grow crops for a number of purposes: food for people, food crops that are also potentially feeds for animals, and industrial feedstocks (cotton, jatrohpa, corn to make sugar or other products, and crops like hay which are strictly for animals). Market prices guide farmers’ production. When ethanol prices increase, more land goes into corn for ethanol. If cotton prices increase, a portion of the land that would have gone to grow corn and soybeans will be planted with cotton. Market prices also guide the ultimate utilization of crops that have multiple uses. For example, should soybeans be used to make vegetable oil for human use, be feed to animals, or be converted into biodiesel fuel? The need to feed hungry people does not enter the calculation. When a poor (so-called “developing”) country attempts to solve its food problem primarily by encouraging farmers to produce more, bumper crops tend to depress prices, thus helping the poor gain greater food access. However, depressed prices may be problematic for farmers, many of whom themselves are poor. This has happened recently in Zambia, where “massive production can send prices tumbling. The smallest farmers, who are the least productive, suffer doubly by producing little and getting paid a pittance for the crop.”3 Thus, bumper crops in capitalist agricultural tend to favor the larger farmers, especially those using inputs such as irrigation and fertilizers that help produce high yields. However, the resulting low prices may force large numbers of small farmers, many unable to protect their crops from the vagaries of nature and lacking the financial resources to weather hard times, into deeper poverty. A new dimension has been added to the phenomena of food as a commodity—a new land grab, with private capital and sovereign wealth funds purchasing or leasing land in Africa, Asia, and Latin America to produce food and biofuels for markets for the home countries of the investors.4 As with food, the most basic input for its production, soil, becomes a commodity ripe for either speculation or to go to the highest bidder. In many countries of the global South, traditional land tenure systems are thrown aside as land is purchased or rented under long-term agreement by private capital or national sovereign wealth funds. The purpose is either to make money, or to produce food or fuel (jatropha or other fuel crops) for the “home” markets. This creates even more rapid “depeasantization” as more farmers are pushed off the land and into city slums that have no jobs for them. It is estimated that some 20 million hectares (50 million acres) have either been sold or are under long-term lease to foreign countries or foreign capital. “In Africa they are calling it the land grab, or the new colonialism. Countries hungry to secure their food supplies—including Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, South Korea (the world’s third largest importer of corn), China, India, Libya, and Egypt—are at the forefront of a frantic rush to gobble up farmland all around the world, but mainly in cash-starved Africa.”5 The “highest and best use” of any commodity is where it can get the best price, regardless of the social, ecological, or humanitarian consequences. One small example of the contradictions that arise from this is a result of the growing market in the North for quinoa, a grain grown in the Andes that is especially nutritious because of its balance of amino acids. This benefits farmers by increasing crop prices, but at the same time it means that this traditional and nutritious food is becoming too expensive for local people.6 Another implication of the commodity nature of food is that it is increasingly subject to speculative price movements. Raw commodities such as metals and food crops have become a prime target of speculators who want to bet on the price changes of tangible products, rather than completely relying on the complex bets embodied in many “financial instruments.” The Chicago Board of Trade (CBOT, owned by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange), opening in 1848, is the oldest organized foodstuffs futures and options trading exchange. Throughout most of its history the CBOT and the other commodity exchanges were used primarily by those interested in hedging prices because they bought, sold, or used the physical products—farmers, buyers, and food processors. It was a sound way to protect your business against the vagaries of weather and competition. But with the financialization of the economy everything has become fair game for speculation, so food and other agricultural products (as well as other raw commodities) have become just more bets that can be made. With the so-called “Commodity Futures Modernization Act,” commodity markets were deregulated in 2000 and “structured” financial products were developed to allow various types of speculation. In addition to straight bets on individual commodities, commodity index funds (pioneered by Goldman Sachs) begun to track prices of commodities. The amount of money in these funds increased from $13 billion in 2003 to $317 billion in 2008. As U.S. hedge fund manager Mike Masters explained: “Speculators today have about 70 percent of the open interest in commodity markets. Ten years ago, they controlled roughly 30 percent of the market.”7 With so much money flowing into the food commodity markets, prices are driven up in a speculative upswing. This, of course, does not mean that commodity prices will only keep going up—they fluctuate based on economic conditions, world food stock levels, crop yields, rumors, and fads. But speculation drives prices up and down further and faster, and as a result contributes to hunger for many—sometimes millions—when prices peak, and to the ruin of small producers when prices crash.

High Food prices are the result of speculation and commodification of food through bio-fuels driven by the capitalist system

(Philip McMichael, Professor of development sociology at Cornell University, 2009, http://monthlyreview.org/2009/07/01/the-world-food-crisis-in-historical-perspective)

The “world food crisis” of 2007-08 was the tip of an iceberg. Hunger and food crises are endemic to the modern world, and the eruption of a rapid increase in food prices provided a fresh window on this cultural fact. Much like Susan George’s well-known observation that famines represent the final stage in an extended process of deepening vulnerability and fracturing of social reproduction mechanisms, this food “crisis” represents the magnification of a long-term crisis of social reproduction stemming from colonialism, and was triggered by neoliberal capitalist development.1 The colonial era set in motion an extractive relation between Europe and the rest of the world, whereby the fruits of empire displaced non-European provisioning systems, as the colonies were converted into supply zones of food and raw materials to fuel European capitalism. In recent history, liberalization policies have deepened the conversion of the global South into a “world farm” for a minority of global consumers, concentrated in the global North and in strategic states and urban enclaves of the South. The combined appropriation and redirection of food production and circulation underlies the socially constructed food scarcity and permanent hunger experienced by, at conservative estimate, nearly one billion humans (approaching 14 percent of the world’s population). The “agflation” that brought this crisis to the world’s attention at the turn of 2008 saw the doubling of maize prices, wheat prices rising by 50 percent, and rice increasing by as much as 70 percent, bringing the world to a “post-food-surplus era.”2 In an article in the Economist titled “The End of Cheap Food,” the editors noted that, by the end of 2007, the magazine’s food-price index reached its highest point since originating in 1845. Food prices had risen 75 percent since 2005, and world grain reserves were at their lowest, at fifty-four days.3 According to the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), agflation from rising agrofuels production “would lead to decreases in food availability and calorie consumption in all regions of the world, with Sub-Saharan Africa suffering the most.”4 The current conjuncture is associated with the intensification of energy and food demand in an age of peak oil. A rising class of one billion new consumers is emerging in twenty “middle-income” countries “with an aggregate spending capacity, in purchasing power parity terms, to match that of the U.S.”5 This group includes new members of the OECD—South Korea, Mexico, Turkey, and Poland, in addition to China and India (with 40 percent of this total)—and the symbols of their affluence are car ownership and meat consumption. These two commodities combine—through rising demand for agrofuels and feed crops—to exacerbate food price inflation, as their mutual competition for land has the perverse effect of rendering each crop more lucrative, at the same time as they displace land used for food crops. Simultaneously, financial speculation has compounded the problem. For example, the price of rice surged by 31 percent on March 27, 2008, and wheat by 29 percent on February 25, 2008. The New York Times of April 22, 2008, reported that, “This price boom has attracted a torrent of new investment from Wall Street, estimated to be as much as $130 billion.” According to the same article, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission noted that “Wall Street funds control a fifth to a half of the futures contracts for commodities like corn, wheat and live cattle on Chicago, Kansas City and New York exchanges. On the Chicago exchanges…the funds make up 47 percent of long-term contracts for live hog futures, 40 percent in wheat, 36 percent in live cattle and 21 percent in corn.”6 Conventional explanations bring together the pressure on food cropland with extreme weather patterns and ecological stress. In November 2007, as summed up by John Vidal in the Guardian, The UN Environment Program said the planet’s water, land, air, plants, animals and fish stocks were all in “inexorable decline.” According to the U.N.’s World Food Program (WFP) fifty-seven countries, including twenty-nine in Africa, nineteen in Asia, and nine in Latin America, have been hit by catastrophic floods. Harvests have been affected by drought and heat waves in south Asia, Europe, China, Sudan, Mozambique and Uruguay.7 With respect to agrofuels, there is in addition the so-called “knock-on” effect, outlined by the OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2007-2016, where expanding U.S. corn production for ethanol reduces oilseed acreage, such that “oilseed prices then also increased as a result of tightening supplies and this price strength was enhanced by rising demand for meals as a cereal feed substitute and increasing demand for vegetable oils for bio-diesel production.”8 In these terms there appears to be a perfect storm. The “perfect storm” metaphor, however, suggests a conjunction of seemingly uncontrollable forces, with transformations in demand threatening and threatened by dwindling supplies.9 For example, the Financial Times editorial of April 9, 2008, offered a simplistic economic view of problem and solution: In the medium term, the imperative must be on increasing supply, for which much of the responsibility lies with developing countries—improving infrastructure, including storage where necessary for buffer stocks, bringing more land into production and encouraging crop insurance or forward markets where they do not exist. Those countries resisting the introduction of genetically modified food should take another look at the productivity gains that it can unleash. Security and stability of food supply are enhanced when markets are allowed to work by being given clear and enduring price signals, with governments providing social and physical infrastructure support.10 While the market may signal resource limits, the structure and politics of the market are ultimately responsible for this situation, and for its interpretation as requiring better market practices. And for this reason it was unsurprising that the crisis served as an opportunity for corporate and multilateral financial institutions to deepen their control and management of the global food system. In the meantime, governments with varying resources have resorted to food import liberalization, price controls and/or export controls on domestically produced food to quell civil unrest, and a global land grab has ensued as governments scramble to secure food supplies offshore.11 At bottom, however, rising food prices signal a more fundamental structural process at work, manifest in both famine and food riots—pheneomena with long genealogies.

Links

NIB

**The notion that transportation can be used for profit is a mask for keeping those in poor areas impoverished and oppressed for the good of capital and strategic investment**

Freemark 11

(Yonah, urbanist and journalist who has worked in architecture, planning, and transportation, June 14th, 2011, “Local Neoliberalism’s Role in Defining Transit’s Purpose”, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/06/14/local-neoliberalisms-role-in-defining-transits-purpose/)

Writing recently in Environment and Planning A, Sociologist Stephanie Farmer argues that the rise of neoliberal ideology in local and national politics has encouraged a “retreat from social redistribution and integrated social welfare policies in favor of bolstering business activity.”\* This, she writes in reference to Chicago, has specifically affected public transportation, which “is increasingly deployed as a means to attract global capital as well as enhance affluent residents’ and tourists’ rights to the city.” This trend, she states, stands in opposition to the mid-century “Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups’ access to the city.”\*\* Farmer’s approach provides something of an explanation for Detroit’s experience: Rather than concentrate on the needs of its most impoverished denizens through the assurance of basic bus service, the city’s business and political elite has instead put its resources into the construction of a light rail line whose primary purpose is to stimulate economic development by creating “place-based advantages for capital.” Similarly, Farmer is very critical of Chicago’s approach, arguing that that city’s investments have repeatedly favored “business elites over everyday users by excluding public transit investment in areas outside of Chicago’s global city downtown showcase zone.” Her evidence for this trend is primary in former Mayor Richard Daley’s obsession in constructing a premium-fare, limited-stop express rail link to the airport (including his willingness to construct a station for said service without providing the funds to actually operate the trains) and the transit authority’s Circle Line plan, which she argued would “effectively redraw [and expand] the downtown boundary,” with little benefit for the city’s most transit dependent. The repeated delays in extending the Red Line south of 95th Street into some of Chicago’s least prosperous neighborhoods suggest that there is no political will to invest outside of the wealthiest areas. Farmer’s argument is revealing of the one of the peculiarities of transit promotion: Those who engage in it simultaneously argue for the social welfare benefits of providing affordable mobility for as many people as possible while also suggesting that good public transportation can play an essential role in city-building — essentially for the elite. After all, one of the primary arguments made for investing in new transit capital projects is that their long-term benefits include raising the property values of the land parcels near stations. This creates an uneasy pro-transit coalition in many places where development and real estate interests align their lobbying with that of representatives of the poor to argue for the construction of new transit lines (usually rail), under the assumption that projects will benefit each group. This produces an identity crisis for transit. For whom is it developed? Can its social mobility goals be reconciled with the interests of capitalists in the urban space? Identifying the value of a transportation project is an essential element of the planning process, so asking these questions is essential, since there are limited resources. When it comes to transit, this seems particularly relevant, since most funds invested in bus or rail projects are provided by the public sector. Ultimately, this means that the promotion of almost every transit project is defined by political ideology. Do we invest our funds in a project to connect downtown with the airport, under the assumption that economic benefits will flow down from the top, as conservatives might suggest? Is spending government money on ensuring the efficient transportation of the elite effective because it grows the economy as a whole and eventually aids the poor? Or should public dollars be reserved for redistributive causes, focusing on the needs of those who are least able to provide for themselves? Of course there are many examples in which these questions appear to have been resolved. Even in Chicago, it would be difficult to argue that the subway and elevated lines that run into to the Loop are unhelpful for the poor, since many of the city’s greatest resources even for the impoverished are located in Farmer’s “downtown showcase zone.” Nonetheless, ponder this question next time a transit project is proposed: For whom is it being built, and why?

Keynesian economics is just an excuse used by the state to maintain current capitalist structures and the military industrial complex

Wright 99

(Erik, professor of sociology at University of Wisconsin, 1999, “ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVES IN MARXIST THEORY OF

ACCUMULATION AND CRISIS”, http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~vburris/soc617/wright.pdf)

a) Contradiction of legitimation and accumulation: The state does not serve the function merely of facilitating accumulation through demand maintenance; the state also serves a vital legitimation function in capitalist society which helps to stabilize and reproduce the class structure as a whole. The legitimation function directs much state activity toward co-opting potential sources of popular discontent by attempting to transform political demands into economic demands. The expansion of Keynesian programs beginning in the 1930’s created a perfect political climate for dramatically expanding such legitimating state expenditures. For a long time it appeared that the state could kill two functional birds with one economic-policy stone. The difficulty, however, is that once a demand on the state to provide some social service or to meet some social need is granted and becomes institutionalized, it becomes viewed as a right. There is a certain logic to legitimation which decrees that the political apparatus gets progressively diminishing returns in added legitimation for a given program over time. Once a program becomes seen as a right the continuation of that program adds little to the legitimacy of the state, whereas a cutback in the program would constitute a source of delegitimation. There is thus not only a tendency for programs once established to continue, but also a constant pressure for programs to expand, regardless of the requirements of the accumulation process. The hypothesis can therefore be advanced that, once Keynesian demand maintenance programs become bound up with the legitimation functions of the state, there is a tendency for unproductive spending to rise more rapidly than the systemic requirements for realization of surplus value might dictate. b) Military Keynesianism and productivity: The particular institutional form that much Keynesian spending takes— specifically the system of state contracting known as the military-industrial complex—tends not only to absorb surplus but also to put a considerable damper on the subsequent development of productivity (except for occasional technological “spin-offs” from military research and development). Corporations who are major suppliers of military hardware are guaranteed a given portrait by the state (especially in cost-plus contracts) and are thus under relatively little pressure to introduce inexpensive, efficient innovations into their production processes. Since for most military production there are only one or two potential suppliers, and since the criterion for awarding contracts generally has little to do with the efficiency of the corporation, military Keynesianism tends generally to reduce the average level of productivity in the economy.

Expansion of private involvement in transportation infrastructure is neo-liberal

Brenner and Theodore, 05 – \*Neil, New York University, and \*\*Nik, based at the University of Illinois (“Neoliberalism and the urban Condition,” City, Vol. 9, No. 1, April 2005, [http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13604810500092106)](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13604810500092106%29RK) KB

Neoliberalism as a modality of urban governance

First, and on the most general level, the preceding articles conceive neoliberalism as a framework that powerfully structures the parameters for the governance of contemporary urban development—for instance, by defining the character of “appropriate” policy choices, by constraining democratic participation in political life, by diffusing dissent and oppositional mobilization, and/ or by disseminating new ideological visions of social and moral order in the city. In each case, the contributions track the discourses, strategies and alliances of political elites as they advance policy proposals aimed at (re)igniting market-led growth while glossing over the socially regressive outcomes that are the frequent by-products of such initiatives. From this perspective, neoliberalism is identified primarily with supralocal forces— for instance, new forms of capital accumulation or new regimes of state power—but the latter are understood to have enveloped cities within an increasingly market-dominated governance regime.The contributors elaborate this perspective in a number of ways. For instance, in their wide-ranging case study, Roger Keil and Julie-Anne Boudreau draw attention to the neoliberalization of municipal governance in the Toronto city-region in the aftermath of restructuring of Canadian intergovernmental relations. They document the rescaling of metropolitan governance that has accompanied federal devolution, regional institution building, and the resultant reshuffling of political alliances at the local level. They show that, ironically, despite strident anti-statist rhetoric among many national, regional and local political elites, an activist, market-driven form of statecraft has been consolidated in Toronto. Just as crucially, Keil and Boudreau outline a variety of regulatory failures and political struggles that have emerged in the wake of these political and institutional transformations. According to Keil and Boudreau, rather than resolving basic problems of urban governance in the Toronto metropolitan region, neoliberalization projects have triggered new forms of elite strategizing and popular resistance in key regulatory arenas such as economic development, environmental policy and transportation policy. Neoliberalization thus reconstitutes the terrain of political-economic governance—and social struggle—in the urban region as a whole. Meanwhile, in his study of mass transit infrastructure investment in Vancouver, Matti Siemiatycki examines the character of public planning processes in a political setting that has embraced an enhanced role for privatesector actors in (formally) public-sector mega projects. Grounded in claims of private-sector efficiency and enforced through national, provincial, and local fiscal policies, the promotion of private-sector initiative has led to a loss of transparency within the policymaking process. The prioritization of privatesector involvement has become entrenched institutionally as public-private partnerships have been elevated in local political discourse to a type of “best practice” in urban governance. Yet, as Siemiatycki demonstrates, the shifting spending priorities associated with these newly consolidated public-private partnerships are likely to result in chronic underinvestment in the services upon which most low-income commuters are dependent. Relatedly, Joe Grengs studies the evolution of mass transit policy in the United States, focusing specifically on policy change and social struggle in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Grengs argues that mass transit policy in Los Angeles is abdicating its traditional role as a redistributive mechanism due to at least two trends—first, a shrinking public sector under conditions of national and state-level neoliberalism; and second, a shift in policy priorities that systematically neglects the needs of lowincome, transit-dependent residents. Within this neoliberalizing policy landscape, Grengs argues, funding for public services needed by poor, central-city residents is being reduced in favor of transit spending intended to ameliorate the traffic congestion and air pollution generated by affluent suburban commuters. In this sense, as both Siemiatycki and Grengs indicate, neoliberalism is generating new forms of empowerment and disempowerment within a key sphere of urban governance.

Mass transit

Public transportation infrastructure is inherently neoliberal. They exclude the working class and minorities

Farmer 11

Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning <http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf>, KB

Taken together, Chicago's public transportation system and the unfolding transformations in Chicago's housing market reveal how neoliberal accumulation is restructuring uneven geographic development and the right to the city for working people and minorities. Chicago's neoliberal public transit and housing projects may improve the exchange value of its Central Area real estate, create place-based advantages to lure highly mobile capital and elevate its global-city status by tying it more closely into global air-transport networks. However, these policies have limited use-value for working-class and minority residents living outside the privileged Central Area who endure a transit system which is unreliable and sluggish for want of access or basic maintenance. I am not suggesting that the Central Area transit projects are without merit: Chicago needs more transit investment, not less. However, the proposed allocation of transit investment in the Central Area reflects the interests of growth-machine elites over and against the interests of the majority of Chicagoans. These trends also demonstrate the changing social role of public transportation in the neoliberal era. Urban public transit in the USA historically served as an instrument aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs, and ameliorating inequalities (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). This share of the social surplus has been redirected to construct premium network transit for capital and the affluent, thus securing their revanchist rights to the city. In effect, the CTA and the Daley administration's transportation and housing policies are contributing to the widening inequality gap between affluent groups and working-class residents, and between Whites and Blacks and Latinos. Unequal access to transportation resources parallels the broader widening of socioeconomic inequality in the era of neoliberalism. Therefore, a complete under-standing of growing inequality and uneven geographic development of the neoliberal accumulation regime should include a public infrastructure

Merely being reactive to US policy lets the war-mongers set the agenda—our strategy must directly fight the state and capitalism, not merely get the government to change its policy.

**Herod 2001** (James, “A Stake, Not a Mistake: On Not Seeing the Enemy”, October, <http://www.jamesherod.info/index.php?sec=paper&id=9&print=y&PHPSESSID=4387a9147ad42723ea101944dd538914>)

  The **'peace now' protesters strike a similar stance**. Of course, it was heartening to see an anti-war movement blossom almost immediately. But it was also disheartening. **It meant that radicals were letting the war-mongers set the agenda. Instead of continuing the fight against neoliberalism and its institutions, and against capitalism, oppositionists suddenly dropped all this to launch an anti-war campaign**. The candlelight vigils, especially, seemed to me a pathetic response to a war-mongering, repressive government. This happens again and again. The government launches a war of aggression, and the peaceniks take to the streets, with their candles, crying "peace now" and "no more war". Do they ever win? Have they ever stopped even one war? Do they ever even think about how they could win? Doesn't the inefficacy of their response prove that they are not really serious about peace? **Do they ever think about ways of actually stopping the murderers rather than just pleading with them not to kill? They keep saying that peace cannot be achieved by going to war. Who says the US government wants peace!?** They quote A.J. Muste as saying that war is not the way to peace; peace is the way. Is this relevant? Does it make sense to quote such thoughts to a government that has always engaged, from its inception two hundred years ago, in systematic mass murder?       **Similarly with the bulk of the other progressive commentators. They are just trying to change the government's policy, not stop them and deprive them of power.** Here is a typical sentence. Rahul Mahajan and Robert Jensen write: "The next step is for us to build a movement that can change our government's barbaric and self-destructive policy."[13] You see, from the government's point of view, its policy is not barbaric or self-destructive. It is intelligent, self-serving, and self-preserving. Mahajan and Jensen actually pretty much admit this in their piece, by reasoning that "This war is about the extension of U.S. power. It has little to do with bringing the terrorists to justice, or with vengeance." (Such a view is rather rare among progressives actually.) They argue that there are three other motives for the war, from the government's point of view: the desire to defend "imperial credibility", to control "oil and natural gas of Central Asia," and "to push a right-wing domestic agenda." Nevertheless, in spite of these insights, **they** still **stop short of realizing that they** therefore **have to fight, stop, and neutralize the government, rather than just change its policy. Given who the government is, who it serves** (capital, the rich), **and what its interests and priorities are, it can't change its policies** into those favored by progressives, not and survive as an imperial power that is.

Natives

The governments protect and guard capitalism – military and police domination are utilized in every way possible to put down nonviolent challenges to the capitalist system

Martin 01

(Brian, professor at the University of Wollongong, 2001, “Nonviolence versus capitalism”, http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/01nvc/nvc03.html)

From the point of view of nonviolence, a crucial feature of capitalism is its links with systems of violence, notably the military and police. For some capitalist countries, which are run as repressive states, this connection is obvious. But for capitalist countries with representative governments, the connections between the military, police and capitalist social relations are less overt. For most of the time, overt state violence is not required to defend capitalism, since most people go along with the way things are. If the challenge to capitalism is violent, such as by a revolutionary party that uses bombings or assaults, then police and military forces are used to crush the challengers. But sometimes there are serious nonviolent challenges, especially when workers organise. Troops are typically called out when workers in a key sector (such as electricity or transport) go on strike, when workers take over running of a factory or business, or when there is a general strike. Spy agencies monitor and disrupt groups and movements that might be a threat to business or government. Police target groups that challenge property relations, such as workers and environmentalists taking direct action. At the core of capitalism is private property.[11] Military and police power is needed to maintain and extend the system of ownership, but this is hidden behind the routine operation of the legal and regulatory system, which is seldom perceived as founded on violence. If a person or corporation believes that their money or property has been taken illegally -- for example through insider trading or patent violation -- they can go to court to seek redress. The court decision, if not obeyed voluntarily, can be enforced by police, for example confiscation of goods or even imprisonment. For most of the time, property rights, as interpreted by the courts and various other government agencies, are accepted by everyone concerned. That goes for billion-dollar share transactions as well as everyday purchases of goods. Petty theft, big-time swindles and organised crime are not major challenges to the property system, since they accept the legitimacy of property and are simply attempts to change ownership in an illegal manner. Criminals are seldom happy for anyone to steal from them. Principled challenges to property, such as squatting and workers' control, are far more threatening. Many people, especially in the United States, believe that government and corporations are antagonistic, with opposite goals. When governments set up regulations to control product quality or pollution, some corporate leaders complain loudly about government interference. But beyond the superficial frictions, at a deeper level the state operates to provide the conditions for capitalism. The state has its own interests, to be sure, especially in maintaining state authority and a monopoly on what it considers legitimate violence, but it depends on capitalist enterprises for its own survival, notably through taxation. In capitalist societies, states and market economies depend on and mutually reinforce each other.[12] In recent decades there has been an enormous expansion of private policing. In the US, for example, there are now more security guards, private detectives and others privately paid to carry out policing duties than there are government-funded police. In the military arena, there are now private mercenary capitalism is built on relationships between people, production and distribution ultimately protected by armed force. As capitalism is increasingly globalised, international policing and military intervention become more important to protect and expand markets and market relationships. For example, economic blockades, backed by armed force, can be imposed on countries such as Cuba. Usually, though, the lure of the market for elites in weaker countries is more effective than military coercion.[13] Investment has done more to promote capitalism in Vietnam than decades of anticommunist warfare.

Simply constructing a laundry list of atrocities, or morally condemning US policies misses the point— the universal “we should” assumes we actually have a voice in the formation of policy, and misidentifies the enemy.

Herod 2001 (James, “A Stake, Not a Mistake: On Not Seeing the Enemy”, October, http://www.jamesherod.info/index.php?sec=paper&id=9&print=y&PHPSESSID=4387a9147ad42723ea101944dd538914)

The widespread belief that the US government has good intentions, a belief held onto tenaciously in spite of decades of overwhelming empirical evidence refuting it, has got to be one of the greatest phenomena of mass delusion in history. It would take a twenty-first century Freud to unravel this one. Here is a government that has already bombed two other countries to smithereens just in the past ten years, first Iraq and then Yugoslavia (not to mention endless interventions abroad since its inception [7]). Now it is bombing Afghanistan to smithereens -- hospitals, fuel supplies, food depots, electrical systems, water systems, radio stations, telephone exchanges, remote villages, mosques, old folks homes, UN offices, Red Cross warehouses, clinics, schools, neighborhoods, roads, dams, airports -- and a victim of the assault escapes to plead for help from the very people who are attacking him. To have created such an illusion as this is surely one of the greatest feats of propaganda ever seen.[8]       So although it is important to try to shatter this illusion, it is ultimately not enough, and of very limited effectiveness, simply to list all the atrocities committed by our rulers, carefully expose all their double standards, accuse them of being the real terrorists, morally condemn what they are doing, or call for peace. All these arguments are useful of course in the battle for the hearts and minds of average people, if average people ever heard them, which they do not, for the most part. And if they do hear them, it's like they (most of them) are tuning in to madness, they're so brainwashed. It takes a lot more than mere arguments to break through the mind set of a thoroughly indoctrinated people.      Of all the dozens of comments that I read on the government's response to the attacks of September Eleven, precious few raised the key question: How do we stop them (the government, from attacking Afghanistan)? For the most part, progressive commentators don't even raise questions of strategy.[9] They are too busy analyzing ruling class ideology, in order to highlight its hypocrisies. Proving that the ruling class is hypocritical doesn't get us very far. It's useful of course. Doing this work is an important task. Noam Chomsky, for example, devotes himself almost exclusively to this task, and we should be thankful that we have his research. He usually does mention also, somewhere in almost every speech, article, or interview, that 'it doesn't have to be this way', that this situation we are in is not inevitable, and that we can change it. But when asked "How?", he replies, "Organize, agitate, educate." Well, sure. But the Christian Coalition organizes, agitates, and educates. So did the Nazis and the Klu Klux Klan. The Taliban organizes, agitates, and educates. So does the ruling class, and it does so in a massive and highly successful way, which results in overwhelming hegemony for its point of view.       In spite of more than three decades of blistering exposés of US foreign policy, and in spite of the fact that he is an anarchist, and is thus supposedly against all government, at least in the long run, Chomsky still regularly uses the 'universal we'. Much of the time Chomsky says "The US government does this, or does that," but some of the time he says "We do this, or we do that," thus including himself, and us, as agents in the formation and execution of US foreign policy. This is an instance of what I call the 'universal we'. It presumes a democracy that does not exist. The average American has no say whatsoever in the formation and execution of US foreign policy. Nor do we even have any influence in picking the people who are making it, since we have no say over who gets to run for office or what they do after they are elected. So to say something like "we shouldn't be bombing Afghanistan", as so many progressives do, is highly misleading, and expresses a misperception and misdiagnosis of the situation we are in.       In the question period following Chomsky's major address on "The New War Against Terror" (delivered at MIT on October 18) [10], Chomsky was challenged by a man in the audience who accused Chomsky of blaming America for the tragedy of September 11. Chomsky correctly said that the term America is an abstraction and cannot do anything. But then he said that he blamed himself, and his questioner, and others present, for this event (implying that 'we' are responsible for what 'our' government does). This is a half-truth at best. The blame for September Eleven rests squarely on those who did it. Next, to the extent that a connection can be proved between their actions and US foreign policy, the US government is to blame, and the ruling class that controls the government. Average Americans are to blame for what the US government does only in the sense that they have not managed to change or block its policies, either because they haven't tried or because they have tried but have failed.       Of course, the category of Average American is an abstraction as well. Many average Americans vigorously support US foreign policy. Others oppose it, but have failed to change it. Those of us who want a real democracy, and want to put an end to Empire, have so far failed to do so, and only in this sense are we in anyway responsible for September Eleven. But even this failure must be judged in light of the relative strengths that the parties bring to the fight. We cannot fault ourselves for being defeated by an opponent with overwhelmingly superior forces, as long as we fought as bravely and as hard as we could. Our task is to find ways to enhance our strengths and weaken theirs. To fail to make a distinction between the ruling class and the rest of us hinders this task, causes us to presume a democracy that does not exist, to misunderstand exactly what we are up against, and to misidentify the enemy. It thus prevents us from devising a successful strategy for defeating this enemy.

Even if it is not directly identified with it, the state acts as the key catalyst to capitalism – it manages, consolidates, and protects it with any means necessary

Harman 06

(Chris, editor of International Socialism Journal and, before that, of Socialist Worker, and a leading figure in the Socialist Workers Party, September 26th, 2006, “The state and capitalism today”, http://www.isj.org.uk/?id=234)

The state may be a structure that developed historically to provide the political prerequisites for capitalist production—to protect capitalist property, to police the dealings of different members of the ruling class with each other, to provide certain services which are essential for the reproduction of the system, and to carry through such reforms as are necessary to make other sections of society accept capitalist rule—but it is not to be identified with the system itself. This view of the state claims to be based on the Communist Manifesto: ‘The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.’ But its origins do not lie in Marx himself so much as in the classical economists who preceded him: in the Communist Manifesto Marx simply takes their insistence on the need for a minimalist, ‘nightwatchman’ state and draws out its class character. Nevertheless it is the view that is to be found in most modern academic Marxism. So, for instance, it was to be found on both sides of the debate which took place in New Left Review between Ralph Miliband and Nicos Poulantzas.2 Miliband argued what has been called the ‘instrumental’ view of the state: it was tied to the capitalist class because its leading personnel came from the same milieu as the owners of private capital.3 Poulantzas argued that this was to see a merely contingent relationship between the state and capitalism, to see the state’s character as depending simply on who manned its top structures. He argued what has been called the ‘functional’ view: the state has to fulfil the needs of the society of which it is part; since this is a capitalist society it is necessarily a capitalist state. The state is, as Poulantzas puts it, ‘a condensate of class forces’, and the forces it ‘condenses’ are capitalist forces.

Riverlocks

Can’t integrate economic competitiveness into movements – makes co-optation inev. Toronto Community building alliances prove

**Allahwala** (doctoral student at York University) **6**

 (Ahmed, Weak policies for strong neighbourhoods? Relay #13, September/October)

As it is firmly grounded in discourses around economic competitiveness that favour the class interests of the global elites within the Toronto City Summit Alliance, it is doubtful whether this civil-society coalition can provide the space for the articulation of radical claims for social transformation. The systematic subordination of social and political issues under the economic imperatives of globalized capital-ism makes this – one could argue – out-right impossible. The integration of community-based organizations into the new governance structures of the post-Fordist city opens up real opportunities for the input of progressive policy proposals. Given the overall framework of economic competitiveness in which the analysis is situated, however, co-optation is likely if not imminent.

Transportation infrastructure is the ultimate example of overdevelopment – civil servants reduce all of nature into monetary and market value in the name of “industry”

Monboit 11

(George, author of The Age of Consent: A Manifesto for a New World Order and Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain, Poisoned Arrows, Amazon Watershed and No Man's Land, and Heat: how to stop the planet burning and Bring on the Apocalypse?, June 6th 2011, “The true value of nature is not a number with a pound sign in front: Cost-benefit analysis of nature is rigged in favour of business”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/jun/06/monetisation-natural-world-definitive-neoliberal-triumph)

Cost-benefit analysis is systematically rigged in favour of business. Take, for example, the decision-making process for transport infrastructure. The last government developed an appraisal method which almost guaranteed that new roads, railways and runways would be built, regardless of the damage they might do or the paltry benefits they might deliver. The method costs people's time according to how much they earn, and uses this cost to create a value for the development. So, for example, it says the market price of an hour spent travelling in a taxi is £45, but the price of an hour spent travelling by bicycle is just £17, because cyclists tend to be poorer than taxi passengers. Its assumptions are utterly illogical. For example, commuters are deemed to use all the time saved by a new high-speed rail link to get to work earlier, rather than to live further away. Rich rail passengers are expected to do no useful work on trains, but to twiddle their thumbs and stare vacantly out of the window throughout the journey. This costing system explains why successive governments want to invest in high-speed rail rather than cycle lanes, and why multibillion pound road schemes which cut two minutes off your journey are deemed to offer value for money. None of this is accidental: the cost-benefit models governments use excite intense interest from business lobbyists. Civil servants with an eye on lucrative directorships in their retirement ensure that the decision-making process is rigged in favour of overdevelopment. This is the machine into which nature must now be fed. The national ecosystem assessment hands the biosphere on a plate to the construction industry. It's the definitive neoliberal triumph: the monetisation and marketisation of nature, its reduction to a tradeable asset. Once you have surrendered it to the realm of Pareto optimisation and Kaldor-Hicks compensation, everything is up for grabs. These well-intentioned dolts, the fellows of the grand academy of Lagado who produced the government's assessment, have crushed the natural world into a column of figures. Now it can be swapped for money.

Conceptions of the state as a competitive entity have become hegemonic- only refusing the aff’s framing can create space for other ways of constructing the state and global economy

Fougner (Assistant Professor of International Relations at the Bilkent University) 6

(Tore, The state, international competitiveness and neoliberal globalisation: is there a future beyond ‘ the competition state’?, Review of International Studies (2006), 32)

The basic idea informing this article has been that the transgression of something that is currently conceived as a given ‘ fact of life’ can be facilitated by showing both that what is, has not always been and, in consequence, need not always be in the future; and that what is, is internal not to an unchanging nature, but rather to politics or relations of power. In accordance with this, the article has showed that the problem of international competitiveness has a quite speciﬁc history of emergence and transformation internal to state and global forms of governance, and that the discourse of international competitiveness is currently at the centre not only of how state authorities conduct their business, but also how their conduct is shaped and manipulated by other actors in the world political economy. The broader signiﬁcance of this (re)problematisation of the problem of international competitiveness lies in its potential contribution to the opening up of a space of possibility for the state to become something other than a competitive entity. In this connection, the issue at stake today is not so much the absence of state conceptions that somehow run counter to the neoliberal one of the state as a competitive entity, as the hegemonic position of the neoliberal problem and discourse of competitiveness as such. If the latter is left unchallenged, as is the case in much of the competition state literature, then alternative state conceptions will unavoidably be assessed in terms of international competitiveness and, in consequence, stand little chance of prevailing in any but distorted and marginal ways.83 Against this background, the historisation and politicisation of the problem of international competitiveness provided in this article can contribute both to make the concept of international competitiveness fall from its current grace, and increase people’s receptivity to both existing and prospective alternatives to the neoliberal conception of the state. With regard to the prospect of the state becoming something other than a competitve entity, an opening might also follow from how the state has been shown to be constituted as a three-headed troll that is competitive, disciplined and sovereign within the context of contemporary efforts at neoliberal global governance. As sovereign entities, states retain the option to put an end to capital mobility, and thereby both reverse the power relationship that currently characterises their relations with transnational capital, and deny non-state actors the opportunity to act upon and manipulate their conduct at a distance. The key point to note, however, is that the hegemony of neoliberalism as a rationality of government has led states to practice sovereignty in a way that effectively subjects them to such external discipline and governance – this, by engaging in efforts to constitute a global marketplace. Moreover, neoliberal global governance is considered such a precious undertaking today that state authorities have voluntarily, if not proactively, adapted to it by both exercising a high degree of self-discipline, and acting on themselves and their populations as competitors in a global market for investment. While an understanding of the state as an externally disciplined entity has the potential to stimulate popular opposition and resistance to contemporary forms of neoliberal global governance – in part, because many people simply do not appreciate being forced to do things that they otherwise would not want to do – this understanding seems at present to be much less prevalent in the popular imagination than the one of the state as a competitive entity. Given both the seemingly ahistorical and apolitical nature of the problem of international competitiveness, and how the quest for improved competitiveness can rather easily be represented as part of a positive national project, this situation can be claimed to inhibit the emergence of more broadly-based popular resistance.84 Against this background, the (re)problematisation of the problem of international competitiveness provided in this article can contribute to delegitimise attempts to rally people behind national competitiveness projects, and provide additional stimulus to popular opposition and resistance to contemporary efforts to constitute a global marketplace.

Universal Design

Capitalism co-opts Utopianism and uses false hopes to dissuade revolution and enforce the status quo

(Bertell Ollman, Teaches politics @ NYU, 2005, http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/the-utopian-vision-of-the-future-then-and-now-a-marxist-critique)

While everyone has utopian impulses, however, only some use them as the main raw material for constructing their vision of the future, only some, therefore, qualify as utopian thinkers. Furthermore, wishing for a better future, speculating what this might consist of, is not always and everywhere progressive or even political. Capitalism, after all, has proven very effective in co-opting free-floating utopian impulses. Fashion, for example, is but one example of how our desires for happiness, beauty, and community are cynically manipulated and turned into a means for enriching the few. Lotteries, rock concerts, and mass spectator sports are others. Given forms that are sufficiently distant from the main battlegrounds of the class struggle, even the most radical impulses can be rendered safe for the status quo

#### The discrimination against people with disabilities is one of the results of the capitalistic work ethic and value system

Drimmer (their Card) ’93 Jonathan Drimmer, Editor, UCLA Law Review, UCLA 6/1993 [“CRIPPLES, OVERCOMERS, AND CIVIL RIGHTS: TRACING THE EVOLUTION OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND SOCIAL POLICY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES” 40 UCLA L. Rev. 1341, lexis]

Society resonates with the message that people with disabilities n2 are somehow "ruined." Based on this notion of inferiority, people with disabilities are treated as second-class citizens, and suffer from "thoughtlessness and indifference," and "benign neglect." n3 [\*1343] They are both pitied and abused: as historical victims of a mix of intolerance, discrimination, fear, and misunderstanding, they are given charity, and yet not afforded many of the rights and opportunities of people with able bodies. n4 Frequently, people with disabilities are stigmatized as less than human, n5 or viewed as examples of the cruelty of life at its worst. n6 In a culture that values the "protestant work ethic" as well as a strong mind and body, people with disabilities are commonly viewed as deficient and inferior. n7 In an [\*1344] industrialized country where self-support is closely tied to self-esteem and national economic strength, the forty-three million Americans with disabilities n8 are often assumed to be mired in feelings of personal inadequacy, n9 and are viewed as sapping the strength of the country when unable to produce financially.

Utopian movements revolve around a single symptom of the capitalist order and imagine fixing this problem. This method of thinking is rooted within the lie of the American dream and moves the focus of analysis away from capitalism

(Bertell Ollman, Teaches politics @ NYU, 2005, http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/the-utopian-vision-of-the-future-then-and-now-a-marxist-critique)

Apart from socialists off building model communities and waiting for their example to spread across the world, there are few thoroughgoing utopians on the left today. Yet, most American radicals carry a significant strain of utopian thinking in their DNA. In part, this is due to the absence of a strong Marxist tradition with its preference for engaging in systemic analysis before tackling any social problem. But modern capitalism, with its need to make people believe they can make it while denying the great majority the means to do so, raising hopes and expectations and dashing them to the ground only to raise them again, and with its ubiquitous advertising, lotto, and talk of the American dream, is peculiarly adept in producing unrealistic dreamers who are also utopian thinkers. Futurology has become something of a capitalist growth industry involving not only those who respect existing property relations but many who do not. The various social movements are particularly affected by the frame of mind that sets out ideals—a pollution-free environment, racial/gender/ethnic equality, an end to hunger, durable peace, etc.—before making any analysis of the encompassing capitalist system, and then offering highly charged moral solutions that blithely ignore what would have emerged from such an analysis. Rather than telling my many comrades in the social movements, if the shoe fits, wear it, I am only suggesting that if you find yourself wearing this shoe, you may want to consider why it fits.

HSR

**High-speed rail accentuates the inequalities of capitalism through social disparities and marginalization of poorer regions**

Geddas 12

(Mike, Offchurch Action Group in Warwickshire, July 2012, “High-speed rail is a rich man’s plaything”, http://www.redpepper.org.uk/high-speed-rail-is-a-rich-mans-plaything/)

So the claims for HS2 are make-believe. Hammond is right that HS2 would have a transformational effect – just not of the kind he suggests. High speed rail would indeed create a new economic geography, accentuating the inequalities of the neoliberal market economy. With stations only for London, Birmingham, Manchester, Nottingham/Derby, South Yorkshire and Leeds, it would tie together major cities (which is why Labour’s big city barons like it) but create a second tier of towns served by fewer and slower trains, and marginalise whole regions – the south and south west, Wales, East Anglia – that the proposed network ignores. This new neoliberal map of Britain, floating free of the places where most of us live and work, and ‘compressing both space and time’, in David Harvey’s phrase, would at the same time accentuate social disparities. The most affluent 20 per cent of the population make nearly half of all long distance rail journeys. As Hammond admitted in a rare moment of realism, HS2 will be a ‘rich man’s toy’. And the government’s willingness to adopt from Labour a route that slices through a clutch of Conservative constituencies testifies to the hegemony of post-Thatcherite neoliberal conservatism over the old ‘shire’ Toryism. The process by which HS2 is being imposed also bears all the hallmarks of neoliberal ‘governance’. It is led by an unaccountable quango, HS2 Ltd, given a narrow remit to design a new rail line, thus ruling out the possibility that it would be better to spend money improving the existing rail network. Exhibiting the classic neoliberal governance model of managerialism and managed ‘participation‑lite’, HS2 did organise a national public consultation. The results showed massive opposition to the project. When asked ‘Do you agree that a national high speed rail network from London to Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester would provide the best value for money solution for enhancing rail capacity and performance?’, less than 7 per cent of respondents said yes; more than 93 per cent said no. Much is made by HS2 advocates of the ‘success’ of high speed rail in Europe. Again, the reverse is the case. The Portuguese government has abandoned a £2.6 billion Lisbon–Madrid HSR link. France’s plans for TGV expansion are running into financing problems because of the recession and the country’s budget deficit. Poland is shelving plans to build a 480-kilometre line. The Dutch high speed train operator needed rescuing from bankruptcy with a £250 million government bailout; plans for an Amsterdam to Germany line have been suspended. There are other similar examples. Cities such as Lille in France are held up as examples of the regeneration impact of HSR, but in fact the regeneration of Lille has been fuelled by quite different funding programmes, and even so unemployment in the city has risen faster than nationally. Across Europe, there is opposition to high speed rail. Under the banner of the ‘Treaty of Hendaye’ (the site of opposition to a Franco–Spanish high speed line), activists in France, Italy, Germany, Spain and the UK have joined forces against grands projets inutiles (useless mega-projects). In Stuttgart, activists against a high speed line have faced water cannon, while in the Susa Valley in Northern Italy a 20-year struggle has seen the route of the TAV project militarised to drive it forward. For these activists, linked to the World Social Forum, high speed rail is at odds with environmentally sustainable local economies and ways of life. In England, there is an alliance of 70 local action groups opposing HS2. The government has tried to characterise the opposition as wealthy ‘nimbys’, and the line does indeed run through attractive rural areas in the Chilterns and Warwickshire. But not everyone who lives in rural areas and opposes HS2 is rich, and it also cuts through swathes of inner city London and Birmingham. In reality, it is the business and political elites who support HS2 who are the rich and privileged.

High-speed rail reinforces neoliberal urbanism and capitalism consumption

Peters 09

(Deike, director of the DFG Research Group “Megaprojects,” at Berlin University of Technology’s Center for Metropolitan Studies, Summer 2009, “The Renaissance of Inner-City Rail Station Areas: A Key Element in Contemporary Urban Restructuring Dynamics”, https://www.geschundkunstgesch.tu-berlin.de/fileadmin/fg95/Hauptordner\_Megaprojekte/literaturanhang/Peters\_162\_185.pdf)

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

Railways epitomize the destructive effects of “perfect” competition and capitalistic corporate greed

Nasser 10

(Alan, Professor of Political Economy and Philosophy Emeritus, The Evergreen State College, Olympia Washington, where he taught from 1975 to 2006. articles in political economy, philosophy, legal theory and psychoanalytic theory have appeared in a number of magazines and journals. This article is taken in part from a book in progress titled The "New Normal": Austerity Capitalism and the Decline of American Democracy, 2010, “(Neo)Liberalism as First and Last Resort”, http://www.stateofnature.org/neoliberalismAsFirst.html)

The nineteenth-century US economy was made up of two types of business, small, local enterprises and two much larger and wealthier operations, the railways and the steel industry. Each of these epitomizes the predominant contradictions of nineteenth-century US capitalism. In each case enterprises repeatedly competed their profits away into bankruptcy or receivership. Between 1823 and 1898, most of the years outside of the Civil War saw the US either in depression or in recession. The trajectories of the railroads and the steel industry illustrate these dynamics perfectly.The railroads and the steel industry suffered the fate of what the textbooks call "perfect" competition, where competitive pressure is so urgent as to virtually compel irrational competition. Keynes famously alluded to what he regarded as a clear instance of irrational competition: "Two masses for the dead, two pyramids are better than one; not so two railroads from London to York." In fact, in Britain and in the US the railroad magnates had repeatedly built more than two railways from A to B, with the predictable unhappy consequences.US railroad investment advanced at a furious pace. Competing routes between the same two points proliferated. The principal competitive weapons were to cut prices, offer rebates and distribute free passes. The result was that bankruptcies abounded. By the end of the nineteenth century the giant railway networks were the largest business enterprises in the world, yet by 1900 half of them had gone into receivership.The steel industry suffered the same fate. The hyper-innovator Andrew Carnegie introduced productivity-enhancing technological innovations with uncommon frequency. His high rate of capital replacement lowered his unit costs, raised his competitors' costs and devalorized their obsolete capital, enabling him to price-compete many of them to bankruptcy. This left bankers like J.P. Morgan with big debtors unable to service their loans. The prototypical form of industrial competition was rightly perceived by Morgan as contrary to the interests of finance capital. Accordingly, Morgan became an outspoken enemy of cutthroat competition. Carnegie was a special nuisance to Morgan, who repeatedly implored him to slow down his innovations. When Carnegie turned a deaf ear, Morgan simply bought Carnegie out. In the process he consolidated the Carnegie Steel Company with some of its weaker competitors, adumbrating the eventual oligopolization of major industries that was to begin in the early twentieth century. Morgan was equally attuned to the destructive effects of fratricidal competition among the railroads. He witnessed the repeated building of tracks in excess of demand. Morgan persuaded many railway barons to form "communities of interest" (the "gentleman's agreement", pools, et al) to reduce destructive competition by fixing rates and/or allocating traffic between competing roads. Just about all of these efforts at pricing and policy coordination failed, because invariably at least one of the "cooperating" companies would try to take advantage of the others' cooperation by breaking its promise, e.g. not to cut rates. In response, Morgan once again consolidated.He took control of one sixth of the nation's largest railroads. But his greatest achievement in this respect remains his buyout of Carnegie, part of a wider consolidation that created in 1901 the industrial giant US Steel. As the Nobel laureate Chicago School economist George Stigler put it, Morgan initiated "a new and lucrative industry: the production of monopolies."

Bicycles