## 1AC

### Inherency

#### The GOP is making it so that all transportation infrastructure plans passed in the status quo are carried out by private corporations who view the projects in terms of the procurement of capital. This takes away from how transportation infrastructure is supposed to be a social service and a stepping stone to socialism.

KOS, congregation of economic analysists, 2011, http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/24/1085717/-GOP-seeks-to-privatize-American-infrastructure-with-taxpayer-backed-guaranteed-corporate-profits

Force Amtrak to contract out 2,000 jobs to the private sector, and if the private sector losses money the taxpayers will automatically bail them out and make up the difference*!* I'm a big fan of Sam Seder's Majority Report. Last week Sam was talking about the Transportation Bill that John Boehner has repeatedly failed to move past his tea party House Freshmen. To explain what was in the version of the bill that Boehner has been pushing, Sam Seder brought on Ed Wytkind, who is the AFL-CIO’s Transportation Trades Department President. Here's the short version: the GOP is trying to outsource one of the last things America has, our infrastructure. That's right, the House Republicans who are screaming COMMUNISM! at anyone who disagrees with them is trying to sell off America's transportation infrastructure to foreign corporations, transforming decent jobs into low paying jobs with no benefits or job security while funneling taxpayer money into the hands of huge foreign and multi-national corporations. The American small businessmen be damned. This should be a scandal. A massive scandal. More below the fold . . . . This is a double screw-job. We NEED a transportation bill, we've been running on small supplemental bills since 2009, but Republicans in the House don't understand the difference between SPENDING and investment. This is why Boehner can't get his corporate welfare larded transportation bill through the House. Amazingly, the tea party has prevented this disaster, but only because they are too ideologically extreme to go along with Boehner's scam. Meanwhile the Senate has put together a decent version of a Transportation bill that passed the Senate with 76 votes. There are some problems with the Senate version of the bill, it is by no means perfect, but it would keep America's transportation infrastructure funded, which is HUGE, because when these public projects are not funded it places a huge strain on the public. In their usual hostage taking manner the House Republicans have held up this bill up so they can pass a version that damages the infrastructure and sells off whatever they can to the highest bidder while mandating that any lost profits will be made up by the American taxpayer. Basically, this is one of their most un-Republican bills EVER. These are the guys who are always saying that the Government should NEVER interfere with the private sector, but I guess that doesn't count when it means mandating that the taxpayer cover any lost profits these private sector firms might incur. Mandate. Funny, I thought Republicans were against that sort of thing? . . . crickets What's worse, the House version of this bill would increase the Federal share of funds from US grants to certain agencies, but only IF they privatize at least 1/4 of their operations. That's right, either go along with the privatization corporate giveaways or see your funding cut, and then when the profit motive makes the privatized service more expensive and less efficient, well, we all know who the conservatives will blame (Rhymes with Odama) Ed Wytkind described this bill that Boehner put together as " just a ridiculous way to do transportation in this country" and a "complete giveaway to foreign companies trying to take over public transportation." Sadly, I can't find many sources on this story. I'm chalking that up to the fact that transportation legislation journalism isn't that sexy, usually nerds like me and a few others might take an interest in this but more often than not this kind of thing is a mundane and routine function of government. Leave it to House Republicans to turn this into a massive giveaway to foreign business. Obstructing this bill and transforming it into corporate welfare fits the GOP MO to a T. This is why we can't have nice things like bridges that don't collapse while we drive over them. Take the basic functions of Government like providing public transportation and turn it into a costly cash cow for private business, that's the GOP *modus operandi*, and nothing says that more than privatizing a public service and then mandating that the taxpayer make up any lost profits the private business may incur. That's right, redistributing wealth is a sin and un-american, unless you are redistributing it from the taxpayers to a private industry. So the GOP is busy make jobs worse and blaming it on Obama, holding up construction projects and delaying transportation investment while they blame it on Obama. For the GOP it is a win/win, they get to screw with public services, making them worse and delaying them which will generate public outrage, then they will blame the government and demand less government and lower taxes, which will result in worse services and bigger deficits, and on and on it goes.

#### nsportation infrastructure is not an isolated instance, but a manifestation of the ideology of neoliberalism that seeks to eradicate social spending and the public sphere in order to achieve unrestrained capitalism. This produces a new mode of warfare that necessitates continuous disaster, in the name of achieving profit, and economic expansion

Naomi Klein, Milibrand Fellow at the London School of Economics, 2001 (“The Shock Doctrine: the Rise of Disaster Capitalism,” p. 11-20)

**Friedman's Chicago School movement has been conquering territory around the world since the seventies, but until recently its vision had never been fully applied in its country of origin**. Certainly Reagan had made head­ way, but the U.S. retained a welfare system, social security and public schools, where parents clung, in Friedman's words, to their "irrational attachment to a socialist system." When the Republicans gained control of Congress in 1995, David Frum, a transplanted Canadian and future speechwriter for George W. Bush, was among the so-called neoconservatives calling for a shock therapy-style economic revolution in the U.S. "Here's how I think we should do it. Instead of cutting incrementally—a little here, a little there —I would say that on a single day this summer we eliminate three hundred programs, each one costing a billion dollars or less. Maybe these cuts won't make a big deal of difference, but, boy, do they make a point. And you can do them right away."25Frum didn't get his homegrown shock therapy at the time, largely because there was no domestic crisis to prepare the ground. But **in 2001 that changed. When the September 11 attacks hit, the White House was packed with Friedman's disciples,** including his close friend Donald Rumsfeld. The Bush team seized the moment of collective vertigo with chilling speed—not, as some have claimed, because the administration deviously plotted the cri­ sis but because the key figures of the administration, veterans of earlier disaster capitalism experiments in Latin America and Eastern Europe, were part of a movement that prays for crisis the way drought-struck farmers pray for rain, and the way Christian-Zionist end-timers pray for the Rapture.When the long-awaited disaster strikes, they know instantly that their moment has come at last. For three decades**, Friedman and his followers had methodically exploited moments of shock in other countries—foreign equivalents of 9/11,** starting with Pinochet's coup on September 11, 1973. **What happened on September 11, 2001, is that an ideology hatched in American universities and fortified in Washington institutions finally had its chance to come home.** **The Bush administration immediately seized upon the fear generated by the attacks not only to launch the "War on Terror" but to ensure that it is an almost completely for-profit venture,** a booming new industry that has breathed new life into the faltering U.S. economy**.** **Best understood as a "disaster capitalism complex,"** it has much farther-reaching tentacles than the military-industrial complex that Dwight Eisenhower warned against at the end of his presidency: **this is global war fought on every level by private companies whose involvement is paid for with public money,** with the unending mandate of protecting the United States homeland in perpetuity while eliminating all "evil" abroad. In only a few short years**,** the complex has already expanded its market reach from fighting terrorism to international peace­ keeping, to municipal policing, to responding to increasingly frequent natural disasters. **The ultimate goal for the corporations at the center of the complex is to bring the model of for-profit government,** which advances so rapidly in extraordinary circumstances, into the ordinary and day-to-day functioning of the state —in effect, **to privatize the government.** To kick-start the disaster capitalism complex, the Bush administration out­ sourced, with no public debate, many of the most sensitive and core functions of government—from providing health care to soldiers, to interrogating prisoners, to gathering and "data mining" information on all of us. **The role of the government in this unending war is** not that of an administrator managing a network of contractors but of a deep-pocketed venture capitalist, both **providing its seed money for the complex's creation and becoming the biggest customer for its new services.** To cite just three statistics that show the scope of the transformation, **in 2003, the U.S. government handed out 3,512 contracts to companies to perform security functions; in the twenty-two-month period ending in August 2006, the Department of Homeland Security had issued more than 115,000 such contracts**.26 The global "homeland security industry" —economically insignificant before 2001 —is now a $200 billion sector. In 2006, U.S. government spending on homeland security averaged $545 per household. And that's just the home front of the War on Terror; the real money is in fighting wars abroad. Beyond the weapons contractors, who have seen their profits soar thanks to the war in Iraq, maintaining the U.S. military is now one of the fastest-growing service economies in the world. "No two countries that both have a McDonald's have ever fought a war against each other," boldly declared the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman in December 1996. Not only was he proven wrong two years later, but thanks to the model of for-profit warfare, the U.S. Army goes to war with Burger King and Pizza Hut in tow, contracting them to run franchises for the soldiers on military bases from Iraq to the "mini city" at Guantânamo Bay. **Then there is humanitarian relief and reconstruction.** Pioneered in Iraq, for-profit relief and reconstruction has already become the new global paradigm, regardless of whether the original destruction occurred from a preemptive war, such as Israel's 2006 attack on Lebanon, or a hurricane. With resource scarcity and climate change providing a steadily increasing flow of new disasters, responding to emergencies is simply too hot an emerging market to be left to the nonprofits—**why should UNICEF rebuild schools when it can be done by Bechtel, one of the largest engineering firms in the U.S.?** Why put displaced people from Mississippi in subsidized empty apartments when they can be housed on Carnival cruise ships? **Why deploy UN peacekeepers to Darfur when private security companies like Blackwater are looking for new clients?** And that is the post- September 11 difference: before, wars and disasters provided opportunities for a narrow sector of the economy—the makers of fighter jets, for in­ stance, or the construction companies that rebuilt bombed-out bridges. **The primary economic role of wars**, however, **was as a means to open new markets that had been sealed off and to generate postwar peacetime booms. Now wars and disaster responses are so fully privatized that they are themselves the new market; there is no need to wait until after the war for the boom —the medium is the message**. One distinct advantage of this postmodern approach is that in market terms, it cannot fail. As a market analyst remarked of a particularly good quarter for the earnings of the energy services company Halliburton, "Iraq was better than expected." That was in October 2006, then the most violent month of the war on record, with 3,709 Iraqi civilian casualties. Still, few shareholders could fail to be impressed by a war that had generated $20 billion in revenues for this one company.3 3 Amid the weapons trade, the private soldiers, for-profit reconstruction and the homeland security industry, what has emerged as a result of the Bush ad­ ministration's particular brand of post-September 11 shock therapy is a fully articulated new economy. It was built in the Bush era, but it now exists quite apart from any one administration and will remain entrenched until the corporate supremacist ideology that underpins it is identified, isolated and challenged. The complex is dominated by U.S. firms, but it is global, with British companies bringing their experience in ubiquitous security cameras, Israeli firms their expertise in building high-tech fences and walls, the Canadian lumber industry selling prefab houses that are several times more expensive than those produced locally, and so on. "**I don't think anybody has looked at disaster reconstruction as an actual housing market before,**" said Ken Baker, CEO of a Canadian forestry trade group. "It's a strategy to diversify in the long run." In scale, the disaster capitalism complex is on a par with the "emerging market" and information technology booms of the nineties. In fact, insiders say that the deals are even better than during the dot-com days and that "the security bubble" picked up the slack when those earlier bubbles popped. Combined with soaring insurance industry profits (projected to have reached a record $60 billion in 2006 in the U.S. alone) as well as super profits for the oil industry (which grow with each new crisis), the disaster economy may well have saved the world market from the full-blown recession it was facing on the eve of 9/11.3 5 **In the attempt to relate the history of the ideological crusade that has culminated in the radical privatization of war and disaster, one problem recurs: the ideology is a shape-shifter, forever changing its name and switching identities.** Friedman called himself a "liberal," but his U.S. followers, who associated liberals with high taxes and hippies, tended to identify as "conservatives," "classical economists," "free marketers," and, later, as believers in "Reaganomics" or "laissez-faire." In most of the world, **their orthodoxy is known as "neoliberalism," but it is often called "free trade" or simply "globalization."** Only since the mid-nineties has **the intellectual movement, led by the right-wing think tanks** with which Friedman had long associations**—Heritage Foundation, Cato Institute and the American Enterprise Institute—called itself "neoconservative," a worldview that has harnessed the full force of the U.S. military machine in the service of a corporate agenda. All these incarnations share a commitment to the policy trinity—the elimination of the public sphere, total liberation for corporations and skeletal social spending**—but none of the various names for the ideology seem quite adequate. Friedman framed his movement as an attempt to free the market from the state, but the real-world track record of what happens when his purist vision is realized is rather different. In every country where Chicago School policies have been applied over the past three decades, what has emerged is a powerful ruling alliance between a few very large corporations and a class of mostly wealthy politicians—with hazy and ever-shifting lines between the two groups. In Russia the billionaire private players in the alliance are called "the oligarchs"; in China, "the princelings"; in Chile, "the piranhas"; in the U.S., the Bush-Cheney campaign "Pioneers." Far from freeing the market from the state, **these political and corporate elites have simply merged, trading favors to secure the right to appropriate precious resources previously held in the public domain—from Russia's oil fields, to China's collective lands, to the no-bid reconstruction contracts for work in Iraq.** A more accurate term for a system that erases the boundaries between Big Government and Big Business is not liberal, conservative or capitalist but corporatist. Its main characteristics are huge transfers of public wealth to private hands, often accompanied by exploding debt, an ever-widening chasm between the dazzling rich and the disposable poor and an aggressive nationalism that justifies bottomless spending on security**. For those inside the bubble of extreme wealth created by such an arrangement, there can be no more profitable way to organize a society. But because of the obvious drawbacks for the vast majority of the population left outside the bubble, other features of the corporatist state tend to include aggressive surveillance** (once again, with government and large corporations trading favors and contracts), **mass incarceration, shrinking civil liberties and** often, though not always, **torture.** From Chile to China to Iraq, torture has been a silent partner in the global free-market crusade. But torture is more than a tool used to enforce unwanted policies on rebellious peoples; it is also a metaphor of the shock doctrine's underlying logic. Torture, or in CIA language "coercive interrogation," is a set of techniques designed to put prisoners into a state of deep disorientation and shock in order to force them to make concessions against their will. The guiding logic is elaborated in two CIA manuals that were declassified in the late nineties. They explain that the way to break "resistant sources" is to create violent ruptures between prisoners and their ability to make sense of the world around them. First, the senses are starved of any input (with hoods, earplugs, shackles, total isolation), then the body is bombarded with over­ whelming stimulation (strobe lights, blaring music, beatings, electroshock). The goal of this "softening-up" stage is to provoke a kind of hurricane in the mind: prisoners are so regressed and afraid that they can no longer think rationally or protect their own interests. It is in that state of shock that most prisoners give their interrogators whatever they want—information, confessions, a renunciation of former beliefs. One CIA manual provides a particularly succinct explanation: "There is an interval—which may be extremely brief—of suspended animation, a kind of psychological shock or paralysis. It is caused by a traumatic or sub-traumatic experience which explodes, as it were, the world that is familiar to the subject as well as his image of himself within that world. Experienced interrogators recognize this effect when it appears and know that at this moment the source is far more open to suggestion, far likelier to comply, than he was just before he experienced the shock."3 7 The shock doctrine mimics this process precisely, attempting to achieve on a mass scale what torture does one on one in the interrogation cell. The clearest example was the shock of September 11, which, for millions of people, exploded "the world that is familiar" and opened up a period of deep dis­ orientation and regression that the Bush administration expertly exploited. Suddenly we found ourselves living in a kind of Year Zero, in which every­ thing we knew of the world before could now be dismissed as "pre-9/11 thinking." Never strong in our knowledge of history, North Americans had become a blank slate —"a clean sheet of paper" on which "the newest and most beautiful words can be written," as Mao said of his people. A new army of experts instantly materialized to write new and beautiful words on the receptive canvas of our post trauma consciousness: "clash of civilizations," they inscribed. "Axis of evil," "Islamo-fascism," "homeland security." With everyone preoccupied by the deadly new culture wars, the Bush administration was able to pull off what it could only have dreamed of doing before 9/11: wage privatized wars abroad and build a corporate security complex at home. **That is how the shock doctrine works:** **the original disaster—the coup, the terrorist attack, the market meltdown, the war, the tsunami, the hurricane — puts the entire population into a state of collective shock.** The falling bombs, the bursts of terror**,** the pounding winds serve to soften up whole societies much as the blaring music and blows in the torture cells soften up prisoners. Like the terrorized prisoner who gives up the names of comrades and renounces his faith, shocked societies often give up things they would otherwise fiercely protect. Jamar Perry and his fellow evacuees at the Baton Rouge shelter were supposed to give up their housing projects and public schools. After the tsunami, the fishing people in Sri Lanka were supposed to give up their valuable beachfront land to hoteliers. Iraqis, if all had gone according to plan, were supposed to be so shocked and awed that they would give up control of their oil reserves, their state companies and their sovereignty to U.S. military bases and green zones.

Plan Text: The United States federal government should take complete control of transportation infrastructure projects in the United States.

We must do this in order to eliminate the capitalism that is intrinsic in privatized transportation infrastructure development and move towards a socialist society, solving for the harms of capitalism.

#### It is important that we oppose capitalism by going against privatization with our plan, rather than accepting capitalism and going along with it by trying to make a transportation infrastructure based plan in the status quo. To be included in capitalism is to derail the anti-capitalist struggle

Herod ‘4(James, Getting Free, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/05.htm>)

The so-called New Social Movements, based on gender, racial, sexual, or ethnic identities, cannot destroy capitalism. They haven’t even tried. Except for a tiny fringe of radicals in each of them, they have been trying to get into the system, not overthrow it. This is true for women, black, homosexual, and ethnic (including ‘native’) identities, as well as all the other identities — old people, the handicapped, welfare mothers, and so forth. Nothing has derailed the anti-capitalist struggle during the past quarter century so thoroughly as have these movements**.** Sometimes it seems that identity politics is all that is left of the left. Identity politics has simply swamped class politics**.** The mainstream versions of these movements (the ones fighting to get into the system rather than overthrow it) have given capitalists a chance to do a little fine tooling, by eliminating tensions here and there, and by including token representatives of the excluded groups. Many of the demands of these movements can be easily accommodated**.** Capitalists can live with boards of directors exhibiting ethnic, gender, and racial diversity, as long as all the board members are pro-capitalist. Capitalists can easily accept a rainbow cabinet as long as the cabinet is pushing the corporate agenda**.** So mainstream identity politics has not threatened capitalism at all. These have been liberal movements, and have sought only to reform the system, not abolish it. The radical wings of the new social movements however are rather more subversive. These militants realized that it was necessary to attack the whole social order in order to uproot racism and sexism — problems which could not be overcome under capitalism, since they are an integral part of capitalism. There is no denying the evils of racism, sexism, and nationalism, which are major structural supports to ruling class control. These militants have done whatever they could to highlight, analyze, and ameliorate these evils. Unfortunately, for the most part, their voices have been lost in all the clamor for admittance to the system by the majorities in their movements. There have been gains of course. The women's movement has forever changed the world's consciousness about gender. Unpaid housework has been recognized as a key ingredient in the wage-slave system. Reproduction, as well as production, has been included in our analysis of the system. Identity politics in general has underscored just how many people are excluded, and exposed gaps in previous revolutionary strategies. Also, the demand for real racial and gender equality is itself inherently revolutionary, in that the demand cannot be met by capitalists, given that racial and gender discrimination are two of the key structural mechanisms for keeping the wage bill low, and thus making profits possible. Nevertheless, I'm convinced that unless we can return to class politics, and integrate the fights for gender, racial, sexual, and age equality into the class struggle, we will continue to flounder**.**

### CONTENTION 1 IS GLOBAL VIOLENCE

#### Failure to take responsibility for our role in the circulation of capital makes global violence against the proletariat inevitable

Žižek & Daly ‘4 **(Slavoj, Prof. of European Graduate School, Intl. Director of the Birkbeck Inst. for Humanities, U. of London, and Senior Researcher @ Inst. of Sociology, U. of Ljubljiana, and Glyn, Professor Intl. Studies @ Northampton U., “Risking the Impossible”** [**http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm**](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm)**)**

It is in the light of this more subtle perspective on the real that zizek has also revised his approach to the question of ideology. In the sublime object of ideology, zizek developed his famous inversion of the classical 'false consciousness' thesis. Thus ideology does not conceal or distort an underlying reality (human nature, social interests etc.) But rather reality itself cannot be reproduced without ideological mystification (zizek, 1989: 28). What ideology offers is the symbolic construction of reality – the ultimate fantasy – as a way to escape the traumatic effects of the real. Reality is always a 'virtual' take on the real; virtualization that can never fully overcome the real or achieve homeostasis. In the language of laclau and mouffe, this means that society as an integrated unity is universally impossible precisely because of the constitutive excess of the real qua the unmasterable negativity upon which every positivization finally depends. And it is here that ideology performs its supreme conjuring trick. **What** **ideology aims at is a fantasmatic re-staging of the encounter with the real in such a way that the impossibility of society is translated into the theft of society by some historical other. In nazi ideology, for example, it is the contingent figure of the jew who is made directly responsible for the theft/sabotage of social harmony – thereby concealing the traumatic fact that social harmony never existed and that it is an inherent impossibility** (1989: 125-7; 1993: 203-4). **By imputing the status of the real to a particular other, the dream of holistic fulfilment – through the elimination, expulsion or suppression of the other – is thereby sustained.** More recently, however, Zizek has developed a new twist to this perspective. Ideology not only constructs a certain image of fulfillment (Plato's City of Reason, the Aryan Community, multiculturalist harmony etc..), it also endeavours to regulate a certain distance from it. [4](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm#4) On the one hand we have the ideological fantasy of being reconciled with the Thing (of total fulfilment), but, on the other, with the built-in proviso that we do not come too close to it. The (Lacanian) reason for this is clear: if you come too close to the Thing then it either shatters/evaporates (like the frescoes in Fellini's Roma) or it provokes unbearable anxiety and psychical disintegration. Crucial here is the status of the category of the impossible For Zizek impossibility is not the kind of neutral category that we tend to find in Laclau and Mouffe (as in their impossibility-of-Society thesis) where it tends to connote a basic constitutive frontier of antagonism. Like the immanent markers of the Real, impossibility gets caught up in ideology and is configured in such a way that it both structures reality and determines the coordinates of what is actually possible. As Zizek argues in this book, beyond the prima facie ideological operation of translating impossibility into an external obstacle there is a further deeper stage to the operation: that is, the "very elevation of something into impossibility as a means of postponing or avoiding encountering it". Ideology is the impossible dream not simply in terms of overcoming impossibility but in terms of sustaining that impossibility in an acceptable way. That is to say, the idea of overcoming is sustained as a deferred moment of reconciliation without having to go through the pain of overcoming as such. The central issue is one of proximity; of maintaining a critical distance by keeping the Thing in focus (like the image on a screen) but without coming so close that it begins to distort and decompose. A typical example would be that of someone who fantasizes about an ideal object (a sexual partner, promotion, retirement etc.) and when they actually encounter the object, they are confronted with the Real of their fantasy; the object loses its ideality, The (ideological) trick, therefore, is to keep the object at a certain distance in order to sustain the satisfaction derived from the fantasy "if only I had x I could fulfil my dream". Ideology regulates this fantasmatic distance in order to, as it were, avoid the Real in the impossible: i.e. the traumatic aspects involved in any real (impossible) change. This allows for a more nuanced reading of ideologies. Let us take the case of an international crisis: the so-called "liberation of Kuwait" during the 1990s Gulf conflict. Here the ideological discourse tended to operate along the following tines: "we must achieve the liberation of Kuwait ... while recognizing that any true liberation (i.e. abolishing Kuwait's feudal dynasty and setting up democratic structures) is currently impossible." And do we not have something similar with the so-called New World Order? Any real (or indeed Real) attempt to establish such an order would inevitably require traumatic far-reaching changes: global democracy based on universal rights, popular participation, the eradication of poverty and social exclusion (etc.) as part of a genuine "reflexive modernization". However, what we actually have is the routine invocation of the New World Order in term of an indefinite ideal that functions precisely as a way of preventing any real movement towards it. In the Kantian terms of the sublime, any convergence with what might be called the Bush-Blair "axis of Good" would become an unbearable evil. So we have the same type of ideological supplement at work: "we are moving towards a New World Order that will not tolerate the Saddam Husseins of this world... while recognizing that a true New World Order (one that would be intolerant of all the autocrats, royal families and the corporate dictatorships of global capitalism) is currently/always impossible . . ." In this way, impossibility loses its innocence and, far from comprising a simple repressed dimension, is rather something that can be seen to function as an implicit-obscene ideological supplement in today's realpolitik. There is a further potential danger. This concerns especially orthodox trends in politically correct multiculturalism and their distortion of a certain type of alliance politics that seeks to establish chains of equivalence between a widening set of differential struggles around gender, culture, lifestyles and so on. While there is nothing wrong in principle with establishing such forms of solidarity, the problem arises where this type of politics begins to assume, in a commonsense way, a basic levelling of the political terrain where all groups are taken to suffer equally ("we are all victims of the state/global capitalism/repressive forces..."). In other words, there is a danger that equivalential politics becomes so distorted that it becomes a way of disguising the position of those who are truly abject: those who suffer endemic poverty, destitution and repressive violence in our world system. In this way, the abject can become doubly victimized: first by a global capitalist order that actively excludes them; and, second, by an aseptic politically correct "inclusivism" that renders them invisible inside its postmodern forest; its tyranny of differences. For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture - with all its pieties concerning "multiculturalist" [6](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm#6) etiquette - Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called "radically incorrect" in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions [7](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm#7) and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. There is a further potential danger. This concerns especially orthodox trends in politically correct multiculturalism and their distortion of a certain type of alliance politics that seeks to establish chains of equivalence between a widening set of differential struggles around gender, culture, lifestyles and so on. While there is nothing wrong in principle with establishing such forms of solidarity, the problem arises where this type of politics begins to assume, in a commonsense way, a basic levelling of the political terrain where all groups are taken to suffer equally ("we are all victims of the state/global capitalism/repressive forces..."). In other words, there is a danger that equivalential politics becomes so distorted that it becomes a way of disguising the position of those who are truly abject: those who suffer endemic poverty, destitution and repressive violence in our world system. In this way, the abject can become doubly victimized: first by a global capitalist order that actively excludes them; and, second, by an aseptic politically correct "inclusivism" that renders them invisible inside its postmodern forest; its tyranny of differences. For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture - with all its pieties concerning "multiculturalist" [6](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm#6) etiquette - Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called "radically incorrect" in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions [7](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm#7) and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and move recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian- Lacanian twist, the few of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the fives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals; such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal **capitalism is one whose "universalism" fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world**'s **population**. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded "life-chances" cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the "developing world"). And Zizek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a "glitch" in an otherwise sound matrix. Risking the impossible The response of the left to global capitalism cannot be one of retreat into the nation-state or into organicist forms of "community" and popular identities that currently abound in Europe and elsewhere. For Zizek it is, rather, a question of working with the very excesses that, in a Lacanian sense, are in capitalism more than capitalism. It is a question, therefore, of transcending the provincial "universalism" of capitalism. To illustrate the point, Zizek draws attention to the category of "intellectual property" and the increasingly absurd attempts to establish restrictive dominion over technological advances - genetic codes, DNA structures, digital communications, pharmaceutical breakthroughs, computer programs and so on - that either affect us all and/or to which there is a sense of common human entitlement Indeed, the modern conjuncture of capitalism is more and more characterized by a prohibitive culture: the widespread repression of those forms of research and development that have real emancipatory potential beyond exclusive profiteering; the restriction of information that has direct consequences for the future of humanity; the fundamental denial that social equality could be sustained by the abundance generated by capitalism. Capitalism typically endeavors to constrain the very dimensions of the universal that are enabled by it and simultaneously to resist all those developments that disclose its specificity-artificiality as merely one possible mode of being. The left, therefore, must seek to subvert these ungovernable excesses in the direction of a political (and politicizing) universalism; or what Balibar would call égaliberté. This means that the left should demand more globalization not less. Where neo-liberals speak the language of freedom - either in terms of individual liberty or the free movement of goods and capital - the left should use this language to combat today's racist obsessions with "economic refugees", "immigrants" and so on, and insist that freedoms are meaningless without the social resources to participate in those freedoms. Where there is talk of universal rights, the left must affirm a responsibility to the universal; one that emphasizes real human solidarity and does not lose sight of the abject within differential discourses. Reversing the well-known environmentalists' slogan, we might say that the left has to involve itself in thinking locally and acting globally. That is to say, it should attend to the specificity of today's political identities within the context of their global (capitalist) conditions of possibility precisely in order to challenge those conditions. Yet here I would venture that, despite clearly stated differences (Butler et al., 2000), the political perspective of Zizek is not necessarily opposed to that of Laclau and Mouffe and that a combined approach is fully possible. While Zizek is right to stress the susceptibility of today's "alternative" forms of hegemonic engagement to deradicalization within a postmodern-p.c. imaginary - a kind of hegemonization of the very terrain (the politico-cultural conditions of possibility) that produces and predisposes the contemporary logics of hegemony - it is equally true to say that the type of political challenge that Zizek has in mind is one that can only advance through the type of hegemonic subversion that Laclau and Mouffe have consistently stressed in their work. The very possibility of a political universalism is one that depends on a certain hegemonic breaking out of the existing conventions/grammar of hegemonic engagement. It is along these lines that Zizek affirms the need for a more radical intervention in the political imagination. The modem (Machiavellian) view of politics is usually presented in terms of a basic tension between (potentially) unlimited demands/appetites and limited resources; a view which is implicit in the predominant "risk society" perspective where the central (almost Habermasian) concern is with more and better scientific information. The political truth of today's world, however, is rather the opposite of this view. That is to say, the demands of the official left (especially the various incarnations of the Third Way left) tend to articulate extremely modest demands in the face of a virtually unlimited capitalism that is more than capable of providing every person on this planet with a civilized standard of living. **For Zizek, a confrontation with the obscenities of abundance** **capitalism** **also requires** a transformation of the ethico-political imagination. It is no longer a question of developing ethical guidelines within the existing political framework (the various institutional and corporate "ethical committees") but of developing a **politicization of ethics**; **an ethics of the Real**. [8](http://www.lacan.com/zizek-daly.htm#8) **The starting point here is an insistence on the unconditional autonomy of the subject; of accepting that as human beings we are ultimately responsible for our actions and being-in-the-world up to and including the construction of the capitalist system itself** Far from simple norm-making or refining/reinforcing existing social protocol, **an ethics of the Real** **tends to** **emerge through** **norm-breaking and in finding new directions that, by definition, involve traumatic changes**: i.e. the Real in genuine ethical challenge. **An** **ethics of the Real does not** simply **defer to the impossible** (or infinite Otherness) as an unsurpassable -horizon that already marks every act as a failure, incomplete and so on. **Rather, such an ethics is one that fully accepts contingency but which is nonetheless prepared to risk the impossible in** **the sense of breaking out of standardized positions**. We might say that it is an ethics which is not only politically motivated but which also draws its strength from the political itself. For Zizek an ethics of the Real (or Real ethics) means that **we cannot rely on any form of symbolic Other that would endorse our (in)decisions and (in)actions: for example, the 'neutral' financial data of the stockmarkets; the expert knowledge of Beck's 'new modernity' scientists; the eco­nomic and military councils of the New World Order; the various (formal and informal) tribunals of political correct­ness; or any of the mysterious laws of God, nature or the market**. What Zizek affirms is a radical culture of ethical iden­tification for the left in which the alternative forms of mili­tancy must first of all be militant with themselves. That is to say, they must be militant in the fundamental ethical sense of not relying on any external/higher authority and in the development of a political imagination that, like Zizek's own thought, exhorts us to risk the impossible.

**Capitalism is the root cause of all war**

**Revolution Magazine, 2001**

(“Is war inherant to capitalism?” <http://www.worldrevolution.org.uk/index.php?id=6,193,0,0,1,0> Social Youth Movement)

The system we live under, **capitalism, is the root cause of most of the world's problems, and war is an inherent feature of it.  
Under capitalism, the resources, the products of the world, and the means to produce them are controlled by a small number of capitalists. The other 5 billion of us are forced to work for this tiny elite either in factories**, offices or on the land. In return for this "privilege" we get a wage at the end of the week. For the billions who live outside the rich Western countries, this wage, if you're lucky enough to have a job, is barely enough to live on.  
**It is a system that runs on competition, and decisions are made on the basis of profit**. Different companies all compete for market share. They come up with different products not to meet human needs but so they can carve out a bigger market share and make a bigger profit. Nike competes with Adidas and Reebok to sell us different coloured trainers and track suits. Music companies compete to sell us more bland manufactured music like Gareth Gates, Will Young. Britney Spears or Pink. The music is secondary; all that matters is what can be sold and how much profit can be made.  
**Competition is so important to capitalism that it tries to introduce it in to every part of society**. So hospitals compete for patients, universities and schools must compete for students. Public utilities like water companies and train services are privatised and broken up into smaller companies so they can compete for customers. **The end result of this is higher bills, a declining standard of services and lower wages for those who work in the industry**. It makes us compete for jobs, housing and food even though there is more than enough to go around. **It is a system that puts the profits and the interest of the big corporations before the needs and interests of billions of people**.  
Imperialism A result of all this competition is that weaker firms either go bankrupt or get taken over by bigger ones. As companies grow (in many cases into monopolies) they not only compete in their own countries but they start to compete with companies all over the world for access to markets, access to cheaper sources of labour and resources like oil. For example not only does Sainsbury compete with Tesco, but both compete with the US supermarket giant Wal-Mart which owns Asda.  
**The end result of this competition on a global scale is that nation states start to compete for the right to exploit the world's resources and people, and this is what leads to war.** In 1916 the Russian revolutionary **Lenin described this period, where capital and wealth are concentrated into a few hands leading to competition between a few nation states for the control of the world, as imperialism. It was the attempt to re-divide the world for exploitation between the imperialist powers that caused the First and Second World Wars.** Using the theory of imperialism as a guide Lenin illustrated the imperialist nature of the first world war with example of "a slave owner who owned 100 slaves warring against a slave owner who owned 200 slaves for a more 'just' distribution of slaves".  
**This has been the logic behind the pattern of wars in the last century. A few rich countries dominate and control the resources of the rest of the world.** They no longer do this through having formal colonial empires, like those once possessed by Britain and France, but **through the more informal means of chaining entire nations through debt-slavery and swallowing up the economy by the First World's multinationals**. Occasionally, the imperialists quarrel amongst themselves over their share of the loot - leading to wars like the two World Wars of the last century. Occasionally, the slaves rebel against their masters and fight for their independence, leading to wars like Vietnam's long war against French and US imperialism. And occasionally, the imperialists wage wars of conquest against countries whose leaders don't know their place or refuse to play their game - like the first Gulf War or in Nicaragua.

### CONTENTION 2 Is Value to life

#### No value to life under Capitalism

Dillon 99Michael 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 0 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.

#### Capitalism is morally insolvent

Morgareidge 98 (Clayton, HE is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Lewis and Clark College, “Why Capitalism is Evil,” Radio Active Philosophy, http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html-Singh

In recent commentaries for the Old Mole I have been trying to make capitalism look bad -- as bad as it really is.  I have argued that capitalism is war, and that those of us who do not own capital suffer from it just as do civilian populations caught between opposing armies, or as foot soldiers conscripted into armies fighting for interests that are not our own.  I've tried to show that capitalism is the violent negation of democracy, for it is the interests of those who own capital that determine how we live: their jobs, products, services, manufactured culture, and propaganda shape our lives and our minds.   Today I'd like to point to the ways in which capital undermines the foundation of moral life. Well, what is the foundation of moral life?  What makes it possible for human beings to recognize that they have responsibilities to each other and to their communities?  For example: What could possibly make anyone willing to pay living wages to workers in Indonesia or Haiti if you can get them to work for less?  The 18th Century philosopher David Hume asks, What reason can anyone give me to not to prefer the annihilation of all mankind to a scratch on my finger?  Hume is one of many philosophers who argue that no such reason can be given.  This means that the foundation of ethics lies not in reason, but rather in our passions or our hearts. For Hume it is part of our nature that we feel sympathy for each other, and this sympathy counters our narrow self-interest.   Other philosophers have taken similar positions.  Josiah Royce an American philosopher of the last century argued that you do not really understand another person if you do not understand her aspirations, fears, and needs.  But to understand someone's feelings is, in part, to share them.  And you cannot share an aspiration or a need without wanting to see it fulfilled, nor can you share a fear without hoping that it will not come to pass.  So the mere recognition of what other human beings are involves us in wanting to see them live and prosper.  The French-Jewish philosopher Emmanual Levinás whose major work appeared in 1961 claims that ethics arises in the experience of the face of the other. The human face reveals its capacity for suffering, a suffering we are capable of either inflicting or opposing.  So to look into the face of another human being is to *see*the commandment, Thou shalt not kill.  Another American philosopher, Nel Noddings, in her 1984 book Caring, argues that the ethical commitment arises out of the caring response that most of us feel towards those who, like children, are in need.   Most parents encourage this caring response in their children, with the result that we grow up with an interest in cultivating our own capacity to care for others. Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior.  The 20th century proves otherwise.  What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the *capacity* to want the best for each other.   So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response?   This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism.  But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care.  Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism.  Nevertheless, I want to claim, the putting the world at the disposal of those with capital has done more damage to the ethical life than anything else.  To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx.    Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money.  For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own.   Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.[[1]](http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html" \l "_ftn1" \o ")   If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products.  If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well-being of human beings and the planet we live on.  Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life.  The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth.  If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each other’s faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life.  But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry.  In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people.  As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth.  Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do.  Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable.  People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress.  They still think they can't stop it.  And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership.  Only a minority ("idealists")  can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making.   Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.

**Capitalism is the root of racism**

Alex **Taylor**, November 22, **2002**, “The roots of racism”, http://socialistworker.org/2002-2/431/431\_08\_Racism.shtml

Both assumptions are wrong. **Racism isn't just an ideology but is an institution. And its origins don't lie in bad ideas or in human nature. Rather, racism originated with capitalism and the slave trade**. As the Marxist writer CLR James put it, "**The conception of dividing people by race begins with the slave trade. This thing was so shocking, so opposed to all the conceptions of society which religion and philosophers had…that the only justification by which humanity could face it was to divide people into races and decide that the Africans were an inferior race.**" History proves this point. **Prior to the advent of capitalism, racism as a systematic form of oppression did not exist**. For example, **ancient Greek and Roman societies had no concept of race or racial oppression. These weren't liberated societies. They were built on the backs of slaves. And these societies created an ideology to justify slavery.** As the Greek philosopher Aristotle put it in his book Politics, "Some men are by nature free, and others slaves, and that for these latter, slavery is both expedient and right." **However,** because **slavery in ancient Greece and Rome was not racially based, these societies had no corresponding ideology of racial inferiority or oppression.** In fact, Egyptian, Greek, Roman and Early Christian societies had a favorable image of Blacks and of African societies. **Septemus Severenus, an emperor of Rome, was African and almost certainly Black**. "The ancients did accept the institution of slavery as a fact of life; they made ethnocentric judgments of other societies; they had narcissistic canons of physical beauty," writes Howard University professor Frank Snowden in his book Before Color Prejudice. "Yet nothing comparable to the virulent color prejudice of modern time existed in the ancient world. This is the view of most scholars who have examined the evidence."

### Contention 3 is Poverty

#### The reason poverty exists in the first place is because of structural dynamics of capitalism that require exclusion. Colonialism, neoliberalism, and resources exploitation are all symptoms of order that privileges profit over people. History is on our side capitalism has produced massive poverty in Africa because the functioning of the global economy require the subordination and exclusion of the vast majority of the population for the benefit of the wealthy – nature of capitalism requires winners and losers

Magdoff ‘3 [Harry, Approaching socialism]

There is a logical connection between capitalism’s achievements and its failures. The poverty and misery of a large mass of the world’s people is not an accident, some inadvertent byproduct of the system**,** one that can be eliminated with a little tinkeringhere or there**.** The fabulous accumulation of wealth**—**as a direct consequence of the way capitalism works nationally and internationally**—**has simultaneously produced persistent hunger, malnutrition, health problems, lack of water, lack of sanitation, and general misery for a large portion of the people of the world. The difficult situation of so much of humanity partly occurs because the economic system does not produce full employment.Instead**,** capitalismdevelops andmaintainswhat Marx called the reserve army of labor—a large sector of the population that lives precariously, sometimes working, sometimes not.These workers might be needed seasonally, at irregular times, when there is a temporary economic boom, for the military, or not at all. In the wealthy countries**,** members of the reserve army of the unemployedand underemployedare generally the poorest, living under difficult conditions including homelessness.Their very existence maintains a downward pressure on wages for the lower echelons of workers. (For a full discussion, see Fred Magdoff & Harry Magdoff, **“**[**Disposable Workers**](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0404magdoff.htm)**,”** *Monthly Review,* April 2004.)Inthe countries ofcapitalism’s peripherythere are severalfactors **at work** thatmaintainsuchlarge numbers of people in miserable circumstances.Part of the story isthe wealth extracted from the countries of the peripherywhen repatriated profits exceed new investments and natural resourcesare exploited for the wealthy core countries**.** Also**,** banks push loans on countries resulting in even more extraction of wealth from the peripherythrough a system of debt peonage.More and more,the people of the periphery serve as participants in the reserve army of labor for capital from abroad as well as for their own capitalists.The labor forces of many former colonies were created purposefully by breaking up their societies and their way of living. One way this was accomplished was to require that a tax be paid, compelling people to join the money economy. The change from traditional land tenure patterns to one based on private ownership was another way colonial powers undermined the conditions of peasant communities. Andas manypeople are pushedfrom the land andinto urban slumsin the periphery**,** there are not sufficient jobs to absorb the workers, creatinga hugehumanitarian crisis.5 Additionally, the power that goes along with wealth allows the manipulation of the political and legal system to benefit continued accumulation at the expense of the sharing or redistribution that might have occurred in more “primitive” societies. Thewealth of the rich countriesat the center of the capitalist systemdependsheavily to this dayon the extraction of resources and riches from the periphery.…continues…Capitalism**,** through a variety of mechanisms—from outright robbery and colonial domination in the early years to the imperialist relations in its more mature version—continues to reproduce the wealth of the core and the underdevelopment of the periphery**.** It also continues to produce and reproduce a class structure in each country—including a servile ruling class in the periphery with their foreign bank accounts and faith in U.S. military force. The production and continual reproduction of a class structure**,** with an always present reserve army of labormeans that there will always be significant inequality under capitalism.Hierarchy and classes mean that differences prevail at every level and with a large overwhelming number of people with little to no effective power. The distribution of wealthin the U**nited** S**tate**s indicates the extent of inequality**.** The bottom 80 percentof the peopleown less than half the wealththat isowned by the top 1 percent, and the bottom 40 percent of households own 0.3 percent of the total wealth ([table 1](http://www.monthlyreview.org/docs/0705tbl1.pdf)). Differences also persist between regions of countries and among different ethnic groups. For example, in 2002 the average family net worth of whites ($88,000) was eleven times greater than for Hispanics and fourteen times that of blacks (“Wealth gap among races widens in recession,” Associated Press, October 18, 2004). While only 13 percent of white families had zero or negative net worth, close to one-third of black and Hispanic families had no net wealth. Average family incomes of blacks and Hispanics in 2000 were approximately half that of whites. And significantly fewer black males are in the labor force than their white counterparts—67 versus 74 percent participation rates, respectively (2005 Economic Report of the President, <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/eop/>). Little needs to be said about the huge difference in national wealth between the highly developed capitalist countries and those in the periphery. Whilethe average developed country’sper capitaGDP is approximately **$**30,000**,** it is around $6,000 in Latin America and the Caribbean, $4,000 in North Africa, and $2,000 in sub-Saharan Africa. But these numbers hide the worst of the problems, because per capita GDP in Haiti is $1,600, in Ethiopia it is $700, and insix countries in sub-Saharan Africa average per capita income is $600 or less**.** The wealthy countries with 15 percent of the world’s population produce 80 percent of its GDP. On the other hand**,** the poorest countries with close to 40 percent of the world’s population produce only 3 percent of its wealth.

#### Poverty: Uneven distribution of wealth creates deprivation of resources to 80% of the population

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>)

Capitalism, with a number of political variations, has produced more goods, inventions, new ideas, and technological advances than in all of previous history. During the approximately two and a half centuries of industrial capitalism there has been—with the important exceptions of severe recessions, depressions, and wars—nearly continuous expansion of the leading capitalist countries. But what has this enormous progress and development of productive capacities created as far as the living conditions and relations of the people on this earth? On the one hand, there is a significant portion of the world’s population, perhaps 20 percent, that lives in comfort with many opportunities for education, housing, and purchasing a variety of goods almost at will. But within this generally well-off group there is a very uneven distribution of riches, with the wealthiest controlling huge amounts of wealth. The wealthiest 691 people on earth have a net worth of $2.2 trillion, equivalent to the combined annual GDP of 145 countries—more than all of Latin America and Africa combined! The richest 7.7 million people (about 0.1 percent of world’s population), with net financial worth of more than $1 million, control approximately $28.8 trillion—equivalent to 80 percent of the annual gross domestic product of all the countries of the world. This is more than the combined annual GDP of all countries of the world minus the United States. (It actually also encompasses about 40 percent of the U.S. GDP as well.) Despite the huge quantity of wealth produced and accumulated in a few hands, the details of how so much of humanity actually lives—the numbers and conditions of the wretched of the earth—are outrageous. Of the approximately 6.3 billion people in the world: About half of humanity (three billion people) are malnourished and are chronically short of calories, proteins, vitamins, and/or minerals.3 Many more are “food insecure,” not knowing where their next meal is coming from. The UN estimates that “only” 840 million (including ten million in the wealthy core industrialized countries) are undernourished, but this is greatly below most other estimates. One billion live in slums (about one-third of the approximately three billion people living in cities). About half of humanity lives on less than what two dollars a day can purchase in the United States. One billion have no access to clean water. Two billion have no electricity. Two and a half billion have no sanitary facilities. One billion children, half of the world’s total, suffer extreme deprivation because of poverty, war, and disease (including AIDS). Even in wealthy core capitalist countries, a significant portion of the population lives insecure lives. For example, in the United States twelve million families are considered food insecure and in four million families (with nine million people) someone regularly skips a meal so there will be enough food for other family members.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism#en4) Another part of the human condition over the past two and a half centuries of industrial capitalism has been the almost continuous warfare with hundreds of millions of people killed. Occupation, slavery, genocide, wars, and exploitation are part of the continuing history of capitalism. Wars have resulted from capitalist countries fighting among themselves for dominance and access to global markets, from attempts to subjugate colonies or neocolonies, and ethnic or religious differences among people—many of which have been exacerbated by colonial occupation and/or imperial interference. The basic driving force of capitalism, to accumulate capital, compels capitalist countries to penetrate foreign markets and expand their market share. However, it is impossible to separate the leading imperialist countries’ economic drive to invest and sell abroad from their political and military policies—all interests are intertwined in a very dangerous combination. Warfare is continuing in the post-Cold War era—with the United States eager to display its military power—and there is potential for even more misery. The estimate that 100,000 Iraqis have died as a result of the U.S. invasion gives some idea of the magnitude of the disaster that has fallen on that nation.

### Contention 4 is Revolution

**1. Any solution to capitalism must be system wide.**

#### A) Small acts of resistance fail. Reforms fail.

Herod, lecturer University of Mass Boston, 2004 (James, Getting Free 4th ed. Online, http://site.www.umb.edu/ faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/C.htm)

We cannot destroy capitalism with single-issue campaigns. Yet the great bulk of the energies of radicals is spent on these campaigns. There are dozens of them: campaigns to preserve the forests, keep rent control, stop whaling, stop animal experiments, defend abortion rights, stop toxic dumping, stop the killing of baby seals, stop nuclear testing, stop smoking, stop pornography, stop drug testing, stop drugs, stop the war on drugs, stop police brutality, stop union busting, stop red-lining, stop the death penalty, stop racism, stop sexism, stop child abuse, stop the re-emerging slave trade, stop the bombing of Yugoslavia, stop the logging of redwoods, stop the spread of advertising, stop the patenting of genes, stop the trapping and killing of animals for furs, stop irradiated meat, stop genetically modified foods, stop human cloning, stop the death squads in Colombia, stop the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, stop the extermination of species, stop corporations from buying politicians, stop high stakes educational testing, stop the bovine growth hormone from being used on milk cows, stop micro radio from being banned, stop global warming, stop the militarization of space, stop the killing of the oceans, and on and on. What we are doing is spending our lives trying to fix up a system which generates evils far faster than we can ever eradicate them. Although some of these campaigns use direct action (e.g., spikes in the trees to stop the chain saws or Greenpeace boats in front of the whaling ships to block the harpoons), for the most part the campaigns are directed at passing legislation in Congress to correct the problem. Unfortunately, reforms that are won in one decade, after endless agitation, can be easily wiped off the books the following decade, after the protesters have gone home, or after a new administration comes to power. These struggles all have value and are needed. Could anyone think that the campaigns against global warming, or to free Leonard Peltier, or to aid the East Timorese ought to be abandoned? Single issue campaigns keep us aware of what's wrong, and sometimes even win. But in and of themselves, they cannot destroy capitalism, and thus cannot really fix things. It is utopian to believe that we can reform capitalism. Most of these evils can only be eradicated for good if we destroy capitalism itself and create a new civilization. We cannot afford to aim for anything less. Our very survival is at stake. There is one single-issue campaign I can wholehearted endorse: the total and permanent eradication of capitalism.

**B) Our solutions must be political. We must act by repeating Lenin and calling for socialism.**

Slavoj Zizek in 2002**(“Plea for Leninist Intolerance,” Critical Inquiry, Winter, http://www.lacan.com/zizek-plea.htm)**

The idea is not to return to Lenin, but to repeat him in the Kierkegaardian sense, to retrieve the same impulse in today's constellation. The return to Lenin aims neither to nostalgically reenact the good old revolutionary times, nor to opportunistically-pragmatically adjust the old program to "new conditions" but to repeat, in present worldwide conditions, the Leninist gesture of reinventing the revolutionary project in the conditions of imperialism and colonialism. Or, more precisely, subsequent to the politico-ideological collapse of the long era of progressivism founded upon the catastrophe of 1914. Eric Hobsbawn defined the concept of the twentieth century as the time between 1914, the end of the long peaceful expansion of capitalism, and 1990, the emergence of the new form of global capitalism after the collapse of "really existing socialism." 13 What Lenin did for 1914 we should do for 1990. "Lenin" stands for the compelling freedom to suspend the stale, existing (post)ideological coordinates, the debilitating Denkverbot in which we live. This simply means that we obtain the right to think again. A Cyberspace Lenin? Lenin's stance against economism as well as against pure politics is crucial today, apropos of the split attitude toward economy in (what remains of) the radical circles. On the one hand, there are the pure politicians who abandon economy as the site of struggle and intervention; on the other hand, there are the economists, fascinated by the functioning of today's global economy, who preclude any possibility of a political intervention proper. **Today more than ever we should return to Lenin: yes, the economy is the key domain, the battle will be decided there; one has to break the spell of global capitalism. But the intervention should be properly political, not economic.**

**The plan invests resources into public works projects to create better infrastructures in poor communities, such a move is necessary to move the poor out of poverty**

Wilsdon 2005 (Tony “How Capitalism Breeds Poverty” http://www.socialistalternative.org/ literature/katrina/logic.html)

Time for a Radical Change: The class and race issues brought up by this tragedy show the desperate need for a radical change in U.S. society. The hundreds of thousands left abandoned in the poor areas of New Orleans without jobs, with crumbling schools, lack of public hospitals, and without any hope of getting them have given Americans a glimpse of the ugly underbelly of this system. As an immediate first step, we need to enact a massive public works program to rebuild the region of New Orleans and other devastated areas of Louisiana and Mississippi. This should be done by offering jobs and, if needed, training to those who have been displaced. The millions of unemployed and underemployed in the region should also be hired. This work should all be done at a living wage, and with full union rights and benefits. However, conditions in New Orleans are an extreme example of the dire conditions facing tens of millions of workers in other cities and regions of the country. We need to set up similar massive programs of public works in these other cities and regions. This would include work to rebuild the infrastructure, build quality public housing, hospitals, transportation, schools, etc. Reallocation of investment and the hiring of unemployed workers could create new productive industries and factories, which would provide for the needs of working-class people living in those communities. Such a rebuilding of the economy could ensure every person in the country had decent housing, a guaranteed living wage, access to quality healthcare and child care, and security in their old age. Funding must also be made available to clean up environmental pollution, and to reallocate scientists to address the massive environmental problems related to global warming and work out a plan to reverse them. An Alternative to Capitalism We should be under no illusions that the capitalist system can do this. The sizeable period of economic growth of the 1950s and 1960s is over. It was based on the period of the explosive emergence of U.S. capitalism during the turn of the last century, and a temporary period of worldwide superiority of U.S. manufacturing in the aftermath of World War II. Today, we see a world economic slowdown, with U.S. corporations shutting down production here in search of areas that produce higher rates of profit. The economic engine of jobs, which helped some workers in previous generations to get out of the ghettos, will not be reoccurring. The vast majority of jobs created under Clinton and Bush have been low-wage jobs, which have replaced higher-wage jobs. Under the rule of capitalism, the majority of the public faces further sharp attacks on their living standards and quality of life, with a growing number being forced into dire poverty, homelessness, and destitution. Capitalism is a system designed to produce for private profit, not for public need. It is only by taking decision-making out of the corporate boardrooms and placing them under the democratic control of the majority that the economy can provide for our needs. To do that, we need to bring into public ownership the largest 500 corporations and financial institutions. If the assets of these giant companies were under our democratic control, then investment and resources could be democratically controlled by working-class people. Resources would be available to address our most pressing social problems and allocated to areas of most need. To achieve this means breaking from giving any support to the two big-business political parties - the Republicans and Democrats. They are both fully implicated in creating the present mess we are in. We need to build a new political party to represent our interests as workers, the poor, and young people, and which points a finger at the real villains, the super-rich and the capitalist system. Freed from control by corporate sponsors, this workers' party could put forward a program that addresses our needs. It would be able to end this system of capitalism, which has been responsible for enriching a tiny group of billionaires at a time of massive need and poverty. We could then create a new democratic socialist society, where the working-class majority would have the power rather than the 1% who are rewarded under this system

**Socialism Undoes Evils of Capitalism**

Gravediggers 08 Capitalism’s Gravediggers; 21 May 2008, 22:33; World Socialist Movement; found: June 26, 2009 http://www.capitalismsgravediggers.info/index.php?display=capitalismsgravediggers.info

Capitalism causes poverty. Socialism has never been tried. Socialism is not about emotional hype, or hating anyone. Socialists want you to understand how capitalism works and why it cannot serve the interests of the working class (everyone who must work, or depend upon social programs, for a living). When people understand why capitalism cannot work for them, the structure of society needed to solve our problems becomes clear. Very briefly, socialism must mean: No Money - because socialism means common ownership. No Poverty and No Wages - because all work will be voluntary, and people will just take what they need from what is produced. No Government - because governments rule over people. Socialist administration will be real democracy. No Countries - because countries are artificial divisions between people which do not serve the majority. No Wars - because the causes of wars (ownership and control of resources, trade routes, and markets, and the poverty caused by capitalism) will be gone. All of the other supposed causes of war (including greed, power madness, “self-determination of peoples”, racism and religion) fall into, or result from, the previous general categories.

**Non-privatized public transportation infrastructure is critical to transferring to socialism**

**Pucher, 1990 (John, associate professor in the Department of Urban Planning at Rutgers University, “Capitalism, Socialism, and Urban Transportation Policies and Travel Behavior in the East and West,” Journal of the American Planning Association, 56:3)**

A more basic difference among the countries compared here is the degree of **public ownership of the means of production**, which is-by the very nature of their socialist economies-extremely high in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and much lower in the capitalist economies of Western Europe and North America. It is not simply a large public sector that **has engendered** such **a strong commitment to public transportation in socialist countries**. Rather, this commitment is **based on the fundamental ideological opposition to most private ownership**, especially in the past, prior to the current attempts to increase economic efficiency by selectively introducing market incentives. **Automobile-based transportation systems require high levels of private ownership, while public transport systems**-both in socialist and capitalist countries-**are almost always publicly owned**. Thus, public policies toward transportation have not evolved exogenously, but rather have reflected the. very different social and economic contexts found in each country. In this respect, **urban transportation systems and travel behavior mirror many aspects of society as a whole**, indeed, perhaps **more visibly than** almost **any other public** service or **institution**. The automobile, for example, by enabling almost unlimited freedom of movement and location, embodies the principles of individualism, privatism, consumerism, and high mobility (Warner 1972, 113-49). By contrast, **public transport depends on and fosters communalism, planned transportation and land use systems**, restricted mobility, and less individual freedom of choice both in travel and location. Indeed, some might argue that socialist governments deliberately restrict mobility-just as they restrict telecommunicationsin order to keep the population under control. In their urban transportation policies, socialist countries sacrifice the personal freedom of the individual supposedly for the good of society as a whole, as indicated perhaps by the perceived environmental, social, and economic advantages of public transport over the automobile (Sankov 1986; Saitz 1988; Vlassov 1984; White 1979; Dumov 1985). Some socialist **governments may** even **view public transport as an expression of social cohesiveness, solidarity, and**-in some sense-perhaps of **Communism itself (**Bater 1980, 10-3 1 ; Blair 1985). **This** very notion **is**, of course, **anathema to capitalist, market-oriented societies**, where each individual is expected to maximize only his or her own well-being, without considering impacts on society as a whole (Samuelson and Nordhaus 1985, 41-58). The designations of the various modes suggest this difference, with the automobile often being referred to as private or individual transportation, while public transport is variously termed mass transit, communal transport, or public transportation. The private-versuspublic aspects of the two modes are obvious; it is little wonder that governments in countries with different economic systems would prefer one or the other, expressing this preference through public policies (Bater 1980; Vlassov 1984; Sankov 1986).

**Our call for a socialist state is the perfect utopian political act that can challenge the prevailing order. Don’t believe the negatives claims of totalitarianism and violence. This is the capitalist system’s attempt to annihilate true freedom and stifle change. Only by returning to Lenin, and repeating his call for a centralized, socialist state, can we truly end capitalism.**

Slavoj Zizek 2002 (“A Plea for Leninist Intolerance,” Critical Inquiry, Winter 2002, http://www.lacan.com/zizek-plea.htm)

The entire history of the Soviet Union can be comprehended as homologous to Freud's famous image of Rome, a city whose history is sedimented in its present in the guise of different layers of archeological remainders, each new level covering up the preceding one, like the seven layers of Troy. One must proceed like an archeologist, discovering Soviet history's new layers by probing deeper and deeper into the ground. Was the (official ideological) history of the Soviet Union not the same accumulation of exclusions of Freud's Rome, of turning persons into nonpersons, of the retroactive rewriting of history? Quite logically, destalinization was signalled by the opposite process of rehabilitation, of admitting "errors" in the past politics of the Party. The gradual rehabilitation of the demonized ex-leaders of the Bolsheviks can thus serve as perhaps the most sensitive index of how far (and in what direction) the destalinization of the Soviet Union was going. The first to be rehabilitated were the high military leaders shot in 1937 (Tukhachevsky and others); the last to be rehabilitated, already in the Gorbachev era, just before the collapse of the Communist regime, was Nicolay Ivanovich Bukharin. This last rehabilitation, of course, was a clear sign of the turn toward capitalism: the Bukharin who was rehabilitated was the one who, in the twenties, advocated the pact between workers and peasants (owners of their land), launching the famous slogan "Get rich!" and opposed forced collectivization. Significantly, however, one figure was never rehabilitated, excluded by the communists as well as by the anticommunist Russian nationalists: Trotsky, the "wandering Jew" of the Revolution, the true anti-Stalin, the archenemy, opposing "permanent revolution" to the idea of **building socialism in one country**. One is tempted to risk here the parallel with Freud's distinction between primordial (founding) and secondary repression in the unconscious; for Trotsky's exclusion amounted to something like the primordial repression of the Soviet state, to something that cannot ever be readmitted through "rehabilitation," since the entire order relied on this negative gesture of exclusion. (It is fashionable to claim that the irony of Stalin's politics from 1928 onwards was that it effectively was a kind of permanent revolution, a permanent state of emergency in which revolution repeatedly devoured its own children. However, this claim is misleading, because the Stalinist terror is the paradoxical result of the attempt to stabilize the Soviet Union into a state like any other, with firm boundaries and institutions; terror was a gesture of panic, a defense reaction against the threat to this state stability.) So Trotsky is the one for whom there is a place neither in the pre-1990 nor in the post-1990 capitalist universe in which even the Communist nostalgics don't know what to do with Trotsky's permanent revolution. Perhaps the signifier Trotsky is the most appropriate designation of that which is worth redeeming in the Leninist legacy. The problem with those few remaining orthodox "Leninists" who behave as if one can simply recycle the old Leninism, continuing to speak on themes like class struggle and the betrayal by the corrupted leaders of the working masses' revolutionary impulses, is that it is not quite clear from which subjective position of enunciation they speak. They either engage themselves in passionate discussions about the past (demonstrating with admirable erudition how and where the anticommunist "Leninologists" falsify Lenin, and so forth), in which case they avoid the question of why (apart from a purely historical interest) this matters at all today, or, the closer they get to contemporary politics, the closer they are to adopting some purely jargonistic pose that threatens no one. Their symptomatic point emerges apropos of every new social upheaval (the disintegration of real socialism ten years ago, the fall of Milosevic); in each of these cases, they identify some working class movement (say, the striking miners in Serbia) that allegedly displayed a true revolutionary or, at least, Socialist potential, but was first exploited and then betrayed by the procapitalist and/or nationalist forces. This way, one can continue to dream that revolution is round the corner; all we need is the authentic leadership that would be able to organize the workers' revolutionary potential. If one is to believe them, Solidarnosc was originally a workers' democratic-socialist movement, later "betrayed" by the corruption of its leadership by the Church and the CIA. And if we add to this position four further ones, we get a pretty full picture of the sad predicament of today's Left: the acceptance of the cultural wars (feminist, gay, antiracist, multiculturalist struggles) as the dominant terrain of emancipatory politics; the purely defensive protection of the achievements of the welfare state; the naive belief in cybercommunism (the idea that the new media are directly creating conditions for a new, authentic community); and, finally, the Third Way, capitulation itself. The reference to Lenin should serve as the signifier of the effort to break the vicious circle of these false options. Consequently, to repeat Lenin does not mean a return to Lenin. To repeat Lenin is to accept that Lenin is dead, that his particular solution failed, even failed monstrously, but that there was a utopian spark in it worth saving. To repeat Lenin means that one has to distinguish between what Lenin actually did and the field of possibilities that he opened up, the tension in Lenin between what he effectively did and another dimension one might call what was "in Lenin more than Lenin himself." There are parts of Lenin that should simply be abandoned today. It may appear attractive to reassert the lesson of Lenin's Materialism and Empirico-criticism apropos of today's New Age reading of quantum physics, where, also, matter is supposed to "disappear," to dissolve in the immaterial waves of energy fields. It is also true (as Lucio Colletti emphasized) that Lenin's distinction between the philosophical and scientific notion of matter undermines the very notion of dialectics in or of nature; because the philosophical notion of matter holds that reality exists independently of mind, any intervention of philosophy into the sciences is precluded. However... this "however" concerns the fact that, in Materialism and Empiricocriticism, there is no place for dialectics, for Hegel. What are Lenin's basic theses? He rejects the reduction of knowledge to phenomenalist or pragmatic instrumentalism (namely, the assertion that, in scientific knowledge, we get to know the way things exist independently of our mindsthe infamous "theory of reflection") and insists on the precarious nature of our knowledge (which is always limited, relative, and "reflects" external reality only in the infinite process of approximation). Does this not sound familiar? Is this, in the Anglo-Saxon tradition of analytical philosophy, not the basic position of Karl Popper, the archetypal anti-Hegelian? In his short article "Lenin and Popper," Colletti recalls how, in a private letter from 1970, first published in Die Zeit, Popper wrote: "Lenin's book on empirico-criticism is, in my opinion, truly excellent".26 To repeat Lenin is to repeat not what Lenin did, but what he failed to do, his missed opportunities. Today, Lenin appears as a figure from a different era: it's not that his notions such as a centralized party seem to pose a totalitarian threat; it's rather that they seem to belong to a different epoch to which we can no longer properly relate. However, instead of reading this fact as proof that Lenin is outdated, one should, perhaps, risk the opposite conjecture. What if this impenetrability of Lenin is a sign that there is something wrong with our epoch, that a certain historical dimension is disappearing from it.

### Contention 5 is Framework

#### Framework:

#### Our interpretation: the round should be judged by the team that endorses the best method to confront suffering.

#### Methodology is the foremost point of departure to any political query. You should prioritize epistemology first because the way you think about problems determines how you respond to them and the consequences they engender.

Smith ‘96

[Steve, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, “Positivism and Beyond,” International theory: Positivism and beyond, New York: Cambridge University Press, 12-1 3//

But the stakes are also high because of the links between theory and practice. International theory underpins and informs international practice, even if there is a lengthy lag between the high- point of theories and their gradual absorption into political debate. Once established as common sense, theories become incredibly powerful since they delineate not simply what can be known but also what it is sensible to talk about or suggest. Those who swim outside these safe waters risk more than simply the judgement that their theories are wrong; their entire ethical or moral stance may be ridiculed or seen as dangerous iust because their theoretical assumptions are deemed as unrealistic. Defining common sense is therefore the ultimate act of political power. In this sense what is at stake in debates about epistemology is very significant for political practice. Theories do not simply explain or predict, they tell us what possibilities exist for human action and intervention they define not merely our explanatory possibilities but also our ethical and practical horizons. In this Kantian light epistemology matters, and the stakes are far more considerable than at first sight seem to be the case.

#### Reasons to prefer our framework

Discussing and evaluating policy is much less intellectually rigorous then debating and critiquing our discourse. By debating critically oriented discussions, it makes evaluating policy options and decisions in our everyday lives comparatively much easier.

Our criticism comes first - A critical perspective of things is best because ontology determines how we view things and their effects. We need to know if the policies that we come up are rooted in something that is true, or if they are just modeled in a certain way so that we can rationalize for the bad things that happen in the advancement of capital gain.

Second, Political utility outweighs theoretical considerations - Some of us are going to become government workers so we should focus on becoming active citizens to strengthen our hold on the world. What we affirm actually changes things, whereas other more policy oriented affs don’t. We speak out against the injustices of capitalism from an internal standpoint and form a much freer way of expression.

We provide the best education – The type of education we provide teaches us to analyze course of action, think deeper about how we got into the problems we need to solve in the first place. This is better since we learn to question our assumptions, which is more politically and personally useful.

The debate is still fair –Criticizing capitalism is a predictable stance in debate, which they should be prepared for.

#### Voting for the affirmative is to reject the capitalistic ideology. Our role is to take sides in the ongoing class struggle.

Tumino ‘2 (Stephen, Professor at Pitt, English Professor at Pitt, “Pierre Bourdieu as New Global Intellectual for Capital,” The Red Critique 6, September/October, <http://redcritique.org/SeptOct02/pierrebourdieuasnewglobalintellectualforcapital.htm>)

It is only such a scientific knowledge of social totality as provided by classical Marxism that can produce an understanding not only of the effects, but of the causes of inequality in capitalism and therefore of what needs to be done to change it. By merely contesting the political dominance of capital and its symbolic mystique through ethical performances of symbolic disinvestments in "cultural capital" while failing to provide a scientific (i.e., materially causal) knowledge of the social, the figure of the new global intellectual in Bourdieu's writings reinscribes the ruling ideas that as a totality make cultural changes at the level of the superstructure more important than meeting the need for what Marx calls "theory as a material force" (*Reader* 60)—"theory […] capable of seizing the masses" because it "grasp[s] things by the root" (60). The "root" of social inequality is not "knowledge" but "labor". The differences in knowledges available in a society reflect differences in labor, especially the amount of time people have after performing the socially necessary labor required for them to live. For the majority this time is mostly spent in performing surplus-labor for the capitalist who realizes a profit from it. This class division of labor between the many who are wage-slaves for the few who own the means of production will not change with changes in lifestyle and knowledge, by the voluntary sacrifice of the privileges that come with performing intellectual labor for example. It will only change when the workers "expropriate the expropriators" (Marx *Capital* Vol. 1 929) and form "an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" ("Manifesto" 506). Because of the high technical level of development of the productive forces such a revolution presupposes workers who have already become class conscious, i.e., "raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement [of class society] as a whole". In other words, the historical materialist theorization of class consciousness in Marxism presupposes that "the time [...] of revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past" (*Reader* 570) as capitalism itself has already produced a proletarian vanguard, that "most advanced and resolute section" ("Manifesto" 497) of "the proletariat [that] is already ***conscious*** of its historic task and is continually working to bring this consciousness to full clarity" (*Reader* 135) in the social movements. What is required of the intellectual because of these conditions is not to perform exemplary actions but to take sides in the ongoing class struggle at the level of theory where, "The ***only*** choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology [for] in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above class ideology" (Lenin *What Is To Be Done?* 41).

#### Intervening into the ballot economy to block any from approving the capitalist resolution is essential – we must stifle the circulation of capital wherever possible to create new sites of solidarity

**Gharavi, 2012 (May 19, Maryam Monalisa, Ph.D. candidate in Comparative Literature and Film & Visual Studies at Harvard University, “In Defense of Spontaneous Contestation and/or Beauty,” The New Inquiry,** [**http://thenewinquiry.com/blogs/southsouth/in-defense-of-spontaneous-contestation-andor-beauty/**](http://thenewinquiry.com/blogs/southsouth/in-defense-of-spontaneous-contestation-andor-beauty/)**)**

His starting point: **design is a marker and site for neoliberal markets. One might choose to read ‘design’ broadly as self-enclosed, highly produced spaces**, ergo your basic mall, museum, amusement park, or sports arena. If design is a repository for obscured market power, Ricardo reasoned, then **those lacking power could intervene with ‘microgestures’ that allow power to stage itself**. In 1985 he performed such a microgesture at a site he viewed as part of an ‘exit culture’ of Disneyfied commodity exchange. **He** bought various packaged commodities—toys and electronics and so forth—but instead of going home he opened them at the exit door of a mall and began displaying and playing with them. Soon a crowd would gather, which inevitably set off mall security and then the police. The kind of person who acquires packaged goods but doesn’t go home is typically a war vet, drug dealer, or homeless person, all of whom invite police attention because they are perceived to be trespassers. **Bodies that deny the process of flow**—by now it is as common to hear move along, there’s nothing to see here in colloquial form as it is to read it in a volume of French theory—**are considered a blockage. Ricardo’s body became an instant site of blockage as a community of people formed around him at precisely** the designated exit point at a shopping mall. He describes this—completely seriously, I might add—**as an act of sabotage**, accounting for the origin of the word ‘saboteur’ as women factory workers who wore wooden sabots at the mill so they could stick them in the machines (Fr. saboter, ‘kick with sabots, willfully destroy’). During the Industrial Revolution, machines replaced workers at an alarming rate throughout Europe, and the once stable economy of guild and craft shop members who had performed manual labor for generations found their very welfare threatened. To protest machine replacement of workers, the workers would toss their shoes into the machine works to make them stop—sabotage. Since his work in the 1980s with the Critical Art Ensemble and the Electronic Disturbance Theater **Ricardo and his cohort have explained streets as dead capital. The streets’ primary design is to aid the flow of people and traffic, and even minor blockages** such as the mall exit experiment **are bound to perk up the antenna of even the laziest squad patrol. If flesh-and-blood bodies are being subjected to unprecedented curbs on freedom** of movement and assembly, then a **virtual alliance with data-bodies retains the possibility to return some power back to the disenfranchised**: ‘[W]e put forth our idea that all digital actions must be part of parallel street action. That via transparency and simulations data bodies and real bodies could act in unison.’ This seems inarguable, especially given how (1) activists have at least since the 2004 DNC and RNC conventions coordinated their real-bodies via TXTMobbing, a technology developed for communicating and reporting in real-time in 160 characters, a direct predecessor to Twitter, Inc., and continue to do so on an exponential level, (2) popular awareness about virtual networks of hackers, hacker cultures, and the liquid potential of the web (e.g. Anonymous, LulzSec, Wikileaks) seems more diffuse than ever, and (3) **allegiance and retaliation for the wrongs done to real-body activists** by police, the FBI, the Justice Department, among others, **have often been exacted by data-body activists**—in fact, sometimes those wrongs are so egregious and the inculcated parties so powerless that **appealing to collectives like Anonymous has became a foreseeable form of real-body/data-body solidarity.**

**The impacts of voting affirmative is taking the correct stance of the massive form of largely accepted global suffering that is capitalism**

## Extensions

### War Extension

#### Ideological belief that ‘interdependence is peace’ whereas ‘disconnection is war’ prompts military interventions to ensure smoothness of neoliberal trading

**Roberts et al ‘3 (Susan Roberts, Anna Secor and Matthew Sparke, Depts. of Geography, U. of Kentucky and Washington, “Neoliberal Geopolitics,” http://faculty.washington.edu/sparke/neoliberalgeopolitics.pdf)**

Barnett’s work is our main example in this paper of a more widespread form of neoliberal geopolitics implicated in the war-making.

**This geopolitical world vision,** we argue, **is closely connected to neoliberal idealism about the virtues of free markets, openness, and global economic integration**. Yet, linked as it was to an extreme form of American unilateralism, we further want to highlight how the neoliberal geopolitics of the war planners illustrated the contradictory dependency of multilateral neoliberal deregulation on enforced re-regulation and, in particular, on the deadly and far from multilateral re-regulation represented by the “regime change” that has now been enforced on Iraq. Such re-regulation underlines the intellectual importance of studying how neoliberal marketization dynamics are hybridized and supplemented by various extraeconomic forces. **Rather than making neoliberalism into a totalizing economic master narrative**, we therefore suggest that **it is vital to examine its interarticulation with certain dangerous supplements, including**, not least of all, **the violence of American military force**. We are not arguing that the war is completely explainable in terms of neoliberalism, nor that neoliberalism is reducible to American imperialism. Instead, **the point is to explore how a certain globalist and economistic view of the world**, **one associated with neoliberalism, did service in legitimating the war while simultaneously finessing America’s all too obvious departure from the “end of the nation-state” storyline. Armed with their simple master narrative about the inexorable force of economic globalization, neoliberals famously hold that the global extension of free-market reforms will ultimately bring worldwide peace and prosperity**. Like Modernity and Development before it, Globalization is thus narrated as the force that will lift the whole world out of poverty as more and more communities are integrated into the capitalist global economy. In the most idealist accounts, such as those of New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman (1999:xviii), the process of marketized liberalization is represented as an almost natural phenomenon which, “like the dawn,” we can appreciate or ignore, but not presume to stop. Observers and critics of neoliberalism as an emergent system of global hegemony, however, insist on noting the many ways in which states actively foster the conditions for global integration, directly or through international organizations such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization (Gill 1995). Under what we are identifying as neoliberal geopolitics, there appears to have been a new development in these patterns of state-managed liberalization. **The economic axioms of structural adjustment, fiscal austerity, and free trade have now, it seems, been augmented by the direct use of military force**. At one level, **this conjunction of capitalism and war-making is neither new nor surprising** (cf Harvey 1985). Obviously, **many wars**—including most 19th- and 20th-century imperial wars—**have been fought over fundamentally economic concerns**. Likewise, one only has to read the reflections of one of America’s “great” generals, Major General Smedley Butler, to get a powerful and resonant sense of the long history of economically inspired American militarism. “I served in all commissioned ranks from Second Lieutenant to Major General,” Butler wrote in his retirement, [a]nd during that period, I spent most of that time being a high-class muscle-man for Big Business, for Wall Street and for the Bankers. In short I was a racketeer, a gangster for capitalism. I suspected I was part of a racket at the time. Now I am sure of it. I helped make Honduras “right” for American fruit companies in 1903. I helped make Mexico, especially Tampico, safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street. The record of racketeering is long. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909–1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. In China I helped to see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested.(quoted in Ali 2002:260). If it was engaged in a kind of gangster capitalist interventionism at the previous fin-de-siècle, today’s American war-making has been undertaken in a much more open, systematic, globally ambitious, and quasi-corporate economic style. Al Capone’s approach, has, as it were, given way to the new world order of Jack Welch. To be sure, **the Iraq war was, in some respects, a traditional national, imperial war aimed at the monopolization of resources**. It was, after all, partly a war about securing American control over Iraqi oil. Russia’s Lukoil and France’s TotalFinaElf will thereby lose out vis-à-vis Chevron and Exxon; more importantly, the US will now be able to function as what Christian Parenti (2003) calls an “energy gendarme” over key oil supplies to East Asia and Europe. Other, still more narrowly national circuits of American capitalism benefited from the war—including, for example, Kellogg Brown and Root, a subsidiary of Vice President Dick Cheney’s Halliburton that, having helped the Pentagon orchestrate the destruction of Iraqi infrastructure, is now receiving generous contracts to rebuild Iraqi infrastructure using proceeds from Iraq’s “liberated” oil sales. But these classically imperial aspects of the hostilities are not our main focus here. Instead, our central concern is with how **a neoliberal world vision has served to obscure these more traditional geopolitics beneath Panglossian talk of global integration and (what are thereby constructed as) its delinquent others**. **In the neoliberal approach, the geopolitics of interimperial rivalry, the Monroe doctrine, and the ideas about hemispheric control** that defined Butler’s era **are eclipsed by a new global vision of almost infinite openness and interdependency**. In contrast also to the Cold War era, danger is no longer imagined as something that should be contained at a disconnected distance. Now, by way of a complete counterpoint, **danger is itself being defined as disconnection from the global system. In turn, the neoliberal geopolitical response**, it seems, **is to insist on enforcing reconnection**—or, as Friedman (2003:A27) put it in an upbeat postwar column, “aggressive engagement.” It would be wrong, of course, to suggest that even this vision is brand new. Much like the broken neoliberal record of “globalization is inexorable,” the vision can be interpreted as yet another cover for the century-old package of liberal development nostrums that critics (eg Smith 2003) and apologists (eg Bacevich 2002) alike argue lie at the defining heart of “American Empire.” But what distinguishes this moment of neoliberal geopolitics is that **the notion of enforced reconnection is today mediated through a whole repertoire of neoliberal ideas and practices**, ranging from commitments to market-based solutions and public-private part- nerships to concerns with networking and flexibility to mental maps of the planet predicated on a one-world vision of interdependency. Thomas Barnett merely represents one particularly audacious and influential embodiment of this trend.

#### The trade as war metaphor creates discursive conditions for literal warfare and creates an expectation of conflict.

**Eubanks 2k (Philip, Associate Prof. and Acting Chair, Dept. of English, NIllinois Univ., A War of Words in the Discourse of Trade: The Rhetorical Constitution of Metaphor, Southern Illinois UP, 1st ed., p. 58-60)**

**Trade Is War as Harbinger of War** The final move back to the literal is not the same as Trade Is War's first link with the literal. It is not that Trade Is War entails a literal trade is peace, but that **Trade Is War pushes the discourse of trade from a dis­cussion of aggressive trade practices into a discussion of literal war**. Brookes nudges the discussion in this direction by mentioning that “Mr. Mosbacher [is] emboldened by his success in substantially modifying the FSX agreement (to build a fighter plane with Japan).” Inevitably, it seems, the topic widens to include World War II, with images of Japanese Ze­ros easily called to mind, and reviving the lingering U.S. fear that Japan cannot be trusted with military power. **The discussion of trade war thinly conceals a discussion of actual war—one of the main reasons that Trade Is War is so often ascribed to others**, and one of the reasons its mappings are so often attenuated. **Trade Is War's push toward the literal is especially evident when the discussion involves Japan**. **For example**, when trade writers describe a dispute involving Canadian and American beers as “a longstanding trade war,” the contiguity of literal war does not show itself (French). Instead the metaphor remaps into a dispute among families: “the heart of the feud” (French). But literal war with Japan remains easily evoked. In Cross­fire's discussion of Super 301 (see chapter 1), John Sununu jabs, “You keep asking why we don't put the focus on the Japanese. We are putting the focus on Japan. But **we also read history. And what happened in the world before World War II is a trade war that cost everybody**.” Similarly, Mitsubishi chairman Akio Morita, during an earlier time of trade fric­tion, is quoted, “Things appear to have gotten as bad as they were on the eve of World War II” (Jameson). Sometimes the literalizing maneuver is reversed, going from literal to metaphoric—underscoring the irony of current war metaphors. Sean O'Leary, tongue-in-cheek columnist for Visual Merchandising and Store Design, makes deft use of the Trade Is War metaphor with such locutions as, “The Japanese citizenry, foot solders of the economic miracle, is get­ting the imperial shaft at the retail level.” This comes, however, on the heels of a textual progress from literal to metaphoric. The article begins with a discussion of the Japanese Shogunate and moves to a burlesque of Perry's opening of relations: “'Listen,' said Commodore Perry. 'We'd like you to do business with us.' He came back a year later with a larger fleet, to hear the decision.” Next, O'Leary specifies the link between war and trade: “The rapid growth of Japan's world economic empire rivals the flowering of our own military machine.” Only then does he move to the metaphoric realm of Japanese economic foot soldiers and an Ameri­can counterinvasion of McDonald's and shopping malls. Finally, Trade Is War comes into intercourse with the literal as the metaphor itself becomes literalized. That is, **the metaphor Trade Is War stands side-by-side with the literal notion that trade is war (really). This literalization occurs when people believe that economic warfare is part and parcel of military war. Economic warriors extend the category of war to include acts of economic aggression ranging from predatory pricing to industrial espionage—or sabotage**. More typically, **the literalization of the metaphor occurs in ascriptions of Trade Is War to others**, usually the Japanese. In Rising Sun, Michael Crichton ascribes Trade Is War/trade is peace to the Japanese in order to accuse them of out-of-bounds trade practices. Likewise, and yet more dramatically, Tom Clancy's Debt of Honor casts the Japanese as aggressors who use both military and eco­nomic techniques to attack the United States. In Clancy's novel, Japan militarily occupies the American-owned Mariana Islands, while simul­taneously sabotaging computer records on Wall Street. Both acts culmi­nate a nefarious investment scheme through which the Japanese under­mine the value of American currency. It is perhaps a testimony to the attractiveness of Japan-bashing that Clancy's novel has enjoyed consid­erable success. But it is also testimony to the deep entrenchment of Trade Is War that it can be literalized as the plot of popular fiction.

### Genocide Extension

#### The inherent use-value within the capitalist order negates the value to life and makes genocide and extinction inevitable.

Kovel 02 (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard, The Enemy of Nature, pg 140-141)

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. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accom­panied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities.

#### Encouraging the capitalist attitude is basically refortifying the slavery and genocide of founding American ideas.

Lindsay 10—(Peta, She is a Youth and Student “Columbus Day: US Capitalism Built on Slavery, Genocide”, Red Ant Liberation Army News, October 11, 2010, http://redantliberationarmy.wordpress.com/2010/10/11/columbus-day-u-s-capitalism-built-on-slavery-genocide) –Singh

The slave trade provided the European and U.S. ruling classes with centuries of free labor. In the 1600s, the Spanish began using African slaves in gold and silver mines. Most European colonies used the plantation system to produce sugar, cotton, tobacco, indigo, rice and othe1r crops for export to the European market. This process provided Europe with enough material wealth to spur the rapid advances in technological development and production known as the Industrial Revolution. Even today some U.S. companies can trace their success to profits made from slavery. A 2002 lawsuit against AETNA insurance, CSX and Fleet Boston sought reparations for African Americans from these companies based on their participation in the slave system. AETNA made its money insuring slaves as the property of their masters. CSX is the present permutation of a company that used slave labor to lay railroad tracks. Fleet Boston is a bank that was founded by a slave trader. The lawsuit is important because it raises the African American community’s just demand for reparations and at tacks the greedy profiteers of slavery. It insists that African Americans be compensated for centuries of forced labor and discrimination. These historical conditions created the economic disparity faced by African Americans in the U.S. today. It is not only specific companies that owe reparations; the U.S. government must pay as well. Slave labor built the White House. The so-called “founding fathers” of America owned slaves. For nearly 100 years, the U.S. government and their capitalist partners reaped massive profits dripping with the blood of African slaves. Genocide and slavery in the name of capitalist accumulation was practiced in the Americas and the rest of the colonized world. Karl Marx wrote in “Capital”: “The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skinned, signaled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production.” Columbus and those like him are heroes to the capitalists. They understand that the cruelty and exploitation that marked the colonization of the Americas benefited them. The capitalists’ unyielding search for profits and superprofits leaves them neither conscience nor morality. Although legal chattel slavery no longer exists in the Americas, capitalist exploitation of poor and oppressed people continues to this day. This is the legacy of Christopher Columbus. For that reason, the masses of people who suffer exploitation have no reason to celebrate on Columbus Day.

### Value to life

#### No value to life under Capitalism

Dillon 99Michael 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 0 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.

#### Capitalism is morally insolvent

Morgareidge 98 (Clayton, HE is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Lewis and Clark College, “Why Capitalism is Evil,” Radio Active Philosophy, http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html-Singh

In recent commentaries for the Old Mole I have been trying to make capitalism look bad -- as bad as it really is.  I have argued that capitalism is war, and that those of us who do not own capital suffer from it just as do civilian populations caught between opposing armies, or as foot soldiers conscripted into armies fighting for interests that are not our own.  I've tried to show that capitalism is the violent negation of democracy, for it is the interests of those who own capital that determine how we live: their jobs, products, services, manufactured culture, and propaganda shape our lives and our minds.   Today I'd like to point to the ways in which capital undermines the foundation of moral life. Well, what is the foundation of moral life?  What makes it possible for human beings to recognize that they have responsibilities to each other and to their communities?  For example: What could possibly make anyone willing to pay living wages to workers in Indonesia or Haiti if you can get them to work for less?  The 18th Century philosopher David Hume asks, What reason can anyone give me to not to prefer the annihilation of all mankind to a scratch on my finger?  Hume is one of many philosophers who argue that no such reason can be given.  This means that the foundation of ethics lies not in reason, but rather in our passions or our hearts. For Hume it is part of our nature that we feel sympathy for each other, and this sympathy counters our narrow self-interest.   Other philosophers have taken similar positions.  Josiah Royce an American philosopher of the last century argued that you do not really understand another person if you do not understand her aspirations, fears, and needs.  But to understand someone's feelings is, in part, to share them.  And you cannot share an aspiration or a need without wanting to see it fulfilled, nor can you share a fear without hoping that it will not come to pass.  So the mere recognition of what other human beings are involves us in wanting to see them live and prosper.  The French-Jewish philosopher Emmanual Levinás whose major work appeared in 1961 claims that ethics arises in the experience of the face of the other. The human face reveals its capacity for suffering, a suffering we are capable of either inflicting or opposing.  So to look into the face of another human being is to *see*the commandment, Thou shalt not kill.  Another American philosopher, Nel Noddings, in her 1984 book Caring, argues that the ethical commitment arises out of the caring response that most of us feel towards those who, like children, are in need.   Most parents encourage this caring response in their children, with the result that we grow up with an interest in cultivating our own capacity to care for others. Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior.  The 20th century proves otherwise.  What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the *capacity* to want the best for each other.   So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response?   This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism.  But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care.  Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism.  Nevertheless, I want to claim, the putting the world at the disposal of those with capital has done more damage to the ethical life than anything else.  To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx.    Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money.  For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own.   Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.[[1]](http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html#_ftn1)   If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products.  If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well-being of human beings and the planet we live on.  Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life.  The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth.  If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each other’s faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life.  But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry.  In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people.  As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth.  Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do.  Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable.  People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress.  They still think they can't stop it.  And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership.  Only a minority ("idealists")  can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making.   Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.

## Topicality

**Counter interpretation**: The ideals behind United States federal government infrastructure development are at the core of every affirmative. Ours engages the United States and its transportation infrastructure policy and the logic behind it.

**Ground/ fairness:** The negative still has access to all kritik, counter plans and disads. Truth is told they could even run their own affirmative to test against the plan

1. **Education:** There aren’t too many serious k affs on this topic. Having an open discussion based on the rhetoric and representations of TI policy is the best way. Both sides are able to voice their opinions without regulations being put on the discussion. Nobody learns when a debate is about a plan policy option we can’t affect.

**A definition from Merriam Webster: AFFIRM:** to express dedication by correcting the infermitties of the resolution. We point out errors and craft a more sculpted form of the resolution. If theres a problem we make it balanced. If anything topicality in this round is not an issue because our ground is on the basis of cleaning the resolution. The negative have all the ground in the world because we have pinned ourself to the res.

#### Topicality Bad

**Larry Smith, 1998.**“Curmudgeonly Thoughts on the State of Policy Debate.” Rostrum, 1998, on-line at <http://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/cxsmith0198.pdf>

And the tragic thing about most rounds is that topicality as an issue too often disappears off the flow sheet after 2nd affirmative constructive's responses. So? Why did first negative waste all that time when he [sic] could have been arguing something more substantive? The answer is simple: institutes teach topicality as a theory, and students come away with whole blocks and briefs that require them to think little in a debate round. And it was traditionally the first negative who had to be the best thinker in the round.Here again the esoteric thinking of theorists overrides the pragmatic arguments one would expect to find in any debate over policy in the real world. Can you imagine congress arguing topicality (definitional issues) over some policy proposal?

#### Claims of fairness, objectivity, predictability are ways to marginalize the out group and silence our voices

Delgado, Law Prof at U. of Colorado, 1992 [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May]

We have cleverly built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. Thus, the stronger party is able to have his/her way and see her/himself as principled at the same time.

Imagine, for example, a man's likely reaction to the suggestion that subjective considerations -- a woman's mood, her sense of pressure or intimidation, how she felt about the man, her unexpressed fear of reprisals if she did not go ahead-- ought to play a part in determining whether the man is guilty of rape. Most men find this suggestion offensive; it requires them to do something they are not accustomed to doing. "Why," they say, "I'd have to be a mind reader before I could have sex with anybody?" "Who knows, anyway, what internal inhibitions the woman might have been harboring?" And "what if the woman simply changed her mind later and charged me with rape?"

What we never notice is that women can "read" men's minds perfectly well. The male perspective is right out there in the world, plain as day, inscribed in culture, song, and myth -- in all the prevailing narratives. These narratives tell us that men want and are entitled  [\*820]  to sex, that it is a prime function of women to give it to them, and that unless something unusual happens, the act of sex is ordinary and blameless. We believe these things because that is the way we have constructed women, men, and "normal" sexual intercourse.

Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about administrability, fairness**,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what** **[\*821]  really counts: the way in which stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

#### Alternative Overview vs policy focus good

**Your ballot is a question of how to align yourself as a subject of capitalism. Either you vote neg to uphold a system based on capital or you vote aff to reject the horrors of capitalism. This is an intellectual strategy aimed at freeing yourselves from the confines of capitalist thought. Herod indicates that only once we see how capitalism has forced us into wage-slavery can we escape being slaves. This debate isn’t about “solving” capitalism but rather about how we approach the political. Our politics rejects this capitalist ontology. This is the first and only step—Capitalism replaces the man with the capitalist consumerist incapable of loving and results in the ontological extinction of humanity.**

#### 2AC A2 policy framework

**First, our offense:**

1. **We are the only ones controlling an in-round impact. The only thing the ballot represents at the end of this round is an endorsement of either an affirmative or negative ethic. A vote Neg is one that endorses a destructive ontology and a violent ethic. At worst, you should vote Aff because you can break down this violent system.**
2. **It’s a pre-requisite—Your ontology is intrinsically tied to the policy, if you have a violent ontology, your plan will only reproduce violence.**

Dillon ’99(Professor of Politics, University of Lancaster, “moral spaces,” JSTOR)

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other regional modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

1. **The Aff impact turns your framework—if your framework is one that upholds a violent ontology, then it is ultimately undesirable which means they have to win their ontology is good before they can win framework**

#### Framework add ons

The cost benefit analysis that the resolution and its capitalist mindset support makes it so that we are unable to accurately weight and evaluate things either critically or realistically. Cost-benefit analysis fails to take anything into account other than the procurement of capital. We only perceive things in terms of capital and begin to ignore much more significant impacts. This ontology fails to take into account the more significant things that can arise from our conduct, like racism and hate.

Following the resolution and running a policy affirmative makes us think like the institutions like the USfg that carry out actions capitalist rhetoric of the resolution makes it so that we think like capitalist institutions. By thinking like institutions, we begin to act like those institutions. We view everything in terms of capital gain and begin to lose our humanity and compassion and view everything with a cost-benefit analysis mindset and terms of evaluation. We lose our interest in things like human relationships as we shift to this mindset.

## Ontology

#### Cap-Onto Overview

**The ontology of capitalism is one of complete violence. It oppresses its subjects through profit maximization then proceeds to hide them in the darkest corners of the globe. The faces of structural violence, whether it’s the women in Africa who can’t reach clean water, or the South American dad who can’t maintain a liveable wage so he has to sell his daughter to the sex trade, is labeled as inevitable in the world of capital, as just how the world works. The politics of capitalism is one that necessitates the subjugation of workers across the world. You have a primary ethical responsibility to confront these situations and recognize capitalism as the reason why these people lack such basic needs.**

**And capitalism creates a vicious cycle that ends in ontological extinction. Capitalism’s profit motive means the only reason to live is to continue to produce more, interpellating existence into a subject unable to love, unable to imagine, and most importantly, unable to break free from capitalism’s hegemonic thought.**

**[[**If no framework arg made]] **And, this ontological damage is a prerequisite to discussion of action**

Dillon ’99(Professor of Politics, University of Lancaster, “moral spaces,” JSTOR)

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other regional modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

**All the consequentialist impacts they are going to stress are highly irrelevant. You must refuse politics as usual no matter what the cost. Only this action can allow ourselves to escape from the confines of capitalist thought that doom us to recurring oppression. Otherwise, you risk your ontological destruction. Capitalism is only a movement towards the highest capitalistic robot that can make the most money, rendering life meaningless.**

## A2 small movements fail

#### The reason that small movements fail is their lack of infrastructure. By exposing the evils of capitalism in the debate community we take a step in solving this infrastructure deficit.

Zald, Mayer and John McCarthy, authors of numerous published political articles, 1990. Social Movements in an Organizational Society. New Brunswick: Transaction.

It is sometimes said that while anti-capitalist and alternative globalization movements are clear on what we do not want, we are less clear on what we do want (socialism, anarchism, specifics). Certainly, recent movements have not been as effective as their predecessors (labor in the 1910s and ‘30s; the social movements of the ‘60s and ‘70s) in sustaining the sorts of practices – intellectual and material – that put into effect aspects of the alternative world we seek. My colleague Alan Sears attributes this current inability to a decline in what he calls “infrastructures of dissent” or what I prefer to call “infrastructures of resistance.” As anti-capitalist movements face possibilities of growth, as happened after Seattle in 1999, questions of organization and the relation of various activities to each other and to broader movements for social change can only become more urgent. Yet, the absence of durable organizations or institutions, formal or informal, rooted in working-class organizations and communities, makes for demoralization or a retreat into subculturalism, as has happened to many of the alternative globalization groups. We now face a pressing need to rebuild “infrastructures of resistance” that might sustain not only activists and organizers, but especially the poor and working-class people who are being disastrously impacted by the current crisis. Infrastructures of resistance create situations in which specific communities build economic and social systems that operate, as much as possible, as working alternatives to the dominant state capitalist structures. They are organized around alternative institutions that offer at least a starting point for meeting community needs such as food, housing, communications, energy, transportation, child care, education and so on. These institutions are autonomous from, and indeed opposed to, dominant relations and institutions of the state and capital. They may also contest “official” organs of the working class such as bureaucratic unions or political parties. In the short term these institutions contest official structures, with an eye towards, in the longer term, replacing them.

## Random AT Section

### AT: Perm

#### State funded transportation acts as a meeting place for the capitalist resistance

Zald, Mayer and John McCarthy, authors of numerous published political articles, 1990. Social Movements in an Organizational Society. New Brunswick: Transaction.

Infrastructures of resistance create situations in which specific communities build economic and social systems that operate, as much as possible, as working alternatives to the dominant state capitalist structures. They are organized around alternative institutions that offer at least a starting point for meeting community needs such as food, housing, communications, energy, transportation, child care, education and so on. These institutions are autonomous from, and indeed opposed to, dominant relations and institutions of the state and capital. They may also contest “official” organs of the working class such as bureaucratic unions or political parties. In the short term these institutions contest official structures, with an eye towards, in the longer term, replacing them.

### Cap Bad

#### Capitalism Increases the Gap Between the Rich and the poor

http://www.socialistalternative.org/publications/s21/

Meanwhile in the US, the richest country on earth, the wealthiest 1% has seen their incomes increase by 157% in real terms since 1979. By contrast, the bottom 20% are actually making $100 less a year in real terms, 45 million people live below the poverty line and over 40% have no medical cover. Despite all the advanced technology and wealth available to the US, more than 32 million people have a life expectancy of less than 60 years.

### AT: USSR Example

#### The form of government that was upheld in the U.S.S.R. and called socialism was far from real socialism.

http://www.socialistalternative.org/publications/s21/

It is not mainly the arguments of socialists that are changing peoples' outlook, it is their experience of the system we live under - capitalism. Ten years ago capitalism declared victory when the Soviet Union collapsed. What existed in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe was not genuine socialism but a grotesque caricature of it. Nonetheless, its failure was a golden opportunity for capitalism worldwide. American philosopher Francis Fukuyama put it bluntly in 1989: "What we are witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War [the post-1945 conflict between US imperialism and the Soviet Union] but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of man's ideological evolution and the universalism of Western liberal democracy. "Ten years after this declaration of the "end point of man's ideological development", and even Fukuyama has changed his tune. The cold war is supposed to be over but arms spending totaled $804 billion in 2000, an average of $130 a person. Humanity's supposedly wondrous endpoint is a world of war, poverty, dictatorship and, above all, incredible inequality. Millions of people are fighting back against the reality of Fukuyama's nirvana. They are the Bolivian masses who rose up and prevented the privatization of their water supply and the Argentineans who overthrew four presidents in two weeks. They are the ten million Indian workers who took strike action against privatization. They are the workers in Spain who held a one-day general strike against attacks unemployment rights, and the workers in Italy who have mobilized in their millions against the right-wing government of Silvio Berlusconi. At the same time as the poor and oppressed of entire countries are fighting back against the effects of capitalism, a minority are beginning to consciously look for an alternative system. If you look up 'capitalism' in the Collins English Dictionary it suggests you compare it with the alternative - 'socialism'. Socialist ideas have been developed over centuries in the course of humanity's fight for a better life. Today they remain the only viable alternative in an increasingly unstable and brutal, capitalist world. It is this reality that ensures that socialism is not a spent force but the wave of the future.

### Solvency

**State owned transportation key to stop the market utopia**

NICHOLAS **Low and** BRENDAN **Gleeson**, 4 December **2001,** “Ecosocialization or Countermodernization? Reviewing the Shifting ‘Storylines’ of Transport Planning” http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.00344/pdf

The environmental crisis has provoked a new countermovement on the part of society to protect its ecological supports and adapt capitalism to its ecological limits (see Bernard, 1997). We term this movement ‘ecosocialization’. This social process is not to be confused with ecosocialism which is an ideological and theoretical field associated with Marxism. **As** **it grew and spread** over the globe from the mid-eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, **industrial capitalism** delivered fabulous wealth, but it also **uprooted societies, destroyed cultures and tore people out of the natural matrix of their being that we now call ‘the environment’**. To protect society and nature from the destructive potential of the institutions of ‘market society’, Polanyi (1944) tells us, there developed a diffuse and widespread countermovement erecting a multitude of institutional supports for human life and its natural integument. The various institutions of **public transport** **(including public roads)** **are** among **the social supports which today make life for humans in cities tolerable.** At the core of Polanyi’s thinking lies the conception of a ‘double movement’ which: can be personified as the action of two organizing principles in society, each of them setting itself specific institutional aims, having the support of definite social forces and using its own distinctive methods. The one was the principle of economic liberalism, aiming at the establishment of a self-regulating market, relying on the support of the trading classes, and using largely laissez-faire and free trade as its methods; the other was the principle of social protection, aiming at the conservation of man and nature as well as productive organization, relying on the varying support of those most immediately affected by the deleterious action of the market — primarily, but not exclusively, the working and landed classes — and using protective legislation, restrictive associations, and other instruments as its methods ( Polanyi’s narrative concludes in the early years of the second world war, when the utopian liberal vision of market society had all but disappeared, but the transformation of which he writes continued. 1 The very success of the postwar social-protective institutionsin facilitating economic growth in the industrial economies alsomade possible **a renewal of faith in the market utopia — demanding the removal of the supposed deadweight of** those very **regulatory and protective institutions.** **With the reassertion of the market utopia, the reality of capitalism organized as a global market society now threatens humanity-in-nature once again, but with new dimensions of danger and new fault lines of contradiction added to the old.** Just as ‘society’ came into view with the struggle to create protective institutions for persons, 2 so ‘the environment’ loomed large with the struggle to protect humanity’s natural matrix: ‘the earth’. It should not surprise us that once ‘the earth’ and ‘the environment’ was hypostasized, the moral importance of humanity’s place in it shrank, for some almost to zero (e.g. Devall and Sessions, 1985). Once again, protective institutions, this time environmental, began to be created by a new countermovement against the renewed drive of capitalism towards market society. There are today not two movements under way but three: economic liberalism renewed, social protection (in retreat but by no means defeated) and environmental conservation — each with its own institutional aims, supportive social forces and characteristic methods. We will not attempt here to elaborate upon them. Suffice it to say that while their tectonic shifts may be contingently harmonized, there is no necessity for harmony. But if they are not harmonized then economy, society and environment risk unparalleled destruction.

**State owned transportation is safer**

Bill **Hopwood**, Writer for Socialism Today, November **1999**, “Transport policy after Paddington”, http://www.socialismtoday.org/43/globalwarning43.html

John Prescott has talked of a 'radical change', but there is little sign of action. **A socialist transport policy would give top priority to safety. The transport providers now almost all privatised,** with the underground and Air Traffic Control soon to go, **would be returned to public ownership and control. Massive investment would be made in public transport.** This would include a shift of resources from the many direct and hidden costs of the present road policy. In the major cities a programme of high quality rapid rail networks are needed. This combined with a good bus service would offer a real alternative to car dependency. This in turn would rescue a great deal of the 30% of city space presently controlled by cars. This public space could be used for cycle ways, pleasant and safe pavements, parks, squares and other uses. A major policy of freight on rail is also needed. Rural areas need a big improvement in bus services. As important as direct investment in transport, changes are needed in land use to end out-of-town development and instead have local services in the communities. The policy of shipping goods all over the country could also be reduced. **This change raises wider issues about the priorities of our, predominantly urban, society.** (See Socialism Today No.36 for the beginnings of a discussion on a socialist urban policy, which is closely linked to transport policy). **It is absolutely clear that private ownership cannot be trusted with safety. It is not even capable of providing a good, integrated and healthy transport system.** The workforce on the railways have pointed out for years the need for improved safety. **Public ownership and workers control of transport is urgently needed.**

**Improving public transportation infrastructure is critical to transferring to socialism**

**Pucher, 1990 (John, associate professor in the Department of Urban Planning at Rutgers University, “Capitalism, Socialism, and Urban Transportation Policies and Travel Behavior in the East and West,” Journal of the American Planning Association, 56:3)**

A more basic difference among the countries compared here is the degree of **public ownership of the means of production**, which is-by the very nature of their socialist economies-extremely high in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and much lower in the capitalist economies of Western Europe and North America. It is not simply a large public sector that **has engendered** such **a strong commitment to public transportation in socialist countries**. Rather, this commitment is **based on the fundamental ideological opposition to most private ownership**, especially in the past, prior to the current attempts to increase economic efficiency by selectively introducing market incentives. **Automobile-based transportation systems require high levels of private ownership, while public transport systems**-both in socialist and capitalist countries-**are almost always publicly owned**. Thus, public policies toward transportation have not evolved exogenously, but rather have reflected the. very different social and economic contexts found in each country. In this respect, **urban transportation systems and travel behavior mirror many aspects of society as a whole**, indeed, perhaps **more visibly than** almost **any other public** service or **institution**. The automobile, for example, by enabling almost unlimited freedom of movement and location, embodies the principles of individualism, privatism, consumerism, and high mobility (Warner 1972, 113-49). By contrast, **public transport depends on and fosters communalism, planned transportation and land use systems**, restricted mobility, and less individual freedom of choice both in travel and location. Indeed, some might argue that socialist governments deliberately restrict mobility-just as they restrict telecommunicationsin order to keep the population under control. In their urban transportation policies, socialist countries sacrifice the personal freedom of the individual supposedly for the good of society as a whole, as indicated perhaps by the perceived environmental, social, and economic advantages of public transport over the automobile (Sankov 1986; Saitz 1988; Vlassov 1984; White 1979; Dumov 1985). Some socialist **governments may** even **view public transport as an expression of social cohesiveness, solidarity, and**-in some sense-perhaps of **Communism itself (**Bater 1980, 10-3 1 ; Blair 1985). **This** very notion **is**, of course, **anathema to capitalist, market-oriented societies**, where each individual is expected to maximize only his or her own well-being, without considering impacts on society as a whole (Samuelson and Nordhaus 1985, 41-58). The designations of the various modes suggest this difference, with the automobile often being referred to as private or individual transportation, while public transport is variously termed mass transit, communal transport, or public transportation. The private-versuspublic aspects of the two modes are obvious; it is little wonder that governments in countries with different economic systems would prefer one or the other, expressing this preference through public policies (Bater 1980; Vlassov 1984; Sankov 1986).

### AT:Politics

**The youth population would approve of a transition to socialism**

Alexander **Eichler**, business reporter at The Huffington Post, 12/29/**11**, “Young People More Likely To Favor Socialism Than Capitalism: Pew” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/12/29/young-people-socialism_n_1175218.html>

Young people **-- the collegiate and post-college crowd, who have served as the most visible face of the Occupy Wall Street movement --** might be getting more comfortable with socialism. **That's the surprising result from a Pew Research Center poll that aims to measure American sentiments toward different political labels. The poll, published Wednesday,** found that while Americans overall tend to oppose socialism **by a strong margin -- 60 percent say they have a negative view of it, versus just 31 percent who say they have a positive view --** socialism has more fans than opponents among the 18-29 crowd.Forty-nine percent of people in that age bracket say they have a positive view of socialism**; only 43 percent say they have a negative view. And** while those numbers aren't very far apart, it's noteworthy that they were reversed just 20 months ago**, when Pew conducted a similar poll. In that survey, published May 2010, 43 percent of people age 18-29 said they had a positive view of socialism, and 49 percent said their opinion was negative. It's not clear why young people have evidently begun to change their thinking on socialism.** In the past several years, the poor economy has had any number of effects on young adults -- keeping them at home with their parents, making it difficult for them to get jobs, and likely depressing their earning potential for years to come -- that might have dampened enthusiasm for the free market among this crowd. **Indeed,** the Pew poll also found that just 46 percent of people age 18-29 have positive views of capitalism**, and 47 percent have negative views -- making** this the only age group where support for socialism outweighs support for capitalism. **Young people have also been among the most involved in the nationwide Occupy movement, whose members have leveled pointed criticism at the capitalist ethos and often called for a more equal distribution of American wealth. In general,** income inequality **-- which a Congressional Budget Office report recently pointed out** is at historic levels **-- has received more and more attention in politics and the media since the Occupy movement launched in mid-September. Usage of the term rose dramatically in news coverage following the start of the protests, and politicians from Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to President Barack Obama have used the movement's language to describe divisions in the American public. Still, the nationwide Occupy demonstrations notwithstanding, socialism doesn't score very well in other age groups in the Pew poll, or across other demographic categories. Pew broke down its results by age, race, income and political affiliation, as well as support for the Occupy Wall Street and Tea Party movements. There were only two other groups among whom socialism's positives outweighed its negatives --** blacks, **who** say they favor socialism 55 to 36 percent, and liberal Democrats, who say they favor socialism 59 to 39 percent**. These were also the only two groups to show net favor for socialism in the.**

#### The GOP is making it so that all transportation infrastructure plans passed in the status quo are carried out by private corporations who view the projects in terms of the procurement of capital. This takes away from how transportation infrastructure is supposed to be a social service and a stepping stone to socialism.

Ministry of truth, economic analysis, 2011, http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/24/1085717/-GOP-seeks-to-privatize-American-infrastructure-with-taxpayer-backed-guaranteed-corporate-profits

Force Amtrak to contract out 2,000 jobs to the private sector, and if the private sector losses money the taxpayers will automatically bail them out and make up the difference*!* I'm a big fan of Sam Seder's Majority Report. Last week Sam was talking about the Transportation Bill that John Boehner has repeatedly failed to move past his tea party House Freshmen. To explain what was in the version of the bill that Boehner has been pushing, Sam Seder brought on Ed Wytkind, who is the AFL-CIO’s Transportation Trades Department President. Here's the short version: the GOP is trying to outsource one of the last things America has, our infrastructure. That's right, the House Republicans who are screaming COMMUNISM! at anyone who disagrees with them is trying to sell off America's transportation infrastructure to foreign corporations, transforming decent jobs into low paying jobs with no benefits or job security while funneling taxpayer money into the hands of huge foreign and multi-national corporations. The American small businessmen be damned. This should be a scandal. A massive scandal. More below the fold . . . . This is a double screw-job. We NEED a transportation bill, we've been running on small supplemental bills since 2009, but Republicans in the House don't understand the difference between SPENDING and investment. This is why Boehner can't get his corporate welfare larded transportation bill through the House. Amazingly, the tea party has prevented this disaster, but only because they are too ideologically extreme to go along with Boehner's scam. Meanwhile the Senate has put together a decent version of a Transportation bill that passed the Senate with 76 votes. There are some problems with the Senate version of the bill, it is by no means perfect, but it would keep America's transportation infrastructure funded, which is HUGE, because when these public projects are not funded it places a huge strain on the public. In their usual hostage taking manner the House Republicans have held up this bill up so they can pass a version that damages the infrastructure and sells off whatever they can to the highest bidder while mandating that any lost profits will be made up by the American taxpayer. Basically, this is one of their most un-Republican bills EVER. These are the guys who are always saying that the Government should NEVER interfere with the private sector, but I guess that doesn't count when it means mandating that the taxpayer cover any lost profits these private sector firms might incur. Mandate. Funny, I thought Republicans were against that sort of thing? . . . crickets What's worse, the House version of this bill would increase the Federal share of funds from US grants to certain agencies, but only IF they privatize at least 1/4 of their operations. That's right, either go along with the privatization corporate giveaways or see your funding cut, and then when the profit motive makes the privatized service more expensive and less efficient, well, we all know who the conservatives will blame (Rhymes with Odama) Ed Wytkind described this bill that Boehner put together as " just a ridiculous way to do transportation in this country" and a "complete giveaway to foreign companies trying to take over public transportation." Sadly, I can't find many sources on this story. I'm chalking that up to the fact that transportation legislation journalism isn't that sexy, usually nerds like me and a few others might take an interest in this but more often than not this kind of thing is a mundane and routine function of government. Leave it to House Republicans to turn this into a massive giveaway to foreign business. Obstructing this bill and transforming it into corporate welfare fits the GOP MO to a T. This is why we can't have nice things like bridges that don't collapse while we drive over them. Take the basic functions of Government like providing public transportation and turn it into a costly cash cow for private business, that's the GOP *modus operandi*, and nothing says that more than privatizing a public service and then mandating that the taxpayer make up any lost profits the private business may incur. That's right, redistributing wealth is a sin and un-american, unless you are redistributing it from the taxpayers to a private industry. So the GOP is busy make jobs worse and blaming it on Obama, holding up construction projects and delaying transportation investment while they blame it on Obama. For the GOP it is a win/win, they get to screw with public services, making them worse and delaying them which will generate public outrage, then they will blame the government and demand less government and lower taxes, which will result in worse services and bigger deficits, and on and on it goes.

### Cap=Racism

**Capitalism is the root of racism**

Alex **Taylor**, November 22, **2002**, “The roots of racism”, http://socialistworker.org/2002-2/431/431\_08\_Racism.shtml

Both assumptions are wrong. **Racism isn't just an ideology but is an institution. And its origins don't lie in bad ideas or in human nature. Rather, racism originated with capitalism and the slave trade**. As the Marxist writer CLR James put it, "**The conception of dividing people by race begins with the slave trade. This thing was so shocking, so opposed to all the conceptions of society which religion and philosophers had…that the only justification by which humanity could face it was to divide people into races and decide that the Africans were an inferior race.**" History proves this point. **Prior to the advent of capitalism, racism as a systematic form of oppression did not exist**. For example, **ancient Greek and Roman societies had no concept of race or racial oppression. These weren't liberated societies. They were built on the backs of slaves. And these societies created an ideology to justify slavery.** As the Greek philosopher Aristotle put it in his book Politics, "Some men are by nature free, and others slaves, and that for these latter, slavery is both expedient and right." **However,** because **slavery in ancient Greece and Rome was not racially based, these societies had no corresponding ideology of racial inferiority or oppression.** In fact, Egyptian, Greek, Roman and Early Christian societies had a favorable image of Blacks and of African societies. **Septemus Severenus, an emperor of Rome, was African and almost certainly Black**. "The ancients did accept the institution of slavery as a fact of life; they made ethnocentric judgments of other societies; they had narcissistic canons of physical beauty," writes Howard University professor Frank Snowden in his book Before Color Prejudice. "Yet nothing comparable to the virulent color prejudice of modern time existed in the ancient world. This is the view of most scholars who have examined the evidence."

**Topicality**

**Framework-you have to win on every single contention to win the debate**

**Lots of solvency trouble**

**Rhetoric matter- needs cards for this**

**More impacts the better- lets you o/w the other team more easily**

**Switch side debate**

**Seeds the political**

**Policy debate good**
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**You must claim out of round impacts**
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**They rejected the res**

The GOP is making it so that all transportation infrastructure plans passed in the status quo are carried out by private corporations who view the projects in terms of the procurement of capital. This takes away from how transportation infrastructure is supposed to be a social service and a stepping stone to socialism.
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