## \*\*\* Notes

This file is mostly a backfile “core” to enable specific capitalism arguments to be read—it does not include links.

To develop an argument, see, for example, the Capitalism Critique of Keynesianism file and the Disabilities Negative for in-depth link and permutation materials specific to the topic.

## \*\*\* 1NC

### 1NC—Capitalism Critique

#### [Insert specific link]

#### Capitalism causes extinction while entrenching racist and sexist violence, outweighs everything about the aff

Brown, 5 — Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan (Charles Brown, http://www.mail-archive.com/pen-l@sus.csuchico.edu/msg04868.html)

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

#### Vote negative as a refusal in order to create fissures and cracks in the capitalist system—inclusion of the state co-opts the permutation

Holloway 5 [John Holloway, Writer of famous anti-capitalist text Change the World Without Taking Power, Ph.D. in Political Science at the University of Edinburgh, teacher at the Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences at the Autonomous University of Puebla, 2005, "Can we change the world without taking power?" ZCommunications, Accessed online at http://www.zcommunications.org/can-we-change-the-world-without-taking-power-by-john-holloway, Accessed on 8/24/11]

I donâ€™t know the answer. Perhaps we can change the world without taking power. Perhaps we cannot. The starting pointâ€”for all of us, I thinkâ€”is uncertainty, not knowing, a common search for a way forward. Because it becomes more and more clear that capitalism is a catastrophe for humanity. A radical change in the organisation of society, that is, revolution, is more urgent than ever. And this revolution can only be world revolution if it is to be effective. But it is unlikely that world revolution can be achieved in one single blow. This means that the only way in which we can conceive of revolution is as interstitial revolution, as a revolution that takes place in the interstices of capitalism, a revolution that occupies spaces in the world while capitalism still exists. The question is how we conceive of these interstices, whether we think of them as states or in other ways. In thinking about this, we have to start from where we are, from the many rebellions and insubordinations that have brought us to Porto Alegre. The world is full of such rebellions, of people saying NO to capitalism: NO, we shall not live our lives according to the dictates of capitalism, we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable and not what capital tells us to do. Sometimes we just see capitalism as an all-encompassing system of domination and forget that such rebellions exist everywhere. At times they are so small that even those involved do not perceive them as refusals, but often they are collective projects searching for an alternative way forward and sometimes they are as big as the Lacandon Jungle or the Argentinazo of three years ago or the revolt in Bolivia just over a year ago. All of these insubordinations are characterised by a drive towards self-determination, an impulse that says, â€˜No, you will not tell us what to do, we shall decide for ourselves what we must do.â€™ **These refusals can be seen as fissures, as cracks in the system of capitalist domination**. Capitalism is not (in the first place) an economic system, but a system of command. Capitalists, through money, command us, telling us what to do. To refuse to obey is to break the command of capital. The question for us, then, is how do we multiply and expand these refusals, these cracks in the texture of domination? There are two ways of thinking about this. The first says that these movements, these many insubordinations, lack maturity and effectiveness unless they are focused, unless they are channelled towards a goal. For them to be effective, they must be channelled towards the conquest of state power either through elections or through the overthrowing of the existing state and the establishment of a new, revolutionary state. The organisational form for channelling all these insubordinations towards that aim is the party. The question of taking state power is not so much a question of future intentions as of present organisation. How should we organise ourselves in the present? Should we join a party, an organisational form that focuses our discontent on the winning of state power? Or should we organise in some other way? The second way of thinking about the expansion and multiplication of insubordinations is to say, No, they should not be all harnessed together in the form of a party, they should flourish freely, go whatever way the struggle takes them. This does not mean that there should be no coordination, but it should be a much looser coordination. Above all, the principal point of reference is not the state but the society that we want to create. The principal argument against the first conception is that it leads us in the wrong direction. The state is not a thing, it is not a neutral object: it is a form of social relations, a form of organisation, a way of doing things which has been developed over several centuries for the purpose of maintaining or developing the rule of capital. If we focus our struggles on the state, or if we take the state as our principal point of reference, we have to understand that the state pulls us in a certain direction. Above all, it seeks to impose upon us a separation of our struggles from society, to convert our struggle into a struggle on behalf of, in the name of. It separates leaders from the masses, the representatives from the represented; it draws us into a different way of talking, a different way of thinking. It pulls us into a process of reconciliation with reality, and that reality is the reality of capitalism, a form of social organisation that is based on exploitation and injustice, on killing and destruction. It also draws us into a spatial definition of how we do things, a spatial definition which makes a clear distinction between the state's territory and the world outside, and a clear distinction between citizens and foreigners. It draws us into a spatial definition of struggle that has no hope of matching the global movement of capital. There is one key concept in the history of the state-centred left, and that concept is betrayal. Time and time again the leaders have betrayed the movement, and not necessarily because they are bad people, but just because the state as a form of organisation separates the leaders from the movement and draws them into a process of reconciliation with capital. Betrayal is already given in the state as an organisational form. **Can we resist this? Yes, of course we can, and it is something that happens all the time.** We can refuse to let the state identify leaders or permanent representatives of the movement, we can refuse to let delegates negotiate in secret with the representatives of the state. But this means understanding that our forms of organisation are very different from those of the state, that there is no symmetry between them. The state is an organisation on behalf of, what we want is the organisation of self-determination, a form of organisation that allows us to articulate what we want, what we decide, what we consider necessary or desirable. What we want, in other words, is a form of organisation that does not have the state as its principal point of reference. The argument against taking the state as the principal point of reference is clear, but what of the other concept? The state-oriented argument can be seen as a pivoted conception of the development of struggle. Struggle is conceived as having a central pivsot, the taking of state power. First we concentrate all our efforts on winning the state, we organise for that, then, once we have achieved that, we can think of other forms of organisation, we can think of revolutionising society. First we move in one direction, in order to be able to move in another: the problem is that the dynamic acquired during the first phase is difficult or impossible to dismantle in the second phase. The other concept focuses directly on the sort of society we want to create, without passing through the state. There is no pivot: organisation is directly prefigurative, directly linked to the social relations we want to create. Where the first concept sees the radical transformation of society as taking place after the seizure of power, the second insists that it must begin now. **Revolution not when the time is right but revolution here and now.**

## \*\*\* Framework

### AT: Competitive Policy Option

#### Demanding that we offer a “competitive policy option” entrenches capitalism and ensures serial policy failure—the problem isn’t that our policies are wrong, it’s that the whole system is wrong.

Wolff 8 — Rick Wolff, Professor of Economics at University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 2008 (“Policies to "Avoid" Economic Crises,” MR Zine—a publication of The Monthly Review, November 6th, Available Online at http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/wolff061108.html, Accessed 11-19-2008)

The whole idea of policy is bizarre. The "right policy" represents an absurd claim that this or that law or regulation can somehow undo the many different factors that cumulatively produced this crisis. Policies are "magic potions" offered to populations urgently demanding solutions to real problems. Whether cynically advocated for ulterior motives or actually believed by the politicians, promoters, and professors themselves, policy is the secular cousin of religion.

These days, the conservative policy amounts, as usual, to "let the private economy solve the problems" and "minimize state intervention because it only makes matters worse." Conservatives protect the freedoms of private enterprise, market transactions, and the wealthy from state regulations and controls and from taxes. The liberals' policy, also as usual, wants the state to limit corporate behavior, control and shape market transactions, and tilt the tax system more toward benefiting middle and lower income groups.

Both policies can no more overcome this economic crisis than they overcame past crises. Historically, both conservative and liberal policies fail at least as often as they succeed. Which outcome happens depends on all the factors shaping them and not on the policy a government pursues. Yet, both sides endlessly claim otherwise in desperate efforts at self-justification. Each side trots out its basic philosophy – dressed up as "a policy to achieve solutions." Conservatives and liberals keep debating. Today's crisis simply provides an urgent sort of context for the old debate to continue. Each side hopes to win converts by suggesting that its approach will "solve the economic crisis" while the other's approach will make it worse. Thus the liberals displaced the conservatives in the depths of the Great Depression, the reverse happened in the recession of the 1970s, and the liberals may now regain dominance. In no instance were adopted policies successful in solving the crises in any enduring way. The unevenness and instability of capitalism as a system soon brought another crisis crashing down on our economy and society.

The basic conservative message holds that the current economic crisis is NOT connected to the underlying economic system. The crisis does NOT emerge from the structure of the corporate system of production. It is NOT connected to the fact that corporate boards of directors, responsible to the minority that owns most of their shares, make all the key economic decisions while the enterprise's employees and the vast majority of the citizenry have to live with the consequences. The very undemocratic nature of the capitalist system of production is NOT related to crisis in the conservative view. The basic liberal message likewise disconnects today's crisis from the capitalist production system. Rather, each side insists that all crises would have been and would now be "avoidable" if only the right policy were in place.

Conservatives and liberals share more than a careful avoidance of connecting the crisis to the underlying capitalist system. They are also complicit in blocking those who do argue for that connection from making their case in politics, the media, or the schools. While conservative and liberal policies do little to solve crises, the debate between them has largely succeeded in excluding anti-capitalist analyses of economic crises from public discussion. Perhaps that exclusion – rather than solving crises – is the function of those endlessly rehashed policy debates between liberals and conservatives.

### Role of the Ballot

#### The role of the ballot is to choose between competing ideas—there is an alternative to capitalism.

Lebowitz 5 — Michael A. Lebowitz, Emeritus Professor of Economics at Simon Fraser University (Canada), 2005 (“The Knowledge of a Better World,” *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, Volume 57, Issue 3, July-August, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Elite, p. 67)

The most immediate obstacle, though, is the belief in TINA, i.e., that there is no alternative. Without the vision of a better world, every crisis of capitalism (such as the one upon us) can bring in the end only a painful restructuring—with the pain felt by those already exploited and excluded. The concept of an alternative, of a society based upon solidarity, is an essential weapon in defense of humanity. We need to recognize the possibility of a world in which the products of the social brain and the social hand are common property and the basis for our self-development—the possibility in Marx's words of "a society of free individuality, based on the universal development of individuals and on their subordination of their communal, social productivity as their social wealth" (Grundrisse [Penguin, 1973], 158). For this reason, the battle of ideas is essential.

### Epistemology

#### The affirmative’s knowledge is not value-neutral, its production is contingent on a specific separation of labor that privileges a small scientific and military elite, and its employment actively sustains capital

Dickens and Ormrod, 7 - \*Peter, Affiliated Lecturer in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Cambridge and Visiting Professor of Sociology, University of Essex and \*\*James, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton

(Cosmic Society: Towards a sociology of the universe, pg 31-32)

It should be noted that, contrary to Lerner’s (1991) argument, Alfred SohnRethel (1975) and Frankel (2003) have argued that this more scientific mode of relating to the universe merely intensified rather than alleviated the alienation of the masses from the universe. Sohn-Rethel’s argument is that ‘abstract’, one might say ‘objective’, knowledge first arose as part of the exchange relationship in what he calls ‘societies of appropriation’ or capitalist societies based on a high division of labour. The person producing a commodity is, as Marx described, alienated from the exchange process, in which s/he comes to see his/her product in terms of an abstract exchange value, which operates independently of the needs and uses which the seller or buyer has in mind. This purely abstract system of thought represented in the form of money (‘a crude approximation of the underlying principle’) leads to abstract, scientific, thought. Postone (1996) has argued similarly that ‘abstraction’ in general is central to capitalist societies. The development of capital in two distinct epochs has led to corresponding developments in epistemology, according to Sohn-Rethel. First, the introduction of coinage in Ancient Greece led to Greek philosophy and mathematics. Second, the development of modern capitalism led to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century scientific revolutions. He goes on to argue, and this forms a major focus of his and Lerner’s thesis, that the abstract form of scientific knowledge was instrumental in legitimizing the division of mental and manual labour in modern capitalism. The argument is that the existence of this abstract system justifies the existence of an elite of scientists capable of studying the system untainted by the practical knowledge of the worker. Davidson (1985) is also extremely critical of the development of objective scientific approaches to the universe that distance knowledge from people’s everyday experience of the universe. The latter, Davidson argues, remains Earth-centred (as in Tycho Brahe’s model). The result of de-centring Earth through science, for Davidson, is the creation of ‘a cold mechanical world’ (ibid.: 4). There are important differences between Sohn-Rethel’s account and Lerner’s. For Lerner, Galileo, like the empiricists Copernicus and Brahe before him, represents a break from the truly abstract philosophy of Plato. It is a break alleviating a lot of the problems of the division of labour by relying on artisan and serf knowledge available to all. However, Sohn-Rethel sees Galileo as representing a distinct break from his predecessors in instituting a new form of abstracted knowledge that severely heightens the mental/manual division of labour. He points to parallels between Galileo’s law of inertial motion and the abstraction of the commodity exchange. Lerner does not draw out a full criticism of the relationship between capital and cosmology that replaced it. Contrary to what Lerner implies during most of the book, colonial capitalism based initially on practical knowledge of navigation (now satellites, and possibly future capitalist exploitation of space resources) has not been an age of equality or celebration of the knowledge of the manual worker. This epoch has had its own cosmic elite of not only scientists but also engineers, and the military and the governments and corporations that control them. The scientific cosmological elite of today is still maintained by others’ labour. They are given ‘the freedom to abandon the constraints of the “ordinary” world’ (Ferguson 1990: 1).

#### Debate is the critical site of contestation against capitalism

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

Mediatization and the struggle to democratize communication Many of the issues at stake in the politics surrounding the form and content of communications media comprise a special instance of the struggle to reclaim the commons. The world of the early 21st century is densely networked by virtue of an unprecedented apparatus of communications, which has opened new possibilities both for bourgeois hegemony and for oppositional politics. Media now comprise a vast field of cultural struggle. In a media-saturated world, capitalist organization of communication creates a multifaceted democratic deficit, evident for instance in the failure of mainstream media to create a democratic public sphere, the centralization of power in media corporations, inequality in media access, homogenization of media content, the undermining of communities through commodification, and the corporate enclosure of knowledge. ‘Media activism’ can be read as a critical response that takes different forms depending on location in the media field. Media democrats struggle to limit corporate power and commercial logic, to democratize media workplaces and labour processes, to develop alternative media, and to foster more literate and critical readers of media texts. When we look at media activism ‘on the ground’ we find many of the rudiments of counter-hegemonic politics. Activists see the struggle to democratize communication as a multi-frontal war of position that needs to be waged in conjunction with other movements. Communicative democracy comprises a social vision in which the voices of citizens and communities carry into a vibrant and diverse public sphere. In pursuing this social vision on several fronts including those of state, corporate media and lifeworld, media democrats build a new nexus among movements, a place where strategies might converge across issue areas and movement identities (Hackett and Carroll, 2006; Downing 2001 ). As a political emergent, media activism underlines the importance to counterhegemony of reclaiming or creating the means and forms of communication necessary for subaltern groups to find their voices and to organize, both locally and translocally. The formation of organic intellectuals is substantially caught up in this struggle to break the dominant class’s monopoly within the intellectual field (Thomas 2009: 418-19). Here, the new includes a mediatized politics of everyday life, as in proliferation of alternative media (often via the internet; Atton 2009) and the diffusion of culture jamming and other practices of media literacy, yet also a politics, focused upon state and capital, that presses for limits upon corporate power and for an opening of access to the means of communication (Hackett and Carroll 2006). The politics of media democratization is necessarily multi-frontal and intersectional. All progressive-democratic movements have an stake in these struggles; the extent to which movements take up democratic communication as a general interest is a measure their catharsis from fractured subalternities (with their characteristic foci upon single issues and narrow constituencies) to an ethicopolitical collective will. The question of autonomy Autonomy from old-left parties and unions, and from overweening regulatory states, was cited by NSM theorists of the 1970s and 1980s as a criterial attribute of the emergent movements of late modernity. In Jean Cohen’s (1985) classic, and rather Americanized treatment, these movements were viewed as practitioners of a ‘self-limiting’ identity politics that rejected large-scale projects. This stylization was never unproblematic as an empirical account, and several decades later, in the wake of neoliberalism’s global triumph and in the midst of its global crisis, the appeal of self-limiting politics is embarrassingly limited. Yet autonomy remains a lasting legacy of the so-called NSMs. Autonomy informs aspects of contemporary counter-hegemonic politics at the level of everyday life, as shown in Gwyn Williams’s (2008) ethnography of alterglobalization activism in the Larzac plateau of southern France. Famous since their dismantling of a McDonald’s restaurant in 1999 and for the slogan, ‘the world is not a commodity,’ these activists resist the hegemony of global market society ‘by cultivating themselves as “autonomous” political subjects and organizing a movement considered to be an “autonomous” counter-power’ (G. William 2008: 63). This has meant not only maintaining independence from political parties and functioning in a ‘bottom-up’ or ‘horizontal’ manner but cultivating in themselves and others an autonomy that partly frees them from neoliberal ideology and the power of consumer society. Here, prefiguration is grounded in a moral imperative to ‘become aware’ and to act ‘coherently’ (2008:72) by living the ideals to which one aspires.5 Becoming aware is both an ongoing aspect of autonomous self-development and a movement-building praxis instantiated in a range of pedagogical activities – forums, information evenings and media actions – designed to provoke public debate and to persuade people join the cause (G. Williams 2008:72-3). Although activists can never be fully autonomous from the forms of power to which they are subject, the struggle for autonomy is a crucial element in challenging hegemony and in bringing into existence what Gramsci (1971: 327) called a ‘new conception of the world … which manifests itself in action.’ 6 As a sensibility that holds both visionary and strategic implications, autonomy has roots not only in NSM theory, but in historical materialism. Harry Cleaver, who introduced the notion of autonomist Marxism into English-language academia in the 1970s (Cleaver 2001; Wright 2008:113), predicated it on an agency-centred analysis of the working class, defining autonomy as the ability of workers to define their own interests and to struggle for them – to go beyond mere reaction to exploitation, or to self defined ‘leadership’ and to take the offensive in ways that shape the class struggle and define the future (Cleaver 1993). The key question is how autonomy and other emergent features of activism might figure in a counter-hegemonic historical bloc. Mark Purcell, drawing on Laclau and Mouffe (1985), suggests that relations between elements of such a formation be conceptualized in terms of equivalence, ‘a concept that evokes relations of simultaneous interdependence and autonomy, obligation and freedom, unity and multiplicity, sameness and difference’ (2009: 301). The movements and interests that comprise the bloc do not dissolve completely into it, but they move together and lean into one another.

## \*\*\* Permutation

### AT: Perm

#### Only complete rejection of capitalism can avert extinction—piecemeal strategies cannot materially transform the system that makes destruction inevitable.

Foster 8 — John Bellamy Foster, Editor of Monthly Review and Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, 2008 (“Capitalism and Climate Change,” The Monthly Review’s MR Zine, October 30th, Available Online at http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/foster301008.html, Accessed 10-30-2008)

We need to go down to 350 parts per million [the safe upper limit for carbon dioxide in the atmosphere], which means very big social transformations on a scale that would be considered revolutionary by anybody in society today – transformation of our whole society quite fundamentally. We have to aim at that, and we have to demand that of our society. Forget about capitalism, forget about whether the system can do it. Don't let that be your barometer. Say this is necessary for the planet, for human survival, for justice, for environmental justice, and we just have to do it. We demand that be done, and we work out the operating system of the world economy, we work out our social relations of production, in accordance with necessity, in accordance with what is necessary for the planet, not in accordance with what is necessary for the accumulation of wealth and profits for a very few.

I think there is no other choice – any other choice is absolutely irrational. We're living in an irrational system -- we can't let that level of irrationality dictate our action. So, we need to do that, but climate change isn't the whole environmental problem. There's species extinction, there's deforestation, desertification, there are a water crisis and the attempt of capital to privatize water, there are umpteen numbers of problems. We have to fight on all these fronts. These are material questions, material in terms of environmental materialism but also in terms of social, historical materialism, and actually all of these problems are going to be connected if we do it right, so that the traditional issues of the working-class are going to conjoin with their materialism, and their attempts to materially transform the world are going to conjoin with any kind of genuine environmentalism that we need.

So there are innumerable ways to struggle. We simply have to do it on the broadest basis that we can. And that means starting with the bottom of society, not relying on the elites to solve the problem for us, because capitalism sells people out. That's the nature of the system – it sells out – that defines it more than anything else.

#### Now is the key time to reject the politics of the permutation—the global financial crisis necessitates that we say “Enough!” and insist on the wholesale rejection of capitalism.

Foster 8 — John Bellamy Foster, Editor of Monthly Review and Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, 2008 (“Postscript to "The Financialization of Capital and the Crisis” (Monthly Review, April 2008),” The Monthly Review’s MR Zine, October 25th, Available Online at http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/foster251008.html, Accessed 10-30-2008)

Six months ago the United States was already deep in a financial crisis -- the roots of which were explained in this article. Yet, the conditions now are several orders of magnitude worse and are affecting the entire world. We are clearly in the midst of one of the great crises in the history of capitalism. More than a mere financial panic, what is taking place is a major devaluation of capital of still undetermined dimensions. Marx explained that capital was invariably over-extended in a boom and that in the crisis that followed a part of that capital was devalued, enabling the rest to return to profitability and to the process of accumulation and expansion. However, we are now to some extent in uncharted territory: a phase of monopoly-finance capital that is in many ways unprecedented. Even at the time of the Great Depression of the 1930s, Keynes explained that after a crisis modern capitalism might return to profitability without a return to full employment, full utilization of existing capacity, and strong growth. Our experience of the last half-century has shown that capitalism at its core was able to avoid stagnation only by vast military expenditures and, when that proved insufficient, by an enormous inflation of asset values and speculation, i.e. "financialization." This growth multiplied by the boom psychology on the way up (the "wealth effect") turned out to also have a contracting multiplier effect on the way down. These factors help to explain why the economic crisis in the real economy is so severe at present, and why there is no chance of an immediate restarting of the growth process.

Many people first woke up to the seriousness of the crisis only on September 18, 2008, when U.S. Secretary of Treasury Henry Paulson told Congress that the U.S. financial sector was within days of a complete meltdown and that a $700 billion bailout for the banks was urgently needed. Since then (and indeed even before) vast amounts of government dollars have been poured into the financial structure (all told the financial exposure of the U.S. government alone in the entire crisis has exceeded $5 trillion at this writing), including direct injection of capital into major banks and partial nationalizations.1 Yet, still there is little sign of the crisis abating. Insolvency is spreading through the economy from consumers to banks, to non-financial firms, back to consumers, in a vicious cycle. The fact that the economy in recent decades was being lifted mainly by financialization makes the problem all that much more severe.

The entire world economy is now affected. Already one economy in the European sphere itself -- Iceland -- has experienced a meltdown, requiring rescue from outside, and some have called Iceland the "canary in the coalmine." Over this last neoliberal epoch, the United States and its European allies have forced upon the entire globe a model of the free flow of capital across borders. The result today is the free flow of catastrophe. Only by the imposition, first, of capital controls and the establishment, second, of non-market based "South-South" cooperation can "emerging" economies avoid becoming the worse victims of the crash.

In these dire economic circumstances we should of course be careful not to fall into an exaggerated frame of mind. It is important to remember that a breakdown of capitalism as a whole will not occur by mere economics alone. Given time to work things out on its own terms the system will no doubt recover -- though a full recovery could be many years away, if possible at all.

The real historical issue before us is to what extent the world's population is willing to wait for this crisis to be resolved on capitalist terms, so that the whole irrational process of exploitation and boom and bust can gain steam again -- or whether they shall decide to insert themselves into the process to say Enough! It is this political insertion from below that the powers that be most fear. From their Olympian position at the top of the system they know perhaps better than anyone else that the conditions exist for the possible renewal of socialism on a global scale. Capitalism has reached its limits as a progressive force and its famous "creative destruction" has turned into a destructive creativity in which both the world's people and the planet are now in jeopardy. Indeed, for the world's population and the earth taken a whole there is today no real alternative – to socialism.

### State Bad DA

#### Their policies will always be tainted by militaristic global capitalism killing value to life.

Rajiva, 6 – Masters in Economics, Doctoral work in international relations and political philosophy

(Lila, The New Centennial Review 6.1 (2006) 133-169, “Prometheus The Emergence of the Police State in America “)

Indeed, to act with impunity, the state prefers a control that leaves no marks, that operates through fear, that appears to its citizens as invisible satellite eyes in outer space, as robot sensors, as scanners that probe mechanically, as spy software that reads keystroke to keystroke the random fluctuations of inner space. Through fear, control remains anonymous and invisible. Invisible, it becomes inevitable, virtuous, and complete. In this fascination with collapsing the boundaries of spirit and body, with dynamism and flux, with probing the outermost and the innermost, the Promethean betrays itself as romantic in its aesthetic, despite its rhetoric of reason and law. Entrepreneurship presents itself less as a necessity of capitalism than as a spiritual ideal of initiative and strife. The ethos of business and military blend into each other in the doctrine of **perpetual war**. A war not merely to fatten defense budgets but to deplete the civilian, for to the Prometheans, populations present themselves as recalcitrant flesh to be disciplined and spiritualized through strife. Under the rhetoric of democracy and egalitarianism, hierarchy is the reality, a hierarchy in which business elites, technocrats, and their ideologues control the masses with the wand of propaganda (Laughland 2003). Thus, the concept of **space** becomes **central** to the Promethean ideology. It is articulated through the ethos of competition and the survival of the fittest, the maintenance of distance between the elites and the masses. Space is the unifying concept in the expansion of the state territorially into the heavens and internally into the psyche. It is also behind the definition of everything outside the state as a lack needing to be remedied or filled, as failed states, regressed cultures, as gaps in order. Into these gaps, whether in the heavens or on earth, the state inserts its rationality through the stealthy monitoring of a robotic technology, which represents the **elimination of the human**. In so expressing rationality without the inconvenience of undisciplined flesh, the Promethean state articulates the demigod. Sensing its own robot impunity and limitless expansiveness, it arrives at that dangerous [End Page 161] solipsism, reflected in such statements as, "We create our own reality." In a world thus fashioned and driven from within, external constraints become not merely ineffective but irrelevant.

#### The perm fails because it attempts to use the state to achieve social change

Holloway, 2, Ph.D in Political Science from University of Edinburgh, (John, “Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today,” http://libcom.org/library/change-world-without-taking-power-john-holloway)

The world cannot be changed through the state. Both theoretical reflection and a whole century of bad experience tell us so. 'We told you so', say the satisfied ones, 'We said so all along. We said it was absurd. We told you that you couldn't go against human nature. Give up the dream, give up!' And millions throughout the world have given up the dream of a radically different type of society. There is no doubt that the fall of the Soviet Union and the failure of national liberation movements throughout the world have brought disillusionment to millions of people. The notion of revolution was so strongly identified with gaining control of the state that the failure of those attempts to change the world through gaining control of the state has led very many people to the conclusion that revolution is impossible. There is a toning down of expectations. For many, hope has evaporated from their lives, giving way to a bitter, cynical reconciliation with reality. It will not be possible to create the free and just society we hoped for, but at least we can vote for a centre or left-of-centre party, knowing quite well that it will not make any difference, but at least that way we will have some sort of outlet for our frustration. 'We know now that we will not be able to change the world,' says one of the characters in a novel by Marcela Serrano. 'That has been the greatest blow of all for our generation. We lost our objective in the middle of the way, when we still had the age and the energy to make the changes... The only thing that is left is to ask with humility: where is dignity?'

### Piecemeal Reform Bad

#### Alternative is a practical approach to dismantle capital—peace-meal fails

Blackledge, 8 (Paul is a Senior Lecturer in Politics at Leeds Metropolitan University. http://www.socialistreview.org.uk/article.php?articlenumber=10634)

Since 1971 István Mészáros has been centrally concerned to explain and combat what he calls the "global structural crisis of capital". His attempt to understand this phenomenon informed the publication of two important books, The Power of Ideology and Beyond Capital. These works were written from a classical Marxist perspective and were intended to renew Marxist ideas in the modern context. And, whatever their faults, they show the continuing vitality of Marx's revolutionary theory. Beyond Capital especially is an incredibly impressive work, although at almost 1,000 closely typed and philosophically dense pages it is not the easiest of reads. The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time by contrast is a much more user friendly book. As John Bellamy Foster writes in the foreword, it is perhaps best read as a more accessible complement, introduction or afterword to Beyond Capital. As such, although some parts of this book assume a more than passing knowledge of a number of the great names of social, political and economic theory, its attempt to provide a readable extension and application of classical Marxism to the contemporary world means it deserves attention. The central message of this book is that Margaret Thatcher's old mantra that "there is no alternative", which has been taken up and embraced not only by New Labour but by neoliberal politicians the world over, is a lie. Mészáros confronts the common sense assumption that capitalism and antagonistic individualism are natural and that, consequently, realistic politics must be limited by the parameters of what can be done within the system. He shows not only that capitalism is a product of human history, but also that it generates a series of fundamental problems which ensure that it has no long-term viability. As a result, although "capital has the upper hand everywhere" far from it being able to overcome these contradictions it can only "fiddle with effects and surface manifestations" in a way that "continues to generate them on an ever increasing scale". If the present economic crisis tends to confirm this general perspective, these recurrent and systemic problems ensure that however many times the left suffer defeats, socialism can never be completely wiped from the political agenda. Nevertheless, Mészáros has no truck with the idea that socialism will inevitably follow from the crisis of capitalism. He simply points to the increasingly obvious fact that capitalism cannot continue on its destructive path indefinitely. Moreover, he shows that socialism is not merely an abstract dream of a better world. Rather, because capitalism creates a class for whom solidarity becomes a basic need, the rule of capital brings in its train transformations which make a socialist alternative to modern antagonistic individualism both desirable and possible. Like Rosa Luxemburg, therefore, Mészáros believes that the long-term choice for humanity is between socialism or barbarism, and that because "the long run is becoming ever shorter...our responsibility is to do something before we run out of time". This sense of political urgency infuses the entire book. Mészáros compares capital's relentless drive for growth with a cancer. He insists that we have reached a point at which some form of radical treatment is absolutely necessary. Concretely, capitalism's essence as a system of growth for growth's sake means that despite the greater potential for free time which increased labour productivity should entail, capitalism forces us to work longer and harder while simultaneously eating into the free time we have outside of work. This free time becomes increasingly commercialised and reduces us to the status of consumers. If this erosion of free time is one consequence of the power of capital, another is the developing environmental crisis. Mészáros shows it is no mere product of industrialisation, but is a more specific consequence of the system's need to "grow inexorably or perish". And if the dehumanisation of free time and the destruction of nature are two sides of capitalist alienation, so long as we confront this world as atomised individuals nothing seems more realistic than the idea that this is a natural system. Hope in such a situation takes the form of the spontaneous collectivist movements against the consequences of the rule of capital. One aspect of the structural crisis of capitalism is the massive levels of unemployment experienced even before the present recession. Commenting on the demand for a 35 hour week in this situation, Mészáros argues that, whatever its limitations, this and similar demands cannot be sustained by traditional forms of trade unionism which hoped to benefit from capitalist growth. He argues that what is necessary today is a more directly political and indeed socialist form of trade unionism - one that is linked to a revolutionary strategy that overcomes the opposition between Luxemburg and Lenin. Such a strategy, by overcoming the reformist separation between politics and economics, can challenge the logic of capital in the here and now in a way that points beyond it to a real socialist alternative.

#### The permutation preserves the political power of capital—only a total replacement by labor can transcend the system

Meszaros, 95 (Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex) 1995 [Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, p. 128]

What requires proof in this respect — concerning a qualitatively different future — is that the historically constituted and still unfolding ontology of labour, in its fundamental meaning of both agency and activity of social metabolic reproduction, can sustain itself with a higher degree of productivity when freed from the strait-jacket of the established mode of expanded surplus- extraction than when its movement is constrained by the latter’s perverse imperative of capital-accumulation. In other words, the alternative to capital’s necessarily external and adversarial mode of controlling the labour process (which can be misrepresented as internal and positive only by the system’s uncritical defenders) is the radical reconstitution of both the labour process and of its social agency, labour, on the basis of internal and consciously adopted consensual/cooperative determinations. This proof may only be anticipated in its broadest outlines on the plane of theory: by indicating in positive terms its conditions of possibility and realization, and in negative terms the unsustainable destructive tendencies of the existing order which point in the direction of its necessary breakdown. But the crucial part of the proof in question must be the actual reconstitution of labour itself nor simply as the antagonist of capital but as the sovereign creative agent of the labour process. An agency capable of securing the chosen in contrast to the now by means of the structural/hierarchical social division of labour from the outside imposed — conditions of expanded reproduction without the crutches of capital. This is the real meaning of the Marxianpractzca/ critique of capital’s political economy, concerned with the necessity to go beyond capital and of its now everywhere dominant, apparently permanent, network of second order mediations.

## \*\*\* Alternative

### Generic Alternative Solvency

#### The crises of global capitalism open up the possibility for revolutionary change

Speth, 08 [James Gustave Speth, law professor, Served as President Jimmy Carter’s White House environmental adviser and as head of the United Nations’ largest agency for international development Prof at Vermont law school, former dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, former Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching environmental and constitutional law, former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President, co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council, The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability, ISBN: 9780300145304, EBrary, pg. 185]

Immanuel Wallerstein, the father of World System Analysis, believes that modern capitalism is driving the world to the point where there is a choice: either costly environmental measures that “could well serve as the coup de grace to the viability of the capitalist world economy” or “various ecological catastrophes” brought on by the ceaseless accumulation of capital and growth inherent in capitalism. “The political economy of the current situation is that historical capitalism is in fact in crisis precisely because it cannot find reasonable solutions to its current dilemmas, of which the inability to contain ecological destruction is a major one, if not the only one.” Wallerstein believes that “the present historical system is in fact in terminal crisis. The issue before us is what will replace it. This is the central political debate of the next 25– 50 years. The issue of ecological degradation, but not of course only this issue, is a central locus of this debate.”5 Political theorist John Dryzek’s analysis is similar. Like Bowles and Wallerstein, he sees environmental problems as a key driver of change: “Ecological problems are sufficiently widespread and serious to constitute an acid test for all actual and proposed political and economic arrangements and for all processes of institutional reconstruction, be they incremental or revolutionary.” Dryzek believes that the combination of capitalism, interest group politics, and the bureaucratic state will prove “thoroughly inept when it comes to ecology” and “that any redeeming features are to be found only in the possibilities that they open up for their own transformation.”6 Dryzek sees a new system as necessary, but he sounds a note of caution: “Historically, the outcomes of revolutions have generally borne little relation to the intentions of revolutionaries. . . . Rather than speculate about grandiose possibilities for sweeping structural transformation, it seems more sensible to locate the real possibilities for change at vulnerable locations in the political economy. Such possibilities exist either where there is significant opposition to dominant structures and their imperatives, or where contradiction and confusion in dominant structures renders them vulnerable to action on behalf of some alternative institutional order.”7 He sees significant opposition coming from a wide variety of issues and oppressed groups and believes that the confrontation of these groups against the state and corporate power can be a major force for change in capitalism. In A Theory of Global Capitalism, William Robinson also sees global capitalism as headed for crisis: “In my view, the crisis that beset global capitalism at the turn of the [twenty-first] century involved four interrelated aspects: (1) overproduction or underconsumption, or what alternatively is known as overaccumulation; (2) global social polarization; (3) the crisis of state legitimacy and political authority; (4) the crisis of sustainability. The last of these . . . raises profound theoretical, historical, and practical issues for humanity.”8 Robinson contends that **fundamental change becomes possible when an organic crisis occurs**. “An organic crisis is one in which the system faces both a structural (objective) crisis and a crisis of legitimacy or hegemony (subjective). An organic crisis [itself] is not enough to bring about fundamental, progressive change in a social order; indeed, in the past it has led to social breakdown, authoritarianism, and fascism. A [positive] outcome to an organic crisis also requires that there be a viable alternative that is in hegemonic ascendance, that is, an alternative to the existing order that is viable and that is seen as viable and preferable by a majority of society.” Robinson concludes that “global capitalism was not experiencing an organic crisis in the early twentyfirst century” but that “the prospect for such a crisis to develop was more palpably on the horizon at the turn of the century than at any time since perhaps 1968.”9

### Try or Die

#### Its try or die for the alt

Sullivan, 6 [Sullivan, Writer for Clearing House, Charles Sullivan, “ Scared Ecology and Capitalism, 06, http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm, 6-25-11]

Eventually the mountains themselves would be blown apart when the mining companies sought cheaper and faster ways to mine coal. The process is known as mountain top removal and it is in vogue in West Virginia and other regions where the great Central Appalachian forests once flourished. Ecologically and economically devastated communities are left behind, while the timber and mining companies move on to greener pastures to repeat the process over and over. These destructive practices spread across Turtle Island like a cancer, destroying world class biodiversity and leaving only a few fragmented, ecologically impaired islands behind. The same destructive forces have been set loose upon every part of the word. This is socialized cost and privatized wealth in the most extreme, subsidized by our tax dollars. Wherever the extractive industries have gone they have left polluted waters and depauperate landscapes, and exhausted and impoverished workers in their wake. The company owners get rich while the workers continue to live in abject poverty and are still dying in the mines. This is the legacy of capitalism, as witnessed by a historical record that is beyond dispute. It is there for the entire world to see, as if etched in granite. You can see it in the face of the miners and the impoverished remnant forest, in the toxic waste left behind in Butte, Montana, where the water in the aftermath of copper mining has the acidity of battery acid. It makes no moral, ecological or economic sense whatsoever for us to continue down this path of self-deception and self-annihilation. As we have seen, capitalism produces only a few winners, and leaves death and devastation in its wake. Either we rebel or die. Think about the kind of world we are leaving future generations. How can they ever forgive us this trespass? Imagine, if you can, living in a world based upon mutual aide and cooperation, rather than cut-throat competition; a world where people cared for the earth and for one another, and the world’s wealth was equitably shared among all beings.

### AT: Alt fails

#### Solvency deficits to the alternative are irrelevant—hope is critical even in the face of failure

Holloway 2, Ph.D in Political Science from University of Edinburgh

(John, “Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today,” http://libcom.org/library/change-world-without-taking-power-john-holloway)

The more we think about power in capitalist society, the more anguished our scream becomes. But the more anguished it becomes, the more desperate, the more helpless. The penetration of power-over into the core of those who are subject to that power-over is the central problem that any revolutionary theory has to deal with. The reaching of the separation of doing and done into the doer herself is both the reason why revolution is desperately urgent and the reason why it is increasingly difficult to conceive. The maiming of the subject through the penetration of power-over into the depths of her existence stirs both indignation and resignation: how can we live in a society based on dehumanisation? But how can we possibly change a society in which people are so dehumanised? This is the dilemma of the urgent impossibility of revolution. There are three possible ways out of the dilemma. The first is to give up hope. Instead of thinking that it might be possible to create a society free of exploitation, free of war, free of violence, an emancipated society based on mutual recognition, this approach accepts that the world cannot be changed radically and focuses instead on living as well as can be and making whatever small changes may be possible. Alienation is recognised, perhaps, but regarded as being permanent. The concepts of revolution and emancipation are abandoned and replaced with the idea of 'micro-politics'. The multiplicity of power comes to be seen as the underpinning of a multiplicity of struggles focussed on particular issues or particular identities: struggles which aim at a rearrangement but not an overcoming of power relations. Disillusionment is associated most commonly with post-modern theory and politics, but it spreads much farther than that. In other cases, the notion of revolution may be retained as a point of reference, but left-wing discourse becomes more melancholic, more and more focussed on denouncing the horrors of capitalism and more and more removed from considering the possibility of a solution. Left-wing intellectuals adopt the position of Cassandra, prophesying the doom that is to come, but with little hope of being heard. The melancholic Cassandras and the post-modernists may, of course, be quite right. Perhaps there is no hope, perhaps there is no possibility of creating a society that is not based on exploitation and dehumanisation. It may well be that when humanity finally destroys itself in a nuclear blast or otherwise, the last post-modernist will be able to say with glee to the last hopeful Marxist, 'you see, I told you so, now you can see that my approach was scientifically correct'. It may well be so, but it does not help us very much. **The scream with which we started announced an obstinate refusal to give up hope, a refusal to accept that the miseries and inhumanities of capitalism are inevitable. From the perspective of the scream, then, giving up hope is simply not an option.**

### Capitalism Unsustainable

#### Transition is inevitable – the underpinnings of capitalism are collapsing

Wallerstein, 11 – \*senior research scholar at Yale

(Immanuel, “The Global Economy Won’t Recover, Now or Ever,” January-February 2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\_wisdom?page=0,9)

Virtually everyone everywhere-economists, politicians, pundits -- agrees that the world has been in some kind of economic trouble since at least 2008. And virtually everyone seems to believe that in the next few years the world will somehow "recover" from these difficulties. After all, upturns always occur after downturns. The remedies recommended vary considerably, but the idea that the system shall continue in its essential features is a deeply rooted faith. But it is wrong. All systems have lives. When their processes move too far from equilibrium, they fluctuate chaotically and bifurcate. Our existing system, what I call a capitalist world-economy, has been in existence for some 500 years and has for at least a century encompassed the entire globe. It has functioned remarkably well. But like all systems, it has moved steadily further and further from equilibrium. For a while now, it has moved too far from equilibrium, such that it is today in structural crisis. The problem is that the basic costs of all production have risen remarkably. There are the personnel expenses of all kinds -- for unskilled workers, for cadres, for top-level management. There are the costs incurred as producers pass on the costs of their production to the rest of us -- for detoxification, for renewal of resources, for infrastructure. And the democratization of the world has led to demands for more and more education, more and more health provisions, and more and more guarantees of lifetime income. To meet these demands, there has been a significant increase in taxation of all kinds. Together, these costs have risen beyond the point that permits serious capital accumulation. Why not then simply raise prices? Because there are limits beyond which one cannot push their level. It is called the elasticity of demand. The result is a growing profit squeeze, which is reaching a point where the game is not worth the candle. What we are witnessing as a result is chaotic fluctuations of all kinds -- economic, political, sociocultural. These fluctuations cannot easily be controlled by public policy. The result is ever greater uncertainty about all kinds of short-term decision-making, as well as frantic realignments of every variety. Doubt feeds on itself as we search for ways out of the menacing uncertainty posed by terrorism, climate change, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation. The only sure thing is that the present system cannot continue. The fundamental political struggle is over what kind of system will replace capitalism, not whether it should survive. The choice is between a new system that replicates some of the present system's essential features of hierarchy and polarization and one that is relatively democratic and egalitarian. The extraordinary expansion of the world-economy in the postwar years (more or less 1945 to 1970) has been followed by a long period of economic stagnation in which the basic source of gain has been rank speculation sustained by successive indebtednesses. The latest financial crisis didn't bring down this system; it merely exposed it as hollow. Our recent "difficulties" are merely the next-to-last bubble in a process of boom and bust the world-system has been undergoing since around 1970. The last bubble will be state indebtednesses, including in the so-called emerging economies, leading to bankruptcies. Most people do not recognize -- or refuse to recognize -- these realities. It is wrenching to accept that the historical system in which we are living is in structural crisis and will not survive. Meanwhile, the system proceeds by its accepted rules. We meet at G-20 sessions and seek a futile consensus. We speculate on the markets. We "develop" our economies in whatever way we can. All this activity simply accentuates the structural crisis. The real action, the struggle over what new system will be created, is elsewhere.

#### Globalization is about to collapse – this is an opportunity to reorient away from the competitive economy

Bello, 9 – Prof of Sociology and Public Administration at the University of the Philippines [September 5, 2009 the Huffpost World, Waledn Bello, Member of the Philippine House of Representatives, Professor of Sociology and Public Administration at the University of the Philippines, Diliman, Executive Director of Foucs on the Global South http://www.huffingtonpost.com/walden-bello/the-virtues-of-deglobaliz\_b\_277531.html]

The current global downturn, the worst since the Great Depression 70 years ago, pounded the last nail into the coffin of globalization. Already beleaguered by evidence that showed global poverty and inequality increasing, even as most poor countries experienced little or no economic growth, globalization has been terminally discredited in the last two years. As the much-heralded process of financial and trade interdependence went into reverse, it became the transmission belt not of prosperity but of economic crisis and collapse. End of an Era In their responses to the current economic crisis, governments paid lip service to global coordination but propelled separate stimulus programs meant to rev up national markets. In so doing, governments quietly shelved export-oriented growth, long the driver of many economies, though paid the usual nostrums to advancing trade liberalization as a means of countering the global downturn by completing the Doha Round of trade negotiations under the World Trade Organization. There is increasing acknowledgment that there will be no returning to a world centrally dependent on free-spending American consumers, since many are bankrupt and nobody has taken their place. Moreover, whether agreed on internationally or unilaterally set up by national governments, a whole raft of restrictions will almost certainly be imposed on finance capital, the untrammeled mobility of which has been the cutting edge of the current crisis. Intellectual discourse, however, hasn't yet shown many signs of this break with orthodoxy. Neoliberalism, with its emphasis on free trade, the primacy of private enterprise, and a minimalist role for the state, continues to be the default language among policymakers. Establishment critics of market fundamentalism, including Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman, have become entangled in endless debates over how large stimulus programs should be, and whether or not the state should retain an interventionist presence or, once stabilized, return the companies and banks to the private sector. Moreover some, such as Stiglitz, continue to believe in what they perceive to be the economic benefits of globalization while bemoaning its social costs. But trends are fast outpacing both ideologues and critics of neoliberal globalization, and developments thought impossible a few years ago are gaining steam. "The integration of the world economy is in retreat on almost every front," writes the Economist. While the magazine says that corporations continue to believe in the efficiency of global supply chains, "like any chain, these are only as strong as their weakest link. A danger point will come if firms decide that this way of organizing production has had its day." "Deglobalization," a term that the Economist attributes to me, is a development that the magazine, the world's prime avatar of free market ideology, views as negative. I believe, however, that deglobalization is an opportunity. Indeed, my colleagues and I at Focus on the Global South first forwarded deglobalization as a comprehensive paradigm to replace neoliberal globalization almost a decade ago, when the stresses, strains, and contradictions brought about by the latter had become painfully evident. Elaborated as an alternative mainly for developing countries, the deglobalization paradigm is not without relevance to the central capitalist economies. 11 Pillars of the Alternative There are 11 key prongs of the deglobalization paradigm: Production for the domestic market must again become the center of gravity of the economy rather than production for export markets. The principle of subsidiarity should be enshrined in economic life by encouraging production of goods at the level of the community and at the national level if this can be done at reasonable cost in order to preserve community. Trade policy — that is, quotas and tariffs — should be used to protect the local economy from destruction by corporate-subsidized commodities with artificially low prices. Industrial policy — including subsidies, tariffs, and trade — should be used to revitalize and strengthen the manufacturing sector. Long-postponed measures of equitable income redistribution and land redistribution (including urban land reform) can create a vibrant internal market that would serve as the anchor of the economy and produce local financial resources for investment. Deemphasizing growth, emphasizing upgrading the quality of life, and maximizing equity will reduce environmental disequilibrium. The development and diffusion of environmentally congenial technology in both agriculture and industry should be encouraged. Strategic economic decisions cannot be left to the market or to technocrats. Instead, the scope of democratic decision-making in the economy should be expanded so that all vital questions — such as which industries to develop or phase out, what proportion of the government budget to devote to agriculture, etc. — become subject to democratic discussion and choice. Civil society must constantly monitor and supervise the private sector and the state, a process that should be institutionalized. The property complex should be transformed into a "mixed economy" that includes community cooperatives, private enterprises, and state enterprises, and excludes transnational corporations. Centralized global institutions like the IMF and the World Bank should be replaced with regional institutions built not on free trade and capital mobility but on principles of cooperation that, to use the words of Hugo Chavez in describing the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA), "transcend the logic of capitalism."

#### Markets can’t make growth sustainable – relying on capitalism guarantees extinction.

Dobkowski and Wallimann, 98 [Michael N. Dobkowski, Professor of Religious Studies at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, and Isidor Wallimann, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work (Switzerland) and Lecturer at the University of Fribourg, 1998, "The Coming Age of Scarcity: An Introduction," The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 12-13]

Furthermore, the jolts emitted by the economic system are also of importance, for production factors like population, land, energy, as well as many environmental constraints are mediated and coordinated by markets. Markets, however, are also known to have a great deal of discontinuity owing to the anonymous number of its participants and the unforeseeable outcome produced by their myriad market interactions. Thus, the capitalist market, the very technique chosen to manage survival, is itself a threat to survival, as is exemplified by speculation, recessions, and depressions, booms and busts. Market dynamics themselves upset the delicate balance between land, energy, population, and the environment, and thereby directly determine survival and death rates. Additionally, techniques to assure continuity in a world of random but significant disturbances may break down. Already insurance companies suspect that a number of recent weather-related events may have ceased to be sufficiently random or insignificant or both to be insured. The private market insurance system may soon prove to be unable to ensure against certain ecosystem risks. The instability would [end page 12] thereby increase, leaving politics as the last potential guarantor of continuity and stability, as is already the case with atomic power plants, where no private insurer is willing to cover the entire risk, nor could such risk be covered. However, how many big risks, should the event and the scarcity associated with them occur, can the political system handle before solidarity breaks down, instability increases, conflicts grow, and massive death results? In times of growth and system expansion, potential conflicts can more likely be ignored, for their resolution is relatively easy. Everybody can come up with Pareto-type conflict resolutions. The going gets much tougher though, and more lives are at stake, when conflicts await resolution during system contraction, increased scarcity, and shrinking surpluses. First, the number and severity of conflicts tend to increase. Second, conflict potentials can no longer be as easily ignored, for, should they erupt, the disturbance would only augment the scarcity and make any resolution increasingly and unnecessarily more difficult. Third, resolutions to conflicts are politically and economically much harder to find in times of general scarcity and contraction. Presently, our world still relies on expansion and Pareto-type conflict resolutions. International exchange and free trade is thus enhanced, as is evident by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Furthermore, Eastern Europe, once a highly self-sufficient economic and political system, is being dismantled and integrated with the world division of labor. China, while still self-sufficient, may because of its participation in international trade and communication also become more unstable and be pressured to further expand market relations. While Eastern Europe and China chose to bring about industrialization by the primacy of political priorities over market priorities and by politically distributing scarcity (also in the sphere of consumption), Eastern Europe is now joining the rest of the world by introducing social and political relations based on the primacy of markets. And China may soon follow and experience large-scale migration, increased inequality, poverty, higher birthrates, and destabilized population growth. Capitalism, which is now the world’s dominant political and economic system, thrives on market expansion. However, how compatible is capitalism with the long-term zero or negative growth environment of the future? It is incompatible! Not only does capitalism have great [end page 13] difficulty in handling such conditions, economically and politically, but it also has, for the same reasons, difficulty in preparing for them. Thus, markets, if left to themselves, cannot factor in long-term scarcity. Has the price of oil, for example, signaled that oil will soon be very scarce? On the contrary, oil markets have, if anything, signaled an ever-growing supply of oil. The same could be said for land, lumber, and many other natural resources in limited supply. The ability of the capitalist market system to guide us through the next decades of increasing scarcity and downscaling of industrial production is very limited indeed, and if lives are to be preserved, the primacy of politics over markets will have to be introduced again, as was the case for practically all of human history except its bourgeois phase. In this context, it is ironic that, just when political control over the economy is especially needed, Eastern Europe is—with huge losses in productive capacity and means of production and at tremendous social and economic restructuring costs—reintroducing the primacy of markets.

#### The profit motive makes sustainability impossible – the market will lead society to inevitable collapse.

Trainer, 98 [Ted Trainer, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of New South Wales, 1998, "Our Unsustainable Society: Basic Causes, Interconnections, and Solutions," The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-first Century, edited by Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, Published by Syracuse University Press, ISBN 0815627440, p. 92]

There can be no solution to the problems outlined above within an economy driven by the profit motive, market forces, capital accumulation, and economic growth (Trainer 1995b). The problems are being generated by these factors, most obviously by the obsession with constantly increasing production and consumption in a world with finite and scarce resources. (Nevertheless, a satisfactory economy could have an important place for market forces and free enterprise; see below.) If the limits-to-growth analyses are at all valid, it is clear that not only must we eventually arrive at a zero-growth or steady-state economy but also we in rich countries must first undergo a long period of negative growth in which per capita production and consumption measured in cash must be drastically reduced. The second major fault built into the foundations of this economy is the very mechanism its advocates are most proud of: the market. As has been explained, the more freedom that is given individuals to maximize their profits in a market, the more effectively will resources flow to those who are richest, and the more surely will there be development of the industries that produce for the rich. More importantly, the more scope that is given the market to determine what is done, the less influence will be exercised by considerations of morality, social benefit, or ecological sustainability. A glance at the Third World problem or the situation in rich-world urban ghettos or the ecological problem shows that all too often the right policies require action contrary to market forces. It requires action that free enterprise will not take because it would not maximize profits and it would either require increased government expenditure and therefore taxation, or the return of control to local people so that they could collectively develop solutions to their problems largely outside the cash economy.

#### Corruption inherent in capitalism makes it unsustainable

Di Tella and MacCulloch, 9 (Rafael, Harvard Business School, Robert, Imperial College London, Brookings Paper on Economy, Brookings Institution, 2009, http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/brookings\_papers\_on\_economic\_activity/v2009/2009.1.di-tella.html)

U.S.-style, pro-capitalist political ideas face electoral difficulties in poor countries. The first part of this paper showed, using data on business entry regulation, on the ideological orientation of political parties, and on people's beliefs about the benefits of private versus government ownership of business, that intrusive regulation and left-wing rhetoric and beliefs are more common in poor countries than in rich ones. The second part of the paper suggested an explanation for these phenomena based on the idea that corruption plays a role in shaping ideologies. We then presented a model in which corruption generates the perception that capitalists are "undeserving" (for example, of their wealth and of the freedom to run their businesses without supervision). When the legal system is slow to punish them, the demand for more regulation, higher taxes, and government intervention to make the environment less business-friendly increases, even if this has material costs. Thus, corruption, even when limited to a small group of businesspersons, might interfere with the spread of capitalism. In some circumstances, however, the government can preserve capitalism by punishing only those capitalists whom the voters perceive as corrupt—as Teddy Roosevelt did almost a century ago. We have presented suggestive evidence consistent with this "unpleasant capitalists" hypothesis. First, we showed that increases in aggregate (country-level) corruption tend to precede electoral gains by left-wing parties in national elections. Second, we showed that in a given country at a given time, people who perceive corruption to be widespread also tend to place themselves toward the left of the ideological spectrum and to demand more government ownership of business and industry. We also found cross-country data on reported emotions, from the Gallup World Poll, to be consistent with the mechanisms involved in our explanation: anger is associated with perceptions of widespread business corruption, but the presence of regulation that makes life harder for business weakens this correlation. We interpret our findings to mean that voters get angry when they see businesspeople engaging in corrupt behavior, and that they are then more likely to elect left-wing governments that will more stringently regulate business, thus reducing their anger. More broadly, the paper shows that corruption has an ideological side to it, eroding the legitimacy of business and hampering the electoral performance of pro-capitalist parties. [End Page 316]

## \*\*\* Impacts

### Endless War

#### Capitalism is the root cause of war:

#### A. Surplus Capital and Economic Coercion

Robinson, 7—Professor of Sociology, Global and International Studies, Latin American and Iberian Studies at the University of California-Santa Barbara

(William I., “The Pitfalls of Realist Analysis of Global Capitalism: A Critique of Ellen Meiksins Wood’s Empire of Capital”, Historical Materialism, 2007, http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/disciplines/politics/research/hmrg/activities/documents/Robinson.pdf)

By the early twenty-ﬁrst century, global capitalism was in crisis. This crisis involves three interrelated dimensions. First it is a crisis of social polarization. The system cannot meet the needs of a majority of humanity, or even assure minimal social reproduction. Second is a structural crisis of over accumulation. The system cannot expand because the marginalization of a signiﬁcant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarization of income, have reduced the ability of the world market to absorb world output. The problem of surplus absorption makes state-driven military spending and the growth of military-industrial complexes an outlet for surplus and **gives the current global order a frightening built-in war drive**. Third is a crisis of HIMA legitimacy and authority. The legitimacy of the system has increasingly been called into question by millions, perhaps even billions, of people around the world, and is facing an expanded counter-hegemonic challenge. Neoliberalism ‘peacefully’ forced open new areas for global capital in the 1980s and the 1990s. This was often accomplished through economic coercion alone, as Wood would likely agree, made possible by the structural power of the global economy over individual countries. But this structural power became less effective in the face of the three-pronged crisis mentioned above. Opportunities for both intensive and extensive expansion dried up as privatizations ran their course, as the former ‘socialist’ countries became re-integrated into global capitalism, as the consumption of high-income sectors worldwide reached a ceiling, and so on. The space for ‘peaceful’ expansion, both intensive and extensive, became ever more restricted. Military aggression has become in this context an instrument for prying open new sectors and regions, for the forcible restructuring of space in order to further accumulation. The train of neoliberalism became latched on to military intervention and the threat of coercive sanctions as a locomotive for pulling the moribund Washington consensus forward. The ‘war on terrorism’ provides a seemingly endless military outlet for surplus capital, generates a colossal deﬁcit that justiﬁes the ever-deeper dismantling of the Keynesian welfare state and locks neoliberal austerity in place, and legitimates the creation of a police state to repress political dissent in the name of security. In the post 9/11 period, the military dimension appeared to exercise an over determining inﬂuence in the reconﬁguration of global politics. The Bush régime militarized social and economic contradictions, launching a permanent war mobilization to try to stabilize the system through direct coercion. But was all this evidence for a new US bid for hegemony? A US campaign to ‘compete’ with other major states? To defend ‘its own domestic capital’? To ‘maintain a critical balance’ and ‘control major [state] competitors’? I trust my reasons for rejecting such an argument have been made clear in this critical article.

#### B. Resource Drive

Bhagwat, 11 (Vishnu, former Chief of the Naval Staff of India, Thee Weaponization of Space: Corporate Driven Military Unleashes Pre-emptive Wars, July 13, 2011, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=21432)

We must understand the reality of our present lawless world, where **corporate driven military** **might** unleashes **pre-emptive wars, invasions and occupations** and the UN system stands paralyzed , its Charter disregarded  , the Treaties and conventions signed and ratified , flouted at every step . It is necessary for us to focus on the stark truth that those treaties and conventions do not protect humanity from the forces that want to dominate and exploit the resources of the world using every weapon system and all mediums  --be they land , sea , the seabed **or space** and if the world system does not create a  balance very soon  than even from military bases that may be established on the earth’s planetary system. Vladimir Putin, then President and now the  Prime Minister of Russia, speaking at the European Security Conference in Munich on 10th February 2007, said: “The unipolar  world refers to a world in which there is one master, one center of authority, one center of force, one centre of decision making. At the end of the day this is pernicious not only for those  within the system , but also for the Sovereign himself from within ; what is more important is that the model itself is flawed because as its basis there is and can be no moral foundation for modern civilization ( and even less for democracy ). We are seeing a greater and greater disdain for the basic principles of international law. We are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force in international relations , force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permament conflicts . I am convinced that we have reached that decisive moment when we must seriously  think about the architecture of global security.” We have to move heaven and earth , the might of humanity to dismantle that decision making ruling elite in the ‘joint corporate –military board rooms ,’ be they located underground in the Strategic Command in Nebraska  or at multi-locations in Wall Street , the City ( London ) or Tel a Viv . The unlimited quest for establishing monopoly over the planet  earth’s resources and markets , has led the world to witness unending wars , sometimes referred to as ‘long wars’ , if that phrase makes it seem less destructive , **and the unending pursuit of weapon platform**s , for attaining  ‘full spectrum dominance’ and the ‘Strategic Defense Initiative’ (SDI ) or the Star Wars initiated by the ‘free market’ of the Reagan administration and Thatcherism , **accelerating the death and destruction that we have witnessed , all across the globe be it in Angola , Congo, Somalia, Afghanistan , Iraq , Palestine , Central and Latin America   , Yugoslavia , Lebanon , Gaza and earlier in Korea, Vietnam and Cambodia** among other countries with the  UN Security Council in some cases acquiescing and even assisting .

#### C. Imperial Competition

Foster, 5 (Foster, Oregon University Department of Sociology Professor, John B., Monthly Review, http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm, 6/22/11)

The global actions of the United States since September 11, 2001, are often seen as constituting a “new militarism” and a “new imperialism.” Yet, neither militarism nor imperialism is new to the United States, which has been an expansionist power—continental, hemispheric, and global—since its inception. What has changed is the nakedness with which this is being promoted, and the unlimited, planetary extent of U.S. ambitions. Max Boot, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, insists that the “greatest danger” facing the United States in Iraq and around the world “is that we won’t use all of our power for fear of the ‘I’ word—imperialism….Given the historical baggage that ‘imperialism’ carries, there’s no need for the U.S. government to embrace the term. But it should definitely embrace the practice.” The United States, he says, should be “prepared to embrace its imperial rule unapologetically.” If Washington is not planning on “permanent bases in Iraq…they should be….If that raises hackles about American imperialism, so be it” (“American Imperialism?: No Need to Run from the Label,” USA Today, May 6, 2003). Similarly, Deepak Lal, James S. Coleman Professor of International Development Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, states: “The primary task of a Pax Americana must be to find ways to create a new order in the Middle East….It is accusingly said by many that any such rearrangement of the status quo would be an act of imperialism and would largely be motivated by the desire to control Middle Eastern oil. But far from being objectionable, imperialism is precisely what is needed to restore order in the Middle East” (“In Defense of Empires,” in Andrew Bacevich, ed., The Imperial Tense, 2003). These views, although emanating from neoconservatives, are fully within the mainstream of U.S. foreign policy. Indeed, there is little dissent in U.S. ruling circles about current attempts to expand the American Empire. For Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, senior fellows at the Brookings Institution, “the real debate…is not whether to have an empire, but what kind” (New York Times, May 10, 2003). Michael Ignatieff, director of Harvard University’s Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, states unequivocally: “This new imperialism…is humanitarian in theory but imperial in practice; it creates ‘subsovereignty,’ in which states possess independence in theory but not in fact. The reason the Americans are in Afghanistan, or the Balkans, after all, is to maintain imperial order in zones essential to the interest of the United States. They are there to maintain order against a barbarian threat.” As “the West’s last military state” and its last “remaining empire,” the United States has a responsibility for “imperial structuring and ordering” in “analogy to Rome….We have now awakened to the barbarians….Retribution has been visited on the barbarians, and more will follow” (“The Challenges of American Imperial Power,” Naval War College Review, Spring 2003). All of this reflects the realities of U.S. imperial power. In his preamble to the National Security Strategy of the United States, released in fall 2002, President George W. Bush declared that since the fall of the Soviet Union there was now “a single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy and free enterprise,” as embodied concretely in U.S. capitalism. Any society that rejected the guidance of that model was destined to fail—and would, it was implied, be declared a security threat to the United States. The main body of the document that followed was an open declaration of Washington’s goal of strategic dominance over the entire planet for the indefinite future. It announced U.S. intentions of waging “preemptive” (or preventive) war against nations that threatened or in the future could conceivably threaten U.S. dominance directly—or that might be considered a threat indirectly through dangers they posed to U.S. friends or allies anywhere on the globe. Preventive actions would be taken, the new National Security Strategy emphasized, to ensure that no power would be allowed to rise up to rival the United States in military capabilities anytime in the future. On April 13, 2004, President Bush proclaimed that the United States needed to “go on the offensive and stay on the offensive,” waging an unrelenting war against all those it considered its enemies.

#### The competitive economic system uses our military as its global policeman – forcing us to be a permanent state of war.

Mooers, 6 – Chair of the Department of Politics and School of Public Administration at Ryerson University [Colin, “The New Imperialists,” 2006, pg 5-6]

The current round of imperialism, therefore, has as its goal the export and entrenchment of capitalist social-property relations throughout the world; it is about the universalization of capitalism. And just as in earlier phases of capitalism, state military power has been central to the imposition of this new stage of primitive accumulation and enclosure. However, if state military power is still essential for the imposition of capitalism in some parts of the world, and if its spectacular display remains vital to U.S. global hegemony, there is an important sense in which the dynamics of imperialism have changed markedly. Unlike its earlier forms, imperialism today no longer relies on direct colonization. Nor does military rivalry between states over resources and territory exist on the scale that it did in the time of Lenin and Bukharin. But if imperialism is no longer defined by formal empire and military competition, how have militarism and capitalist imperatives become so closely linked in the new imperialism? The simple answer is that in a world comprised of limited territorial states and the global reach of capital, the use of overwhelming military might becomes the only way of policing capitalist interests. When terrorist violence beyond the state is thrown into the mix, the problem becomes even more intractable. For these reasons, a more or less permanent state of warfare – war without end – has become definitive of twenty-first-century capitalism: “Boundless domination of a global economy, and of the multiple states that administer it, requires military action without end, in purpose or time.” 12 If a state of permanent war has become the “new normal” of our time, it is clear why the discourse of empire has become so vital to those who defend this new order of things: the domestication of war and imperial conquest has become an urgent ideological imperative.

#### Globalization will cause endless war and will make any other country not part of it, “rogue”

Chowdhury, 6 (Kanishka, Professor on American Culture at St. Thomas University, “Interrogating ‘Newness’”, Culture Critique, 2006, http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/cultural\_critique/v062/62.1chowdhury.html#FOOT4)

In a sense, globalization is now used as a cover for endless war. Countries are designated as "rogue" regimes to the extent that they fail to assimilate into global capitalism. Globalization, then, has been presented as the natural economic order and one connected inextricably to the forces of democracy and civilization. Globalization as described by its advocates thus suggests a natural, neutral process, one in which a larger, benign global family looks out for each member's interests, and where the powerful nations teach, at a cost, those who are economically "backward" the ways of the world. This is a process in which the "Third World" elite are, of course, willing participants. Consider, for instance, the text of the May 6, 2003, full-page advertisement in the New York Times celebrating the new Nigeria: "In Nigeria, a new generation is looking to attract increased foreign investment. . . . New legislation has made foreign involvement easier. . . . Several state-owned enterprises are being prepared for privatization. . . . Foreign investors with unique and innovative projects are granted 'pioneer status.' . . . We have very generous tax-waivers—five years for pioneer status companies. . . . We are doing everything possible to cooperate with the United States" (C11). One doesn't have to look very hard at this advertisement to understand that the forces of multinational capital have produced this text many times over. After all, such "promotions," paid for in more ways than one by Third World citizens, are created in the West, for the Western consumer, and by Western advertising firms. Despite such glossy claims, we are clearly not considering [End Page 128] a harmonious, mutually beneficial process of global cooperation here; rather, we are witnessing the legitimized and systematic looting and subjugation of a sovereign nation, assisted by its national bourgeoisie; in short, we are observing another step in the process of endless war. Let us then begin our analysis of globalization by reattaching the designation "capitalist" to globalization, so we can focus on the unvarnished economic logic of this violent process of endless war. Globalization, of course, is not merely an economic process but one that has multiple cultural articulations. Although advocates celebrate the growth of cultural exchange, the greater accessibility to a range of cultural products, and the potential democratization of authoritarian societies through so-called liberatory cultural imports, these cultural transactions are characterized by and depend upon existing economic inequalities between metropolitan centers and the peripheries. Certainly the speed and volume of production and distribution of culture have made cultural goods like film and music more widely available, but the profits from these transactions are controlled by and distributed among an elite minority. Increased access to cultural material, moreover, has not translated into increased access to economic opportunity. Finally, those who have economic power establish the terms and rules for cultural exchange. Consequently, even though much is made of the occasional cultural product from the developing world that makes it way to the West, the financial and cultural traffic largely flows one way.6

### Cooperation

#### Capitalism prevents cooperation and makes war inevitable

Spector, 10 – Associate Professor of Sociology at Purdue University Calumet [Alan J Spector, “Neoliberal Globalization and Capitalist Crises in the Age of Imperialism” in “Globalization in the 21st Century: Labor, Capital, and the State on a World Scale”, pg 48-51]

How might this impact international relations? One might assume that the biggest, wealthiest nations will see a need to cooperate to solve their common problems, and indeed, in the short term, we can see meetings and conferences designed to encourage cooperation. But underlying this whole process are serious potential problems as the advanced capitalist countries **compete with each other for profits** and control over the less developed countries (what Lenin called “interimperialist rivalry”), and **that can set the stage for sharper conflicts among the imperialist countries themselves** (Lenin 1969). This intense economic crisis puts even greater strains on these capitalist economies and pressures them into finding more international sources of profits, and this, in turn, increases the possibilities for various types of conflicts, not just with smaller countries but with larger ones as well. World War I appeared to have been started by a conflict between two different factions from small countries in the Balkans, but these countries were proxies for the powerful nations that were battling for much bigger prizes, including Arabian oil. More recently, the U.S. war in Iraq, begun in 2003, has been characterized by some as a war for democracy. This has been critiqued by those who point out U.S. military inaction in the many other areas of the world where the lack of democracy has hurt many more people. Others see it as a war for oil. This has been critiqued by those who point out that the United States has vast quantities of oil, and, in fact, imports very little oil from Iraq. A more subtle but still economically based analysis sees the war as largely motivated by the need to control the flow of oil to Europe, China, and other rivals of U.S. imperialism. Stabilizing a regime in Iraq that would be friendly to U.S. corporate interests is seen as providing a military base to protect U.S. oil company interests in the whole region. It is seen as a way to neutralize Iran, perhaps turning it into a U.S. ally, as it had been for a part of the twentieth century. It would protect the profits that U.S. corporations reap as middlemen, resellers of the region’s oil to others (e.g., Europe). It is not so much the actual oil that the U.S. needs, but rather the huge profits that are made acquiring and then reselling that oil to others who need it. Finally, controlling that oil has other important politicaleconomic benefits. Neither France, nor Germany, Japan, Italy, or Spain own significant sources of oil. Russia has huge amounts of natural gas, but also eyes the clean, inexpensive Arabian and Iranian oil. China has growing needs and is fervently seeking new sources of oil from the Sudan, Eastern Ethiopia, and Nigeria to Venezuela and Mexico. India, too, will have growing needs. If the U.S. corporations can maintain tight control on the oil resources of Iraq, and by extension parts of that region, they can maintain an advantage over those competing oil importers and thus assure U.S. control and domination over the oil resources of the Middle East. It might seem counterintuitive to see allies such as the United States, France, Germany, India, and Japan as rivals to be outmaneuvered by each other, but **in a capitalist world, all alliances are ultimately temporary while competition is fundamental.** Wallerstein, among others, has argued that there was a sizeable faction within the erstwhile Bush administration that was motivated not just by the so-called Clash of Civilizations between the United States and the radical Islamic movement, but by the economic and political power of Western Europe, Russia, and China as well. More recently, President Obama has sent a force of over 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan. While Afghanistan may seem to be a poor country with few resources, the reality is that it is strategically located for gas and oil pipelines and for military positioning near Russia, China, and the oil-rich areas in that region. When the USSR collapsed and much of Eastern Europe pushed aside the various Soviet-style regimes, many mainstream politicians and political theorists postulated that the United States would be the sole superpower for many years to come, the premier world power in a world that was embracing free market capitalism. Even China was opening up its economy to U.S. investments. Within a few years, however, various regional nationalists, especially in the Islamic world, were working to expand their political and economic influence. It was not only the United States that would gain from the collapse of Soviet influence in much of the world. Meanwhile, much of Western Europe moved toward closer economic and political integration, with a unified currency, political alliances, and more coordinated international cooperation on environmental and other policies. This unity might appear to help stabilize the global political situation, but it also creates pressure on some political and economic interests within the United States. The Euro is being used in place of the U.S. dollar in parts of the world, the opposition to U.S. foreign policy, military action, and human rights and environmental policy seems to be growing, and European investments in areas formerly secure for U.S. investments, such as Latin America, are competing with U.S. interests. The European Union, much of which President Bush derided as “Old Europe” in decline, has helped bolster the Hugo Chavez regime in Venezuela and continues to trade with Cuba, as well as lending support to other political movements that are at odds with U.S. imperialism. Currently, the European Union is investing heavily in Mexico. China, too, is rapidly increasing its investments in Latin America. The recent war of words between Russia and the United States, because Russia sees U.S. missiles near its border as a threat, is another example of increased tensions among the great powers. This has been further intensified by the recent conflict between Russia and the former Soviet republic of Georgia, where the United States has been propping up a regime to stir up trouble along the Russian border. No one is predicting a massive inter-imperialist World War in the near future. The big powers have much to gain from cooperation and much to lose from a major war. However, the increased rivalry among the major capitalist powers in a shrinking world, combined with the rise in economic, technological, and political power of China and India, will create more pressure on all the major capitalist powers. World War I was unthinkable in the early 1890s, the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution and the big influence that the Soviet government had over hundreds of millions of people over the next seventy years was not imagined by anyone twenty years earlier, the rise of defeated Germany to world power status just twenty years after its crushing defeat in World War I was not predicted by many, and the rather sudden collapse of the Soviet Bloc around 1990 and the very different world that has developed since then were also unexpected just twenty years earlier. How the increased economic pressures of today will be resolved cannot easily be predicted, but history should caution us against predicting one hundred years of world peace, especially as today’s pressures and crises have become globalized in this shrinking world.

#### Capitalism makes the US belligerent—leads to environmental destruction and global instability

Foster, 5, Oregon University Department of Sociology Professor (John B., Monthly Review, http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm, 6/22/11)

From the longer view offered by a historical-materialist critique of capitalism, the direction that would be taken by U.S. imperialism following the fall of the Soviet Union was never in doubt. Capitalism by its very logic is a globally expansive system. The contradiction between its transnational economic aspirations and the fact that politically it remains rooted in particular nation states is insurmountable for the system. Yet, ill-fated attempts by individual states to overcome this contradiction are just as much a part of its fundamental logic. In present world circumstances, when one capitalist state has a virtual monopoly of the means of destruction, the temptation for that state to attempt to seize full-spectrum dominance and to transform itself into the de facto global state governing the world economy is irresistible. As the noted Marxian philosopher István Mészáros observed in Socialism or Barbarism? (2001)—written, significantly, before George W. Bush became president: “[W]hat is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal.” The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue.

### Environment/Warming

#### Capitalism is the root cause of their environment impacts—exponential growth and corporate control

Speth, 08 [James Gustave Speth, law professor, Served as President Jimmy Carter’s White House environmental adviser and as head of the United Nations’ largest agency for international development Prof at Vermont law school, former dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, former Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching environmental and constitutional law, former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President, co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council, The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability, ISBN: 9780300145304, EBrary, pg. 6-9]

The underlying drivers of today’s environmental deterioration have been clearly identified. They range from immediate forces like the enormous growth in human population and the dominant technologies deployed in the economy to deeper ones like the values that shape our behavior and determine what we consider important in life. Most basically, we know that environmental deterioration is driven by the economic activity of human beings. About half of today’s world population lives in abject poverty or close to it, with per capita incomes of less than two dollars a day. The struggle of the poor to survive creates a range of environmental impacts where the poor themselves are often the primary victims— for example, the deterioration of arid and semiarid lands due to the press of increasing numbers of people who have no other option. But the much larger and more threatening impacts stem from the economic activity of those of us participating in the modern, increasingly prosperous world economy. This activity is consuming vast quantities of resources from the environment and returning to the environment vast quantities of waste products. The damages are already huge and are on a path to be ruinous in the future. So, a fundamental question facing societies today— perhaps the fundamental question— is how can the operating instructions for the modern world economy be changed so that economic activity both protects and restores the natural world? With increasingly few exceptions, modern capitalism is the operating system of the world economy. I use “modern capitalism” here in a broad sense as an actual, existing system of political economy, not as an idealized model. Capitalism as we know it today encompasses the core economic concept of private employers hiring workers to produce products and services that the employers own and then sell with the intention of making a profit. But it also includes competitive markets, the price mechanism, the modern corporation as its principal institution, the consumer society and the materialistic values that sustain it, and the administrative state actively promoting economic strength and growth for a variety of reasons. **Inherent in the dynamics of capitalism is a powerful drive to earn profits, invest them, innovate, and thus grow the economy, typically at exponential rates**, with the result that the capitalist era has in fact been characterized by a remarkable exponential expansion of the world economy. The capitalist operating system, whatever its shortcomings, is very good at generating growth. **These features of capitalism**, as they are constituted today, work together to produce an economic and political reality that is highly **destructive of the environment**. An unquestioning society-wide commitment to economic growth at almost any cost; enormous investment in technologies designed with little regard for the environment; powerful corporate interests whose overriding objective is to grow by generating profit, including profit from avoiding the environmental costs they create; markets that systematically fail to recognize environmental costs unless corrected by government; government that is subservient to corporate interests and the growth imperative; rampant consumerism spurred by a worshipping of novelty and by sophisticated advertising; economic activity so large in scale that its impacts alter the fundamental biophysical operations of the planet— all combine to deliver an ever-growing world economy that is undermining the planet’s ability to sustain life. The fundamental question thus becomes one of transforming capitalism as we know it: Can it be done? If so, how? And if not, what then? It is to these questions that this book is addressed. The larger part of the book proposes a variety of prescriptions to take economy and environment off collision course. Many of these prescriptions range beyond the traditional environmental agenda. In Part I of the book, Chapters 1– 3, I lay the foundation by elaborating the fundamental challenge just described. Among the key conclusions, summarized here with some oversimplification, are: • The vast expansion of economic activity that occurred in the twentieth century and continues today is the predominant (but not sole) cause of the environmental decline that has occurred to date. Yet the world economy, now increasingly integrated and globalized, is poised for unprecedented growth. **The engine of this growth is modern capitalism** or, better, a variety of capitalisms. A mutually reinforcing set of forces associated with today’s capitalism combines to yield economic activity inimical to environmental sustainability. This result is partly the consequence of an ongoing political default— a failed politics— that not only perpetuates widespread market failure— all the nonmarket environmental costs that no one is paying— but exacerbates this market failure with deep and environmentally perverse subsidies. The result is that our market economy is operating on wildly wrong market signals, lacks other correcting mechanisms, and is thus out of control environmentally. The upshot is that societies now face **environmental threats of unprecedented scope and severity**, with the possibility of various catastrophes, breakdowns, and collapses looming as distinct possibilities, especially as environmental issues link with social inequities and tensions, resource scarcity, and other issues. • Today’s mainstream environmentalism— aptly characterized as incremental and pragmatic “problem solving”—has proven insufficient to deal with current challenges and is not up to coping with the larger challenges ahead. Yet the approaches of modern-day environmentalism, despite their limitations, remain essential: right now, they are the tools at hand with which to address many very pressing problems. The momentum of the current system— fifty-five trillion dollars in output in 2004, growing fast, and headed toward environmental disaster— is so great that only powerful forces will alter the trajectory. Potent measures are needed that address the root causes of today’s destructive growth and transform economic activity into something environmentally benign and restorative. • In short, my conclusion, after much searching and considerable reluctance, is that most environmental deterioration is a result of systemic failures of the capitalism that we have today and that long-term solutions must seek transformative change in the key features of this contemporary capitalism. In Part II, I address these basic features of modern capitalism, in each case seeking to identify the transformative changes needed.

#### Only the alternative can solve for climate change—the problem is the “underlying logic of our economic system” and the only solution is a new civilizational paradigm.

Klein 11—Naomi Klein is an award-winning journalist, syndicated columnist, fellow at The Nation Institute and author of the international and New York Times bestseller The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism. In 2004 her reporting from Iraq for Harper’s Magazine won the James Aronson Award for Social Justice Journalism. Klein is a former Miliband Fellow at the London School of Economics and holds an honorary Doctor of Civil Laws from the University of King’s College. (“Capitalism vs. the Climate,” Published Online on November 9, 2011 for *The Nation*, Available Online at http://www.thenation.com/article/164497/capitalism-vs-climate?page=full)

The deniers did not decide that climate change is a left-wing conspiracy by uncovering some covert socialist plot. They arrived at this analysis by taking a hard look at what it would take to lower global emissions as drastically and as rapidly as climate science demands. They have concluded that this can be done only by radically reordering our economic and political systems in ways antithetical to their “free market” belief system. As British blogger and Heartland regular James Delingpole has pointed out, “Modern environmentalism successfully advances many of the causes dear to the left: redistribution of wealth, higher taxes, greater government intervention, regulation.” Heartland’s Bast puts it even more bluntly: For the left, “Climate change is the perfect thing…. It’s the reason why we should do everything [the left] wanted to do anyway.”

Here’s my inconvenient truth: they aren’t wrong. Before I go any further, let me be absolutely clear: as 97 percent of the world’s climate scientists attest, the Heartlanders are completely wrong about the science. The heat-trapping gases released into the atmosphere through the burning of fossil fuels are already causing temperatures to increase. If we are not on a **radically different** energy path by the end of this decade, we are in for a world of pain.

But when it comes to the real-world consequences of those scientific findings, specifically the kind of deep changes required **not just to our energy consumption but to the underlying logic of our economic system**, the crowd gathered at the Marriott Hotel may be in considerably less denial than a lot of professional environmentalists, the ones who paint a picture of global warming Armageddon, then assure us that we can avert catastrophe by buying “green” products and creating clever markets in pollution.

The fact that the earth’s atmosphere cannot safely absorb the amount of carbon we are pumping into it is a symptom of a much larger crisis, one born of the central fiction on which our economic model is based: that nature is limitless, that we will always be able to find more of what we need, and that if something runs out it can be seamlessly replaced by another resource that we can endlessly extract. But it is not just the atmosphere that we have exploited beyond its capacity to recover—we are doing the same to the oceans, to freshwater, to topsoil and to biodiversity. The expansionist, extractive mindset, which has so long governed our relationship to nature, is what the climate crisis calls into question so fundamentally. The abundance of scientific research showing we have pushed nature beyond its limits does not just demand green products and market-based solutions; it **demands a new civilizational paradigm**, one grounded not in dominance over nature but in respect for natural cycles of renewal—and acutely sensitive to natural limits, including the limits of human intelligence.

So in a way, Chris Horner was right when he told his fellow Heartlanders that climate change isn’t “the issue.” In fact, it isn’t an issue at all. Climate change is a message, one that is telling us that many of our culture’s most cherished ideas are no longer viable**. These are profoundly challenging revelations** for all of us raised on Enlightenment ideals of progress, unaccustomed to having our ambitions confined by natural boundaries. And this is true for the statist left as well as the neoliberal right.

While Heartlanders like to invoke the specter of communism to terrify Americans about climate action (Czech President Vaclav Klaus, a Heartland conference favorite, says that attempts to prevent global warming are akin to “the ambitions of communist central planners to control the entire society”), the reality is that Soviet-era state socialism was a disaster for the climate. It devoured resources with as much enthusiasm as capitalism, and spewed waste just as recklessly: before the fall of the Berlin Wall, Czechs and Russians had even higher carbon footprints per capita than their counterparts in Britain, Canada and Australia. And while some point to the dizzying expansion of China’s renewable energy programs to argue that only centrally controlled regimes can get the green job done, China’s command-and-control economy continues to be harnessed to wage an all-out war with nature, through massively disruptive mega-dams, superhighways and extraction-based energy projects, particularly coal.

It is true that responding to the climate threat requires strong government action at all levels. But real climate solutions are ones that steer these interventions to systematically disperse and devolve power and control to the community level, whether through community-controlled renewable energy, local organic agriculture or transit systems genuinely accountable to their users.

#### Only the alternative solves—real solutions to climate change necessitate upending the free-market system

Klein 11—Naomi Klein is an award-winning journalist, syndicated columnist, fellow at The Nation Institute and author of the international and New York Times bestseller The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism. In 2004 her reporting from Iraq for Harper’s Magazine won the James Aronson Award for Social Justice Journalism. Klein is a former Miliband Fellow at the London School of Economics and holds an honorary Doctor of Civil Laws from the University of King’s College. (“Capitalism vs. the Climate,” Published Online on November 9, 2011 for *The Nation*, Available Online at http://www.thenation.com/article/164497/capitalism-vs-climate?page=full)

So let’s summarize. Responding to climate change requires that **we break every rule in the free-market playbook** and that we do so with great urgency. We will need to rebuild the public sphere, reverse privatizations, relocalize large parts of economies, scale back overconsumption, bring back long-term planning, heavily regulate and tax corporations, maybe even nationalize some of them, cut military spending and recognize our debts to the global South. Of course, none of this has a hope in hell of happening unless it is accompanied by a massive, broad-based effort to radically reduce the influence that corporations have over the political process. That means, at a minimum, publicly funded elections and stripping corporations of their status as “people” under the law. In short, climate change supercharges the pre-existing case for virtually every progressive demand on the books, binding them into a coherent agenda based on a clear scientific imperative.

More than that, climate change implies the biggest political “I told you so” since Keynes predicted German backlash from the Treaty of Versailles. Marx wrote about capitalism’s “irreparable rift” with “the natural laws of life itself,” and many on the left have argued that an economic system built on unleashing the voracious appetites of capital would overwhelm the natural systems on which life depends. And of course indigenous peoples were issuing warnings about the dangers of disrespecting “Mother Earth” long before that. The fact that the airborne waste of industrial capitalism is causing the planet to warm, with potentially cataclysmic results, means that, well, the naysayers were right. And the people who said, “Hey, let’s get rid of all the rules and watch the magic happen” were disastrously, catastrophically wrong.

There is no joy in being right about something so terrifying. But for progressives, there is responsibility in it, because it means that our ideas—informed by indigenous teachings as well as by the failures of industrial state socialism—are more important than ever. It means that a green-left worldview, which rejects mere reformism and challenges the centrality of profit in our economy, offers humanity’s best hope of overcoming these overlapping crises.

But imagine, for a moment, how all of this looks to a guy like Heartland president Bast, who studied economics at the University of Chicago and described his personal calling to me as “freeing people from the tyranny of other people.” It looks like the end of the world. It’s not, of course. But it is, for all intents and purposes, the end of his world**. Climate change detonates the ideological scaffolding on which contemporary conservatism rests**. There is simply no way to square a belief system that vilifies collective action and venerates total market freedom with a problem that demands collective action on an unprecedented scale and a dramatic reining in of the market forces that created and are deepening the crisis.

#### And environmental sustainability outweighs everything – it’s the basis of human existence

Taylor, 08 [Graeme Taylor is a social activist committed to constructive global transformation and the coordinator of BEST Futures, a project supporting sustainable solutions through researching how societies change and evolve, Evolution's Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of Our World, Pomegranate Press, 2008, ISBN: 9781550923810, EBrary, pg. 117-8]

The real bottom line is not financial profits but survival, and our survival is utterly dependent on our environments. The air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat all come from our environments. The energy and raw materials used by our economies come from our environments. As a result, the long-term viability of human societies depends on the long-term viability of the biophysical systems that support them. We know that the present industrial system is unsustainable because it is progressively degrading major ecosystems, and history and science tell us that any human society that destroys its environment cannot survive for long. In 1987, the Brundtland Report defined sustainability as the ability to meet the present needs of humanity without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. 4 Sustainable development has also been defined as improving the quality of human life while living within the carrying capacity of supporting ecosystems. 5 Every living system (plants, animals and societies) is sustainable to the extent that it is able to meet its essential needs on an ongoing basis. This is a key concept: in order to function, a living system must be able to satisfy its essential needs. Once we grasp the relationship between sustainability and needs, we can begin to clearly understand societal and environmental interrelationships and dynamics. When living biological or social systems are able to meet their essential needs, they usually have sufficient resilience (adaptability) to withstand normal environmental stresses and to reorganize in healthy ways in response to changing conditions. When they can’t meet their essential needs, they weaken and become increasingly dysfunctional and incapable of managing stress.

#### The market’s only prerogative is growth – the impact is extinction

Speth, 08 [James Gustave Speth, law professor, Served as President Jimmy Carter’s White House environmental adviser and as head of the United Nations’ largest agency for international development Prof at Vermont law school, former dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, former Professor of Law at Georgetown University Law Center, teaching environmental and constitutional law, former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President, co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council, The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability, ISBN: 9780300145304, EBrary, pg. 60-61]

Third, as Karl Polanyi described long ago in The Great Transformation, the spread of the market into new areas, with its emphasis on efficiency and ever-expanding commodification, can be very costly environmentally and socially. It is a pleasure to read Polanyi. He saw so clearly in 1944 the costs of unbridled capitalism, yet he believed this “19th century system,” as he called it, was collapsing. He saw the self-adjusting market as a “stark utopia.” “Such an institution could not exist for any length of time without annihilating the human and natural substance of society; it would have physically destroyed man and transformed his surroundings into a wilderness. . . . “To allow the market mechanism to be sole director of the fate of human beings and their natural environment, indeed, even of the amount and use of purchasing power, would result in the demolition of society. . . . Nature would be reduced to its elements, neighborhoods and landscapes defiled, rivers polluted, military safety jeopardized, the power to produce food and raw materials destroyed. . . . “[T]he commodity fiction disregarded the fact that leaving the fate of soil and people to the market would be **tantamount to annihilating them**.”27 Of course, the ever-expanding, self-adjusting market that Polanyi feared did not collapse. It took off again after World War II, became more fearsome and expansive, and the consequences that Polanyi warned against came to pass. Landscapes are defiled, rivers polluted. Polanyi would, I suspect, be both surprised and appalled by the ascendancy of the ruthless capitalism of the Anglo-American variety and by the erosion of social democracy of the European variety. The dynamics of today’s financial marketplace enhance the pressure on corporate managers to achieve high profit growth. The prime measure of corporate success to investors is growth in market capitalization and stock price. Market value responds to a number of factors, but one of the most influential is the expected rate of profit growth. When earnings growth fails to meet expectations, even for one quarter, stock prices can plummet. Differences of pennies per share can drive financial analysts’ recommendations to buy or sell. The message to managers is clear: expand markets, contain costs, and increase profitability. Grow.

### Ethics

#### Capitalism destroys ethical concerns.

Morgareidge, 98—Associate Professor of Philosophy at Lewis and Clark College [Clayton, “Why Capitalism is Evil”, Radio Active Philosophy, Lewis and Clark Educational Papers, http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html]

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 any thing 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] 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 others 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.

### Inequality

#### Capitalism is the system of greed and creates inequality along with injustice among the population

McCarraher, 11, an associate professor of humanities at Villanova University (Eugene McCarraher, an associate professor of humanities at Villanova University, “The End of Capitalism and the Wellsprings of Radical Hope”, The nation, June 27th, 2011, accessed June 22nd, 2011, T.C>) http://www.thenation.com/article/161237/end-capitalism-and-wellsprings-radical-hope?page=0,0,0,0

Why should we want to reinvent capitalism? Rather than reinvent it, we should remind ourselves why capitalism is so pernicious. We could start by stating the obvious (which, apparently, needs restating): the nature and logic of capitalism are incorrigibly avaricious. As a property system driven by the need to maximize profit and production, capitalism is a giant, ever-whirling vortex of accumulation. Anything but conservative, it’s the most dynamic and protean economy in history. As Marx observed in the opening pages of The Communist Manifesto, capitalism thrives on constant reinvention: “The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society.” Always seeking new ways to make money, capitalists have reinvented the system several times already. Enclosures, factories, Fordism, automation and “flexible production”—metamorphosis for the sake of profit is the only constant in capitalism. Each incarnation has featured new brands of exploitation and corruption, designed and packaged by masters of economic and managerial sophistry. To be sure, reformers have been partially successful at shaping these reinventions: collective bargaining, regulations of business, the welfare state. Whatever victories for justice working people have won have been hard-fought and tenuous, the fruit of protracted struggle. But however ingenious or effective the reforms, they’ve been limited, if not eventually subverted, by the intractably mercenary nature of capitalism. As we can see from the history of the past forty years—an era that has been marked by a transatlantic assault on social democracy and New Deal/Great Society liberalism—the rage to accumulate remains the predatory heart and soul of capitalism. We have good reason to assume that capitalists will always seek and find fresh ways to cast off the fetters and vanquish their opponents. But the iniquity of capitalism goes deeper than its injustice as a political economy, its amoral ingenuity in technical prowess or its rapacious relationship to the natural world. However lissome its face or benign its manner, capitalism compels us to be greedy, callous and petty. It takes what the Greeks called pleonexia—an endless hunger for more and more—and transforms it from a tawdry and dangerous vice into the central virtue of the system. The sanctity of “growth” in capitalist culture stems from this moral alchemy, as does the elevation of market competition into a model of human affairs. Conscripting us into an economic war, capitalism turns us into soldiers of fortune, steeled against casualties and collateral damage, ransacking the earth to fill the shelves and banks with plunder. Capitalism stands condemned most profoundly not by its maldistribution of wealth or its ecological despoliation but by its systematic cultivation of people inclined toward injustice and predation. And I think we on the left need to start dismissing as utterly irrelevant the standard apologetic riposte: the material prosperity and technological achievement generated by capitalist enterprise. No amount of goods can compensate for the damage wrought on human nature by the deliberate nurturance of our vilest qualities. The desecration of the values we claim to hold most dear is the primary reason we should want to abolish, not reinvent, capitalism.

### Laundry List

#### Capitalism leads to every major impact including nuclear war, global warming and extinction

Brumpy, Kinney and Kirby, 11, March 4th,

 [Otis Brumpy, Bill Kinney and Joe Kirby, publishers of the Marietta Daily Journal, “Around Town: KSU's new colors ... black, gold - and red?” Marietta Daily Journal, March 4th, 2011, http://mdjonline.com/bookmark/12173684, accessed March 21st of 2011]

MARXISM? GOOD. Capitalism? Bad. Very, very bad. And the United States? Why, it is "the most violent nation-state in history." No, we're not quoting Nikita Khrushchev or Hugo Chavez. Not Moammar Gadhafi or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Those sentiments and that quote can be found in a lengthy research paper by Kennesaw State University's new $228,000-a-year provost, Dr. Timothy Chandler of Kent State University, who will be the second-highest administrator and right-hand man to President Dr. Dan Papp.Papp, meanwhile, told Around Town on Friday that he was "blindsided" to learn what Chandler had written. Papp was reached by phone at the investiture ceremony for popular former KSU Provost Dr. Lendley Black, who is the new Chancellor of the University of Minnesota-Duluth. Chandler's paper was published in the Jan.-Feb. 1998 issue of The Journal of Higher Education and titled "Beyond Boyer's 'Scholarship Reconsidered': Fundamental Change in the University and the Socioeconomic Systems." (The "Boyer" referred to is Ernest Boyer, author of "Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.") Chandler co-authored the piece with fellow Kent State professor Walter E. Davis, Ph.D. - who has gone on to greater fame (or notoriety) as one of the foremost 9/11 conspiracy theorists, charging that President Bush was complicit in the attacks. When Davis's name is "Googled," the very first item that appears is his 7,000-word screed arguing that it is "not logical" and "impossible" that bin Laden was responsible; that the U.S. was planning to invade Afghanistan before the attacks; that the Bush family "got their start as key Hitler supporters," and much more. But one can't hold it against Chandler that he co-wrote a paper with such a kook when the 9/11 attacks were still years in the future.Chandler on Friday said he disagrees with Davis, and Papp told AT that Davis' anti-Bush rant was "a piece of trash."Far more serious is Chandler and Davis' obvious fondness for Marx and vehement dislike of capitalism, which underpins much of their paper. Though Marx is mentioned by name only a few times in their magnum opus, they seem to have swallowed Marxist theory hook, line and sinker. Some excerpts: \* "Although the close connection of capitalism to violence is easily shown, it is seldom acknowledged. The allocative resources, which are increasingly disproportionably possessed, were obtained by individuals and groups, at one time or another, by physical force, coercion." \* "Increased competition results in increased ethnicity and racism." \* "Militarism, the development and use of weapons of mass destruction, occurs for the primary purpose of accumulating and protecting ownership of material wealth and obtaining or maintaining domination and is thus an effective goal of capitalism." \* "The goal of accumulating material wealth in the context of a hierarchical social structure influences an individual's desire for power, privilege and self-determination toward characteristics of greed and selfishness, which in turn produce inequality and conflict with others." "Capitalism requires an ever increasing consumption (growth) and can easily lead to the destruction of the physical environment. Because of its hegemonic nature, capitalism penetrates into every aspect of life ... and often with devastating effects. Capitalism is hierarchically structured and characterized by a high degree of inequity and an extreme disproportioned distribution of wealth and power. ... As a result, masses of people are forced to succumb to the economic system in order to survive. An asymmetric distribution of resources guarantees high levels of competition, greed, and violence. These three outcomes are important explicit goals of capitalism." \* "While the United States has the most sophisticated propaganda apparatus ever assembled, it is also the most violent nation-state in history." \* "Ownership is taken for granted in capitalistic societies and is central to the accumulation of wealth and domination. All ownership of land or material means of production was at one time or another obtained by force. One prominent means of maintaining ownership and control is through generational inheritance, a concept that is accepted without question, whereas reparations for certain groups, which can be argued for with the same logic, is not." \* "The record of Western science is mixed. Along with all the advances in technology and industry comes five hundred years of oppression and destruction. Universities must take a major responsibility for this destruction, as they must take a major role in halting the slide down the slippery slope of self-elimination. The university in the context of capitalism clearly must be evaluated."