# Capitalism K 2012

## \*\*SHELLS\*\*

### Short

**Infrastructure investment is a tool of the capitalist state—people, values and goods all become commodities to be transported**

**Giddens and Held 82** (Anthony and David; M.A. and Ph.D. in economics, Prof. at Cambridge, Director of the London School of Economics, he has 15 honorary degrees; Master of University College, Durham, professor of politics and international relations at Durham University; “Classes, Power and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates”; Pg. 253)//RSW

7. Policies which pursue the goal of reorganizing, maintaining and generalizing exchange relationships make use of a specific sequence of instruments. These instruments can be categorized in the following way. First, we find regulations and incentives applied which are designed to control "destructive" competition and to make competitors subject to rules which allow for the economic survival of their respective market partners. Usually these regulations consist in measures and laws which try to protect the "weaker" party in an exchange relationship, or which support this party through various incentives. Second, we find the large category of public infrastructure investment which is designed to help broad categories of commodity owners (again: both labor and capital) to engage in exchange relationships. Typical examples are schools of all kinds, transportation facilities, energy plants, and measures for urban and regional development. Third, we find attempts to introduce compulsory schemes of joint decision making and joint financing which are designed to force market partners to agree upon conditions of mutually acceptable exchange in an organized way, outside the exchange process itself, so that the outcome is reliable for both sides. Such compulsory schemes of mutual accommodation are to be found not only in the area of wage bargaining, but equally in areas like housing, education. and environmental protection. Such attempts to stabilize and universalize the commodity form and exchange process by political and administrative means leads to a number of specific structural contradictions of state capitalist societies which in turn can become the focus of social conflict and political struggle. Such contradictions can be found on the economic, political and ideological levels of society. On the economic level, the very state policies which are designed to maintain and promote universal exchange relationships have the effect of threatening the continuity of those relationships. For all three of the above-mentioned instruments of economic policy making (regulations, infrastructure and compulsive accommodation) deprive the owners of capital of value to varying degrees, either in the form of capital that is just "taxed away," or in the form of labor, or in form of their freedom to utilize both of these in the way they deem most profitable. To the extent such state policies of "administrative recommodification" are "effective," they are bound to put a burden upon the owners of capital which has the paradoxical effect of making them ineffective. Since, in a capitalist society, all exchange relationships depend upon the willingness of owners of money capital to invest, i.e., to exchange money capital for constant capital and variable capital; since this willingness depends upon the expected profitability of investment; and since all observable state policies of recommodification do have the side-effect of depriving capital of either capital or labor power or the freedom to use both in profitable ways, the cure tums out to be worse than the illness. That is to say, reformist policies of the capitalist state by no means unequivocally "serve" the interests of the capitalist class: very often they are met by the most vigorous resistance and opposition of this class. Social conflicts and political struggles do not, of course, emerge automatically from this contradiction. They are waged by political forces which are willing and able to defend the reformist policies of the capitalist state against the obstructive resistance of the capitalist class itself.

**Capitalism results in neo-imperialist wars, the destruction of the environment and the subjugation and genocide of entire sections of the population**

**Everest 12** (Larry; correspondent for Revolution newspaper; 5/24/12; “WAR AND GLOBAL CAPITALISM: “Money for Jobs Not for War”: American Chauvinism and Reformist Illusions” http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=31024)//RSW

“Money for Jobs and Education! Jobs and Education, Not War and Occupation!” This slogan put forth by several US social movements is profoundly wrong and harmful—both in terms of morality that’s actually in the interests of humanity, and in terms of a scientific understanding of imperialism and war. Why should antiwar demands focus first and foremost on the war’s impact on Americans and their lives—and not on the victims of U.S. aggression: Pakistanis murdered in U.S. drone strikes, Iraqis rounded up and tortured by U.S. forces, Afghans seized and terrorized in night raids, and countless others? Aren’t their lives every bit as precious as the lives of those who happen to live in the U.S.? “Money for jobs, not for war” argues that American lives are more important than other people’s lives. This logic goes right along with—and amplifies—the mindset relentlessly fostered by the system’s rulers and their media machine: that American lives come first. This is the very mindset the rulers count on to justify and build public support (or acquiescence) for their predatory wars of empire. The slogan also promotes the idea that the political powers-that-be—if pressured by enough people—could scale back their military, stop attacking other countries, and instead use the money for jobs, education, and other social welfare programs at home. But that’s not how the system actually operates! Wars, invasions, and occupations are not policies of one set of politicians or another, or arbitrary choices made by this or that president. At this stage in history, capitalism is a global system, with the U.S. the world’s most dominant capitalist-imperialist power, presiding over a worldwide empire of exploitation. This empire rests on the domination of the oppressed countries where the vast majority of humanity lives, and on control of labor, markets, and resources. This entails the violent suppression of the masses of people in the dominated areas—and also entails fighting off challenges from other imperialists as well as rising forces in those countries that stand in the way. This requires a monstrously huge military that is deployed worldwide, with bases in over 100 countries, and wars when necessary. The wars for domination in the Middle East, Central Asia, and elsewhere don’t “interfere” with the functioning of U.S. capital—they’re absolutely essential to it, and to the U.S.’s overall global dominance. This is why the U.S. rulers are compelled—and willing to—spend trillions on the military, including during periods of severe economic and fiscal stress, no matter who happens to sit in the White House or Congress. This system of global capitalism-imperialism headed by the U.S. is the main source of the horrors that torment so many across the globe—from the ethnic cleansing and slow genocide of the Palestinian people by the U.S. and Israel, to the mass incarceration and slow genocide of Black people in the U.S.; from the rape of the planet to the systematic degradation and violence against women—here and around the world; from the extreme deprivation and starvation faced by billions across the planet to the growing poverty and desperation faced by millions in the U.S. The rulers in these imperial metropoles distribute some of the spoils of empire to provide a higher standard of living than in the oppressed countries and buy social peace and loyalty at home (which “Money for Jobs, Not For War” encourages). People in the U.S. should reject that foul pact! The vast majority in the U.S. have a profound interest in making common cause with oppressed people worldwide, not in siding with “their” rulers. That means fostering a morality that declares: “American lives are not more important than other people’s lives!”—not pandering to American chauvinism, which strengthens the system responsible for so much misery. It means people shouldn’t appeal to those on the top to “spend more on jobs,” but to clearly and unequivocally demand a STOP to the horrors the U.S. is committing around the world. Through this process of actively opposing U.S. aggression and the “America Number 1” mindset fostered to justify it, people can and must be won to increasingly see that this capitalist system and state is utterly un-reformable and that it’s going to take revolution to get rid of it, end its predatory wars once and for all, and bring into being a whole new system and state that is in the actual interests of the people in the U.S. and around the world.

**Alternative text: Reject the affirmative as a means of refusing complicity with capitalism.**

**Rejecting capitalism is key to opening up new alternatives. Only complete refusal, not piecemeal reform, can prevent otherwise inevitable slavery and extinction.**

**Herod, 04** (James, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm, Getting Free, 4th Edition

A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004

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

### Long

**Infrastructure investment is a tool of the capitalist state—people, values and goods all become commodities to be transported**

**Giddens and Held 82** (Anthony and David; M.A. and Ph.D. in economics, Prof. at Cambridge, Director of the London School of Economics, he has 15 honorary degrees; Master of University College, Durham, professor of politics and international relations at Durham University; “Classes, Power and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates”; Pg. 253)//RSW

7. Policies which pursue the goal of reorganizing, maintaining and generalizing exchange relationships make use of a specific sequence of instruments. These instruments can be categorized in the following way. First, we find regulations and incentives applied which are designed to control "destructive" competition and to make competitors subject to rules which allow for the economic survival of their respective market partners. Usually these regulations consist in measures and laws which try to protect the "weaker" party in an exchange relationship, or which support this party through various incentives. Second, we find the large category of public infrastructure investment which is designed to help broad categories of commodity owners (again: both labor and capital) to engage in exchange relationships. Typical examples are schools of all kinds, transportation facilities, energy plants, and measures for urban and regional development. Third, we find attempts to introduce compulsory schemes of joint decision making and joint financing which are designed to force market partners to agree upon conditions of mutually acceptable exchange in an organized way, outside the exchange process itself, so that the outcome is reliable for both sides. Such compulsory schemes of mutual accommodation are to be found not only in the area of wage bargaining, but equally in areas like housing, education. and environmental protection. Such attempts to stabilize and universalize the commodity form and exchange process by political and administrative means leads to a number of specific structural contradictions of state capitalist societies which in turn can become the focus of social conflict and political struggle. Such contradictions can be found on the economic, political and ideological levels of society. On the economic level, the very state policies which are designed to maintain and promote universal exchange relationships have the effect of threatening the continuity of those relationships. For all three of the above-mentioned instruments of economic policy making (regulations, infrastructure and compulsive accommodation) deprive the owners of capital of value to varying degrees, either in the form of capital that is just "taxed away," or in the form of labor, or in form of their freedom to utilize both of these in the way they deem most profitable. To the extent such state policies of "administrative recommodification" are "effective," they are bound to put a burden upon the owners of capital which has the paradoxical effect of making them ineffective. Since, in a capitalist society, all exchange relationships depend upon the willingness of owners of money capital to invest, i.e., to exchange money capital for constant capital and variable capital; since this willingness depends upon the expected profitability of investment; and since all observable state policies of recommodification do have the side-effect of depriving capital of either capital or labor power or the freedom to use both in profitable ways, the cure tums out to be worse than the illness. That is to say, reformist policies of the capitalist state by no means unequivocally "serve" the interests of the capitalist class: very often they are met by the most vigorous resistance and opposition of this class. Social conflicts and political struggles do not, of course, emerge automatically from this contradiction. They are waged by political forces which are willing and able to defend the reformist policies of the capitalist state against the obstructive resistance of the capitalist class itself.

**Capitalism makes mass nuclear annihilation inevitable.**

**Webb, 04** (Sam Webb, National Chairman, Communist Party USA. “War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush.” 4-20-04. http://www.pww.org/article/view/ 4967/1/207/O)

Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty. Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead. Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind’s ability to solve these problems. Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation. With the end of the Cold War, most of us thought that the threat of nuclear war would fade and with it the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But those hopes were dashed. Rather than easing, the nuclear threat is more palpable in some ways and caches of nuclear weapons are growing. And our own government possesses the biggest stockpiles by far. Much like previous administrations, the Bush administration has continued to develop more powerful nuclear weapons, but with a twist: it insists on its singular right to employ nuclear weapons preemptively in a range of military situations. This is a major departure from earlier U.S. policy – the stated policy of all previous administrations was that nuclear weapons are weapons of last resort to be used only in circumstances in which our nation is under severe attack. Meanwhile, today’s White House bullies demonize, impose sanctions, and make or threaten war on states that are considering developing a nuclear weapons capability. Bush tells us that this policy of arming ourselves while disarming others should cause no anxiety because, he says, his administration desires only peace and has no imperial ambitions. Not surprisingly, people greet his rhetorical assurances skeptically, especially as it becomes more and more obvious that his administration’s political objective is not world peace, but world domination, cunningly couched in the language of “fighting terrorism.” It is well that millions of peace-minded people distrust Bush’s rhetoric. The hyper-aggressive gang in the Oval Office and Pentagon and the absolutely lethal nature of modern weapons of mass destruction make for a highly unstable and explosive situation that could cascade out of control. War has a logic of its own. But skepticism alone is not enough. It has to be combined with a sustained mobilization of the world community – the other superpower in this unipolar world – if the hand of the warmakers in the White House and Pentagon is to be stayed. A heavy responsibility rests on the American people. For we have the opportunity to defeat Bush and his counterparts in Congress in the November elections. Such a defeat will be a body blow to the policies of preemption, regime change, and saber rattling, and a people’s mandate for peace, disarmament, cooperation, and mutual security. The world will become a safer place. In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war. This doesn’t mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king. Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle within and between classes and social movements at the national and international level.

**Capitalism is inevitably going to cause human extinction from a wide variety of practices that destroy the global environment. Reform is not enough. The whole system needs to be radically altered.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism,* p 66-67)

The consequences of such shortsighted attention to economic growth and profit before all else are of course enormous, since they call into question the survivability of the entire world. It is an inescapable fact that human history is at a turning point, the result of a fundamental change in the relationship between human beings and the environment. The scale at which people transform energy and materials has now reached a level that rivals elemental natural processes. Human society is adding carbon to the atmosphere at a level that is equal to about 7 percent of the natural carbon exchange of atmosphere and oceans. The carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere as a result has grown by a quarter in the last 200 years, with more than half of this increase since 1950. Human beings now use (take or transform) 25 percent of the plant mass fixed by photosynthesis over the entire earth, land and sea, and 40 percent of the photosynthetic product on land. Largely as a result of synthetic fertilizers, humanity fixed about as much nitrogen in the environment as does nature. With human activities now rivaling nature in scale, actions that in the past merely produced local environmental crises now have global implications. Moreover, environmental effects that once seemed simple and trivial, such as increases in carbon dioxide emissions, have now suddenly become threats to the stability of the fundamental ecological cycles of the planet. Destruction of the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect, annihilation of ancient and tropical forests, species extinction, reductions in genetic diversity, production of toxic and radioactive wastes, contamination of water resources, soil depletion, depletion of essential raw materials, desertification, the growth of world population spurred by rising poverty – all represent ominous trends the full impact of which, singly or in combination, is scarcely to be imagined at present. “With the appearance of a continent-sized hole in the Earth’s protective ozone layer and the threat of global warming,” Barry Commoner has written, “even droughts, floods, and heat waves may become unwitting acts of man.” The sustainability of both human civilization and global life processes depends not on the mere slowing down of these dire trends, but on their reversal. Nothing in the history of capitalism, however, suggests that the system will be up to such a task. On the contrary there is every indication that the system, left to its own devices, will gravitate toward the “let them eat pollution” stance so clearly enunciated by the chief economist of the World Bank. Fortunately for the world, however, capitalism has never been allowed to develop for long entirely in accordance with its own logic. Opposition forces always emerge – whether in the form of working class struggles for social betterment or conservation movements dedicated to overcoming environmental depredations – that force the system to moderate its worst tendencies. And to some extend the ensuing reforms can result in lasting, beneficial constraints on the market. What the capitalist class cannot accept, however, are changes that will likely result in the destruction of the system itself. Long before reform movement threaten the accumulation process as a whole, therefore, counter-forces are set in motion by the ruling interests, and the necessary elemental changes are headed off. And there’s the rub. Where radical change is called for little is accomplished within the system and the underlying crisis intensifies over time. Today this is particularly evident in the ecological realm. For the nature of the global environmental crisis is such that the fate of the entire planet and social and ecological issues of enormous complexity are involved, all traceable to the forms of production now prevalent**.** It is impossible to prevent the world’s environmental crisis from getting progressively worse unless root problems of production, distribution, technology, and growth are dealt with on a global scale. And the more that such questions are raised, the more it becomes evidence that capitalism is unsustainable – ecologically, economically, politically, and morally – and must be superseded.

**Capitalism no longer sustainable – the recession was not a blip but a product of a structurally deficient system that will inevitably collapse.**

**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](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0,9" \t "_blank),]

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.

**Alternative text: Reject the affirmative as a means of refusing complicity with capitalism.**

**Rejecting capitalism is key to opening up new alternatives. Only complete refusal, not piecemeal reform, can prevent otherwise inevitable slavery and extinction.**

**Herod, 04** (James, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm, Getting Free, 4th Edition

A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004

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

**The configuration of infrastructure is a key point of contestation of global capital – expansion of infrastructure creates the condition of possibility for rapid capital accumulation**

**Derickson, 11** Ph.D in Geography and Womens Studies (Kate Driscoll, “NEOLIBERALISM AND THE POLITICS OF LAND USE IN POST-KATRINA MISSISSIPPI”, Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University The Graduate School College of Earth and Mineral Science https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/paper/11630/7208 SW)

Major reconfigurations of the built environment, as moments of creative destruction, can provide a particularly telling window into neoliberal capitalist social relations.1 Indeed, given Marxism‟s materialist lineage, it is quite surprising that geographers with roots in that tradition have paid so little attention to the built environment and its reconfiguration in the course of their many efforts to analyze neoliberalism. It is all the more surprising given the strong emphasis on private property that runs through the liberal philosophical tradition, neoliberalism, and contemporary struggles over the built environment alike. The politics, processes, and discourses associated with major reconfigurations of the built environment should be critical sites for the investigation and analysis of neoliberalism because they contain and represent the implementation of ideologically driven imaginations of the city, involve extensive justification and debate, and contain intricate land use decisions and political battles that play out as the larger project itself is debated. Moreover, whatever is eventually built inscribes current social relationships into the material environment in ways that often make them long-lasting, resistant to change, and distant from the social relations and process which created them. Thus, as I flesh out further below, major reconfigurations of the built environment and the associated politics and processes provide great promise for gaining a deeper understanding of the interconnection between large scale macroeconomic shifts, the ways in which capital, the state, and labor position themselves relative to those shifts, and the ways in which citizen subjectivities and cultural politics are articulated in and through the politics of the built environment. As Kathryne Mitchell (2004) has argued, “documenting in detail the transformation of space and consciousness in a particular urban environment makes it possible to understand the tightly interwoven relationship between socio- economic change, urban spatial transformation, and the narratives and practices of contemporary regimes of governance” (5). The term “built environment” refers to all human-made structures and their configuration. This includes infrastructure such as roads, bridges, highways, subdivisions, and public housing projects, as well as ports, wharves, and train yards. Examples are endless, of course. The built environment encapsulates sites of both production and reproduction, and its configuration is shaped largely by the interplay between the two. Workforce housing, road configuration, and public transportation – to name just a few – are designed to facilitate labor‟s access to work, commerce, and the transportation of goods. Each of these elements of the built environment exists in relation to the others – for example, sites of production and reproduction are in a particularly important relationship with one another and their relative location can be manipulated based on available transportation routes. Indeed, the tension between the needs and interests of labor and capital with respect to the built environment are often at the heart of struggles over land use. Capital accumulation requires particular configurations of the built environment insofar as the means of production are part and parcel of the built environment itself, **as are supporting facilities such as ports, industrial parks, and other infrastructure**. The cost of construction and maintenance, as well as the management of these features of the built environment is often borne by the state, at times with the explicit purpose of facilitating capital accumulation, and at other times with the stated purpose of improving quality of life (though often there are profit motives and opportunities attached). The recent allocation of $600 million dollars by the state of Mississippi to the redevelopment and enhancement of the Port of Gulfport to facilitate larger produce shipments with shorter turnaround times and improved handling of produce and access to transportation networks is one such example of the state facilitating and managing infrastructure for the explicit purpose of capital accumulation (Gidwani and Chari 2004; Harvey 2007 [1982]). The built environment is not only a venue in which capitalist social relations play out, it also provides another window into the internal logic of capitalism. The creation and organization of the built environment represents a contradictory moment for capital. Its development is necessary for further accumulation and innovation, yet it freezes, for a short time at least, a particular configuration that is often outmoded by the dynamic needs of capital. This tension, between the built environment and its material resistance to change and the fluid and dynamic nature of capital, creates **friction** that is recognizably played out in neighborhoods, city centers, suburbs, and downtowns. There are two important ways in which the built environment provides a window into the internal logic of capitalism in cities. First, major reconfigurations of the built environment are largely funded by and mediated through the state. As the geographies of production and manufacturing have evolved, so have the place-specific needs of capital. These needs are communicated by capitalists to the state in the form of political pressure to promote change. This evolution can be seen clearly and is well described by Wilson (2007) as he documents the shifting needs of deindustrializing cities seeking their new fortunes by reinventing themselves as “global cities.” By examining these efforts we can understand how the needs of capital are changing and how its relationship with the state is evolving. Second, favorable configurations of the built environment can drive down labor costs and increase relative surplus value. By lowering the cost of social reproduction in the form of housing and transportation, capitalists stand to increase their relative surplus value. In Biloxi, where rising insurance costs threaten the affordability of housing for nearby casinos, business leaders are concerned about travel time to work and the labor market‟s access to affordable housing. Of course, the extent to which housing is “affordable” is directly related to regional wages. Thus, any responsibility that the state takes relative to providing affordable housing functions, in part, to allow local employers to decrease the social wage. To paraphrase Harvey (1989b), capital thus creates artifacts which create a sort of friction with which it must contend in the future. In the case of this study, these artifacts with which capital must contend include established minority and low-income neighborhoods in currently inconvenient locations, and wide swaths of waterfront real estate littered with industrial ruins and **outmoded infrastructure**. Interestingly, however, it is not just capital that must contend with these things, but also the state. And to some degree, these outmoded or inconvenient configurations are the state‟s problem, as it looks to attract capital and develop the regional economy. Still, place-based capitalists with assets in the region, or existing investment, must contend with them as well. Hence we see “growth machine politics” (Molotch 1976; Logan and Molotch 1987) advocating state investment and spending in infrastructure in order to offset capital investment and expenditure and enhance relative surplus value. Finally, insofar as capital must contend with existing configurations of the built environment that are slow to change, these configurations necessarily shape the possibilities available to capital for accumulation. The built environment is stubbornly material. Perhaps even more than social service programs, institutions, or modes of governance, the built environment is materially resistant to change. Of course, material change to the built environment is possible, and happens all the time. Buildings can be torn down, remodeled, or gentrified – converted from mills to artist “live/work” space. Highways can be torn down, and new ones can be built. But major remakings of the built environment take time, cost money, and confront the vexing challenge of private property ownership, all of which must be dealt with in and through the state. Thus, struggles over the built environment are a relevant but under-explored sphere for understanding the logic of capital accumulation in a given period insofar as they encompasses, to a degree, the evolving relationship between the state, civil society and capital.

**Prefer our epistemological method – we must have a systemic view of critical globalization studies that recognizes the interconnectedness of social relations– to do otherwise creates binaries**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

CGS = critical globalization studies

A CGS therefore requires dialectical thought at the level of epistemology**,** as a way of knowing. In epistemological terms, dialectics means a dialogue seeking truth through exploration of contradictions and through identifying the internal relations that bind together diverse and multifaceted dimensions of social reality into an open totality. In the dialectical approach the different dimensions of our social reality do not have an ‘‘independent’’ status insofar as each aspect of reality is constituted by, and is constitutive of, a larger whole of which it is an internal element. An internal relation is one in which each part is constituted in its relation to the other, so that one cannot exist without the other and only has meaning when seen within the relation, whereas an external relation is one in which each part has an existence independent of its relation to the other (Ollman, 1976). Viewing things as externally related to each other inevitably leads to dualist constructs and false dichotomies (e.g., political economy versus culture, the local/national and the global). The distinct levels of social structure—in this case, global social structure—cannot be understood independent of each other, but neither are these levels reducible to any one category. They are internally related, meaning that they can only be understood in their relation to each other and to the larger social whole.

## \*\*LINKS\*\*

### Generic

**Capitalism and transport are intrinsically related – free mobility exists in the acts of consumption of the privileged class while immobility corresponds with the coerced and restricted movements of the oppressed.**

**Seiler 9** [Cotten, Associate professor of American studies at Dickinson College, “Republic of Drivers : A Cultural History of Automobility in America” pg 22-23]

Mobility’s status as a right— liberalism’s conceptual stock in trade— also owes to capitalism. Raymond Williams historicized mobility as “essentially an impulse formed in the breakdown and dissolution of older and smaller kinds of settlement and productive labor.” 22 Inasmuch as capitalism has depended upon the availability of a large pool of labor willing to move across distances small and great, mobility has been extolled culturally as a salutary and enriching characteristic. Indeed, capitalism communicates its ethos using tropes of motion, as in the capitalist who “hustles” for profit and cultivates the image of himself as a “mover” (an image that, as Benjamin Franklin pointed out, is itself a form of capital). Acts of production, consumption, and commodification—even the worker’s alienation of her labor power and her sale of it— are ultimately acts of transport. Mobility is ostensibly a universal right; yet it has been and remains a perquisite of social, political, and economic power, insofar as its true goal is “not movement as such; it is access to people and facilities.” 23 As Mark Simpson points out, “To the extent that mobility is not so much a common resource as a social and material resource crucial to the production and reproduction . . . of national, raced, engendered, classed subjectivities, it becomes the locus of contest.” 24 The volitional mobility of the knight-errant, pilgrim, entrepreneur, or tourist—“someone who has the security and privilege to move about in relatively unconstrained ways”— throws into relief the unsanctioned motion of vagrants or tramps (those in possession of the volatile, expansive subjectivity the historian Patricia Fumerton distinguishes as “unsettled”), the coerced mobility of the nomad, undocumented worker, or refugee (as in the forced removal of Native Americans), and the circumscribed mobility of the disabled, racial others (as in the Black Codes and Jim Crow statutes), the poor, and women. 25 As a component of male prerogative, mobility has traditionally depended, Leed and others have observed, on “the sessility of women.” 26 Scholars such as Clifford, Doreen Massey, Janet Wolff, Annette Kolodny, and Sidonie Smith have further explored mobility as a deeply gendered practice and form of capital, asking how and why, in Smith’s words, “‘the traveler’ has remained endurably ‘masculine’” and “modes of motion [are] identified with masculine competencies.”

**Transportation infrastructure is critical to globalization and sustains capitalism**

**Harvey 01** (David; Professor at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY), Director of The Center for Place, Culture and Politics; “Globalization and the ‘Spatial fix’”; <http://geographische-revue.de/archiv/gr2-01.pdf#page=23>; RSW)

For geographers like myself, however, the production, reproduction and reconfiguration of space have always been central to understanding the political economy of capitalism. For us, the contemporary form of globalization is nothing more than yet another round in the capitalist production and reconstruction of space. It entails a further diminution in the friction of distance (what Marx referred to as “the annihilation of space through time” as a fundamental law of capitalist development) through yet another round of innovation in the technologies of transport and communications. It consequently entails a geographical restructuring of capitalist activity (deindustrialization here and reindustrialization there, for example) across the face of planet earth, the production of new forms of uneven geographical development, a recalibration and even recentering of global power (with far greater emphasis upon the Pacific and newly industrializing countries) and a shift in the geographical scale at which capitalism is organized (symbolized by the growth of supra-state organizational forms such as the European Union and a more prominent role for institutions of global governance such as the WTO, the IMF, the G8, the UN and the like). Contemporary globalization has been, we can argue, the product of these specific geographically grounded processes. The question is not, therefore, how globalization has affected geography but how these distinctive geographical processes of the production and reconfiguration of space have created the specific conditions of contemporary globalization.

**Their calls for more transportation infrastructure serve to crowd out discussion of systemic social issues that allow the industry to sustain a profit.**

**Lavender 12** [Harold, longtime social activist and editor of the New Socialist, “Review of Bianca Mugyenyi and Yves Engler, *Stop Signs: Cars and Capitalism on the Road to Economic, Social and Ecological Decay*” 24 February 2012]

Marketing car culture Consumer demand for the automobile did not arise by magic, but by the skillful manipulation of human values and emotions, and powerful lobbying forces. Successful marketing ploys, such as introducing new models every year, have helped maintain sales, as has generous provision of credit for those who don't have cash on hand. And through intensive and well-funded lobbying, the auto and oil industries have fended off challenges that put consideration of health, safety, the environment, energy efficiency and social justice at the top of the political agenda. Through funding, the auto industry has influenced the direction of education and research at universities. This helped shape the ideas of urban planners and architects, and direct money into scientific research that benefits companies, away from alternatives to auto dominance. Stop Signs documents how much the car has become an integral part of US popular culture in song lyrics, movies, widely read magazines, promotions and sporting events such as NASCAR.

**Transportation infrastructure puts limits on societal movement and structures society in the service of capital**

**Derickson, 11** Ph.D in Geography and Women‟s Studies (Kate Driscoll, “NEOLIBERALISM AND THE POLITICS OF LAND USE IN POST-KATRINA MISSISSIPPI”, Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University The Graduate School College of Earth and Mineral Science https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/paper/11630/7208 SW)

The work of Jenson (1990; 1991; 1993) is notable because of its overt attention to culture and cultural politics within the framework of RA. While David Harvey (1989a) has addressed what he saw as cultural changes as a result of changes in the regime of accumulation, his failure to attribute agency on the part of feminists or others in bringing about cultural shifts (Deutsche 1991; Morris 1992; Massey 1994) means he can also be accused of what Jenson argues is a failure within RA in general to address the question of agency. To develop an RA more attuned to agency, she argues that there are two stories to tell, which she terms the “double optic”: on the one hand, there are the macro-structural relations that play out whether people are conscious of it or not, and on the other, the sphere of everyday life. It is through lived experience and everyday life, she argues, that acceptance of new modes of regulation arise and the contradictions of capitalism are explained. It is at this level of “strategic choices and the unintended consequences of actions” that we can begin to understand how (temporarily) stable arrangements of social relations are constituted and sustained” (1991, 190). The built environment and its associated politics is one underexplored arena in which to empirically explore Jenson‟s double optic insofar as it functions in close relation with those macro-strcutural shifts that are well documented by the regulation approach, while also being an important site through which everyday politics and subjectivities are produced and play out. This is evident in small scale neighborhood struggles over gentrification, displacement, encroachment, and environmental (in)justices, and in city-wide debates about urban planning, place-making, and the future of cities (Mitchell, K 2004; Purcell 2008). The shifting configurations of the built environment also tell us a story about the relationship between capitalist production and labor. As I have argued, capitalists are **deeply concerned** about the configuration of the built environment as it relates to attracting labor, facilitating commutes to work, and housing workers. In the latter two cases, particular configurations and organizations of the built environment stand to generate relative surplus value if the costs can be borne by the state. In coastal Mississippi, capitalists actively intervened in the planning and organization of the built environment with an eye toward facilitating low cost housing options in comfortable commuting distance for their employees or potential labor market. As I argue in Chapter 2, this relationship is particularly relevant for understanding land use politics as class politics. As seen through Jenson’s double optic, then, the built environment becomes a site where macro- structural changes in production and the labor process are addressed and worked out and a site where subjectivities are produced and contested. It is thus possible that we can see these processes as a window to begin to understand how contestation could possibly have an impact on structural relations. Certain configurations which are no longer politically viable or socially acceptable pose **limits** on the possibilities for configuration of the built environment amenable to capital accumulation. Examples of these politically contentious processes and configurations include dense high-rise public housing, taking properties by eminent domain in low income and minority neighborhoods, and the siting of environmentally hazardous facilities in low income and minority neighborhoods. Finally, the RA is a useful lens for analyzing the political economy of the built environment, as it has strongly theorized the relationship between post-crisis stabilization and the search for relative surplus value. French regulationist Aglietta (2001) explicitly recognized that the reorganization of relations between state, market, and civil sectors involves profound urban environmental changes that have the potential to radically affect the course of primary and social forms of (re)production within cities (2001), and discussions concerning the reorganization of spatial relations between the state, market, and civil society sectors feature prominently in the regulationist literature (Jessop and Sum 2006). As argued above, both the organization of, and **state investment in,** **the built environment functions to create relative surplus value for capitalists,** by decreasing the cost of social reproduction, enhancing relative location for production, and contributing to “space-time compression” (Harvey 2007 [1982]) in the production and distribution of goods. With respect to social reproduction, reconfigurations of the built environment can lower commuting times and costs, lowering the social wage, and subsidized housing costs leads to lower costs of social reproduction which allow capitalists to pay lower wages while maintaining the rate of surplus value. Any decrease to the cost of social reproduction results in an increase in relative surplus value, at least temporarily. Further, space-time compression can be achieved and relative location enhanced by major state investment in transportation infrastructure like public transit or highway projects, or the provision of amenities and utilities to areas to facilitate housing construction. States can also manipulate zoning codes and land use regulations to create new opportunities for increased profitability, or sell state property to developers for below market value. These possibilities for realizing relative surplus value through manipulations in the built environment make capitalists particularly interested in the politics of land use. The configuration of the built environment is of equal importance to labor. Not only are its configurations relevant to social reproduction and its associated costs, the built environment is imbued with history, culture, and symbolic landscapes that represent, produce, and reproduce identities and subjectivities. As this study demonstrates, residents derive a sense of identity and belonging from their neighborhoods, which is manifested in a strong desire to preserve the configuration and “character” of the built environment. These desires are not merely symbolic or nostalgic, however. As Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrate, residents of low income neighborhoods see the preservation of their neighborhoods as a matter of survival, as well as a mechanism for building and maintaining wealth. Finally, as feminist geographers (Hanson and Pratt 1995; Gilbert 1998) and others (Logan and Molotch 1987; Briggs 2005) have shown, the configuration of the built environment produces and limits opportunities for various segments of the population**.** Thus, the regulation approach provides a solid and fruitful theoretical framework in which to ground an investigation into the relationship between major reconfigurations of the built environment and neoliberalization. When augmented by the work of Jenson (1990; 1991; 1993), whose work has expanded the concept of the “mode of social regulation” to include a meaningful theorization of cultural politics, and Purcell (2002), who emphasizes the need to consider the state‟s complicated relationship with both capital and citizens in a democracy, the framework of RA becomes an especially promising lens for a more thorough and convincing theorization and empirical analysis of the interplay between cultural politics and political economy.

### New Deal

**The New Deal politics of the affirmative only serve to prop up capitalism**

**Smith 08** (Jason; B.A. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, M.A. University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D. University of California, Berkeley; 5/19/08; “The New Deal Order”; Enterprise & Society; Volume 9 Issue 3)//RSW

Indeed, in setting out to preserve capitalism in the face of the Great Depression, New Dealers turned to what they knew. They experimented with their various policy measures, strengthened federal power to boost the standing of labor and consumers vis á vis business, and regulated the nation's labor and financial markets to address the greatest economic crisis of the twentieth century. Environmental shortsightedness on their part should be viewed within this broader context: despite deficiencies, the New Deal kept the United States from embracing undemocratic political philosophies such as fascism or communism. Through its public works projects, the federal government justified its new presence in the nation's economy. The New Dealers compellingly demonstrated—in almost every county of the nation—that public investment and state-sponsored economic development were essential to a modern society, not only for surviving the Great Depression, but especially for laying the foundations for a subsequent period of postwar economic growth and sustained productivity rarely equaled in world history. Labeling the trajectory of New Deal liberalism as a narrative of declension leading to the “end of reform,” as a journey away from the 1933 statist intervention of the National Recovery Administration's industrial codes to the manipulation of fiscal policy in 1937 and 1938, misses the central significance of the New Deal's commitment to public works throughout these years and afterward. By using the interpretive lens of political economy, we can comprehend more fully the New Deal's long-lasting achievements in using public investment to spur economic development during and after the 1930s. Indeed, the “mixed economy” constructed by the New Deal—with its public investment, its regulation of banking and capital markets, and its recognition of organized labor's right to bargain collectively—soon helped to foster tremendous economic growth (between 1940 and 1973 American GDP grew, in real terms, at an average annual per capita rate of 3 percent).15 While using the concept of political economy in this fashion can aid in providing a more complete understanding of the New Deal order, it also has broader uses. More generally, attending to political economy—to the deeper relationships of power, inscribed in institutions and organizations—presents historians with an opportunity to advance a broader rethinking of political history that a variety of scholars have endorsed.16 Indeed, three eminent social and intellectual historians recently joined this movement; emphatically agreeing that what the profession needs, put simply, is a renewed focus on political history and political economy.17 In sum, with so many US historians embarked upon taking a political turn in their work, it seems the concept of political economy can help us in asking significant questions about the concrete institutions, social practices, labor relations, and policy regimes that have helped to shape economy and society over time. The past thirty years have witnessed the intellectual disaggregating of “the state,” an effort led by sociologists, historians, and political scientists; we now need to deploy this insight into disaggregating “the market,” understanding it not only as an economic institution, but also as one shaped by politics and society.18 (The New Deal is a particularly important period for this undertaking, representing as it does a period of state building taken up in direct response to the enormous market failures exposed by the Great Depression.) Business historians, who have long understood the importance of situating the activities of firms in broader networks of power, are well suited to be key players in advancing this project. Given this essay's largely optimistic picture of what there is to gain from embracing the concept of political economy, it's worth pausing to ask if there are costs to adopting this approach? In a limited sense, the answer to this question must necessarily be “yes.” Different approaches to studying the past come into existence because, by definition, they provide alternative modes for addressing specific questions, or areas of inquiry, that had been ignored by previous approaches. In performing this intellectual work of reframing history, newer subfields are generally not engaged with asking the same sets of questions posed by older ways of organizing knowledge. To the extent that historians working on issues of political economy are no longer asking the same questions that used to occupy the “new” social or cultural historians, then, there is by definition a cost to this shift in emphasis. At this level of discussion, though, what really seems to be at stake between political economy on the one hand, and older, more entrenched ways of practicing history on the other, is less a question of intellectual costs and benefits and more a recapitulation of a classic tension: “structure” versus “agency.” Political economy, for many of the scholars mentioned in this essay, is a concept that aids in investigating questions about structures—legal, political, institutional, economic—and treats the agency of ordinary people mainly when they are acting within these structures, as lawmakers, organized workers, or contractors, for example.19 But it would be a mistake, I think, simply to split the difference in this fashion. Rather, if we are to attempt to address this seeming dichotomy between structure and agency in a productive way, scholars on either side of this issue might benefit from considering how historian William Sewell has handled it. Indeed, Sewell's own intellectual trajectory, encompassing history, anthropology, political science, and sociology, is itself instructive in this regard. Rather than viewing structure and agency in an unchanging, static opposition, Sewell argues that we instead recognize that “enactments of structures imply a particular concept of agency—one that sees agency not as opposed to, but as constituent of, structure.” Structures, Sewell observes, “empower agents differentially, which also implies that they embody the desires, intentions, and knowledge of agents differentially as well. Structures, and the human agencies they endow, are laden with differences in power.”20 In the spirit of Sewell's formulation, then, historians interested in political economy might draw upon the earlier achievements of the new social and cultural history in order to ground these studies in larger networks of power. Similarly, new social and cultural historians might well find useful the insights provided by this “new” political economy, which reveal how deeper relationships of power have changed over time. In this way, I would propose, the emerging move toward political economy, with the potential it holds for connecting long-popular questions of agency to long-neglected questions concerning structures, and with its insights into understanding how differing power relationships have shaped institutions, politics, and history, can help to significantly advance our understandings of the historical, political, and institutional origins of our present moment.

### Cars

**Transportation infrastructure programs utilize cars as a means to perpetuate the worst forms of global capitalism.**

**Lavender 12** [Harold, longtime social activist and editor of the New Socialist, “Review of Bianca Mugyenyi and Yves Engler, *Stop Signs: Cars and Capitalism on the Road to Economic, Social and Ecological Decay*” 24 February 2012]

Cars are noisy and dangerous. Corporate media culture fuels fear of murder and violent crime, but automobiles are the biggest killers of children and youth. Globally, cars kill more than one million people each year. Much of this carnage takes place in the unregulated space of the Third World. In the US, the annual toll is 40 000 deaths, including 6000 pedestrians and 700 cyclists. Every study shows that increasing speed promoted by auto companies sharply increases the number of fatalities. Studies also prove that other options, such as buses and commuter rail, are far safer. Similarly, cars create smog, particulate matter and environmental toxins. Poisoning the environment contributes to rising rates of asthma and cancers, and indirectly leads to many thousands of premature deaths annually. And in a car-dependent culture, people walk less. Lack of exercise and the stress of long commutes exacerbate health problems. The US contains four percent of the world's population, but consumes one-quarter of the globe's oil and close to half of its gasoline. Yet the worst impact will not be suffered in the US. Global climate change will lead to increased drought, uninhabitable areas and threats to food security, most starkly in poorer countries. One example is the Niger delta, where the oil industry has destroyed land and failed to benefit the Ogoni people who have been brutally repressed. Oil has been a rising force behind US foreign policy and intervention in the Middle East as well, helping fuel the extremist counter-reaction of 9/11. Creating need for profit Stop Signs says, "The logic of corporate profit is conspicuous consumption, a trait embodied by the auto's endless need for endless space." The book's primary focus is the auto industry's capacity to reproduce itself through the constant creation of expanding needs. Particularly in the US, the "auto-industrial complex" does this via advertising and control of media, anti-competitive practices, political lobbying, influencing education and academia, and general promotion of "car culture." But the authors also critique other social consequences, for instance noting Detroit's demise due to policies of car domination, poor mass transit and the trend toward the dispersal of manufacturing. In the early twentieth century auto production began a meteoric rise, becoming the economic engine of US capitalism by generating huge demands for related industrial products and raw materials. It went on to become the world's largest manufacturing industry and, along with the oil industry, the leading source of corporate profits. At the peak of its domination in 1982, one in five US employees worked in auto-related industries. Car dependency could not have happened without massive publicly subsidized road projects, including the US interstate system which fuelled suburban growth. Freeways cut through US cities destroying existing -- often Black -- communities, and aiding "white flight" to the suburbs. Many inner cities were left with a reduced tax base and declining public services. Jobs shifted to the suburbs, making it difficult for those without cars or dependent upon inadequate public transit to get jobs. Government in effect provide massive amount of corporate welfare to the auto industry. Meanwhile society is expected to pay for the social and ecological damages created by the industry. Meanwhile, the auto industry aggressively pursued its self-interest, shoving aside competition. It regularly put profits before safety as in, for example, the case of the 1979 Malibu whose fuel tank was placed in a position vulnerable to rear-end collisions. During a lawsuit, it was revealed that General Motors didn't alter their design because they had calculated that the potential cost of damages and related deaths would be less than the cost of changing the product. In the 1930s, auto companies conspired to eliminate the electric trolley. By taking over bus companies, they made it difficult for electric companies to operate trolleys, and eventually bought out the operators. By the 1950s, 90 percent of street cars had disappeared from city streets.

**A reform in mass transit is necessary to make a shift towards public transportation and shirk off the shackles of oil dependence and automobile capitalism.**   
**Lavender 12** [Harold, longtime social activist and editor of the New Socialist, “Review of Bianca Mugyenyi and Yves Engler, *Stop Signs: Cars and Capitalism on the Road to Economic, Social and Ecological Decay*” 24 February 2012]

Some look to quick energy fixes for the problems generated by our dependence on fossil fuel. But the authors are highly skeptical. They argue technological solutions and supposed alternative sources are not the answer. In particular, they lambaste bio-fuels, noting it takes five times the land to grow corn to produce ethanol than it does to produce food for the poor. Instead Mugyenyi and Engler argue for investing in more efficient means of transport. We need to drastically shift our mode of transportation from cars to buses, street cars and subways. More hopefully, new critical thinking is evident in actions such as Car-Free Days, Reclaim the Streets and Critical Mass Bike rides. While some of these are focused on individual choice to reject the car, Mugyenyi and Engler recognize the need for broad systemic change. There is a need for mass-based movements and alliances that are inclusive of those who drive, as a way of gaining sufficient weight to change public policy. The authors note some successes in stopping highways and freeways in the US and Canada when community opposition was particularly strong, and look to build on such successes. The authors are also pro-worker, and favour some kind of eco-socialist or economic democracy alternative. Despite this, there is little focus on the role of unions in the auto industry. There are obvious difficulties in convincing auto workers and anti-car activists to join together. However, the authors don't mention openings that could be explored, such as the conversion of plants to produce more social and ecological transportation products. Overall, the book underemphasizes the need to move from a system in which giant corporations decide what gets produced, to a system in which production decisions are socially controlled. Mugyenyi and Engler recognize the need for a huge shift in public and social investment -- but don't fully address the need to organize campaigns to do this. Nor do they give enough emphasis to campaigns to lower or eliminate public transit fares. Unless fares are lowered, and service greatly expanded and improved most drivers will continue to see their cars as a necessity. Stop Signs maintains a certain coherence by focusing on the auto, auto corporations, and the emerging social movements against their domination. However, these issues cannot be resolved in isolation. We need to address broader question of social justice, social inequality, and the global threat of austerity-driven cuts to public transportation systems and corporate rule that created car culture in the first place, and actively sustains it now.

**Our love affair with the automobile is born out of the government’s attempts to mask capitalism’s violent, racist and excessive nature.**

**Furness 10** [Zack, Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies at Columbia College Chicago, “One Less Car: Bicycling and the Politics of Automobility” pg 5-6]

The historical transformation of the United States in to a full-blown car culture is commonly, though somewhat erroneously, attributed to choice or desire, as if the aggregation of individual consumer choices and yearnings necessarily built the roads, lobbied the government, zoned the real estate, silenced the critics, subsidized auto makers, underfunded public transit, and passed the necessary laws to oversee all facets of these projects since the 1890s. One of the primary stories used to bolster this broad-based claim is that of America's love affair with the automobile-a common trope in U.S. popular culture that colors our understanding of transportation history and also buttresses some of the most partisan arguments posed by the car's vigorous defenders'' It is unquestionable that many Americans do, in fact, love their cars and cling to the myth of "The Road" with the zeal of Madison Avenue and Jack Kerouac combined. However, the fidelity of the narrative is almost irrelevant when considering how it is put to use and for whom it is made to work. That is to say, while the love affair serves a variety of social and cultural functions in the United States, it is particularly compelling to a relatively small group of freemarket ideologues and multinational corporations (particularly oil conglomerates) who largely govern and/or profit from the production, marketing, sales, and regulation of the automobile. Indeed, the love story satisfies two of the most cherished myths of free-market capitalism concurrently: it corroborates the idea that consumer choices equal authentic power (i.e., people vote with their wallets), and it normalizes the false notion that consumer desires ultimately determine the so-called evolution of technologies- a position that ignores the profound roles that material and cultural infrastructures play in the success of any technology, much less the development of techno logical norms. Such explanations not only are misleading; they also effectively downplay some of the most undemocratic and thoroughly racist decision-making processes at the heart of postwar urban development and transportation policy implementation in the United States, as well as the political influence historically wielded by what could easily be termed an automobile-industrial complex. 23 This is not to suggest that power is always exerted from the top down, nor to imply that the average person plays no role in the production or contestation of technological and cultural norms. Rather, it is simply a way of acknowledging that technological desires and choices, particularly those concerning transportation and mobility, are necessarily constrained by the profit imperatives of very specific and very powerful institutions and organizations.

**United States automobile infrastructure projects are empirically a mask for the worst forms of capitalist consumption.**

**Seiler 9** [Cotten, Associate professor of American studies at Dickinson College, “Republic of Drivers : A Cultural History of Automobility in America” pg 70-72]

Over and above the reformulation of individualism, there remained questions of the form the renewal and affirmation of national values would assume. As U.S. propagandists sought “for our enemies, our allies, the uncommitted, and ourselves, a set of working principles, a definition of fundamental beliefs,” they simultaneously sought to remove their fingerprints from the product. 9 Seeking to distance themselves from the transparently ideological political communication associated with totalitarian regimes, American experts theorized that nearly any cultural phenomenon, properly positioned and interpreted, could assume a propaganda function. 10 Compounding the propagandists’ difficulties were the vagueness of the crucial term freedom and the fact that both of the belligerents claimed to embrace it. A prodigiously fertile signifier, “freedom” has always required clarification through material expression, “a fence,” the sociologist Dorothy Lee wrote, “around [its] formless idea.” 11 A merely rhetorical affirmation of individual freedom, even one forcefully and consistently reiterated in official pronouncements, academic scholarship, and middlebrow media, would not suffice to summon the necessary martial energies. Addressing the crucial question at the center of cold war America, “what are we for?,” Eisenhower aide Arthur Larson asserted that “it is less important to stress that we are for freedom (since most uncommitted peoples accept freedom as an ideal) than to stress that we are for the institutions that in fact create and advance freedom” (italics his). “Freedom must find a purpose,” echoed another Eisenhower staffer. 12 The defeat of collectivist ideology abroad and the liberation from “conformity” at home required a material infrastructure that would foreground the individual as the essential focus of American society. Thus by the 1950s, as Kim McQuaid observes, the cold war “began to be waged about everything.” 13 This chapter considers the Interstate Highway System as a component of the postwar “practical affirmation” of American values demanded by NSC 68 and other cold war rhetoric. It characterizes the interstates as a massive piece of propaganda expressing what one 1966 commentator called “the intense dedication of our age to motion.” 14 In the years leading up to its authorization by the federal government in 1956, the proposed National System of Interstate and Defense Highways was portrayed by politicians, bureaucrats, engineers, military officials, business leaders, and the popular media as the fulfillment of middle-class Americans’ desires for automotive safety, national security, economic prosperity, and expanded mobility. It was the largest public works project in human history: from 1956 to 1975, over 42,500 miles of the continental U.S. would be paved; and a federal trust fund would raise and distribute an estimated $41 billion (in actuality, over $100 billion) in construction costs. This chapter argues, then, that we look beyond what has become a standard explanation of the Interstate Highway System as a product of postwar abundance and/or military exigency. We must pay attention instead to the ways in which the cold war organized the political and cultural conditions under which automobility took on a redoubled significatory power. The act of driving became, in this historical context, a sort of palliative ideological exercise that was seen to reverse, or at least to arrest, the postwar “decline of the individual” and the deterioration of the “American character” of a heroic and expansionist past. The figure of the driver, moreover, embodied the ideological gulf separating the United States from its communist antagonists, and proved— to those antagonists, to allied nations, to those cultures the United States sought to annex ideologically, and, most important, to Americans themselves— the continuing vitality of the essential individual freedom enjoyed under liberalism and capitalism. The radical expansion of automobility that the Interstate Highway System enabled was catalyzed by at least five interrelated midcentury phenomena. The first is the revision of individualist ideology in mainstream political and business rhetoric to reflect more accurately and justify more effectively the contemporary corporate model of organization. Second is the elaboration of the social-scientific concept of “character” that, though it articulated selfhood as socially formed and culturally specific, nonetheless enabled the resurrection of the “autonomous individual”—as the heroic “American character.” Third is the discourse of the declining American character and a corresponding reassertion of a heroic, archaic, and emphatically masculine individualism in cultural and scholarly production and state propaganda. Fourth is the related designation of mobility— automobility in particular— as a constituent element of the American character and therefore as an antidote to the latter’s current decline. Fifth is the cold war state’s practical acceptance of its role in creating and reinforcing specific subjects, even as that state, especially under the Eisenhower administration, disavowed such a role.

**Automobile infrastructure facilitates a culture of material excess and endless capitalist consumption**

**Engler 11** [Yves, author and social activist, “Cars & Capitalism” <http://www.zcommunications.org/cars-and-capitalism-by-yves-engler>]

The list of industries that profit from the car is virtually endless. Even in death, the car is a moneymaker. An entire culture has been spawned by weekend adventures and day trips to search out junkyard gems. Including chains the six thousand auto scrap yards strewn across the USA do $30 billion a year in sales. But many bits and pieces don’t make it to the yards; landfills are the final resting place of a huge amount of material from cars. This is another multi billion-dollar industry. Beyond direct spin-offs, the private car underpins a host of (heavily capitalized) businesses that would not exist if bikes were the dominant form of transportation. Wal-Mart, for instance, grew on the back of the highway to become the biggest company in the world. Similarly, the motel (or “motor hotel”) business created by and for the car does tens of billions of dollars in sales annually while the $120 billion fast food industry began on Southern California highways and continues to do most of its business via the drive-thru. Sprawling car infrastructure has also allowed for the massive growth in house sizes. Brick, wood, ceramic, grass, paint, glass and pipe producers have all benefited. Appliance manufacturers are the better for it too. It’s not easy fitting two fridges, a dishwasher a freezer, a washer and drier, a pool table, six beds and four TVs into a small house or apartment; big houses are a boon to the appliance industry. “Urban areas have less junk than suburbs”, said 1-800-GOT-JUNK’s Darryl Arnold. “But only because they have less space. My residential jobs in apartments and condos downtown are on average one eighth of a load, compared with closer to half a truck load in the suburbs.” When all is said and done, cars facilitate an extra large culture, which is grand for business. Propelling the capitalist economic system full speed ahead, the automobile is a vehicle of endless consumption. (Capitalism would prefer everyone traveling to the grocery store by private jet but since that’s not practical 3,000 or 4,000 pound metal boxes will have to do.) The car’s ability to generate business explains in large part why public monies are overwhelmingly devoted to this dangerous, unhealthy and unsustainable form of transport. Those who want cities structured for safer and more ecologically sustainable forms of transport need to challenge, rather than reinforce, the idea that transit policy should be designed to expand profits. Proponents of the bike and walking will thrive as more people challenge the logic of a system driven by the endless accumulation of profit.

**Car culture is the engine of the violent patriarchal nature of capitalism**

**Paterson 2000** [Matthew, Professor of political science at the University of Ottawa, “Car culture and global environmental politics” Review of International Studies 26, 253–270]

What I want to show is that use of cars is deeply embedded in the reproduction of global power structures. These daily consumptive practices and experiences simultaneously both systemically produce environmental degradation on global and local scales and also help to reproduce capitalist, statist, patriarchal identities and structures. Thus I argue that in this way such structures are deeply implicated in the production of environmental degradation. I advance such an argument here by analysing the rise of the car in terms of Global Political Economy. This involves three aspects: that the car industry has been instrumental in creating the transnational flows associated with globalization; that the reproduction of a globalizing capitalism has involved the expansion of the car industry as that industry made crucial contributions to securing accumulation; and that the state has been highly involved in promoting the car over its competitors, both because of the state’s structural role in promoting accumulation, and because of the consequences of interstate competition, the importance of a car industry for development, and in some instances the car industry’s connection to a state’s warmaking capacities. Such an argument is necessarily partial. A Global Political Economy which ignores the ways in which cars have become deeply embedded in twentieth century modern identities fails to explain the dynamics which have secured the car’s rise. While outside IPE, political economy has started to come to terms with the importance of consumer culture in sustaining twentieth century capitalism, for example in debates surrounding post-Fordism,18 IPE has yet to follow suit. Indeed, Gramscian IPE, on which much of my argument below is premised, remains resolutely productivist in its orientation.19 Thus we should consider questions of consumer culture and identity in general terms through a focus on the symbolic power which the car has gained, where the car is valorized as a supremely modern (and rhetorically at least, therefore irresistible) technology and commodity. Furthermore, such forms of identification around the car have helped to reproduce the social inequalities endemic to modern societies and the symbolic politics of identity. However, for reasons of space I do not explore such questions here, and the analysis is limited to questions of political economy conventionally understood. I explore the cultural-symbolic aspects of cars in more detail elsewhere.20

**Car culture reproduces capitalism on a global scale – we must resist these global power structures or risk destruction of the environment**

**Paterson 2000** [Matthew, Professor of political science at the University of Ottawa, “Car culture and global environmental politics” Review of International Studies 26, 253–270]

At the same time, the development of a car industry has helped to reproduce such power structures because of the ways it has facilitated accumulation. The acceleration of the movement of goods, the transformation of production by car manufacturers in what became known as Fordism, and the direct stimulation of the economy by the car industry, all meant that the car has played a key role in promoting accumulation in the twentieth century, and thus in reproducing capitalist society on a global scale. It has also played an important role in integrating the economy globally as car manufacturers have led the way in organizing production transnationally. As a consequence of its role in reproducing capitalism, it also became a part of state managers’ strategies for reproducing their own state power, legitimizing their rule through promoting the car and thus economic growth. Such an analysis starts with questions which could be posed within a neoGramscian framework in IPE. But it also exceeds the limits of that framework by asking not only how accumulation is organized, distributed and contested, but what role specific material practices (which therefore have specific ecological consequences) and the technologies through which such practices operate, play in the organization, distribution and contestation of accumulation. Thus an ecological approach to IR or IPE asks not only how has the car been an example of the dynamics of twentieth century capitalism, but in what ways have the features specific to the car and its associated social practices made such dynamics possible? This article has offered some preliminary answers to such a question. This is a stronger argument than simply saying that such power structures are incompatible with successful responses to environmental change, which has been the focus of most critical writers on GEP to date. If global power structures are complicit in producing environmental change in the first place, then this is another perhaps stronger reason to reject liberal institutionalist analyses which presume the neutrality of such structures. However this argument goes substantially beyond a simple critique of regime-theoretic approaches, outlining a form of analysis which focuses on the social forces which underpin practices which produce global environmental change. It also helps to show us, although I have not been able to develop this point here, how we might think about global social change towards sustainability. It suggests both that the principles on which existing systems are based (accumulation, globalization, interstate competition) are unsustainable, but also that practices of resistance could begin to change consumption practices and social structures over time. Increasingly, the ‘man’ with the good [sic] car, does need justification, and while fate is in our hands, it is increasingly being seen as involving abandoning the transmission. However, what is perhaps not yet recognized is the depth of global social change implied by such an abandonment.

**Automobiles are the quintessential symbol of American capitalism and the narrative associated with them serves to posit them as an essential part of life while masking the harms they create.**

**Urry 4** [John, Professor of Sociology at Lancaster University, “The ‘System’ of Automobility” Theory, Culture & Society October 2004 vol. 21 no. 4-5 25-39 ]

ONE BILLION cars were manufactured during the last century. There are currently over 700 million cars roaming the world. World car travel is predicted to triple between 1990 and 2050 (Hawken et al., 1999). Country after country is developing an ‘automobility culture’ with the most significant currently being that of China. By 2030 there may be 1 billion cars worldwide (Motavalli, 2000: 20–1). Yet strangely the car is rarely discussed in the ‘globalization literature’, although its specific character of domination is more systemic and awesome in its consequences than what are normally viewed as constitutive technologies of the global, such as the cinema, television and especially the computer (see Castells, 2001). In this article I examine what kind of system is automobility, how its character of domination has been exerted, and whether there are any ways in which we might envisage an ending to this systemic domination. Such an automobility system comprises six components that in their combination generate and reproduce the ‘specific character of domination’ that it exercises (see original argument in Sheller and Urry, 2000). Automobility is: 1. the quintessential manufactured object produced by the leading industrial sectors and the iconic firms within 20th-century capitalism (Ford, GM, Rolls-Royce, Mercedes, Toyota, VW and so on), and the industry from which the definitive social science concepts of Fordism and post Fordism have emerged; 2. the major item of individual consumption after housing which provides status to its owner/user through its sign-values (such as speed, security, safety, sexual desire, career success, freedom, family, masculinity); through being easily anthropomorphized by being given names, having rebellious features, seen to age and so on; and which disproportionately preoccupies criminal justice systems (Miller, 2001); 3. an extraordinarily powerful complex constituted through technical and social interlinkages with other industries, car parts and accessories; petrol refining and distribution; road-building and maintenance; hotels, roadside service areas and motels; car sales and repair workshops; suburban house building; retailing and leisure complexes; advertising and marketing; urban design and planning; and various oil-rich nations (Freund, 1993); 4. the predominant global form of ‘quasi-private’ mobility that subordinates other mobilities of walking, cycling, travelling by rail and so on, and reorganizes how people negotiate the opportunities for, and constraints upon, work, family life, childhood, leisure and pleasure (Whitelegg, 1997); 5. the dominant culture that sustains major discourses of what constitutes the good life, what is necessary for an appropriate citizenship of mobility and which provides potent literary and artistic images and symbols (from E.M. Forster to Scott Fitzgerald to John Steinbeck to Daphne du Maurier to J.G. Ballard: see Bachmair, 1991; Eyerman and Löfgren, 1995; Graves-Brown, 1997). 6. the single most important cause of environmental resource-use. This results from the scale of material, space and power used in the manufacture of cars, roads and car-only environments, and in coping with the material, air quality, medical, social, ozone, visual, aural, spatial and temporal pollution of global automobility. Transport accounts for one third of CO2 emissions and is indirectly responsible for many 20th century wars (Adams, 1999; Whitelegg, 1997)

### Roads

Roads are arranged based on class distinctions – only those on the lower spectrum experiences ecological damage

Parenti 11 (Michael, PhD in political science from Yale, one of the nations’ leading political analysts, “Profit Pathology and Disposable Planet”, Michael Parenti political archive, http://www.michaelparenti.org/capitalism%20apocalypse.html)

Isn't ecological disaster a threat to the health and survival of corporate plutocrats just as it is to us ordinary citizens? We can understand why the corporate rich might want to destroy public housing, public education, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Such cutbacks would bring us closer to a free market society devoid of the publicly-funded "socialistic" human services that the ideological reactionaries detest. And such cuts would not deprive the superrich and their families of anything. The superrich have more than sufficient private wealth to procure whatever services and protections they need for themselves. But the environment is a different story, is it not? Don't wealthy reactionaries and their corporate lobbyists inhabit the same polluted planet as everyone else, eat the same chemicalized food, and breathe the same toxified air? In fact, they do not live exactly as everyone else. They experience a different class reality, often residing in places where the air is markedly better than in low and middle income areas. They have access to food that is organically raised and specially transported and prepared. The nation's toxic dumps and freeways usually are not situated in or near their swanky neighborhoods. In fact, the superrich do not live in neighborhoods as such. They usually reside on landed estates with plenty of wooded areas, streams, meadows, and only a few well-monitored access roads. Pesticide sprays are not poured over their trees and gardens. Clear cutting does not desolate their ranches, estates, family forests, lakes, and prime vacation spots. Still, should they not fear the threat of an ecological apocalypse brought on by global warming? Do they want to see life on Earth, including their own lives, destroyed? In the long run they indeed will be sealing their own doom along with everyone else's. However, like us all, they live not in the long run but in the here and now. What is now at stake for them is something more proximate and more urgent than global ecology; it is global profits. The fate of the biosphere seems like a remote abstraction compared to the fate of one's immediate--and enormous--investments. With their eye on the bottom line, big business leaders know that every dollar a company spends on oddball things like environmental protection is one less dollar in earnings. Moving away from fossil fuels and toward solar, wind, and tidal energy could help avert ecological disaster, but six of the world's ten top industrial corporations are involved primarily in the production of oil, gasoline, and motor vehicles. Fossil fuel pollution brings billions of dollars in returns. Ecologically sustainable forms of production threaten to compromise such profits, the big producers are convinced. Immediate gain for oneself is a far more compelling consideration than a future loss shared by the general public. Every time you drive your car, you are putting your immediate need to get somewhere ahead of the collective need to avoid poisoning the air we all breath. So with the big players: the social cost of turning a forest into a wasteland weighs little against the immense and immediate profit that comes from harvesting the timber and walking away with a neat bundle of cash. And it can always be rationalized away: there are lots of other forests for people to visit, they don't need this one; society needs the timber; lumberjacks need the jobs, and so on.

### Trucks

**Trucking is the basis of capitalism.**

**Hamilton 6** (Shane, assistant professor of history at the University of Georgia, "Trucking Country: Food Politics and the Transformation of Rural Life in Postwar America," p667-668, Trucking Country: Food Politics and the Transformation of Rural Life in Postwar America, Muse)

By showing how trucking reconfigured the technological, political, and cultural relationships between rural producers and urban consumers from the 1930s to the 1970s, my dissertation reveals the rural roots of a radical transformation of American capitalism in the midtwentieth century. Highway transportation provided the infrastructure for a transition from the New Deal–era political economy—based on centralized political authority, a highly regulated economy, and collective social values—to a post–New Deal capitalist culture marked by widespread antistatism, minimal market regulation, and fierce individualism. From the 1930s to the late 1970s, consumer demand for low-priced food, coupled with farmers' demands for high commodity prices, prompted the federal government to encourage agribusinesses to use long-haul trucks, piloted by fiercely independent "truck drivin' men," to privatize the politics of food. Western meatpackers and other agribusinesses were determined to shred government regulations and labor unions in the name of "free enterprise," low wages, and irresistibly low consumer prices for goods such as well-marbled steaks, jugs of milk, and frozen orange juice. The post–World War II highway-based food economy began unraveling the social fabric of rural America for the sake of low [End Page 666] consumer prices—long before Wal-Mart became infamous for said strategy.[1](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v007/7.4hamilton.html" \l "FOOT1) Trucks, I contend, were political technologies, used to define the contours of public policy regarding foods and farmers; at the same time, trucks as technologies shaped the economic and social structures underlying those political debates. In doing so, long-haul trucking in the rural countryside set the pace for the low-price, low-wage, "free-market" economic ideologies of late twentieth-century American capitalism.

### Rail

**The rail system is rooted in capitalist exploitation**

**Marrs 8** (Aaron W., on the editorial staff at the Office of the Historian, United States Department of State, Ph.D. from the University of South Carolina, “Roads and Time Consciousness in the Antebellum South”, Enterprise and Society, Muse)

Business and economic historians have contributed substantially to our understanding of "clock consciousness." Most famously, E. P. Thompson argued in 1967 that industrial capitalism—not agriculture—introduced this consciousness, which valued punctuality and regularity.[2](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f2) In agricultural employment or fishing, tasks "seem to disclose themselves by the logic of need," instead of being linked to clock time.[3](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f3) The introduction of the clock routinized labor. Moreover, "time-measurement" was a "means of labour exploitation."[4](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f4) Workers performed tasks not on the basis of need, but with unstinting regularity under the eye of a manager armed with a watch. Industrial workers fought "not against time, but about it."[5](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f5) To demand a ten-hour day is to accept the manager's desire for time management and discipline. In antebellum America, free-wage laborers experienced the time discipline Thompson described. While the transition was not a monolithic one, managers adopted "the notion of time as a measured commodity in the employment transaction," and in so doing used time as a regulatory and disciplining device.[6](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f6) As valuable as Thompson's insights have been, the experience of the SCRR forces us to revise Thompson's argument in two important ways. First, its location in the South takes us to a region not characterized by industrial capitalism. Although advancements in time management and movements toward precision have been closely indexed to free-wage labor and industrial capitalism, the South's comparative lack of industry did not mean that time did [End Page 435] not have signal importance to southerners as well.[7](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f7) As Mark M. Smith has demonstrated, examining time-consciousness in the South lets us see how the South modernized on its own terms. Southern planters "wanted to be perceived as modern, and they wanted to make money," but they did not want to challenge the regional social order, or "invit[e] the dangerous democratic tendencies associated with modernization into their society."[8](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.baylor.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.marrs.html" \l "f8)Planters demonstrated their facility in co-opting the aspects of modernity that they desired while avoiding larger social implications by adapting the time techniques of northern factories to their own plantation management, while remaining steadfastly opposed to free wage labor. Since much of the southern labor on railroads was being exploited by virtue of workers' enslavement, examining a southern railroad allows us to move beyond Thompson's conception of time management as labor exploitation. Pushing his insight beyond the realm of the worker and boss, we can use time to examine how early corporations interacted with the communities they served. Railroad companies soon discovered that they could not simply dictate time at their pleasure. Instead, debates about time and the railroad were about power within the communities in which railroads operated. Time had to be negotiated with a wide range of partners in order for the railroad to function.

**Railways are crucial to capitalism.**

**Schivelbusch77** (Wolfgang, awarded the Heinrich Mann prize of the Academie of Arts in Berlin, German scholar of cultural studies and history, “The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the 19th Century”, Forward by: Alan Trachtenberg from Yale University, Google Books)

Nothing else in the nineteenth century seemed as vivid and dramatic a sign of modernity as the railroad. Scientists and statesmen joined capitalists in promoting the locomotive as the engine of 'progress', a promise of imminent Utopia. By the end of the century their naiveté came home to them, especially in the United States where railroad corporations were seen as the epitome of ruthless, irresponsible business power, a grave threat to order and stability, both economic and political. But in fact from its beginnings the railroad was never free of some note of menace, some undercurrent of fear. The popular images of the 'mechanical horse' manifest fear in the very act of seeming to bury it in a domesticating metaphor: a fear of displacement of familiar nature by a fire-snorting machine with its own internal source of power. Once it appeared, the machine seemed unrelenting in its advancing dominion over the landscape in the way it 'lapped the miles', in Emily Dickinson's words - and in little over a generation it had introduced a new system of behavior: not only of travel and communication but of thought, of feeling, of expectation. Neither the general fear of the mechanical and the specific fights of accident and injury, nor the social fear of boundless economic power entirely effaced injury, nor the social fear of boundless economic power entirely effaced the Utopian promise implicit in the establishment of *speed* as a new principle of public life. In fact the populations of the industrial world, including the American populists who aimed their profound hostility toward corporate capitalism at the railroad, accommodated themselves to the sheer physical fact of travel by rail as a normal fact of existence. Now, as the railroad recedes in importance as a mode of personal travel and of economic distribution, it reappears as an object of study of historical contemplation. Scholars have weighted its importance in the making of industrial capitalism, as transportation and as the business of organization. Not only was its economic function of first importance, but that function exerted itself in many indirect ways upon what seemed to be simple personal needs for getting from one place to another. Personal travel by railroad inevitably (if unconsciously) assimilated the personal traveler into a physical system for moving goods. Behind the railroad’s 'annihilation of space by time', wrote Karl Marx, lay the generative phenomenon of capital. The 'creation of the physical conditions of exchange' was 'an extraordinary necessity' for capital, which 'by its nature drives beyond every spatial barrier'. Products become commodities only as they enter a market. They must be moved from the factory to the customer. Entering a market requires a movement in space, a 'locational moment'. The industrial system also requires the movement of resources from mine to factory - a movement which is already a transformation of nature. Thus the railroad fulfilled inner necessities of capital, and it is this alone that accounts for its unhindered development in the nineteenth century. The 'railway journey' which fills nineteenth-century novels as an event of travel and social encounter was at bottom an event of spatial relocation in the service of production. By exposing this hidden nerve within mechanized travel, Wolfgang Schivelbusch has placed the journey by rail in a new and revealing light. It was a decisive mode of initiation of people into their new status within the system of commodity production: their status as object of forces whose points of origin remained out of view. Just as the path of travel was transformed from the road that fits itself to the contours of land to a railroad that flattens and subdues land to fit its own needs for regularity, the traveler is made over into a bulk of weight, a 'parcel', as many travelers confessed themselves to feel. Compared to what it replaced, the journey by stage coach, the real way journey produced novel experiences - of self, of fellow-travelers, of landscape (now seen as swiftly-passing panorama), of space and time. Mechanized by seating arrangements and by new perceptual coercions (including new kids of shock), routinized by schedules by undeviating pathways, the railroad traveler underwent experiences analogous to military regimentation - not to say to 'nature' transformed into 'commodity'. He was converted from a private individual into one of a mass public - a mere consumer.

### Airports

**Airports are integral to the process of globalization and thus capital itself**

**Hutchison 10** (Ray; MA, PhD Sociology, University of Chicago, 1977, 1985; Chair, Urban and Regional Studies; *Encyclopedia of urban studies*; “Airports” 01/01/10; RSW)

Airports are important transportation and communication nodes in the network age. As essential hubs in the global urban fabric, they show the extent to which the traffic of digital information, people, and things depends on high-speed logistical systems. The growth in world air travel relates directly to the major developments in globalization and demonstrates the extent to which the process of modernization is being rolled out across the first world and “developing” countries. To this extent, airports provide “early warning” signals or “laboratory conditions” for the study of global networks and information flows. This is particularly evident in the post–September 11, 2001, context, which has seen the intensification of data profiling, biometrics, and other intrusive security measure being trialed and tested throughout many international air terminals in the name of passenger safety and risk management. Although airports have always been important markers in the spectacularization of technology, it is important to consider the different ways in which technology has been implemented at the airport over the past 100 years. The airport is one of the most significant sites of human–machine interaction in contemporary life. The airport is the site par excellence where multiple networks—both human and nonhuman, global and local—interact across multiple scales. In such a context, a new set of concerns needs to be taken into account when considering the human and cultural factors at play in everyday networks, not only those that are specifically concerned with aviation. This interaction of scale can be seen at the airport as increasingly mammoth: Airplanes interface with passengers, who are scanned and checked down to scales as minute as the irises of their eyes. Further, the ability of digital technologies to duplicate, distribute, and manipulate data has enabled networks to converge in an unprecedented fashion. “Hard” and “soft” networks (like technical infrastructure, code and information flows, the flesh of the passenger, and metal of the plane) can no longer be considered as discrete and separate. The Birth of the Aerodrome The modern airport evolved out of the converging operations of commercial, governmental, military, and private interests. The first structures built for air travel were largely produced in an ad hoc and unplanned manner. Runways, passenger terminals, and communication networks were constructed with little concern for logistical interconnection or future development. Initially aviation was not seen as suitable for mass transportation and was developed mainly for mail and small freight services. Due to the danger and discomfort of early planes, the transportation of human cargo was seen primarily as the preserve of a small and daring mobile elite. Passenger services were initially dependent on government policies that linked profitable mail contracts to the less profitable cargo of human passengers. Moreover, government authorities were not keen to invest in the necessary infrastructure involved in this costly mode of transportation, and as a consequence, aviation regulation and planning was largely neglected. For this reason the growth of complex urban infrastructure around the early aerodromes quickly outstripped their original usage, and surrounding hinterland gradually became annexed as part of the growing regime of the airport. Many cities whose major airport developed out of the first aerodrome soon found their airport's physical capacity for expansion severely limited by the growth of suburban and exurban developments. This, coupled with a growing need for local, state, and national government regulation led to a number of crises that culminated during the immediate post–World War II period. Aided by the huge investments in aviation design and infrastructure made during war time, aviation as a mode of mass passenger transport began to boom. As aircraft design and flight times improved, air travel became desirable and potentially profitable. In the years following World War II, urban planners and architects began envisaging a future in which air travel would facilitate new business opportunities on an international scale. Various design styles for both terminals and airports were trialed during this period. Large hall structures, satellite designs, and terminals encircling ring roads were all tried, each attempting to resolve logistical issues of getting passengers to terminal to plane, and plane to terminal to runway as seamlessly as possible. The Airport as Mass Transportation Hub Passenger services had always been one of the least stable sectors of aviation and remain secondary to military aviation in terms of profitability as well as research and development. Civil aviation, like telecommunications, has had vigorous competition on the profitable main routes, and airlines have had national obligations to service less-profitable regional routes. The introduction of jet aircraft such as the Boeing 707 (itself a spin-off of military aviation research) provided a major boost to the flagging civil aviation industry. Faster, quieter, more comfortable, and able to fly longer without refueling, jets began to make passenger services financially viable. The first full jet services in the early 1960s spawned a new popular vision of aviation as accessible to the “common person”—flight itself became a commodity. Jet age airports staged this popular vision by way of their architecture, entwining capitalism and glamour in order to invoke a particularly optimistic vision of the future. Their individualistic shapes and vaulting interiors helped promote the idea that anyone could access the limitless horizons that had previously been the provenance of the rich and powerful. The age of the jet set popularized the practice of global travel and put it up for sale as a piece of the future, as part of progress. Airports are extremely sensitive to global, cultural, and technological developments. They are constantly upgrading, adapting for bigger planes, more traffic, increased security measures, and for the frequent flying population (for whom perpetual transit is becoming a way of life). Few of the early airports remain, either being subsumed within larger structures, such as Heathrow in London or John F. Kennedy Airport in New York, or decommissioned entirely (e.g., Templehof in Berlin was decommissioned in 2008). The growth in world air travel relates directly to major developments in globalization, and is an essential part of the process of modernization that continues to advance (apparently unhindered by diminishing natural resources and associated problems of environmental degradation) across the first world and increasingly in so-called developing countries (Asia in particular). The huge amount of corresponding infrastructure required to manage the rapid movement of goods and people across large distances has led to innovations in the practice, procedure, and construction of airports and their related facilities. Many international airport terminals are built by well-known architects, such as Norman Foster, Paul Andreu, and Helmut Jahn, and are spectacular displays of a nation's ability to participate in the global economy. Contemporary airports are a central part of the ubiquitous global networks that constitute contemporary spaces of flow. Due to their interconnected nature and the enormous loads of traffic that they process, recently built airports bear little resemblance to their jet age forebears. Modern airports—like cyberspatial networks—are designed according to a logic of procedures, exchanges, and traffic flows. Regardless of location they facilitate global procedures and follow standardized global signage using internationally agreed upon picto-grams and typefaces.

**Airports embody the mobility of capital and are crucial to globalization**

**Harvey 01** (David; Professor at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY), Director of The Center for Place, Culture and Politics; “Globalization and the ‘Spatial fix’”; <http://geographische-revue.de/archiv/gr2-01.pdf#page=23>; RSW)

There are two dimensions to the problem that require separate treatment. Both, incidentally, track back to the complicated meanings of the word “fix”. The first concerns the difficulties posed by the circulation of fixed capital and the contradictions that attach thereto. The second deals more broadly with the whole problem of the territorial structures, spatial forms and uneven geographical development of capital accumulation. The category of fixed capital in Marxian theory refers to capital that is embedded in some asset or thing (such as machinery) which is not directly or even indirectly consumed in production (as are raw materials or energy inputs) but which gets used up (and worn out) over several production cycles. The lifetime of the fixed capital determines the rate at which it is used up (amortized) and the rate its value (e.g. that embodied in the machine) has to be transferred to the final product (e.g. the shirt). The lifetime is not only determined by rates of physical deterioration. Physically viable machinery can be replaced by new or less costly machines so that obsolescence through technological change plays a key role. Obsolescence can destroy the value remaining in existing fixed capital well before its physical lifetime is up (I still have an old Remington typewriter in my study, though I never use it). The devaluation of fixed capital is a serious problem for capitalists. It locates a potential crisis point for capital accumulation (hence the connection between business cycles and cycles of fixed capital investment and the importance of real-estate crashes in triggering crises, as, for example, in 1973). Note that the term “fixed” in this case refers to the way capital is locked up and committed to a particular physical form for a certain time-period. But a distinction must be drawn between fixed capital that is mobile and that which is not. Some fixed capital is embedded in the land (primarily in the form of the built environment or more broadly as ‘second nature’) and therefore fixed in place. This capital is “fixed” in a double sense (tied up in a particular object like a machine and pinned down in place). There is a relationship between the two forms. Aircrafts (a highly mobile form of fixed capital) require investments in immobile airport facilities if they are to function. The dialectic between fixity and motion then comes into play even within the category of fixed capital. While jumbo-jets can in principle fly anywhere, in practice they are confined to landing at fixed sites. In order for the capital invested in airport facilities to be realised, aircraft must fly in and out fully laden. In order for the capital invested in the aircraft to be paid off, the airports must encourage as much traffic as possible which means that the places they serve must be attractive sites for the convergence of commodities, people, ideas, information, cultural activities, and the like. Plainly there are multiple opportunities here for mismatches, localised crises (perhaps building into regional and even global crises) as well as abundant opportunities to absorb surplus capital in mutually reinforcing structures of investment (airlines need airports and vice versa). Much of what we call “globalization” has been produced through innumerable symbiotic and mutually reinforcing activities of this kind (airline expansion and airport building). The “spatial fix” (in the sense of geographical expansion to resolve problems of overaccumulation) is in part achieved through fixing investments spatially, embedding them in the land, to create an entirely new landscape (of airports and of cities, for example) for capital accumulation. Finance capital and its derivative forms of “fictitious capital” have a vital role to play in reallocating investments across space and time (an important topic in itself which I must lay aside since it would take too long to elaborate upon here, but see my Limits to Capital, particularly chapters 8, 9 and 10). Suffice it to remark that the much vaunted hypermobility of finance and fictitious capital exists in a dialectical relation with, among other things, fixed capital investments of both the mobile and immobile sort. On the immobile front, the infrastructures of urbanization are crucial, both as foci of investment to absorb surpluses of capital and labor (providing localized/regional forms of the “spatial fix” as through the dynamics of suburbanization or the building of airport complexes) and as the necessary fixed capital of an immobile sort to facilitate spatial movement and the temporal dynamics of continued capital accumulation. In much of my own work, I have focussed upon the production of space through urbanization as a key site where the contradictions of capital are always at work. Many of these studies focus upon the tension between the two kinds of “fixes” – that which is perpetually seeking to resolve the crisis tendencies of capitalism (overaccumulation) through the production of space (consider, as an example, the key role of suburbanization in the United States after 1945 in absorbing surpluses of capital and labor); and that version of the fix which is about the tying up and the pinning down of large amounts of capital in place through the production of fixed and immobile capital in the built environment (e.g. the highways systems needed to facilitate suburbanization). Here, the two kinds of fixes both feed off each other to stimulate symbiotic forms of accumulation (suburbs need cars and vice versa) and collide to form a potentially serious contradiction. Globalization in its present guise has entailed, among other things, the pursuit of a whole series of spatial fixes to the crisis that erupted around 1973. Capital, most would agree, has since become much more global in all of its forms of production, commerce, merchanting, and finance. It has shifted rapidly (and often with considerable volatility) from one location to another. At the same time massive amounts of capital and labor have been invested in the sorts of immobile fixed capital we see in airports, commercial centers, office complexes, highways, suburbs, container terminals, and the like. Global flows have been in part guided by such investments but at the same time these investments are speculative developments that depend for their profitability upon a certain expansionary pattern of global flows of commodities, capital, and people. If the flows fail to materialize, then the fixed capital stands to be devalued and lost (the bankruptcy of Canary Wharf in London in the 1990s is a case in point, though, as often happens, the devaluation worked through in such a way as to provide profitable opportunities for the banks that ended up holding the physical asset). The production of space under capitalism proceeds under the shadow of this contradiction. But there are also some more general arguments concerning the production of uneven geographical development that need to be integrated into this account. Capital is always in motion and much of that motion is spatial: commodity exchange (as opposed to the buying and selling of assets) always entails change of location and spatial movement. The market is spatialized (as Krugman now recognizes) and how that spatiality works has consequences for uneven geographical development. One of the laws of the market, for example, is that “there is nothing more unequal than the equal treatment of unequals”. The equality presupposed in market exchange produces spiraling inequalities between regions and spaces insofar as these regions and spaces possess differential endowments. The outcome is that rich regions grow richer and poor regions grow relatively poorer. The relaxation of state regulatory controls throughout the capitalist world (unevenly according to political circumstances) has produced a “neo-liberal” phase of capitalist development in which the inequalities of wealth and power have grown markedly But the end result of fierce competition, as Marx long ago observed, is monopoly or oligopoly as the strong drive out the weak in a Darwinian struggle for survival. While, therefore, the virtues of market competition are perpetually being extolled by the ruling classes, an astonishing trend towards monopoly and oligopoly has been taking place in all sorts of arenas, varying from mass media to airlines and even into traditional sectors such as autos. It is also said that the power of the state has been undermined when in fact the state has increasingly been restructured politically and economically as “an executive committee for the ruling class” as Marx long ago suggested. Here, too, the neoliberal phase of globalization has been characterized by a reconfiguration of state powers and the geographical concentration and centralization of political-economic powers within regional alliances of immense strength (with, of course, the USA very much leading the way). The geopolitical consequences are marked by a certain spatial fluidity but also by competitive fights between evolving territorial complexes. The spatial fixes of recent globalization have therefore been occurring in a distinctive setting and have been shaped by the reconfiguration of institutional structures. This has entailed a transformation in spatial scale, so that global institutions like the IMF, the WTO and the World Bank have become much more powerful and significant, while supra-national arrangements such as the European Union, NAFTA and Mercosur have become more salient. The underlying addiction for spatial and technological fixes is being expressed through these rather more complex processes of uneven geographical development. In conclusion, I want to re-emphasize the value of the geographical standpoint in understanding contemporary processes of globalization. Far too often in the literature (both popular and academic) we find places depicted as victims or victors of some ethereal process called globalization. A well-grounded historical-geographical materialism teaches us that globalization is the product of these distinctive processes of the production of space on the ground under capitalism. The question is not, therefore, what can an understanding of globalization tell us about geography but what can an understanding of geographical principles tell us about globalization, its successes and its failures, its specific forms of creative destruction, and the political discontents and resistances to which it gives rise. Above all, a better understanding of those geographical principles can surely help bring together the vast array of oppositional movements, currently geographically fragmented as well as unevenly developed, that offer hope for and aspire to some alternative.

**Investment in airport infrastructure props up globalization**

**Cidell 06** (Julie; Assistant Professor at the University of Illinois and Cal state, Ph.D. and M.A. in Geography; *Urban Geography Volume 27 Number 7;* “Air Transportation, Airports, and the Discourses and Practices of Globalization” RSW)

The literature on economic globalization discusses networks of firms, workers, and consumers; flows of both people and goods across international borders; and the uneven patterns of economic development that result. All these processes of globalization depend on transportation to some extent to get goods and people from one place to another. But there has been little discussion as to the connections between transportation and globalization. Even less attention has been paid to air transportation, although this mode in particular is vital to the continuing growth in global transfers of people and materials. As Smith notes, the fluidity of the processes of globalization ironically depends upon infrastructure that is fixed in place. As demand for this infrastructure grows, there are pressures on existing airports, roadways, ports, etc., to provide more capacity, as well as on other places that might play host to facilities in the future. If actors at local scales are unwilling to cooperate with demands for increased capacity, the potential exists for global economic networks to be constrained or at least reconfigured, perhaps requiring longer routings or using alternative terminals. Airports are thus a prime example of not only how the global can affect the local, but the converse as well, through what has been termed “environmental capacity” (Upham et al., 2003). The material processes of globalization place certain demands on the air transportation network, leading to calls for increased capacity in a variety of places. However, it is the individual characteristics of those places—their history, governance, politics, and geography—that determine whether and how the demands for capacity will be met. At the same time, the discourses from debates over airport expansion reveal how major cities position themselves with regards to the “space of flows” (Castells, 2000) that has come to characterize globalization. While airport operators, airlines, and municipalities in different places all argue for more capacity, they do so in different ways based on how they envision their relationship with other parts of the world. This paper explores the interactions between transportation and globalization based on two major U.S. airports: Minneapolis–St. Paul (MSP) and Chicago’s O’Hare. The case studies reflect Philip Kelly’s argument that “globalization […] must be seen as an inherently localized process rather than as a universal and homogenizing force. It is through local politics and social structures […] that globalized development is constructed. From there, other scales spiral outwards” (Kelly, 2000, pp. 164–165). MSP, for example, is perceived as the gateway to the Upper Midwest in terms of access to air transportation and thus to global economic forces. Its status as a fortress hub of Northwest Airlines makes globalization of the airline industry particularly relevant. At O’Hare, on the other hand, while the city of Chicago has argued that expansion is the only viable solution to delays, this is not because of the implacable forces of globalization. Rather, any other solution would reduce the power that the city, as airport owner and operator, has over aviation infrastructure.

**Expansion of airports under the guise of “capacity” is a capitalist tool dedicated towards globalization**

**Cidell 06** (Julie; Assistant Professor at the University of Illinois and Cal state, Ph.D. and M.A. in Geography; *Urban Geography Volume 27 Number 7;* “Air Transportation, Airports, and the Discourses and Practices of Globalization” RSW)

Goetz and Rodrigue observed that “One cannot fully appreciate how globalization works without understanding how seaports, airports, rail terminals, and truck terminals operate as the linchpins of the global economy” (1999, p. 237). Yet for the most part, transportation (particularly air transportation) has been taken for granted within the globalization literature. 3 It is assumed that transportation is not problematic, that if two places need to be connected, they will be. Authors do not mention possible limits; indeed, they suggest that transportation demand will decrease with production and communications technology, making possible ever-larger networks of firms (e.g., Dicken, 2003; Dunning, 1997; Held et al., 1999; Janelle and Beuthe, 1997). However, with production processes increasingly spread throughout the world, the demand for transportation is likelier to increase, as has been observed for road (Downs, 2004), maritime (McCalla et al., 2004), and air (Graham, 1995) modes of transportation. Within the global cities literature, transportation is likewise considered a necessary (if not sufficient) component of a “global city,” but is not analyzed in and of itself as a nexus between the global and the local, nor for the ways in which debates over transportation infrastructure are prone to global discourse being used to shape local politics. For example, Testa’s analysis of the new Chicago draws upon “studies [that] indicate significant future losses if Chicago fails to add to the region’s air capacity” (p. 42), yet in the next paragraph notes that international flights grew by 75% from 1993 to 2002, a time period in which no significant capacity was added. More to the point, one of Abu-Lughod’s (1999) brief mentions of O’Hare is to include it in a list of Mayor Richard J. Daley’s patronage projects in conjunction with the regional “growth machine.” Making connections between statements such as these could lead to a more critical appraisal of transportation infrastructure within the global cities literature, rather than continuing to take it for granted as ever-growing and always beneficial. For not only does transportation have important impacts at the regional and local level that are often ignored, but those impacts can lead to a backlash in the form of constraints on the expansion of the network. Such constraints have the potential to affect the flows of people and goods that define globalization processes. Upham et al. (2003, p. 146) have termed these constraints “environmental capacity,” arguing that airport capacity consists not only of infrastructure and management constraints, but “the capacity of the receiving environment, both human and non-human, to tolerate the impacts of airport activity.” Environmental capacity therefore has the potential to shape globalization by determining where and when transportation infrastructure can be provided or expanded.

**Airports are lynchpins of global trade—they are embedded in the process of production**

**Cidell 06** (Julie; Assistant Professor at the University of Illinois and Cal state, Ph.D. and M.A. in Geography; *Urban Geography Volume 27 Number 7;* “Air Transportation, Airports, and the Discourses and Practices of Globalization” RSW)

There are three processes of globalization that are particularly relevant to air transportation: trade and the transnational organization of firms; technological improvements; and deregulation and liberalization. Increased international trade is one of the fundamental processes of globalization (e.g., Streeten, 1998; Dicken, 2003), and it would not be possible without reductions in transportation costs. Particularly within high-tech sectors, air transport is the preferred mode for carrying parts or products, whether or not they are going to another location affiliated with the same firm (Bell and Feitelson, 1991). Because of the integration of transportation in international production chains, delays in the system are more than a personal inconvenience; they threaten the entire production process, whether it is physical goods or information in the form of business travelers that are making the journey. Another component of globalization that is closely connected to air transportation is technological change. In fact, the jet engine is often cited as one of the technological improvements that made many of the processes of globalization possible: *It is well acknowledged that* globalization has been supported by improvements in transport technology and massive investments in transport infrastructures. *The result has been* a space/time collapse of global proportions, *which has shrunk the transactional space and enabled extended exploitation of the comparative advantages of space in terms of resources, capital and labor. (Rodrigue, 1999, p. 256)*

### Competitiveness

**The focus on competitiveness is founded on the geo-political aspects of capitalism**

**Luke 97** Department of Political Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Timothy W., The (Un)Wise (Ab)Use of Nature: Environmentalism as Globalized Consumerism?

http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim528.PDF

Discourses of "geo-economics," as they have been expounded more recently by voices as diverse as Robert Reich, Lester Thurow, or Edward Luttwak, as well as rearticulations of "geopolitics" in an ecological register, as they have been developed by President Bill Clinton or Vice President Al Gore, both express new understandings of the earth's economic and political importance as a site for the orderly maximization of many material resources.6 Geo-economics, for example, often transforms through military metaphors and strategic analogies what hitherto were regarded as purely economic concerns into national security issues of wise resource use and sovereign property rights. Government manipulation of trade policy, state support of major corporations, or public aid for retraining labor all become vital instruments for "the continuation of the ancient rivalry of the nations by new industrial means."7 The relative success or failure of national economies in head-to-head global competitions typically are taken by geo-economics as the definitive register of any one nation-state's waxing or waning international power as well as its rising or falling industrial competitiveness, technological vitality, and economic prowess. In this context, many believe that ecological considerations can be ignored, or given at best only meaningless symbolic responses, in the quest to mobilize as private property as many of the earth's material resources as possible. This hard-nosed response is the essence of "wise use." In the on-going struggle over economic competitiveness, environmental resistance even can be recast by "wise use" advocates as a type of civil disobedience, which endangers national security, expresses unpatriotic sentiments, or embodies treasonous acts. Geo-economics takes hold in the natural resource crises of the 1970s. Arguing, for example, that "whoever controls world resources controls the world in a way that mere occupation of territory cannot match," Barnet in 1979 asked, first, if natural resource scarcities were real and, second, if economic control over natural resources was changing the global balance of power.8 After surveying the struggles to manipulate access to geo-power 5 assets, like oil, minerals, water, and food resources, he did see a new geo-economic challenge as nation-states were being forced to satisfy the rising material expectations of their populations in a much more interdependent world system.9 Ironically, the rhetorical pitch of Reich, Thurow and Luttwak in the geoeconomics debate of the 1990s mostly adheres to similar terms of analysis. Partly a response to global economic competition, and partly a response to global ecological scarcities, today's geoeconomic reading of the earth's political economy constructs the attainment of national economic growth, security, and prosperity as a zero-sum game. Having more material wealth or economic growth in one place, like the U.S.A., means not having it in other places, namely, rival foreign nations. It also assumes material scarcity is a continual constraint; hence, all resources, everywhere and at any time, are private property whose productive potentials must be subject ultimately to economic exploitation. Geo-economics accepts the prevailing form of mass market consumerism as it presently exists, defines its many material benefits as the public ends that advanced economies ought to seek, and then affirms the need for hard discipline in elaborate programs of productivism, only now couched within rhetorics of highly politicized national competition, as the means for sustaining mass market consumer lifestyles in advanced nations like the United States. Creating economic growth, and producing more of it than other equally aggressive developed and developing countries, is the sine qua non of "national security" in the 1990s. As Richard Darman, President Bush's chief of OMB declared after Earth Day in 1990, "Americans did not fight and win the wars of the twentieth century to make the world safe for green vegetables."10 However, not everyone sees environmentalism in this age of geo-economics as tantamount to subversion of an entire way of life tied to using increased levels of natural resources to accelerate economic growth.

### Environmentalism

**Market incentives ignore the limits of exponential growth – the idea that regulations will solve environmental problems obscures the need to eliminate capitalism itself.**

**Foster, 01** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “Ecology Against Capitalism” http://www.monthlyreview.org/1001jbf.htm)

Capitalism and its economists have generally treated ecological problems as something to be avoided rather than seriously addressed. Economic growth theorist Robert Solow wrote in the American Economic Review in May 1974, in the midst of the famous “limits to growth” debate, that, “if it is very easy to substitute other factors for natural resources, then there is in principle no ‘problem.’ The world can, in effect, get along without natural resources, so exhaustion is just an event, not a catastrophe.” Solow, who later received the Nobel Prize in economics, was speaking hypothetically and did not actually go so far as to say that near–perfect substitutability was a reality or that natural resources were fully dispensable. But he followed up his hypothetical point by arguing that the degree of substitutability at present is so great that all worries of Doomsday ecological prophets could be put aside. Whatever minor flaws existed in the price system, leading to the failure to account for environmental costs, could be cured through the use of market incentives, with government playing a very limited role in the creation of such incentives. What had outraged orthodox economists such as Solow, when a group of MIT whiz kids first raised the issue of the limits to growth in the early 1970s, was that the argument was premised on the same kinds of mathematical computer forecasting models, pointing to exponential growth trends, that economists frequently used themselves. But in this case, the focus was on exponential increases in the demands placed on a finite environment, rather than the magic of economic expansion. If the forecasting of the limits to growth theorists was full of problems, it nonetheless highlighted the truism—conveniently ignored by capitalism and its economists—that infinite expansion within a finite environment was a contradiction in terms. It thus posed a potential catastrophic conflict between global capitalism and the global environment. Capitalist economies are geared first and foremost to the growth of profits, and hence to economic growth at virtually any cost—including the exploitation and misery of the vast majority of the world’s population. This rush to grow generally means rapid absorption of energy and materials and the dumping of more and more wastes into the environment—hence widening environmental degradation. Just as significant as capitalism’s emphasis on unending expansion is its short–term time horizon in determining investments. In evaluating any investment prospect, owners of capital figure on getting their investment back in a calculable period (usually quite short) and profits forever after. It is true that a longer–term perspective is commonly adopted by investors in mines, oil wells, and other natural resources. In these areas the dominant motives are obviously to secure a supply of materials for the manufacture of a final product, and to obtain a rate of return that over the long run is exceptionally high. But even in these cases the time horizon rarely exceeds ten to fifteen years—a far cry from the fifty to one hundred year (or even more) perspective needed to protect the biosphere. With respect to those environmental conditions that bear most directly on human society, economic development needs to be planned so as to include such factors as water resources and their distribution, availability of clean water, rationing and conservation of nonrenewable resources, disposal of wastes, and effects on population and the environment associated with the specific locations chosen for industrial projects. These all represent issues of sustainability, i.e., raising questions of intergenerational environmental equity, and cannot be incorporated within the short–term time horizon of nonphilanthropic capital, which needs to recoup its investment in the foreseeable future, plus secure a flow of profits to warrant the risk and to do better than alternative investment opportunities. Big investors need to pay attention to the stock market, which is a source of capital for expansion and a facilitator of mergers and acquisitions. Corporations are expected to maintain the value of their stockholder’s equity and to provide regular dividends. A significant part of the wealth of top corporate executives depends on the growth in the stock market prices of the stock options they hold. Moreover, the huge bonuses received by top corporate executives are influenced not only by the growth in profits but often as well by the rise in the prices of company stock. A long–run point of view is completely irrelevant in the fluctuating stock market. The perspective in stock market “valuation” is the rate of profit gains or losses in recent years or prospects for next year’s profits. Even the much–trumpeted flood of money going into the New Economy with future prospects in mind, able momentarily to overlook company losses, has already had its comeuppance. Speculative investors looking to reap rich rewards via the stock market or venture capital may have some patience for a year or so, but patience evaporates very quickly if the companies invested in keep having losses. Besides investing their own surplus funds, corporations also borrow via long–term bonds. For this, they have to make enough money to pay interest and to set aside a sinking fund for future repayment of bonds. The short–term time horizon endemic to capitalist investment decisions thus becomes a critical factor in determining its overall environmental effects. Controlling emissions of some of the worst pollutants (usually through end–of–pipe methods) can have a positive and almost immediate effect on people’s lives. However, the real protection of the environment requires a view of the needs of generations to come. A good deal of environmental long–term policy for promoting sustainable development has to do with the third world. This is exactly the place where capital, based in the rich countries, requires the fastest return on its investments, often demanding that it get its initial investment back in a year or two. The time horizon that governs investment decisions in these as in other cases is not a question of “good” capitalists who are willing to give up profits for the sake of society and future generations—or “bad” capitalists who are not—but simply of how the system works. Even those industries that typically look ahead must sooner or later satisfy the demands of investors, bondholders, and banks. The foregoing defects in capitalism’s relation to the environment are evident today in all areas of what we now commonly call “the environmental crisis,” which encompasses problems as diverse as: global warming, destruction of the ozone layer, removal of tropical forests, elimination of coral reefs, overfishing, extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, the increasing toxicity of our environment and our food, desertification, shrinking water supplies, lack of clean water, and radioactive contamination—to name just a few. The list is very long and rapidly getting longer, and the spatial scales on which these problems manifest themselves are increasing.

**Green jobs will never help the environment because they necessitate increased consumer spending**

**Blackwater 12** (Bill; associate editor of the quarterly Renewal: A Journal of Social Democracy; 6/14/12; “The contradictions of environmental Keynesianism”; http://climateandcapitalism.com/2012/06/14/the-contradictions-of-environmental-keynesianism/)//RSW

Short-term green stimulus, and its environmental critics The multiplier effect was a feature of numerous national stimulus plans rolled out in 2009. They were typically attacked by environmentalists because the green components were dwarfed by much larger spending on carbon-intensive areas. A more profound criticism was made by Tim Jackson, author of Prosperity Without Growth. He criticised the very concept of the multiplier effect as an environmental instrument, since it relies on the recipients of state money spending a proportion of their income on other things. This can only reinforce the carbon-intensive impacts of conventional consumer spending. Despite this, Jackson remained firmly supportive of environmental Keynesian proposals, because he supported the second and third concepts, relating to the use of green investment to transform the economy. In reality, the same objections he made to short-term green stimulus apply to long-term green investment. For the latter to work successfully as an economic investment, it must lead to an expansion in the consumer economy – with all the stresses on environmental resources, not least carbon sinks, that this would entail. Long-term green investment: the ‘economic wing’ Those calling for state spending on green R&D and infrastructure projects fall into two camps. The first are the economic wing those (Nicholas Stern, for example) who stress that this is the key to economic expansion. Typically they compare green investment to earlier waves of infrastructure development (e.g. railways, highways, electrification), and project that it will lead to a new industrial revolution. But there are strong reasons to doubt that. Most green infrastructure projects – e.g. wind farms – are just more expensive replacements for what we already have. To businesses and households, there will be no difference in what comes out of the socket, whether it’s been produced by a solar array or a coal plant. This brings us to a second problem. To use Marx’s analysis, the energy sector forms part of Department I – production of the means of production – upon which Department II – production of consumer goods – is based. Advocates of green investment tend to argue that spending on low-carbon energy infrastructure will lead to new jobs and wealth. But the direct beneficiary of such investment would merely be a subsector of Department I, one which does not employ many people. In order for investment in low-carbon energy to lead to a rise in jobs and wealth, it would need to give rise to an expansion in Department II, the conventional consumer economy. Whence else does the energy sector derive a profit? Not only would green investment only be as green as the objects of consumer spending, therefore, but in order to a) recover its increased costs, and b) lead to economic growth, it would have to lead to an expansion in consumer spending. Long-term green investment: the ‘environmental wing’ Another group of people who make the argument for green investment stresses environmental protection over economic growth; we might call this the environmental wing. Tim Jackson, for example, is in this group. The underlying contradictions in their arguments are exactly the same as for the economic wing, since they, too, justify their proposals on economic grounds. The environmental wing tends to build up an economic case for green investment as follows. They assume that the business-as-usual costs of energy production are sure to rise: fossil fuels will get more scarce and thus expensive; ongoing use of fossil fuels would lead to dangerous climate change and economic costs; and, governments are likely to impose increasing costs on carbon. They then argue that investing in low-carbon energy projects will lead to financial savings compared to business-as-usual. Often, they conclude that such investments are guaranteed to make a profit – and that the higher the oil price or carbon tax, the bigger the profit. One problem with these arguments relates to the rebound effect, whereby an increase in resource efficiency tends, by lowering prices, to increase demand. The environmental wing typically argues that investments in energy efficiency will make a return by generating cost savings. But in order for these savings to be realised as a benefit they must be spent. The question is: on what will households and businesses spend this windfall? Further personal consumption and business investment will simply reinforce the unsustainability of the consumer economy. In essence, the economic case of the environmental wing depends on the rebound effect. A contrasting problem would arise if an increase in the costs of energy cancelled out the rebound effect. There are good reasons to believe a low-carbon energy system would be more expensive than that in place today (e.g. wind farms don’t generate when it’s not windy, and still require gas/coal plants as standbys). This could mean that all savings are absorbed by meeting the higher costs of energy. There would then be no boost to demand, and the economy would be saddled with the costs of low-carbon investment. Economics of climate change The overarching problem with the environmental wing is their conflation of savings compared to a counterfactual future scenario, with a profitable return on current investment. Climate change is a key example. As a new phenomenon, it represents a new cost. Investing in low-carbon infrastructure, imposing carbon taxes, and building flood defences may reduce the new costs imposed by climate change in the future, compared to doing nothing. But that is not the same as reducing an existing cost and enjoying a cashable windfall one could spend on other things – and use to pay back the original investment. Meanwhile, carbon mitigation is itself a new cost. It will be a drag on today’s economy (compared to other investment that might create more jobs and commercial opportunities), and may simply slow down the rate at which we become poorer in the future. Environmental macroeconomics The environmental wing generally misunderstands the implications of its proposals. Typically they realize that the ideas of the economic wing are environmentally unsustainable, but not that their own are economically unsustainable – within a capitalist economy, that is. In practice, growth is smuggled into their assumptions as a theoretical constant. Without this assumption, their proposals do not make the conventional economic sense they claim. Tim Jackson, for instance, envisions a no-growth economy (in practice, one that contracts until reaching a steady state), and still expects investment in the low-carbon economy to generate a return. But a return means an increase in real purchasing power over what one could have enjoyed with the original funds. This, in turn, requires the whole economy to grow. There are a number of reasons for this. First, if the economy stops growing, there would be a deflationary implosion in which it actually contracted. Second, for an investment in one sector of the economy to do well, other sectors of the economy must also grow; e.g. as already discussed, wind farms will only make a profit from business and household consumption. Third, if the economy contracts, then even if an investment (in wind turbines, say) does well on its own terms, an investor might end up with a greater share of tomorrow’s economy, but still be only able to buy a lesser value of goods and services. Fourth, if investments are funded out of borrowing rather than savings, future earnings from those investments would have to be higher than today’s costs plus interest – impossible in an economy that has permanently contracted. Conclusion To summarize, if the proposals of environmental Keynesianism do well economically, they will harm the environment. And if they are environmentally effective, they will not be economically sustainable in a capitalist economy that requires ceaseless growth. Environmentalist supporters of these ideas tend to believe their own proposals are both environmentally and economically sustainable. But this mistake often comes from conflating the future savings that would come from avoiding dangerous climate change, with a growth in profits that could earn a return on current investment. As climate change is a new cost, reducing its future effects will not eliminate an existing cost burden and free up resources we can spend in other ways. In all, environmental Keynesianism is a failed theory of how capitalism can save itself from itself. There is no reason to believe it can both stimulate growth and fit within environmental limits. The implication is that a much more radical approach is required – something which goes beyond Keynes, whose policy toolkit was restricted to rescuing the capitalist economy from its occasional depressions. Keynesianism is not the answer, because it is all about expanding demand, while our environmental problem today requires reducing demand. But what must be remembered is that investments in climate change mitigation and adaptation are necessary. They will not make us richer; but if we accept that, we can also accept that we are not going to get richer anyway, because growth must be curtailed to avoid environmental disaster. What is required is a new mechanism for directing a significant proportion of current resources into such projects – one not based on earning an economic return. Fundamentally this means capitalism is incompatible with a rapid transition to a low-carbon world. It is thus essential that the state take a decisive role in allocating economic resources for the common good – and that more environmentalists come to recognise this.

**Environmental legislation externalizes blame onto others, obscuring individual responsibility and turning the case.**

**Bobertz, 95** (Bradely C. Bobertz- assistant professor of law, University of Nebraska College of Law, Texas Law Review, “Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory,” Lexis Nexis)

The theory advanced in this relocates federal environmental law, a relative newcomer to the legal scene, to a more traditional place in the geography of social reform legislation. Rather than manifesting an unprecedented legal experiment, environmental law simply reflects a recent iteration of an old problem -- the attempt to influence mass behavior through the instruments of the legal system. In environmental law, one witnesses the same issues that for decades have provided grist for reform-minded lawmakers: struggles to define desirable and undesirable behavior; debates over incentives, deterrence, and punishment; and questions about who makes the rules and when these rules might violate other aims and values of society. As with other areas of the law, these issues all emerge in the context of a complex, multitiered system of delegated collective power and individual liberty. In contrast to other areas of social reform, however, environmental law presents some unique problems. While the causes of crime, poverty, and other social problems can, without too much intellectual turmoil, be attributed to individual behavior, environmental degradation appears to implicate all of us. Pollution can strike observers as the integral by-product of the relatively comfortable lifestyle enjoyed by a majority of Americans in the late twentieth century. Yet, with images of smokestacks, dying lakes, and oil-drenched otters constantly intruding on the public consciousness, we are forced to live out Pogo's dilemma: We have met the enemy, and he is us. Because the deep-seated causes of pollution tend to implicate us all, we feel the desire for psychological guilt release or redemption with special force. Thus, laws that externalize blame to outside forces allow us to preserve a way of life to which we have grown accustomed and one that we are reluctant to change -- the very way of life that generates pollution in the first place. Environmental laws help us escape this psychological dilemma. They establish clear lines between the perpetrators and the victims, maintaining our position safely on the side of the innocent by treating pollution not as a natural, expected outcome of industrialization, but instead as an aberration from a norm of cleanliness.

**Environmental laws prevent a deeper scrutinizing of personal habits. Bobertz 95** (Bradely C. Bobertz- assistant professor of law, University of Nebraska College of Law, Texas Law Review, “Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory,” Lexis Nexis)

The enactment of environmental laws also includes a less virtuous tendency to return with one hand what is taken away by the other. We wish to exorcise our demons, but still retain the pleasures of their company. A law that strikes at the external manifestations of an environmental problem satisfies the common desire for identifying and banishing the guilty. On a personal level, however, no one wants her own habits exposed to the same harsh light. By acting with righteous vehemence against the visible end-products of pollution, we avoid asking harder questions about global resource allocation and the sustainability of existing industrial, agricultural, and personal patterns of behavior. Enactment of environmental laws not only releases us from guilt -- or the state of being "part of the problem" -- but also enables us to avoid scrutinizing deeper patterns that implicate our personal habits and appetites. Few would like to admit that these habits, and not simply the immediate targets of environmental law, create the very problems the law appears to address. In this manner, laws aimed at curtailing pollution can ultimately create barriers to lasting reform by legitimizing the more deeply rooted causes of pollution that the very process of lawmaking has exonerated from blame. Except for the environmental scapegoats -- duly shamed and punished -- the rest of society is liberated, free to pursue its old ways without fear of reprisal.

### Renewables

**Renewable energy makes capitalism WORSE. The plan simply guarantees that we have the fuel to continue destroying the planet.**

**Trainer 07** – Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales (Ted, *Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain A Consumer Society,* pg. 125-126)

The core “limits to growth” claim is that the huge global problems we are facing cannot be solved in a society that is driven by obsession with high rates of production and consumption, affluent living standards, market forces, the profit motive and economic growth. The resource demand generated by this society is the direct cause of ecological destruction, Third World poverty, resource depletion, conflict and social breakdown. These problems cannot be solved unless we move to simpler lifestyles, more self-sufficient and cooperative ways, and a very different economy. Chapter 11 will detail what many see as “The Simpler Way.” Again energy depletion is only one of the alarming problems we are running into, and our limits to growth predicament would still exist even if renewable energy sources could provide all the energy we need. Indeed the more energy we get our hands on, the more enthusiastically we will dig up minerals, log forests, mine the sea floors, dam rivers, develop cities, clear land, travel, and buy. There are two major faults built into our society causing the main problems facing the planet. The first is the obsession with affluent living standards and economic growth, i.e., the insistence on high and ever-increasing levels of production and consumption. The second fault is allowing competition within the market to be the major determinant of what is done in our society. 10.1. FAULT 1: WE ARE FAR BEYOND SUSTAINABLE LIMITS TO PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION Following are some of the most forceful limits-to-growth arguments. • Rich countries, with about one-fifth of the world’s people, are consuming about three-quarters of the world’s resource production. Our per capita consumption of assets like oil is about 15 to 20 times that of the poorest half of the world’s people. World population will probably stabilise around 9 billion, somewhere after 2060. If all those people were to have the present Australian per capita resource consumption, then annual world production of resources would have to be eight to ten times as great as it is now. If we tried to raise present world production to that level by 2060, we would by then have completely exhausted all probably recoverable resources of one third of the basic mineral items we use. All probably recoverable resources of coal, oil, gas, tar sand oil, shale oil, and uranium (via burner reactors) would have been exhausted by 2050 (Trainer, 1985, Chapters 4 and 5). • Petroleum appears to be especially limited. As was noted at the start of Chapter 1, a number of geologists have concluded that world oil supply will probably peak by 2010 and be down to half that level by 2025–30, with big price increases soon after the peak. None of the limits-to-growth themes is as potentially terminal in the short term for consumer society. • If all 9 billion people were to use timber at the rich-world per capita rate, we would need 3.5 times the world’s present forest area. If all 9 billion were to have a rich-world diet, which takes about 0.5 ha of land to produce, we would need 4.5billion ha of food-producing land. But there is only 1.4 billion ha of cropland in use today, and this is not likely to increase. • Recent “Footprint” analysis (Wachernagel and Rees, 1996) estimates that it probably takes 7􏰀ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. The US figure is close to 12 ha. So if 9 billion people were to live as we do in rich countries, we would need about 70 billion ha of productive land. But that is about 10 times all the available productive land on the planet. • As was explained in Chapter 1, the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that if the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere is to be kept to sensible levels, and carbon use was shared equally among the world’s people, then rich-world per capita carbon release would probably have to be reduced to somewhere under 5% of the present amount. These are some of the main limits to growth arguments which lead to the conclusion that there is no possibility of all people rising to anywhere near the living standards we take for granted today in rich countries. We can only live the way we do because we are taking and rapidly using up most of the scarce resources, and preventing most of the world’s people from having anything like a fair share. Therefore we cannot morally endorse our affluent way of life. We must accept the need to move to far less resource-expensive ways. Few people seem to grasp the magnitude of the required reductions.

**The question is not whether the renewable tech they advocate is good or not in a vacuum—the issue is whether it is operating in the service of capitalism. Mainstream environmentalism has no hope of fundamentally challenging the system.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 7-8)

As Chapter 10 will make clear, the Green Movement in general is deeply flawed. It is for the most part, only light green. Most environmental gurus and agencies never go beyond seeking reforms within consumer-capitalist society. They do not consider the possibility that environmental and other major global problems cannot be solved without radical change to a very different kind of society. Chapter 10 explains why a sustainable and just society cannot be a consumer society, it cannot be driven by market forces, it must have relatively little international trade and no economic growth at all, it must be made up mostly of small local economies, and its driving values cannot be competition and acquisitiveness. Whether or not we are likely to achieve such a transition is not crucial here (... and I am quite pessimistic about achieving it). The point is that when our “limits to growth” situation is understood, a sustainable and just society cannot be conceived in any other terms. Discussion of these themes is of the utmost importance, but few if any green agencies ever even mention them. 8 *Chapter 1* The “tech-fix optimists”, who are to be found in plague proportions in the renewable energy field, are open to the same criticism. If the position underlying this book is valid, then despite the indisputably desirable technologies all these people are developing, they are working for the devil. If it is the case that a sustainable and just world cannot be achieved without transition from consumer society to a Simpler Way of some kind, then this transition is being thwarted by those who reinforce the faith that technical advances will eliminate any need to even think about such a transition.

**Explosive growth in energy demand will mean that renewables can never catch up—consumption patterns must change.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability”, pg.7-8)

Above all, consider the magnitude of the task the technical fix optim­ist is assuming can be performed. If we have only 3 per cent p.a. economic growth to 2060, or if by then all Third World people are going to have the material living standards we in rich and environmental damage are unsustainable, but the technical fix optimist is assuming that within 70 years we will be able to deal with levels ten times as great. Chapter 9 will explain why more energy conservation, better pollution control and countries have now, the world output will have to be about ten times what it is now. Present levels of output changing to renewable energy will not solve the problems, highly desirable though these changes are.

**Renewable energy cannot be transformative within a capitalist economy—the need for fossil fuel backup and central management just support status quo economies.**

**Harriss-White, 06** (Barbara, Professor of Development Studies at the University of Oxford, “Undermining Sustainbale Capitalism: The Market-Driven Politics of Renewable Energy”, Paper for the Workshop on ‘The Ecological Crisis and its Political Economy’, Oxford University, February)

Can renewable energy (RE) be developed under capitalist production arrangements? Historically, while a given technology has appeared in more than one kind of labour process and more than one kind of mode of production, the mode of production has always shaped the way technology is developed and nature is appropriated. To anticipate technology is, as Michael Burawoy has said, ‘like asking a feudal journeyman to anticipate capitalist atomic power. The question is not whether socialist technology is possible but whether it is necessary. That is, can socialism operate with capitalist machines, or do the machines impose constraints on relations of and in production that make socialism impossible?’ We do not have to anticipate technology, and RE is not ‘innocent machinery’. The production of the technology which is used to produce renewable energy currently takes place under capitalist production relations, using non-renewable energy. Yet two powerful arguments have been made for RE as a socially and politically transformative technology. One stresses the potential of its optimal small scale to service ‘sustainable communities’ and to decentralise and democratise energy control, from which flow claims about community cohesion and social inclusion While it is indeed the case that wind-power technologies have developed experimentally under forms of common ownership, user-shareholding and the like, the argument is mainly being beamed at late developing countries where energy grids are defective, transmission losses are profligate, decentralised energy generation is necessary and ‘rural communities’ are believed to exist to manage it. The second argument, which stresses the social value of ‘self reliance’, can be used at any social scale. It ignores the real causes of the political instability of the major energy sources (and thus the need for supply security), and assumes a very localised conception of solidarity.

**The plan attempts to sustain a level of affluence which is impossible in a world of rising demand—renewables cannot fuel a capitalist society.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 128-29)

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that whether or not renewable energy can sustain consumer-capitalist society is not a matter of whether it can meet present energy demand. The essential question is whether it can enable constant increase int he volume of goods and services being consumed and the associated increase in energy demand. Energy demand is rising significantly, although estimates of future demand vary. ABARE’s *Energy Outlook 2000*shows that the average annual rate of growth in energy use in Australia over the decade of the 1990s was around 2.5% p. a. The *Australian Yearbook* shows that between 1982 and 1998 Australian energy use increased 50%, an arithmetical average growth rate of 3.13% p.a., and the rate has been faster in more recent years. (Graph 5.12.) However ABARE estimates that Australian energy demand will slow, reaching about 1.9% p.a. by 2040, meaning more than a doubling in annual use by then. In July 2003 Australian electricity authorities warned that blackouts are likely in coming years due to the rapid rate of increase in demand, estimated at almost 3% pa for the next five years. (ABC News, 31 July.) Robbins (2003) reports NEMMCO predicting electricity growth over the next 10 years in NSW, Queensland and Victoria as 3.1%, 3.5% and 2.6% p.a. respectively. Poldy (2005) shows that over the past 100 years Australian energy consumption has followed GDP growth closely, and he estimates that in recent years it has approximated a growth rate of 3.6% p.a. In 2004 world energy use jumped, growing at 4.3% p.a. (Catan, 2005.) Thus the commitment to growth greatly exacerbates the problem, and in turn all of the other resource supply problems, because all involve an energy component. For instance if the cost of fuel increases significantly, then so will the cost of food and minerals, and even university courses, because fuel is needed to produce them. It has been argued above that renewables are not likely to be capable of meeting present electricity and liquid fuel demand, but given the inertia built into growth trends, the demand to be met will probably be three or four times as big as it is now by mid century...and doubling every approximately 35 years thereafter. To summarise regarding Fault 1, consumer-capitalist society is obviously grossly unsustainable. We have far overshot levels of production, consumption, resource use and affluence that are sustainable for ourselves over a long period of time, let alone extended to all the world’s people. Yet our top priority is to increase them continuously, without limit. This is the basic cause of the many alarming sustainability problems now threatening our survival.

**Renewables will not be viable in a capitalist framework—the demand for energy will simply overwhelm the technical possibilities. And, their evidence is biased—renewables advocates are trying to sell their products with overly optimistic claims.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 2-3)

Consumer-capitalist society has overshot viable levels of production and consumption by a huge amount. In effect we have to give up fossil fuels altogether. That is, we have to live almost entirely on renewables. This book argues that these very high levels of production and consumption and therefore of energy use that we have in today’s consumer-capitalist society cannot be sustained by renewable sources of energy. However the foregoing numbers only define the magnitude of the *present* problem. This is nothing like the magnitude of the problem set when our commitment to growth is also taken into account. As will be detailed in Chapter 10, if 9.4 billion people are to have the “living standards” we in rich countries will have by 2070 given 3% economic growth, total world economic output every year would then be *60 times*as great as it is now. The question of whether we can run our society on renewable energy is therefore not about whether it can meet present demand, and this book concludes that it can- not do that, it is about whether it can meet the vastly increased demand that will be set by the pursuit of limitless increase in production and consumption. There is an overwhelmingly powerful, never questioned, assumption that all these problems can and will be solved by moving to renewable energy sources. That is, it is generally believed that sources such as the sun and the wind can replace fossil fuels, providing the quantities of energy that consumer society will need, in the forms and at the times that they are needed. Surprisingly, almost no literature has explored whether this is possible. Wildly optimistic and highly challengeable claims are often encountered. “Hydrogen is abundant. All we need is water.”1 “It is esti- mated that renewable energy has the potential of meeting the energy demand of the *The Context* 3 human race well into the future.” (Lewis, 2003). “... existing renewable energy resources are capable of substituting for coal-fired power stations...” (Diesendorf, 2005, p. 1). “Renewable energy and energy efficiency can deliver the power we need, without the problems.” (ACF, 2005). “...energy crops can provide ample biofuel feedstock.” (Lovins, et al., 2005, p. 107). “All observers of energy seem to agree that various energy alternatives are virtually inexhaustible.” (Gordon, 1981, p. 109). “An entirely renewable and thus sustainable electricity supply is possible using existing technologies.” (Czisch, 2004). “Solar energy can replace fossil and nuclear fuels over the next 50 years thus creating a truly sustainable energy supply system.” (Blakers, 2003). Unfortunately in the task of assessing the validity of this dominant assumption we have not been helped by the people who know most about the field, the renewable energy experts. They have a strong interest in boosting the potential of their pet tech- nology and in not drawing attention to its weaknesses, difficulties and limits. Exaggerated, misleading, questionable and demonstrably false claims are often encountered in the promotional literature. Minor technical advances which might or might not become significant in the long run are announced as miraculous solutions. Doubts regarding the potential of renewable technologies are rarely if ever heard from within these fields. This enthusiasm is understandable in view of the need to attract public support and research funding, but it means that contributions by those most familiar with these fields to the critical assessment of the potential and limits of renewables are quite rare.

**Renewable energy will never be able to keep up with exploding demand. Capitalism must be addressed.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “Towards a Sustainable Economy”, pg. 40-41)

Energy conservation measures are also unlikely to alter this picture significantly. At present considerable savings are being made as attention is given to introducing more energy-efficient technologies. This will probably continue for many years, given that our history of energy extravagance has left much fat to trim. The most common estimates seem to indicate that rich countries might eventually be able to cut their present per capita energy use by half. If 10 billion people were to rise to that total level world energy production would have to be about 5 times as great as it is today - which, as the previous discussion indicates, it is far beyond the capacity of renewable to meet. The same logic applies to better pollution control. If we cut by 33 per cent the environmental impact caused per dollar of GNP but keep economic output increasing at 3 per cent p. a., then in only 14 years total impact will be as high as it was before the cut, and in another 23 years it will be twice as high. The most important point here is that if there remains any commit­ment to growth in economic output, any plausible cuts in energy use will be overwhelmed in time by the increase in energy needed to produce the increasing volumes of output.

### Climate

**Rhetoric about C02 being the root of climate change makes it seem as if a simple excess of a natural element is at fault—masking the economic arrangement that caused such destructive practices. Only radical questioning can prevent environmental disaster.**

**Swyngedouw,** **06** (Erik, Dept of Geography, School of Environment and Development, Manchester University, “Impossible “Sustainability” and the Post-Political Condition”, Forthcoming in: David Gibbs and Rob Krueger (eds.) Sustainable Development, www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/**Sustainability**paper.doc)

I have not been able to find a single source that is against ‘sustainability’. Greenpeace is in favour, George Bush Jr. and Sr. are, the World Bank and its chairman (a prime war monger in Iraq) are, the pope is, my son Arno is, the rubber tappers in the Brazilian Amazon are, Bill Gates is, the labour unions are. All are presumably concerned about the long-term socio-environmental survival of (parts of) humanity; most just keep on doing business as usual. The clear and present danger posed by the environmental question is obviously not dramatic enough to be taken seriously in terms of embarking on a different socio-environmental trajectory. That is left to do some other time and certainly not before the day after tomorrow. Of course, this cacophony of voices and imaginations also points to the inability to agree on the meaning or, better, to the lack of a singular ‘Nature’. There are obviously multiple imaginations that mobilise or appropriate sustainability as radically and truthfully theirs, based on equally imaginative variations of what constitutes ‘Nature’. Environmentalists (whether activists or scientists) invariably invoke the global physical processes that threaten our existence, and insist on the need to re-engineer nature, so that it can return to a ‘sustainable’ path. Armed with their charts, formulas, models, numbers, and grant applications, to which activists usually add the inevitable pictures of scorched land, factories or cars emitting carbon fumes, dying animals and plants, suffering humans, apocalyptic rhetoric, and calls for subsidies and financial support, scientists, activists, and all manner of assorted other human and non-human actants enter the domain of the social, the public, and, most importantly, the political. Thus “natures” enter the political. A particular and symbolically enshrined nature enters the parliament of politics, but does so in a duplicitous manner. It is a treacherously deceitful Nature that enters politics, one that is packaged, numbered, calculated, coded, modelled, represented by those who claim to possess, know, understand, speak for the “real Nature”. In other words, what enters the domain of politics is the coded and symbolised versions of nature mobilised by scientists, activists, industrialists and the like. This is particularly evident in examples such as the debate over GMOs, global climate change, BSE, biodiversity loss, and other equally pressing issues. Invariably, the acting of Nature -- as scripted by the bearers of nature’s knowledge – enters the political machinery as coded language that also already posits its political and social solution and does not tolerate, in the name of Nature, dissent other than that framed by its own formulations. It is in this sense of course that the argument about climate change is exclusively formulated in terms of believers and non-believers, as a quasi-religious faith, but the weapons of the struggle in this case are matters of fact like data, models, and physico-chemical analysis. And the solutions to the question of sustainability are already pre-figured by the way in which nature is made to speak. Creeping increases in long term global temperatures, which will cause untold suffering and damage, are caused by CO2 output. Hence, the solution to future climate ills resides in cutting back on CO2 emissions. Notwithstanding the validity of the role of CO2 in co-constituting the process of climate change, the problematic of the future calamities the world faces is posited primarily in terms of the physical acting of one of nature’s components, CO2 as is its solution found in bringing CO2 within our symbolic (socio-economic) order, futilely attempted with the Kyoto agreement or other neo-liberal market-based mechanisms. Questioning the politics of climate change in itself is already seen as an act of treachery, as an unlawful activity, banned by ‘Nature’ itself.

**The weakness and failure of Kyoto proves that capitalism resists fundamental reform and that we must fundamentally change course.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism,* p. 21-22)

From any rational perspective, greenhouse gas emission reductions on a level far more aggressive than what was envisioned by the Kyoto Protocol are now needed to address global warming. The IPCC Working Group I concluded in its 2001 report that “there is new and strong evidence that most of the warming observed over the last fifty years is attributable to human activities.” In place of the IPCC’s earlier estimate of an increase in temperature by 1.0-3.5 degrees C in this century, they now estimate an increase of 1.5-6.0 degrees C. If this increase (even in the middle range) comes true, the earth’s environment will be so radically changed that cataclysmic results will undoubtedly manifest themselves worldwide. These will surely include increased desertification in arid regions and heavier rainfall and risks of floods in other regions; serious damage to crops in the tropics and eventually in temperate areas as well; rising sea levels (due to the melting of glaciers) that will submerge islands and delta regions; damage to ecosystems; and loss of both species and genetic diversity. On top of all of this, there will be increased risks to human health. As always the most exploited areas of the world and their inhabitants will prove most vulnerable. Yet, no matter how urgent it is for life on the planet as a whole that greenhouse gas buildup in the atmosphere be stopped, the failure of the Kyoto Protocol significantly to address this problem suggests that capitalism is unable to reverse course – that is, to move from a structure of industry and accumulation that has proven to be in the long run (and in many respects in the short run as well) environmentally disastrous. When set against the get-rich-quick imperatives of capital accumulation, the biosphere scarcely weighs in the balance. The emphasis on profits to be obtained from fossil fuel consumption and from a for of development geared to the auto-industrial complex largely overrides longer-term issues associated with global warming – even if this threatens, within just a few generations, the planet itself.

### Free Trade

**Their attempt to simplify trade with far away places ‘virtualizes’ relationships of commodity – this turns people into goods and gears the economy up for inevitable collapse**

**Hart 01** Faculty of University of Aberdeen, Scotland(Keith, “Money in an unequal world”, 9/1/01, Anthropological Theory 1:307, Sage SW)

Virtual means ‘as good as’. All communication, whether the exchange of words or money, has a virtual aspect in that symbols and their media of circulation stand for what people really do for each other. In that sense, capitalism was always virtual. Indeed Marx’s intellectual effort was devoted to revealing how the power of money was mystiﬁed through its appearance as things (coins, products, machinery) rather than as relations between living men (Marx, 1970 [1867]). Both Marx and Weber (1981 [1923]) were at pains to show how capitalists sought to detach their money-making activities, as far as possible, from real conditions obstructing their purposes. Money-lending, the practice of charging interest on loans without any intervening act of production or exchange, is one of the oldest forms of capitalism. So the idea of the money circuit becoming separated from reality is hardly new. Yet there are changes taking place that deserve a distinctive label and, for the time being, ‘virtual capitalism’ will have to do. The point of virtuality (or ‘virtualism’, according to Carrier and Miller, 1998) is to achieve concrete results by more abstract means, to generate a physical process through applying an equation, to tell a story on celluloid. In essence, being virtual allows us to make society at distances of time and space, while usually losing some of the qualities associated with presence. A shift to exchange on a global scale would be impossible without it. But reliance on more abstract forms of communication carries with it the potential for real persons to be involved with each other at distance in very concrete ways. The idea of virtual reality expresses this double movement: on the one hand machines whose complexity their users cannot possibly understand, on the other live experiences ‘as good as’ real. It is the same with money. Capitalism has become virtual in two main senses: the shift from material production (agriculture and manufacturing) to information services, and the corresponding detachment of the circulation of money from production and trade. This in turn is an aspect of the latest stage of mechanization, the communications revolution of the late 20th century. The question is whether the same developments that have been responsible for the recent integration of world society are also the cause of its increasing polarization. The answer is yes. Long-distance trade in information services requires a substantial technical infrastructure (Naughton, 1999). The internet has its origins in scientiﬁc collaboration between America and Europe during the Cold War. Its main language is English. Every stage of mechanization has been initially concentrated in a narrow enclave of world society, and this one is no different. The internet had only 3 million users when it went public in 1993; this number increased to 100 million in the next ﬁve years, but that is still only 1 in 60 human beings. Equally, diffusion of these new techniques has often been quite rapid. Satellite and cellular telephony, as well as videotape, have brought telecommunications to many parts of the world where the old infrastructure of electric power was underdeveloped. There is even talk of the western market for the means of communication (telephones, computers, television) being saturated or nearly so, leading to a new version of the scramble for Africa, this time for shares in a largely untapped telecommunications market. But, for all this talk, the short conclusion is that many poorer regions appear to be stuck in phases of production that have been marginalized by this latest round of uneven development. The expansion of markets for money in countless notional forms seems to have injected a new instability into global capitalism, if only by allowing accumulation to transcend the controls that nation-states once seemed able to impose. The east Asian bubble of endlessly rising stock prices has recently burst, precipitating unprecedented upheavals on Wall Street and pushing the Japanese banking system into a tailspin. Billions of paper assets have been wiped out overnight. Mismanagement by the banks has reached colossal proportions (Crédit Lyonnais made ‘errors of judgement’ that amounted to losses equal to the deﬁcit on the French national social security fund!). This apotheosis of capital, its effective detachment from what real people do, has made many huge fortunes and produced devastating losses. Here is certainly one of the motors of global inequality, money being made with money. The situation is comparable to that between the First and Second World Wars in America, especially, and also in Europe. A stock market boom ended with the Wall Street crash of 1929. The resulting depression lasted a decade. This was the opportunity for states to assert their own dominance over a capitalism that was then still more national than international. The subsequent period of about four decades was the heyday of state capitalism. What political forces are adequate to regulate the present money madness in the interest of people in general? The world organization of money has now reached a social scale and technical form that make it impossible for states to control it. This may be good news for democrats and anarchists in the long run, but in the meantime Hegel’s (1952 [1821]) recipe for state moderation of capitalism has been subverted, with inevitable results: rampant inequality at all levels and appalling human distress without any apparent remedy. We may be on the verge of a new stage in global capitalism led by the United States in which earlier constraints on development are transcended, as they have been before. On the other hand, it is no longer self-evident that being inside the virtual economy is a privilege. If the balloon goes up, people sitting on little plots of land in the countryside will count themselves lucky to have missed the bonanza. In another sense, development is no longer conceivable as a linear process describing unequivocal winners and losers in the global economy, advanced and backward producers. The rules of the game are being rewritten so fast and with such uncertain consequences that it is no longer apparent who is best placed to beneﬁt from them. The populations of America and Europe, which have grown passively dependent on the impersonal institutions of statecapitalism, may be less well-placed than many Africans who have never known the relatively painless security of a welfare state. It is too early to discern the new social forms that are likely to win out in the shift from state to virtual capitalism engendered by the communications revolution. Governments everywhere are gearing up to reassert their authority in the face of forces subverting it. Corporate capital ranges more freely in world markets, yet the question of the legal basis for income, property and contracts remains unresolved, if the rules imposed by nation-states lose their force. New forms and levels of political association are emerging (global, regional and local, as well as national), with Europe in the experimental vanguard and the USA caught between world empire and a reinvigorated federalism. The relationship between a rapidly expanding internet and territorial organization remains indeterminate as yet. Nevertheless, we can begin to discern the contours of what may be taking shape in the coming century. But more than empiricism will be needed if we are to grasp the world of possibility involved. With this in mind, I approach the question of money and inequality in the age of the internet through the lens of the categories developed by classical political economy at the beginning of the machine revolution.

[We do not endorse the gendered language of this evidence]

**Free trade exports capitalism**

**Robinson 7** (William I., Professor of Sociology, Global and International Studies, Latin American and Iberian Studies at the University of California-Santa Barbara, “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)

The evidence indicates that US policies in the current era – such as the imposition of neoliberal structural adjustment programmes and the sponsorship of free-trade agreements – by and large served to further pry open regions and sectors around the world to global capitalism. Approached from an empirical standpoint, there is little evidence to suggest that US state policies in recent years have advanced the interests of ‘US’ capital over other ‘national’ capital. To the contrary, the US state has, in the main, advanced transnational capitalist interests. The Bush régime, for instance, consistently ratiﬁed and pursued a policy not of national economic retrenchment but of neoliberal global market integration. And an analysis of TNS institutions suggests that they act not to enforce ‘US’ policies but to force nationally-oriented policies in general into transnational alignment.

**Attempts to increase the expanse of global trade spreads material inequality, creates internal conflicts among states, and commodifies life**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

CGS = critical globalization studies

The task of a CGS is certainly daunting, given such a vast and complex theoretical object as emergent global society, and the character of the current situation as transitionary and not accomplished. Globalization in my analysis is a qualitatively new stage in the history of world capitalism (Robinson, 2004). If earlier stages brought us colonial conquest, a world economy, and an international division of labor, the partition of the world into North and South, and rising material prosperity amidst pauperization, this new era is bringing us into a singular global civilization, in which humanity is bound together as never before, yet divided into the haves and the have-nots across national and regional borders in a way unprecedented in human history. This new transnational order dates back to the world economic crisis of the 1970s and took shape in the 1980s and 1990s. It is marked, in my analysis, by a number of fundamental shifts in the capitalist system. These shifts include, ﬁrst, the rise of truly transnational capital and the integration of every country into a new global production and ﬁnancial system. The era of the primitive accumulation of capital is coming to an end as commodiﬁcation penetrates every nook and cranny of the globe and invades public and community spheres previously outside its reach. In this process millions have been wrenched from the means of production, proletarianized, and thrown into a (gendered and racialized) global labor market that transnational capital has been able to shape. Second is the appearance of a new transnational capitalist class (TCC), a class group grounded in new global markets and circuits of accumulation, rather than national markets and circuits. In every country of the world, a portion of the national elite has become integrated into this new transnationally oriented elite. Global class formation has also involved the rise of a new global working class—a labor force for the new global production system— yet stratiﬁed less along national than along social lines in a transnational environment. Third is the rise of a transnational state (TNS), a loose but increasingly coherent network comprised of supranational political and economic institutions, and of national state apparatuses that have been penetrated and transformed by the TCC and allied transnationally oriented bureaucratic and other strata. Once captured by such forces, national states tend to become components of a larger TNS that serves the interests of global over national or local accumulation processes. The TNS has played a key role in imposing the neoliberal model on the Global South. It has advanced the interests of transnational capitalists and their allies over nationally oriented groups among the elite, not to mention over workers and the poor. National states become wracked by internal conﬂicts that reﬂect the contradictions of the larger global system. Fourth is the appearance of novel relations of inequality in global society. As capitalism globalizes, the twenty-ﬁrst century is witness to new forms of poverty and wealth, and new conﬁgurations of power and domination. Global capitalism has generated new social dependencies around the world. Billions of people have been brought squarely into the system, whereas before they may have been at the margins or entirely outside of it. The system is very much a life-and-death matter for billions of people who, willing or otherwise, have developed a stake in its maintenance. Indeed, global capitalism is hegemonic not just because its ideology has become dominant but also, and perhaps primarily, because it has the ability to provide material rewards and to impose sanctions. Globalization is anything but a neutral process. It has produced winners and losers, and therefore has its defenders and opponents. There is a new conﬁguration of global power that becomes manifest in each nation and whose tentacles reach all the way down to the community level. Each individual, each nation, and each region is being drawn into transnational processes that have undermined the earlier autonomies and provincialisms. This makes it entirely impossible to address local issues removed from global context. At the same time, resistance has been spreading throughout global society. There are burgeoning social movements of workers and the poor, transnational feminism, indigenous struggles, demands for human rights and democratization, and so on.

**Free trade will just expand the ability of capitalism to utterly destroy ecosystems.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm 6/6/2006).

Combined with a human population explosion, the growth of highly industrialized cultures driven by capitalism’s ceaseless quest for raw materials, new markets, cheap labor and higher profits, we are witnessing the systematic and wanton destruction of the biosphere in exchange for capital. Free trade is not what the name would seem to imply. Free trade has nothing to do with freedom for people or the promotion of democracy. It is in fact the capacity for multinational corporations to do business without restrictions of any kind.

**Free trade is far from it –economic openness is enforced with guns and threats**

**Moody, 01** Director of a monthly magazine (Kim, “Closing the Door on U.S. Imperialism & Capitalist Globalization” New Politics, Winter 2001 Vol. VIII, Iss. 2; pg. 96 Proquest SW)

IN THE LAST DECADE WE HAVE WITNESSED THE TRIUMPH of American "Open Door" imperialism. The idea of the "open door" as the centerpiece of U.S. economic policy in the world goes back over 100 years to the classic age of imperialism. While the European powers were conducting the "race for Africa," jockeying for territory and "concessions" in Asia, and contesting areas in Europe itself, the political elite in the U.S. sought a different means to export capital, commodities, and manufactured goods. As latecomers in the rush for colonies, U.S. imperial theorists devised a cost-effective alternative. They reasoned that American industry could find all the markets and outlets for investment it needed without administering colonies the world over like Britain. The U.S. government was, of course, not adverse to grabbing a few off-shore colonies for its business sponsors once the continent had been subdued. First, there were the "guano island" colonies of the 1850s, seized to overcome a soil fertility crisis at home. Then, when Spain's aging empire collapsed in the face of internal revolt and the brief war provoked by the U.S., Puerto Rico and the Philippines became colonies, while Cuba served as a semi-colonial outpost for decades. In general, however, as a latecomer, the U.S. avoided the rush for colonies of that epoch. First applied in China in 1899, the "open door" notes were addressed to the other major powers with interests in that country. They demanded that U.S. business interests have access to all of China regardless of previous territorial claims or business concessions obtained from China. The "open door" soon became a global policy for breaking into the markets of developing or colonial nations. It was, where necessary, imposed and/or backed up by a Navy (accompanied by Marines, of course) that, like Britain's before it, claimed the seven seas as its own. It had at its core a seemingly simple exchange. Developing nations that agreed to let in U.S. goods and capital were granted "most favored nation" status, what is now called "Normal Trade Relations," and could sell their goods (usually raw materials) in the U.S. on the best terms offered to any other nation. "Open door" imperialism was pursued in the name of free trade, freedom of the high seas, equality of exchange, and anti-colonialism and democracy. In reality, this policy was conducted with the utmost thuggery and there was little freedom or equality about it. Until the end of World War II, it was not all that successful as a strategy for world economic "primacy," to use the current polite term. The old European colonial empires remained a barrier, as did upstart imperial powers like Japan and Germany, not to mention the new Soviet Union. Even after the Second World War, when U.S. ideas of free trade dominated Western thinking, the expanded Communist bloc(s) took a third of the world out of play. Then, too, various national liberation and anti-colonial movements posed at least temporary stumbling blocs in many cases. Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI) strategies of development, with their dense networks of regulations, elements of planning, and extensive use of public enterprises, also put limits on U.S. and other foreign capital in many Third World nations. The Alliance for Progress of the 1960s that tried to break down some of these barriers in exchange for aid, for example, was pretty much a flop. At the same time, the Cold War polarization of the world provided the excuse for proliferating military bases, serving Washington's Air Force as well as its Navy. By virtue of the sheer size of its economy, much expanded military, and the single-minded determination of its business and bi-partisan political leadership, the U.S. became the dominant power in the "West."

**‘Free trade’ enforces imperialism and poverty on globally – local needs are ignored as ‘barriers’ to US business**

**Moody, 01** Director of a monthly magazine (Kim, “Closing the Door on U.S. Imperialism & Capitalist Globalization” New Politics, Winter 2001 Vol. VIII, Iss. 2; pg. 96 Proquest SW)

IN THE LAST DECADE, A VIRTUAL WHIRLWIND OF CHANGE has opened the door to U.S. economic aspirations to a degree all the gun boats, Marines, low- and high-intensity wars, and massive bombings had not. In more or less order of importance, the major changes were: the collapse of the centrally planned economies, the elimination of the other "superpower," the institutionalization of the debt crisis as a permanent feature of uneven development, the fading or imploding of the last ISI-style economies, the crisis of the Japanese economy, and the urbanization of Latin America and much of the Third World. Of course, globalization is a long-term trend and all of these trends or events were underway before the 1990s. But it is in this last decade that they came together to create a sort of vacuum into which America's highly activist ruling class and political elite could rush. And so they did with predator corporations on a global mission to improve profit rates, a revamped IMF/World Bank, NAFTA, the Uruguay Round of GATT, and then the WTO. These instruments of contemporary "open door" imperialism were negotiated with the other major powers and imposed on the rest of the world. This time the lever was the institutionalization of Third World debt and the export regime imposed by the IMF et al. that made access to the U.S. (and/or European) market a necessity for most developing nations**.** Foreign policy shifted from military geo-politics to the militant pursuit of global commerce, taking on its most aggressive form under Clinton. Once again, this is all backed up by world-wide military might deployed these days in "humanitarian" interventions, bloody clean-up missions, and the victimization of defenseless populations. Collectively and justifiably known since the early 1990s as the "Washington Consensus," these policy initiatives have two goals. The first, of course, is to implement the "open door" through economic agreements that eliminate barriers to trade and investment. This includes barriers that the original theorists of "most favored nation" status never dreamed of -- not just tariffs and quotas, but health care systems, traditional seeds and life forms, labor standards, state-owned enterprises, etc. In other words, the concept of trade or investment barriers was extended to include domestic policies. Looked at from a different angle, as Daniel Singer pointed out in The Nation (November 6, 2000), the U.S. thrust toward globalization amounts to the "spread of the U.S. model." The second goal is less well recognized and seldom made explicit, but is at the heart of the contemporary structure of capitalist globalization and is, in fact, the other side of the "open door" coin. This is to preclude the rise of a new, rival, independent economic power or bloc based on domestically-owned production (non-OECD multinational-owned) and autonomous internal development. That is, these agreements and institutions are designed to head off the development of a new Japan or Korea. The prime candidate for the next Asian economic "miracle" and potential threat to U.S. economic expansion was China. Along with the rules of the WTO, to which China will soon sign on, the agreement between the U.S. and China reached last November guarantees that this will never happen. While China will become an export dynamo, it will be foreign firms, above all U.S. and Japanese, doing the bulk of the exporting, exploiting, and profiting as well as setting the priorities for China's entire economy. In fact, almost all of the "trade" agreements signed in the 1990s, including the Uruguay Round that begat the WTO, were crafted to this end and represent a departure from earlier efforts to promote free trade which focused primarily on tariffs and quotas on goods. The agreements of the 1990s included elements that require equivalent treatment of foreign and domestic firms, that terminate national preference in government procurement, that bend domestic policies to the needs of global capital, and that grant multinational corporations a monopoly on technology in overseas markets through the protection of "intellectual property rights." Financial and other services have also come under these expanding "rules" for the first time. These features alone would give capital-rich multinational corporations a vast advantage over domestic, private and public enterprises in any developing country, even large ones like Brazil or China. The free market requirements of the 1990s agreements also render any sort of planning ineffective. Even the development of autonomous national capital is severely limited in favor of U.S. or other imperial capital and/or various kinds of joint ventures under the dominance of foreign capital. Domestic firms that provide anything more than basic consumer items for the domestic market, probably in a losing battle with U.S. retailers, will populate the bottom end of contracted production chains and will remain small by global standards. The transformation of the IMF into the enforcer and institutional guardian of Third World debt gave it the power to undo other elements of national development, in particular public ownership and social programs. Under these conditions, there will be no new Korean-style upstart exporters of advanced industrial products in the early 21st century -- not, at least, without drastically breaking the rules of the global trading system and facing banishment from normal trade channels or access to capital. Aside from Europe, itself thoroughly penetrated by U.S. capital, there will be no major contestant for world economic "primacy" under the current regime of global, above all U.S., capital.

**Global trade encourages the view of the ‘market’ as an independent force – this turns humans into objects, encourages violent exploitation, and takes value away from lives**

**Heron, 08** (Taitu, “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, January, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 85-101, Springerlink SW)

Since the early 1990s, the subsequent ideological shift that accompanied the collapse of socialism in Eastern Europe, suggests that development models based on liberal democracy and capitalist economics must not deviate away from the route of development being led by the USA and the European Union (EU) and by the three major international financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO), and followed closely by official development assistance organisations such as United States Agency for International Development and the EU. The collapse of Eastern European socialism and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) provided the impetus for trade and financial liberalisation to occur at a global level. Global specifications for trade between nations are being prioritized above national specifications. Globalization, is, apparently the development model to be pursued. In many countries, the space for national development policy formation is crowded by liberalization policies that accentuate and exacerbate asymmetric globalization and social inequalities between nations and among women, men and children (UN 2005). Thus, there is a disjuncture in the relationship between local/national development and global requirements for those that lead the ‘global’ economy and the financial and economic institutions that govern. This disjuncture is critical as its social realities speak to the deterioration of the human condition in the midst of materialist improvement, both in the developing and developed world. With governments spending less on social services, followed by a decline in real expenditure per person, the quality of life of the poor in particular has deteriorated. At the same time, the cost of providing care has shifted to communities and households and is primarily borne by women, in unpaid social reproductive roles. However, there has been the suggestion that this disjuncture will dissolve, and that this is just a phase to the next level of development (World Bank 1999; Randriamaro 2002). Globalization began in the late sixteenth century when feudalism ended in Western Europe and capitalism was born. In a very general sense, globalization represents the consolidation of a western-led model of development marked by the establishment of the European nation–state, which, has, by extension, never really existed within the confines of its national boundaries. The nature and requirements of capitalism has meant the search for products and the expansion of capital in other parts of the world. (Addo 1984; Wallerstein 1999, 2000; Watson 2000). To facilitate this, military force, violent removal/dislocations of peoples, slaughtering of different groups, ‘expansion,’ ‘progress’ has always accompanied the growth of capitalism in its global reach. No region of the world has been speared. Therefore, understanding capitalism as a social relation leads to the core of that relationship: domination. It is the capacity to use force or to inflict suffering, Heilbroner (1985, p. 39) opines, that “remains the essence of the capacity for domination.” At various levels, this pattern of domination may be the common thread that significantly influences relations between and often found among families, communities and nations, across ethnicity, class and gender. Globalization is intricately tied up with the forces of imperialism and is essentially, not really new in form, but rather new in the nature of its manifestations of domination. Petras and Veltmeyer (2001) point out that globalization at a minimum involves the creation of a world economy that is not just merely the sum of its national economies, but rather a powerful independent reality, created by the international division of labour and the world market, which, in the present epoch, predominates national markets. Large scale, long term flows of capital, commodities, technology and labour across national boundaries, have always defined the process of globalization. The driving force of contemporary globalization retains some of the key features of its earlier periods: dominated and led by a set of core states (the G8 countries, including the triad—USA, Japan and Germany), supported by international financial institutions (IMF, World Bank, etc.) and backed by transactional corporations (Petras and Veltmeyer 2001; Wallerstein 1999). As the new telos of capitalism, globalization is much broader and fast in the scope and scale of the movement of capital and commodities; and blurs the meanings of privacy, freedom and agency due to technological advancements. All the relations of production and of labour are geared towards capitalist and materialist accumulation. Dominance of capital as a social relation may manifest itself in a very socially dysfunctional form that is often supported by ideology. It may give the illusion of capital accumulation as the ultimate satisfaction or a form of human happiness. In so doing, other forms of human activity lose validity and ethical meaning. Disempowered human agency or human agency, which unquestioningly submits to the technological demands of capitalism, is a life that exists solely as a mere peg in the wheel of capitalism—a consumer citizen. Globalization, as the technological era of global capitalism increasingly governed and led by the use of technological instruments, tempts us to question the meaning and the value of human life. More and more of the majority of the world's poor, women who may be producing for exchange value, have to struggle to obtain basic food, water, shelter, clothing, sanitation, medicine and protection.

### Intl Law

**Internationalism will be co-opted by the forces of global market liberalization to create ‘modern’ societies. The results are devastatingly violent for cultures as well as the environment.**

**Dillon & Reid ‘00** [Michael and Julian, Lecturer at the University of Lancaster and Lecturer on International Politics at University of London, Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance, Vol. 25 Ish. 1, January-March ]

The disorder of emerging political complexes is of course fueled by local factors. In a world that has always been more or less interdependent, however, it would be grossly naive to think that local factors were ever permanently or totally isolated historically from global developments.[2] Much less so now, then, in an age of virulent globalization. Global liberal governance is not, of course, a neutral phenomenon, indifferent to local cultures, traditions, and practices. Neither is it benignly disposed toward them. Rather, it has always been virulently disruptive of them and aggressively related to them as much in moral as in economic and military terms. Much of the disorder that borders the domain of liberal peace is clearly also a function, therefore--albeit a fiercely contested function--of its very own normative, political, economic, and military agendas, dynamics, and practices, and of the reverberations these excite throughout the world. It seems increasingly to be a function, specifically, of the way in which development is now ideologically embraced by all of the diverse institutions of liberal peace as an unrelenting project of modernization.[3] The chief economist of the World Bank (Joseph Stiglitz) attacks the Washington Consensus on liberalization, stabilization, and privatization in the world economy, for example, as too technical and too narrowly framed a development strategy. He espouses instead a new intensive as well as extensive policy committed to the unqualified and comprehensive modernization and "transformation of traditional societies."[4] "Honesty, however requires me to add one more word. In calling for a transformation of societies, I have elided a central issue," Stiglitz had the candor to conclude, "transformation to what kind of society and for what ends?" The impact of modernization on modern as well as traditional societies is, of course, as violent as the impact on global resources and global ecology.

**International law that ultimately relies on state power will not fundamentally change anything—military advantage will be the guiding force.**

**Dillon & Reid ‘00** [Michael and Julian, Lecturer at the University of Lancaster and Lecturer on International Politics at University of London, Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance, Vol. 25 Ish. 1, January-March ]

Just as governance is a specific feature of liberalism, so also liberal peace is therefore a specific form of liberal governmental power. Hence the peace of global liberal governance differs from other forms of liberal peace inasmuch as its liberalism differs from earlier and other forms of liberalism in respect, specifically, of the increasing emphasis placed on its networks of global governance. It does not, for example, aspire to the ideal of world government. It does not rely exclusively upon the juridical power of international law. Neither does it problematize the foundational question of order by premising it exclusively on the sovereign power of states alone. It is also a combative and heavily armed peace deeply reluctant to forgo its own military advantages in the cause of restraining the dissemination of weapons of mass destruction or the effective control of the conventional-arms economy globally.

### Heg

**Hegemony is a means of spreading global capitalism.**

**Ferguson '04** (Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at Harvard University, 2004, "Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire, pg. 10)

To the majority of Americans, it would appear, there is not contradiction between the ends of global democratization and the means of American military power. As defined by their president, the democratizing mission of the United States is both altruistic and distinct from the ambitions of past empires, which (so it is generally assumed) aimed to impose their own rule on foreign peoples. The difficulty is that President Bush's ideal of freedom as a universal desideratum rather closely resembles the Victorian ideal of "civilization." "Freedom" means, on close inspection, the American model of democracy and capitalism; when Americans speak of "nation building" they actually mean "state replicating," in the sense that they want to build political and economic institutions that are fundamentally similar, though not identical, to their own. They may not aspire to rule, but they do aspire to have others rule themselves in the American way. Yet the very act of imposing "freedom" simultaneously subverts it.

**Hegemony causes the wars they seek to prevent—capitalism drives the need to grab resources at any cost and ensures escalating wars.**

**Mészáros, 07** (Professor Emeritus in Philosophy and Political Theory, University of Sussex. “The Only Viable Economy” http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm)

In our time, by contrast, we have to face up to the reality -- and the lethal dangers -- arising from global hegemonic imperialism, with the United States as its overwhelmingly dominant power.7 In contrast to even Hitler, the United States as the single hegemon is quite unwilling to share global domination with any rival. And that is not simply on account of political/military contingencies. The problems are much deeper. They assert themselves through the ever-aggravating contradictions of the capital system's deepening structural crisis. U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism is an -- ultimately futile -- attempt to devise a solution to that crisis through the most brutal and violent rule over the rest of the world, enforced with or without the help of slavishly "willing allies," now through a succession of genocidal wars. Ever since the 1970s the United States has been sinking ever deeper into catastrophic indebtedness. The fantasy solution publicly proclaimed by several U.S. presidents was "to grow out of it." And the result: the diametrical opposite, in the form of astronomical and still growing indebtedness. Accordingly, the United States must grab to itself, by any means at its disposal, including the most violent military aggression, whenever required for this purpose, everything it can, through the transfer of the fruits of capitalist growth -- thanks to the global socioeconomic and political/military domination of the United States -- from everywhere in the world. Could then any sane person imagine, no matter how well armored by his or her callous contempt for "the shibboleth of equality," that U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism would take seriously even for a moment the panacea of "no growth"? Only the worst kind of bad faith could suggest such ideas, no matter how pretentiously packaged in the hypocritical concern over "the Predicament of Mankind." For a variety of reasons there can be no question about the importance of growth both in the present and in the future. But to say so must go with a proper examination of the concept of growth not only as we know it up to the present, but also as we can envisage its sustainability in the future. Our siding with the need for growth cannot be in favor of unqualified growth. The tendentiously avoided real question is: what kind of growth is both feasible today, in contrast to dangerously wasteful and even crippling capitalist growth visible all around us? For growth must be also positively sustainable in the future on a long-term basis.

**Hegemony is not a tool of peace—it is the extension of brutal economic imperialism. Backlash in the form of nuclear proliferation is an inevitable consequence of capitalism.**

**Foster ‘05** (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon in Eugene, September, http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm).

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. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society.

### Democracy

**Democracy works alongside capitalism—it is a radical limit on political freedom.**

**Dean 05-** Prof. of Political Science @ Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Ph.D from Columbia

(Jodi, “Zizek Against Democracy”, http://tinyurl.com/llnbtt)

In a number of his early books published in English, Zizek voices a sense of betrayal at the bait and switch occurring in Eastern Europe when they “went for” democracy and got capitalism and nationalism instead. For example, in *For They Know Not What They Do*, his first book written after the collapse of “actually existing socialism,” Zizek wonders if the Left is “condemned to pledge all its forces to the victory of democracy?” He notes that in the initial days of communism’s disintegration in Eastern Europe, the democratic project breathed with new life. Democracy held out promises of hope and freedom, of arrangements that would enable people to determine collectively the rules and practices through which they would live their lives. But instead of collective governance in the common interest, people in the new democracies got rule by capital. Their political choices became constrained within and determined by the neoliberal market logics of globalized capitalism already dominating Western Europe, Great Britain, and the United States. What emerged after the communists were gone was the combination of neoliberal capitalism and nationalist fundamentalism, a “scoundrel time” when capitalism appears as democracy and democracy as and through capitalism. Is this what the Left is doomed to defend? That skepticism toward democracy is not a recent radical gesture but a central element in Zizek’s thinking is also clear in the fact that one of his most fundamental theoretical insights concerns the constitutive non-universalizability of liberal democracy. Thus, in *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, written before the collapse of communism, Zizek refers to the universal notion of democracy as a “necessary fiction.” Adopting Hegel’s insight that the Universal “can realize itself only in impure, deformed, corrupted forms,” he emphasizes the impossibility of grasping the Universal as an intact purity. In all his work thereafter, Zizek struggles with the relation between democracy and universality, concerned with the way that contemporary adherence to democracy prevents the universalizing move proper to politics.

**Capitalist democracies are war-like.**

**Robinson 7** (William I., Professor of Sociology, Global and International Studies, Latin American and Iberian Studies at the University of California-Santa Barbara, “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 polarisation. The system cannot meet the needs of a majority of humanity, or even assure minimal social reproduction. Second is a structural crisis of overaccumulation. The system cannot expand because the marginalisation of a signiﬁcant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarisation 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 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 privatisations 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. h e 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 overdetermining inﬂuence in the reconﬁguration of global politics. The Bush régime militarised social and economic contradictions, launching a permanent war mobilisation to try to stabilise the system through direct coercion.

**Democratic rhetoric is used as a tool of the elite to impose unequal forms of power on populations**

**Hart 01** Faculty of University of Aberdeen, Scotland(Keith, “Money in an unequal world”, 9/1/01, Anthropological Theory 1:307, Sage SW)

The situation is not unlike that found in agrarian civilizations, where small urban elites sought to maintain control over rural masses condemned to drudgery and political impotence. Generally speaking, modern populations are more mobile and difﬁcult to control than the peasantries of old. Indeed the main difference between the two cases lies in the fact that modern world society is supposed to be organized by an ideology of human freedom and equality. This is the legacy of a democratic revolution, begun in the 17th and 18th centuries, which aimed to install rule by the people in general as the only legitimate form of government. The industrial revolution, which closely followed its political counterpart, implied that humanity might now be released from material as well as social constraints on its development. But the evidence of global inequality today shows that this emancipatory rhetoric is an illusion. One reason for this is the effectiveness of education and propaganda systems that disguise the true nature of social reality. Another is the national form of society, which inhibits recognition of the urgent need to redress global wrongs. In consequence, world society today is at base as rotten as the aristocratic regimes that preceded the modern age. Power has been concentrated into forms held against the people, ﬁrst in the hands of owners of money (capitalists) and then in a revived and strengthened state apparatus. In the second half of the 19th century, no major thinker envisaged the possibility of imposing state control on the restless energies of industrial/commercial society. Yet in the course of our own century, the rule of elites has been restored: state bureaucracies seek to regulate the lives of citizens in unprecedented ways, and world society is divided into national fragments. There is no popular government anywhere, and most people have forgotten when they last took an active interest in such a possibility. The confusing part lies in the widespread use of a rhetoric derived from the democratic revolutions to cloak the purposes of those who reserve effective power to themselves. Western states are no more liberal than the Soviet Union was Marxist. At least the old regime of agrarian civilization called itself what it was. The vast majority of intellectuals are complicit in the lies needed to sustain this latterday revival of the state. Behind a smokescreen of democratic slogans, the bureaucracy relies on impersonal institutions to maintain grotesquely unfair levels of inequality.

**The rhetoric of democracy sets up a false choice between fundamentalism and democracy that ensures the struggle against capitalism will fail.**

**Dean 05-** Prof. of Political Science @ Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Ph.D from Columbia

(Jodi, “Zizek Against Democracy”, http://tinyurl.com/llnbtt)

Finally, in his recent work, Zizek names the limit to current thinking “democratic fundamentalism.” One should read the term in two ways. First, democratic fundamentalism refers to the connection between liberal democracy and ethnic/religious fundamentalism. Rather than two opposing forces in an ideological battle (as presented in mainstream U.S. media and politics), liberal democracy and fundamentalism are two components of the current ideological formation. Fundamentalism is not the preservation of authentic traditionsagainst forces of modernization. Rather, it is the postmodern appropriation of cultural forms in the context of global capital. Likewise, liberal democracy is not an alternative to fundamentalism; indeed, it is laced through with fundamentalisms. The choice liberal democracy sets up—fundamentalism or democracy—is thus false; not only is it premised on the hegemony of democracy but it disavows its own relationship to fundamentalism. Indeed, the false choice is one of the ways that liberal democracy attempts to ensure that “nothing will really happen in politics,” that everything (global capital) will go as before. The second way to read “democratic fundamentalism” is in terms of this hegemony, this basic framework so apparently immune to contestation and renegotiation. Democracy today is not the living breathing, activity of politics. The apparent suspension of social hierarchy in elections is the form of its opposite: it’s a disavowal of the antagonisms rupturing the social. In this way, democratic fundamentalism attempts to ensure that nothing will happen. It precludes politics, if by politics we have in mind actions that can produce major change. This second sense of democratic fundamentalism thus refers to the way democracy conditions and binds our thinking—anything that is not democratic is necessarily horrible, totalitarian, unacceptable to any rational person. In sum, democratic universality appears in Zizek’s early thinking as a necessary fiction, as an impossible universality that opens up because of an excess, obstacle, or stain that impedes it. In the wake of the demise of socialism and expansion and intensification of capital and racist fundamentalisms, Zizek finds that this opening no longer exists, that it’s been closed off. As I detail below, the empty place of democracy now appears as a politically hopeless insofar as Capital, that other system that relies on disruption, crisis, and excess, displaces the excess necessary for democracy. Zizek writes, “Insofar as we play the democratic game of leaving the place of power empty, of accepting the gap between this place and our occupying it (which is the very gap of castration), are we—democrats—all not . . . faithful to castration?” Continued service to democracy today functions as our disavowal of the foreclosure of the political under global capital. Instead of a political practice structured around change—what one might expect from elections—we have instead a democratic fundamentalism that renders change unthinkable.

### Democracy promotion

**Democracy promotion goes hand-in-hand with opening up nations to Western capitalism.**

**Hanieh 06** (Adam, PhD student in Political Science at York University, Relay Magazine / In the Name of Democracy; “Relay Roundtable/Democracy Promotion and Neoliberalism in Iraq” http://inthenameofdemocracy.org/en/node/62 )

The ‘spread of democracy’ is frequently advanced by the US and British governments as a key justification for the invasion and occupation of Iraq. As with other regions of the world, however, US-led democracy promotion is intimately connected with the spread of neoliberalism. As an explicit feature of democratization, the economic policies of the Iraqi Baathist regime have been rewritten under the tutelage of the US, EU and international financial institutions. The aim of these new policies is to institutionalise a separation of economic decision-making from sovereign political structures. As a part of this process, the US government has outsourced the development of Iraqi neoliberalism to a private company, Bearing Point. Over the last decade, Bearing Point has been centrally involved in the development of neoliberal economic policies in regions earmarked for ‘democracy promotion.’ Following its first foray into El Salvador during the early 1990s, Bearing Point began work in the former Yugoslavia in 1999. Its work included the creation of a ministry of finance in Kosovo, and the development of privatization guidelines across the region. USAID writes that in July 2003 it “began a program to build the capacity of the Iraqi Government to manage the transition from a command economy to that of one that is market-driven.” The aim of this program is to carry out the “…reforms necessary to help Iraq establish a policy-enabling environment that fosters private sector led growth.” USAID awarded Bearing Point two contracts worth over US$180 million to implement these measures. Bearing Point’s contract with USAID required it to “… reform, revise, extract or otherwise advise on changes to the policies, laws and regulations that impact the economy… the contractor will provide … macroeconomic reform advice, with a focus on tax, fiscal, exchange rate, monetary policy and banking reform. Contractor will recommend changes to policies, laws and regulations that impede private sector development, trade and investment.” In a remarkably frank outline of US plans for the Iraqi economy, Bearing Point was required to “… assess state owned enterprises (SOEs) in Iraq in terms of their potential market value for sale as ongoing concerns … [the] contractor will also evaluate and recommend the potential for liquidation or dissolution of specific firms or industries, as necessary…. Based on contractor recommendations (and approved by USAID), the contractor will implement a privatization plan, focusing first if approved on strategic investors and on creating and supporting an institution responsible for privatization…. If changes to legislation are required, contractor will assist legislative reform specifically to allow for the privatization of state-owned industries and firms and/or establishing a privatization entity. The contractor will implement USAID approved recommendations to begin supporting the privatization of strategic industries and appropriate privatization of public utilities, including potentially food distribution and agro-processing industries.” Decentralization and Local Governance In the place of state control, US-style democratization emphasizes de-centralization, devolution and local governance. While these phrases may sound liberating given the track record of centralized, undemocratic regimes in the area, in reality they hide atomization and massive disempowerment. When a country’s resources are passed into the hands of large international companies through a supposedly democratic mandate, no amount of neighborhood consultations can determine how those resources are utilized. Local governance in a context of centrally driven neoliberal austerity will most likely mean a dismantling of public health, education and the introduction of fees for those least able to pay. Instead of building popular strength across a country, devolution of power in this context deliberately sets up different regions, groups, and individuals against each other – forced to compete for scarce resources. Fragmentation inevitably follows neoliberal democratization.

**The U.S. explicitly ties democracy promotion to the spread of Western capitalism.**

**Hanieh 06** (Adam PhD student in Political Science at York University, Relay Magazine / In the Name of Democracy; “Relay Roundtable/Democracy Promotion and Neoliberalism in Iraq” http://inthenameofdemocracy.org/en/node/62 )

As Bush himself puts it, the cornerstones of US democracy promotion efforts in the Middle East are “free elections and free markets.” The drive for democratization is inseparable from the implementation of neoliberalism. By making ‘state control’ synonymous with ‘bad governance’, democratization serves to legitimate privatization, the dismantling of state sectors, and all of the miseries that inevitably follow in the wake of neoliberalism. All of these policies require ideological sustenance and support. A plethora of democracy promotion NGOs, think-tanks and private companies are funded by US institutions such as the NED in order to make sure that those who think the right way come to power - and the rest of the population is sufficiently confused as to not get in the way. Challenging these policies requires a rejection of liberal democracy’s claim that politics and economics are separate. It is impossible to have any real political democracy without economic democracy. Democracy means being able to control the what, where and how of production and in whose interests this production occurs. The truth behind the myth of free markets is that they only provide freedom to the largest and most powerful corporations to make a profit. As long as free markets are synonymous with free elections, then democratization will also remain an elusive myth.

### Humanitarianism

**Attempts at global humanitarianism devolve into the service of globalism and capital – their project upholds an illegitimate system**

**Moody, 01** Director of a monthly magazine (Kim, “Closing the Door on U.S. Imperialism & Capitalist Globalization” New Politics, Winter 2001 Vol. VIII, Iss. 2; pg. 96 Proquest SW)

GIVEN THE "PRIMACY" OF THE U.S. in the hierarchy of world imperialism and the globalization process, the first general principle is that we should neither expect nor advocate that the U.S. play world-wide guardian for human or labor rights or of the environment despite the occasional promise from Washington to do so. While we demand that U.S. corporations adhere to any international standards that do exist or are negotiated, we also understand that these multinational corporations and the government that opens doors for them abroad bear disproportionate responsibility for the increase in social inequality, economic injustice, and environmental ruin around the world. Although, for reasons of their own, many nations have long practiced home-grown forms of repression, exploitation, and environmental rot, it is the investments, unequal trade, IMF and World Bank policies, and WTO "rules" that push all nations in the direction of greater inequality, increased poverty, and the political and labor repression needed to enforce them. Even where the wave of democratization of the last decade or so has taken hold and unions emerged to improve living standards, as in South Korea, Taiwan, or South Africa, the push to limit trade union rights through legislation has accelerated as these nations are simultaneously drawn deeper into the global neoliberal order. To put this another way, it is U.S. corporations and successive governments along with the trade agreements and multilateral institutions they command or influence that have led the push for neoliberalism (the U.S. model) world-wide. This, in turn, has encouraged more anti-union laws, repression of union and other grassroots activists, the return of child labor, global pressure for lower labor costs, etc. This is the framework in which the present and likely future of the bad human- and labor-rights records of other nations, as well as that of the U.S., recently documented by Human Rights Watch, should be viewed. This doesn't, of course, mean that socialists should let the governments and ruling elites of nations with poor human and labor rights records, from China to Indonesia to the U.S., off the hook. We should protest these practices and offer every form of help and solidarity possible to movements of resistance and liberation everywhere. It does mean, however, that we should not call for "humanitarian" intervention by U.S. armed forces, economic sanctions except where labor or social movements call for them as they did in Apartheid South Africa, or other U.S. government-based "solutions" to problems abroad.

### K affs

**Our argument is not about root cause of oppression– rather, that suffering is realized as material deprivation and so critiquing capitalism is deeply relevant.**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

Critical thought, in this regard, means applying a dialectical as opposed to a formal logic, one that focuses not on things in themselves but on the interrelations among them. A dialectical logic involves identifying how distinct dimensions of social reality may be analytically distinct (such as the three most salient axes of social inequality—race, class, and gender) yet are mutually constitutive of each other as internal elements of a more encompassing process. Our task is to uncover internal linkages among distinct sets of historical relationships and their grounding in an underlying (that is, more primary) historic process, which in my view are material relations of production and reproduction and the historical ordering principle those relations put forth. This is to argue that historical processes of production and reproduction are causal processes. To take the case of race and class, it is not that racialization processes occurring around the world in the twenty-ﬁrst century can be explained in terms of class but that class itself became racialized in the formative years of the world capitalist system because of the particular historyof that system. I will not draw out the point further here. Sufﬁce it to note that ultimately we are concerned here with the dialectical relationship between consciousness and being.

**Appealing to the system for an end to exploitation is like having a fox guard a hen house – rules will be circumvented and used to maintain the legitimacy of the system**

**Moody, 01** Director of a monthly magazine (Kim, “Closing the Door on U.S. Imperialism & Capitalist Globalization” New Politics, Winter 2001 Vol. VIII, Iss. 2; pg. 96 Proquest SW)

It is self-defeating to address the problem of super-exploited labor abroad by calling on the U.S. government or the multilateral institutions it dominates to protect global labor as the AFL-CIO does. Whether it is through trade sanctions, side-bars tacked on to trade agreements, or even through trade agreements that include labor rights in the text, as does the new agreement with Jordan, this is a matter of the fox guarding the hen house. In any case, while we support labor and human rights everywhere, opposition to the kinds of trade agreements that characterize contemporary "open door" imperialism should hardly be abandoned for the promise of paper rights by powers who show no respect for them at home or abroad. Regardless of intentions, such an approach also underwrites the U.S. role as final arbiter in world affairs, i.e., as chief justice of the imperial court. While we would support broad multilateral agreements banning sweatshop practices, child labor, etc., unconnected to trade or investment, as the ILO conventions already do, we should also realize that such agreements and codes generally lack enforcement and that proposing enforcement by the world's greatest violators (certainly in other people's countries) is shaky ground for improvement. As one U.S. worker told Human Rights Watch about U.S. labor law, "I know the law gives us rights on paper, but where's the reality?" Enforcement of agreements that include labor rights clauses, like the enforcement of many domestic laws, ultimately comes down to the actions of the workers and their organizations and allies. Therefore, we should be emphasizing direct solidarity with social and labor movements abroad whenever possible. There are plenty of examples that show it can make a difference.

### Single Issue Movement

**Single issues can never solve for capitalism—our survival depends upon eradicating the system.**

**HEROD, 2004**

Getting Free, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/05.htm

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

### SIM- Envt

**Reform within neo-liberalism makes radical politics impossible—the system itself is the problem, not specific technologies.**

**Swyngedouw,** **06** (Erik, Dept of Geography, School of Environment and Development, Manchester University, “Impossible “Sustainability” and the Post-Political Condition”, Forthcoming in: David Gibbs and Rob Krueger (eds.) Sustainable Development, www.liv.ac.uk/geography/seminars/**Sustainability**paper.doc)

The post-political environmental consensus, therefore, is one that is radically reactionary, one that forestalls the articulation of divergent, conflicting, and alternative trajectories of future socio-environmental possibilities and of human-human and human-nature articulations and assemblages. It holds on to a harmonious view of nature that can be recaptured while re-producing if not solidifying a liberal-capitalist order for which there seems to be no alternative. Much of the sustainability argument has evacuated the politics of the possible, the radical contestation of alternative future socio-environmental possibilities and socio-natural arrangements, and silences the radical antagonisms and conflicts that are constitutive of our socio-natural orders by externalising conflict. In climate change, for example, the conflict is posed as one of society versus CO2. In fact, the sustainable future desired by ‘sustainablity’ pundits has no name. While alternative futures in the past were named and counted (for example, communism, socialism, anarchism, libertarianism, liberalism), the desired sustainable environmental future has no name and no process, only a state or condition. This is as exemplified by the following apocalyptic warning in which the celebrated quote from Marx’s Communist Manifesto and its invocation of the ‘the spectre of communism that is haunting the world’ (once the celebrated name of hope for liberation) is replaced by the spectre of Armageddon: “A specter is haunting the entire world: but it is not that of communism. ….. Climate change - no more, no less than nature’s payback for what we are doing to our precious planet - is day by day now revealing itself. Not only in a welter of devastating scientific data and analysis but in the repeated extreme weather conditions to which we are all, directly or indirectly, regular observers, and, increasingly, victims” (Levene, 2005). Climate Change is of course not a politics, let only a political programme or socio-environmental project; it is pure negation, the negativity of the political; one we can all concur with, around which a consensus can be built, but which eludes conflict, evacuates the very political moment. By doing so, it does not translate Marx’s dictum for the contemporary period, but turns it into its radical travesty.

## \*\*IMPACTS\*\*

**Capitalism results in neo-imperialist wars, the destruction of the environment and the subjugation and genocide of entire sections of the population**

**Everest 12** (Larry; correspondent for Revolution newspaper; 5/24/12; “WAR AND GLOBAL CAPITALISM: “Money for Jobs Not for War”: American Chauvinism and Reformist Illusions” http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=31024)//RSW

“Money for Jobs and Education! Jobs and Education, Not War and Occupation!” This slogan put forth by several US social movements is profoundly wrong and harmful—both in terms of morality that’s actually in the interests of humanity, and in terms of a scientific understanding of imperialism and war. Why should antiwar demands focus first and foremost on the war’s impact on Americans and their lives—and not on the victims of U.S. aggression: Pakistanis murdered in U.S. drone strikes, Iraqis rounded up and tortured by U.S. forces, Afghans seized and terrorized in night raids, and countless others? Aren’t their lives every bit as precious as the lives of those who happen to live in the U.S.? “Money for jobs, not for war” argues that American lives are more important than other people’s lives. This logic goes right along with—and amplifies—the mindset relentlessly fostered by the system’s rulers and their media machine: that American lives come first. This is the very mindset the rulers count on to justify and build public support (or acquiescence) for their predatory wars of empire. The slogan also promotes the idea that the political powers-that-be—if pressured by enough people—could scale back their military, stop attacking other countries, and instead use the money for jobs, education, and other social welfare programs at home. But that’s not how the system actually operates! Wars, invasions, and occupations are not policies of one set of politicians or another, or arbitrary choices made by this or that president. At this stage in history, capitalism is a global system, with the U.S. the world’s most dominant capitalist-imperialist power, presiding over a worldwide empire of exploitation. This empire rests on the domination of the oppressed countries where the vast majority of humanity lives, and on control of labor, markets, and resources. This entails the violent suppression of the masses of people in the dominated areas—and also entails fighting off challenges from other imperialists as well as rising forces in those countries that stand in the way. This requires a monstrously huge military that is deployed worldwide, with bases in over 100 countries, and wars when necessary. The wars for domination in the Middle East, Central Asia, and elsewhere don’t “interfere” with the functioning of U.S. capital—they’re absolutely essential to it, and to the U.S.’s overall global dominance. This is why the U.S. rulers are compelled—and willing to—spend trillions on the military, including during periods of severe economic and fiscal stress, no matter who happens to sit in the White House or Congress. This system of global capitalism-imperialism headed by the U.S. is the main source of the horrors that torment so many across the globe—from the ethnic cleansing and slow genocide of the Palestinian people by the U.S. and Israel, to the mass incarceration and slow genocide of Black people in the U.S.; from the rape of the planet to the systematic degradation and violence against women—here and around the world; from the extreme deprivation and starvation faced by billions across the planet to the growing poverty and desperation faced by millions in the U.S. The rulers in these imperial metropoles distribute some of the spoils of empire to provide a higher standard of living than in the oppressed countries and buy social peace and loyalty at home (which “Money for Jobs, Not For War” encourages). People in the U.S. should reject that foul pact! The vast majority in the U.S. have a profound interest in making common cause with oppressed people worldwide, not in siding with “their” rulers. That means fostering a morality that declares: “American lives are not more important than other people’s lives!”—not pandering to American chauvinism, which strengthens the system responsible for so much misery. It means people shouldn’t appeal to those on the top to “spend more on jobs,” but to clearly and unequivocally demand a STOP to the horrors the U.S. is committing around the world. Through this process of actively opposing U.S. aggression and the “America Number 1” mindset fostered to justify it, people can and must be won to increasingly see that this capitalist system and state is utterly un-reformable and that it’s going to take revolution to get rid of it, end its predatory wars once and for all, and bring into being a whole new system and state that is in the actual interests of the people in the U.S. and around the world.

### Generic

**Capitalism is the greatest threat to human survival.**

**MacUaid, 07** (Liam, “Savage Capitalism—The Ecosocialist Alternative,” August, http://liammacuaid.files.wordpress.com/2007/08/savage-capitalism.pdf)

All this has happened not only because of the general priorities of any form of capitalism, but because of the present phase of ‘savage capitalism’, stalking the earth with all sense of social responsibility abandoned, increasing amounts of surveillance, violence, war and torture, and aimed at short term profits squeezed from the labour of the poor, rather than the development of social solidarity, peace and the possibility for most people to live a happy life. It is now obvious that this morbid phase of capitalism has brought upon humanity the biggest ever threat to its existence – the threat of environmental catastrophe. The overall threat to humanity and the planet we sum up here under four headings – environmental catastrophe, imperialist war and the crushing of the third world, savage capitalism in everyday life and the surveillance- security lockdown state. They are all linked; they all are part of a single system of power and exploitation. ‘Neoliberalism’, with the added ingredient of US-style neoconservatism, has degenerated into a new and more barbarous phase – ‘savage capitalism’. This new phase of capitalism forces an inevitable conclusion – only by a total transformation in politics and production, in other words a transformation of our social relations, can a sustainable future for humanity be established. We are facing the biggest crisis of human civilisation ever. No previous crisis has ever posed the existence human civilisation so directly.

**Capitalism causes global wars, environmental destruction, and poverty – Constant drive for accumulation makes global economic collapse inevitable**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

We are living in troubling times. The system of global capitalism that now engulfs the entire planet is in crisis. There is consensus among scientists that we are on the precipice of ecological holocaust, including the mass extinction of species; the impending collapse of agriculture in major producing areas; the meltdown of polar ice caps; global warming; and the contamination of the oceans, the food stock, water supply, and air. Social inequalities have spiraled out of control and the gap between the global rich and the global poor has never been as acute as it is in the early twenty-ﬁrst century. While absolute levels of poverty and misery expand around the world under a new global social apartheid, the richest 20 percent of humanity received in 2000 more than 85 percent of the world’s wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with less than 15 percent, according to the United Nation’s oft-cited annual Human Development Report (UNDP, 2001). Driven by the imperatives of overaccumulation and transnational social control, global elites have increasingly turned to authoritarianism, militarization, and war to sustain the system. Many political economists concur that a global economic collapse is possible, even probable.

**Capitalism is the root cause of Genocide and Nuclear conflict**

**International Perspectives 2K** (from Internationalist Perspective #36, spring 2000] <http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html>)

Mass death, and genocide, the deliberate and systematic extermination of whole groups of human beings, have become an integral part of the social landscape of capitalism in its phase of decadence. Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima are not merely the names of discrete sites where human beings have been subjected to forms of industrialized mass death, but synecdoches for the death-world that is a component of the capitalist mode of production in this epoch. In that sense, I want to argue that the Holocaust, for example, was not a Jewish catastrophe, nor an atavistic reversion to the barbarism of a past epoch, but rather an event produced by the unfolding of the logic of capitalism itself. Moreover, Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima are not "past", but rather futural events, objective-real possibilities on the Front of history, to use concepts first articulated by the Marxist philosopher Ernst Bloch. The ethnic cleansing which has been unleashed in Bosnia and Kosovo, the genocide of the Tutsis in Rwanda, the mass death to which Chechnya has been subjected, the prospect for a nuclear war on the Indian sub-continent, are so many examples of the future which awaits the human species as the capitalist mode of production enters a new millenium. Indeed, it is just such a death-world that constitutes the meaning of one pole of the historic alternative which Rosa Luxemburg first posed in the midst of the slaughter inflicted on masses of conscripts during World War I: socialism or barbarism! Yet, confronted by the horror of Auschwitz, Kolyma, and Hiroshima, Marxist theory has been silent or uncomprehending. While I am convinced that there can be no adequate theory of mass death and genocide which does not link these phenomena to the unfolding of the logic of capital, revolutionary Marxists have so far failed to offer one. Worse, the few efforts of revolutionary Marxists to grapple with the Holocaust, for example, as I will briefly explain, have either degenerated into a crude economism, which is one of the hallmarks of so-called orthodox Marxism, or led to a fatal embrace of Holocaust denial; the former being an expression of theoretical bankruptcy, and the latter a quite literal crossing of the class line into the camp of capital itself. Economism, which is based on a crude base-superstructure model (or travesty) of Marxist theory, in which politics, for example, can only be conceived as a direct and immediate reflection of the economic base, in which events can only be conceived as a manifestation of the direct economic needs of a social class, and in the case of the capitalist class, the immediate need to extract a profit, shaped Amadeo Bordiga's attempt to "explain" the Holocaust. Thus, in his "Auschwitz ou le Grand Alibi" Bordiga explained the extermination of the Jews at the hands of the Nazis, as the reaction of one part of the petty bourgeoisie to its historical demise at the hands of capital by "sacrificing" its other -- Jewish -- part so as to save the rest, an undertaking welcomed by big capital, which could thereby liquidate a part of the petty bourgeoisie with the support of the rest of that same class. Quite apart from an economism which simply ignores the dialectic between the economy on the one hand, and the political and ideological on the other (about which more later), such an "explanation" asks us to conceive of genocide not as the complex outcome of the unfolding of the operation of the law of value in the diverse spheres of social life, but as the direct outcome of the utilitarian calculation of segments of the petty bourgeoisie and big capital. Auschwitz, the veritable hallmark of the fundamental irrationality of late capital, is transformed by Bordiga into a rational calculation of its direct profit interests on the part of the capitalists. However, an undertaking which fatally diverted the scarce resources (material and financial) of Nazi Germany from the battlefields of the imperialist world war, simply cannot, in my view, be comprehended on the basis of a purely economic calculus of profit and loss on the part of "big capital." While Bordiga's reaction to Auschwitz fails to provide even the minimal bases for its adequate theorization, the reaction of the militants of La Vieille Taupe, such as Pierre Guillaume, constitutes a political betrayal of the struggle for communist revolution by its incorporation into the politics of Holocaust denial. For Guillaume, Auschwitz can only be a myth, a fabrication of the allies, that is, of one of the imperialist blocs in the inter-imperialist world war, because it so clearly serves their interests in mobilizing the working class to die in the service of democracy; on the alter of anti-fascism. Hence, La Vieille Taupe's "fervor to contest the evidence of its [the Holocaust's] reality by every means possible, including the most fraudulent. For the evidence of genocide is just so many deceptions, so many traps laid for anticapitalist radicality, designed to force it into dishonest compromise and eventual loss of resolve." It is quite true that capital has utilized antifascism to assure its ideological hegemony over the working class, and that the Holocaust has been routinely wielded for more than a generation by the organs of mass manipulation in the service of the myth of "democracy" in the West (and by the state of Israel on behalf of its own imperialist aims in the Middle-East). And just as surely the ideology of antifascism and its functionality for capital must be exposed by revolutionaries. Nonetheless, this does not justify the claims of Holocaust denial, which not only cannot be dissociated from anti-Semitism, but which constitutes a denial of the most lethal tendencies inherent in the capitalist mode of production, of the very barbarism of capitalism, and thereby serves as a screen behind which the death-world wrought by capital can be safely hidden from its potential victims. This latter, in its own small way, is the despicable contribution of La Vieille Taupe, and the basis for my conviction that it must be politically located in the camp of capital. Marxism is in need of a theory of mass death and genocide as immanent tendencies of capital, a way of comprehending the link (still obsure) between the death-world symbolized by the smokestacks of Auschwitz or the mushroom cloud over Hiroshima and the unfolding of the logic of a mode of production based on the capitalist law of value. I want to argue that we can best grasp the link between capitalism and genocide by focusing on two dialectically inter-related strands in the social fabric of late capitalism: first, are a series of phenomena linked to the actual unfolding of the law of value, and more specifically to the completion of the transition from the formal to the real domination of capital; second, are a series of phenomena linked to the political and ideological (this latter understood in a non-reductionist sense, as having a material existence) moments of the rule of capital, specifically to the forms of capitalist hegemony. It is through an analysis of the coalescence of vital elements of these two strands in the development of capital, that I hope to expose the bases for the death-world and genocide as integral features of capitalism in the present epoch. The real domination of capital is characterized by the penetration of the law of value into every segment of social existence. As Georg Lukács put it in his History and Class Consciousness, this means that the commodity ceases to be "one form among many regulating the metabolism of human society," to become its "universal structuring principle." From its original locus at the point of production, in the capitalist factory, which is the hallmark of the formal domination of capital, the law of value has systematically spread its tentacles to incorporate not just the production of commodities, but their circulation and consumption. Moreover, the law of value also penetrates and then comes to preside over the spheres of the political and ideological, including science and technology themselves. This latter occurs not just through the transformation of the fruits of technology and science into commodities, not just through the transformation of technological and scientific research itself (and the institutions in which it takes place) into commodities, but also, and especially, through what Lukács designates as the infiltration of thought itself by the purely technical, the very quantification of rationality, the instrumentalization of reason; and, I would argue, the reduction of all beings (including human beings) to mere objects of manipulation and control. As Lukács could clearly see even in the age of Taylorism, "this rational mechanisation extends right into the worker's `soul'." In short, it affects not only his outward behavior, but her very internal, psychological, makeup. The phenomenon of reification, inherent in the commodity-form, and its tendential penetration into the whole of social existence, which Lukács was one of the first to analyze, is a hallmark of the real domination of capital: "Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a `phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people." Reification, the seeming transformation of social relations into relations between things, has as one of its outcomes what the German-Jewish thinker H.G.Adler designated as "the administered man" [Der verwaltete Mensch]. For Adler, when human beings are administered, they are treated as things, thereby clearing the way for their removal or elimination by genocide. The outcome of such a process can be seen in the bureaucractic administration of the Final Solution, in which the organization of genocide was the responsibility of desk killers like Adolf Eichmann who could zealously administer a system of mass murder while displaying no particular hatred for his victims, no great ideological passion for his project, and no sense that those who went to the gas chambers were human beings and not things. The features of the desk killer, in the person of Eichmann, have been clearly delineated by Hannah Arendt. He is the high-level functionary in a vast bureaucratic organization who does his killing from behind a desk, from which he rationally plans and organizes mass murder; treating it as simply a technical task, no different than the problem of transporting scrap metal. The desk killer is the quintessential bureaucrat functioning according to the imperatives of the death-world. As a human type, the desk killer, that embodiment of the triumph of instrumental reason, has become a vital part of the state apparatus of late capitalism. Here, the Lukácsian concept of reification, the Adlerian concept of the administered man, and the Arendtian portrait of the desk killer, can be joined to Martin Heidegger's concept of das Gestell, enframing, in which everything real, all beings, including humans, are treated as so much Bestand, standing-reserve or raw material, to be manipulated at will. This reduction of humans to a raw material is the antechamber to a world in which they can become so many waste products to be discarded or turned into ashes in the gas chambers of Auschwitz or at ground zero at Hiroshima. While the reification which attains its culminating point in the real domination of capital may contain within itself the possibility of mass murder and its death-world, it does not in and of itself explain the actual unleashing of the genocidal potential which, because of it, is now firmly ensconced within the interstices of the capitalist mode of production. To confront that issue, I want to elucidate two concepts which, while not directly linked by their authors to the unfolding of the capitalist law of value, can be refunctioned to forge such a link, and have already been effectively wielded in the effort to explain genocide: the concept of the obsolescence of man [Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen], articulated by the German-Jewish philosopher Günther Anders, and the concept of bio-politics, articulated by Michel Foucault. For Anders, the first industrial revolution introduced the machine with its own source of power as a means of production, while the second industrial revolution saw the extension of commodity production to the whole of society, and the subordination of man to the machine. According to Anders, the third industrial revolution, in the epoch of which humanity now lives, has made humans obsolete, preparing the way for their replacement by machines, and the end of history (Endzeit). For Anders, the Holocaust marked the first attempt at the systematic extermination of a whole group of people by industrial means, opening the way for the extension of the process of extermination to virtually the whole of the human species; a stage which he designates as "post-civilized cannibalism" [postzivilisatorischen Kannibalismus], in which the world is "overmanned", and in which Hiroshima marks the point at which "humanity as a whole is eliminatable"[tötbar]. Anders's philosophy of technology is unabashedly pessimistic, leaving virtually no room for Marxist hope (communist revolution). Nonetheless, his vision of a totally reified world, and technology as the subject of history, culminating in an Endzeit, corresponds to one side of the dialectic of socialism or barbarism which presides over the present epoch. Moreover, Anders's concept of an overmanned world can be fruitfully linked to the immanent tendency of the law of value to generate an ever higher organic composition of capital, culminating in the present stage of automation, robotics, computers, and information technology, on the bases of which ever larger masses of living labor are ejected from the process of production, and, indeed, from the cycle of accumulation as a whole, ceasing to be -- even potentially -- a productive force, a source of exchange-value, in order to become an insuperable burden for capital, a dead weight, which, so long as it lives and breathes, threatens its profitability. This "obsolescence of man" can at the level of total capital thereby create the necessity for mass murder; inserting the industrial extermination of whole groups of people into the very logic of capital: genocide as the apotheosis of instrumental reason! Reason transmogrified into the nihilistic engine of destruction which shapes the late capitalist world. Michel Foucault's concept of bio-power can also be refunctioned to explicitly link it to the basic tendencies of the development of capitalism, in which case it provides a point of intersection between the triumph of the real domination of capital economically, and the political and ideological transformation of capitalist rule, while at the same time making it possible to grasp those features of capital which propel it in the direction of genocide. The extension of the law of value into every sphere of human existence, the culminating point of the real domination of capital, is marked by the subordination of the biological realm itself to the logic of capital. This stage corresponds to what Foucault designates as bio-politics, which encapsulates both the "statification of the biological", and the "birth of state racism". Bio-politics entails the positive power to administer, manage, and regulate the intimate details of the life -- and death -- of whole populations in the form of technologies of domination: "In concrete terms ... this power over life evolved in two basic forms ... they constituted ... two poles of development linked together by a whole intermediary cluster of relations. One of these poles ... centered on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterized the disciplines: an anatomo-politics of the human body. The second ... focused on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary. Their supervision was effected through an entire series of interventions and regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population." Such a bio-politics represents the subjugation of biological life in its diverse human forms to the imperatives of the law of value. It allows capital to mobilize all the human resources of the nation in the service of its expansion and aggrandizement, economic and military. The other side of bio-politics, of this power over life, for Foucault, is what he terms "thanatopolitics," entailing an awesome power to inflict mass death, both on the population of one's enemy, and on one's own population: "the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual's continued existence. .... If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers ... it is because power is situated at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population." Nuclear, chemical, and biological, weapons make it possible to wield this power to condemn whole populations to death. Bio-politics, for Foucault, also necessarily entails racism, by which he means making a cut in the biological continuum of human life, designating the very existence of a determinate group as a danger to the population, to its health and well-being, and even to its very life. Such a group, I would argue, then, becomes a biological (in the case of Nazism) or class enemy (in the case of Stalinism, though the latter also claimed that biological and hereditary characteristics were linked to one's class origins). And the danger represented by such an enemy race can necessitate its elimination through physical removal (ethnic cleansing) or extermination (genocide). The Foucauldian concept of bio-politics allows us to see how, on the basis of technologies of domination, it is possible to subject biological life itself to a formidable degree of control, and to be able to inflict mass death on populations or races designated as a biological threat. Moreover, by linking this concept to the real domination of capital, we are able to see how the value-form invades even the biological realm in the phase of the real domination of capital. However, while bio-power entails the horrific possibility of genocide, it is Foucault's ruminations on the binary division of a population into a "pure community" and its Other, which allows us to better grasp its necessity. Such a perspective, however, intersects with the transformations at the level of the political and ideological moment of capital, and it is to these, and what I see as vital contributions to their theorization by Antonio Gramsci and Ernst Bloch, that I now want to turn in an effort to better elucidate the factors that propel capital in the direction of mass death and genocide. What is at issue here is not Gramsci's politics, his political practice, his interventions in the debates on strategy and tactics within the Italian Communist Party, where he followed the counter-revolutionary line of the Stalinist Comintern, but rather his theorization of the political and ideological moment of capital, and in particular his concept of the "integral state", his understanding of the state as incorporating both political and civil society, his concept of hegemony, and his understanding of ideology as inscribed in practices and materialized in institutions, which exploded the crude base-superstructure model of orthodox Marxism and its vision of ideology as simply false consciousness, all of which have enriched Marxist theory, and which revolutionaries ignore at their peril. In contrast to orthodox Marxism which has equated the state with coercion, Gramsci's insistence that the state incorporates both political and civil society, and that class rule is instanciated both by domination (coercion) and hegemony (leadership) allows us to better grasp the complex and crisscrossing strands that coalesce in capitalist class rule, especially in the phase of the real domination of capital and the epoch of state capitalism. For Gramsci, hegemony is the way in which a dominant class installs its rule over society through the intermediary of ideology, establishing its intellectual and cultural leadership over other classes, and thereby reducing its dependence on coercion. Ideology, for Gramsci, is not mere false consciousness, but rather is the form in which humans acquire consciousness, become subjects and act, constituting what he terms a "collective will". Moreover, for him, ideology is no mere superstructure, but has a material existence, is materialized in praxis. The state which rests on a combination of coercion and hegemony is what Gramsci designates as an integral state. It seems to me, that one major weakness of the Gramscian concept of hegemony is that he does not seem to apply it to the control exercised over an antagonistic class. Thus, Gramsci asserts that one dominates, coerces, antagonistic classes, but leads only allied classes. Gramsci's seeming exclusion of antagonistic classes from the ideological hegemony of the dominant class seems to me to be misplaced, especially in the epoch of state capitalism, when the capitalist class, the functionaries of capital, acquire hegemony, cultural and intellectual leadership and control, not just of allied classes and strata (e.g. the middle classes, petty bourgeoisie, etc.), but also over broad strata of the antagonistic class, the working class itself. Indeed, such hegemony, though never total, and always subject to reversal (revolution), is the veritable key to capitalist class rule in this epoch. One way in which this ideological hegemony of capital is established over broad strata of the population, including sectors of the working class, is by channeling the disatisfaction and discontent of the mass of the population with the monstrous impact of capitalism upon their lives (subjection to the machine, reduction to the status of a "thing", at the point of production, insecurity and poverty as features of daily life, the overall social process of atomization and massification, etc.), away from any struggle to establish a human Gemeinwesen, communism. Capitalist hegemony entails the ability to divert that very disatisfaction into the quest for a "pure community", based on hatred and rage directed not at capital, but at the Other, at alterity itself, at those marginal social groups which are designated a danger to the life of the nation, and its population. One of the most dramatic effects of the inexorable penetration of the law of value into every pore of social life, and geographically across the face of the whole planet, has been the destruction of all primitive, organic, and pre-capitalist communities. Capitalism, as Marx and Engels pointed out in the Communist Manifesto, shatters the bonds of immemorial custom and tradition, replacing them with its exchange mechanism and contract. While Marx and Engels stressed the positive features of this development in the Manifesto, we cannot ignore its negative side, particularly in light of the fact that the path to a human Gemeinwesen has so far been successfully blocked by capital, with disastrous consequences for the human species. The negative side of that development includes the relentless process of atomization, leaving in its wake an ever growing mass of rootless individuals, for whom the only human contact is by way of the cash nexus. Those who have been uprooted geographically, economically, politically, and culturally, are frequently left with a powerful longing for their lost communities (even where those communities were hierarchically organized and based on inequality), for the certainties and "truths" of the past, which are idealized the more frustrating, unsatisfying, andinsecure, the world of capital becomes. Such longings are most powerfully felt within what Ernst Bloch has termed non-synchronous strata and classes. These are stata and classes whose material or mental conditions of life are linked to a past mode of production, who exist economically or culturally in the past, even as they chronologically dwell in the present. In contrast to the two historic classes in the capitalist mode of production, the bourgeoisie and proletariat, which are synchronous, the products of the capitalist present, these non-synchronous strata include the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, and -- by virtue of their mental or cultural state -- youth and white-collar workers. In my view, Bloch's understanding of non-synchronicity needs to be extended to segments of the working class, in particular those strata of the blue-collar proletariat which are no longer materially synchronous with the high-tech production process upon which late capitalism rests, and the mass of workers ejected from the production process by the rising organic composition of capital and its comcomitant down-sizing. In addition, the even greater mass of peasants streaming into the shanty towns around the great commercial and industrial metropolitan centers of the world, are also characterized by their non-synchronicity, their inability to be incorporated into the hyper-modern cycle of capital accumulation. Moreover, all of these strata too are subject to a growing nostalgia for the past, a longing for community, including the blue-collar communities and their institutional networks which were one of the features of the social landscape of capitalism earlier in the twentieth century. However, no matter how powerful this nostalgia for past community becomes, it cannot be satisfied. The organic communities of the past cannot be recreated; their destruction by capital is irreversible. At the same time, the path to a future Gemeinwesen, to which the cultural material and longings embodied in the non-synchronous classes and strata can make a signal contribution, according to Bloch, remains obstructed by the power of capital. So long as this is the case, the genuine longing for community of masses of people, and especially the nostalgia for past communities especially felt by the non-synchronous strata and classes, including the newly non-synchronous elements which I have just argued must be added to them, leaves them exposed to the lure of a "pure community" ideologically constructed by capital itself. In place of real organic and communal bonds, in such an ideologically constructed pure community, a racial, ethnic, or religious identification is merely superimposed on the existing condition of atomization in which the mass of the population finds itself. In addition to providing some gratification for the longing for community animating broad strata of the population, such a pure community can also provide an ideological bond which ties the bulk of the population to the capitalist state on the basis of a race, ethnicity, or religion which it shares with the ruling class. This latter is extremely important to capital, because the atomization which it has brought about not only leaves the mass of humanity bereft, but also leaves the ruling class itself vulnerable because it lacks any basis upon which it can mobilize the population, physically or ideologically. The basis upon which such a pure community is constituted, race, nationality, religion, even a categorization by "class" in the Stalinist world, necessarily means the exclusion of those categories of the population which do not conform to the criteria for inclusion, the embodiments of alterity, even while they inhabit the same geographical space as the members of the pure community. Those excluded, the "races" on the other side of the biological continuum, to use Foucauldian terminology, the Other, become alien elements within an otherwise homogeneous world of the pure community. As a threat to its very existence, the role of this Other is to become the scapegoat for the inability of the pure community to provide authentic communal bonds between people, for its abject failure to overcome the alienation that is a hallmark of a reified world. The Jew in Nazi Germany, the Kulak in Stalinist Russia, the Tutsi in Rwanda, Muslims in Bosnia, blacks in the US, the Albanian or the Serb in Kosovo, the Arab in France, the Turk in contemporary Germany, the Bahai in Iran, for example, become the embodiment of alterity, and the target against which the hatred of the members of the pure community is directed. The more crisis ridden a society becomes, the greater the need to find an appropriate scapegoat; the more urgent the need for mass mobilization behind the integral state, the more imperious the need to focus rage against the Other. In an extreme situation of social crisis and political turmoil, the demonization and victimization of the Other can lead to his (mass) murder. In the absence of a working class conscious of its historic task and possibilities, this hatred of alterity which permits capital to mobilize the population in defense of the pure community, can become its own impetus to genocide. The immanent tendencies of the capitalist mode of production which propel it towards a catastrophic economic crisis, also drive it towards mass murder and genocide. In that sense, the death-world, and the prospect of an Endzeit cannot be separated from the continued existence of humanity's subordination to the law of value. Reification, the overmanned world, bio-politics, state racism, the constitution of a pure community directed against alterity, each of them features of the economic and ideological topography of the real domination of capital, create the possibility and the need for genocide. We should have no doubt that the survival of capitalism into this new millenium will entail more and more frequent recourse to mass murder.

**The root cause of warfare is resource scarcity generated by capitalist growth.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “Towards a Sustainable Economy”, pg. 33-4)

The basic factor here is that capitalism inescapably involves expansion. Capitalists only invest if they can make more money than they invest. They typically expect to make at least 10 per cent profit. Some of this must go into repairing old plant, but there is a constant increase in the amount of money available for investment. In fact, capitalism's greatest long-term problem is to find enough profitable areas for investing the constantly accumulating volumes of capital. It is a system in which this problem regularly gives rise to slumps and recessions. For long periods this problem might be solved without generating armed conflicts, but from time to time it does lead towards war because capitalists looking for new ventures tend to get in each others' way. They find themselves competing with businesses from other countries for access to resources and markets, and they are always ready to call upon their governments to help them protect against or overcome the competition. This is not to say that only economic factors cause international conflict, but there is an extensive literature on the central role of economic factors, especially where a rising power threatens to over- take the dominant one. A glance at modern history shows that there has always been a struggle between the biggest states to grab most of the wealth and prestige and power and to disadvantage others. The main source of conflict and war in the world is the ceaseless quest for greater wealth and power. We have no chance of achieving a peaceful world until nations stop being greedy and work out how to live without constantly striving to grow richer. Yet the supreme commitment in our economy is to rapid and ceaseless growth it is possible that for a long time to come the transnational corporations from the rich countries can go on securing most of the world's resources and markets without clashing and drawing their governments into armed conflict. But the tendency for this to happen must increase as resources and markets become more scarce. The only satisfactory way to remove this dangerous tendency is by shifting to an economic system which permits us to live comfortably without constantly striving for economic growth. We must understand that the problem of world peace is part of the problem of global economic justice. So long as we refuse to bring about a fairer distribution of the world's wealth, which means de-development on the part of the rich and over-developed countries, we can only expect continued and accelerating conflict and violence.

### Envt

**Capitalism is inevitably going to cause human extinction from a wide variety of practices that destroy the global environment. Reform is not enough. The whole system needs to be radically altered.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism,* p 66-67)

The consequences of such shortsighted attention to economic growth and profit before all else are of course enormous, since they call into question the survivability of the entire world. It is an inescapable fact that human history is at a turning point, the result of a fundamental change in the relationship between human beings and the environment. The scale at which people transform energy and materials has now reached a level that rivals elemental natural processes. Human society is adding carbon to the atmosphere at a level that is equal to about 7 percent of the natural carbon exchange of atmosphere and oceans. The carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere as a result has grown by a quarter in the last 200 years, with more than half of this increase since 1950. Human beings now use (take or transform) 25 percent of the plant mass fixed by photosynthesis over the entire earth, land and sea, and 40 percent of the photosynthetic product on land. Largely as a result of synthetic fertilizers, humanity fixed about as much nitrogen in the environment as does nature. With human activities now rivaling nature in scale, actions that in the past merely produced local environmental crises now have global implications. Moreover, environmental effects that once seemed simple and trivial, such as increases in carbon dioxide emissions, have now suddenly become threats to the stability of the fundamental ecological cycles of the planet. Destruction of the ozone layer, the greenhouse effect, annihilation of ancient and tropical forests, species extinction, reductions in genetic diversity, production of toxic and radioactive wastes, contamination of water resources, soil depletion, depletion of essential raw materials, desertification, the growth of world population spurred by rising poverty – all represent ominous trends the full impact of which, singly or in combination, is scarcely to be imagined at present. “With the appearance of a continent-sized hole in the Earth’s protective ozone layer and the threat of global warming,” Barry Commoner has written, “even droughts, floods, and heat waves may become unwitting acts of man.” The sustainability of both human civilization and global life processes depends not on the mere slowing down of these dire trends, but on their reversal. Nothing in the history of capitalism, however, suggests that the system will be up to such a task. On the contrary there is every indication that the system, left to its own devices, will gravitate toward the “let them eat pollution” stance so clearly enunciated by the chief economist of the World Bank. Fortunately for the world, however, capitalism has never been allowed to develop for long entirely in accordance with its own logic. Opposition forces always emerge – whether in the form of working class struggles for social betterment or conservation movements dedicated to overcoming environmental depredations – that force the system to moderate its worst tendencies. And to some extend the ensuing reforms can result in lasting, beneficial constraints on the market. What the capitalist class cannot accept, however, are changes that will likely result in the destruction of the system itself. Long before reform movement threaten the accumulation process as a whole, therefore, counter-forces are set in motion by the ruling interests, and the necessary elemental changes are headed off. And there’s the rub. Where radical change is called for little is accomplished within the system and the underlying crisis intensifies over time. Today this is particularly evident in the ecological realm. For the nature of the global environmental crisis is such that the fate of the entire planet and social and ecological issues of enormous complexity are involved, all traceable to the forms of production now prevalent**.** It is impossible to prevent the world’s environmental crisis from getting progressively worse unless root problems of production, distribution, technology, and growth are dealt with on a global scale. And the more that such questions are raised, the more it becomes evidence that capitalism is unsustainable – ecologically, economically, politically, and morally – and must be superseded.

**Capitalism’s drive for profit makes wholesale ecological destruction inevitable**

**Foster 99** (John Bellamy; professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review; Ch 6 from “The Vulnerable Planet”)//RSW

The foregoing contradictions between ecology and the economy can all be reduced to the fact that the profit-making relation has become to a startling degree the sole connection between human beings and between human beings and nature. This means that while we can envision more sustainable forms of technology that would solve much of the environmental problem, the development and implementation of these technologies is blocked by the mode of production-by capitalism and capitalists. Large corporations make the major decisions about the technology we use, and the sole lens that they consider in arriving at their decisions is profitability. In explaining why Detroit automakers prefer to make large, gas-guzzling cars, Henry Ford II stated simply “minicars make miniprofits.” The same point was made more explicitly by John Z. DeLorean, a former General Motors executive, who stated, “When we should have been planning switches to smaller, more fuel-efficient, lighter cars in the late 1960s in response to growing demand in the marketplace, GM management refused because ‘we make more money on big cars.’”[12] Underlying the general counter-ecological approach to production depicted here is the question of growth. An exponential growth dynamic is inherent in capitalism, a system whereby money is exchanged for commodities, which are then exchanged for more money on an ever increasing scale. “As economists from Adam Smith and Marx through Keynes have pointed out,” Robert Heilbroner has observed, “a ‘stationary’ capitalism is subject to a falling rate of profit as the investment opportunities of the system are used up. Hence, in the absence of an expansionary frontier, the investment drive slows down and a deflationary spiral of incomes and employment begins.” What this means is that capitalism cannot exist without constantly expanding the scale of production: any interruption in this process will take the form of an economic crisis. Yet in the late twentieth century there is every reason to believe that the kind of rapid economic growth that the system has demanded in order to sustain its very existence is no longer ecologically sustainable.[13]

**Capitalism collapses the environment – rapid expansion and accumulation takes the environment with it**

**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, SW)

Crucially, the economic crisis of neoliberal globalization has been accompanied and amplified by a deepening ecological crisis. In the 20thcentury, capitalism ‘scaled up’ from a network of local economies centred in a few regions of the global north (articulated via colonialism with precapitalist modes of production on the periphery) to a system of transnational production and consumption in which most of the world’s burgeoning population is ensnared. So did the ecological externalities of accumulation, so that by the late 20thcentury capitalism’s footprint, evident in species extinction, the thinning of the ozone layer, and global warming, was outgrowing the biosphere. What James O’Connor (1990) has called the second contradiction of capitalism sharpened, as capitalist appropriation of nature cumulatively eroded capital’s own conditions for expanded reproduction (cf Kovel 2006). The economic and ecological moments of crisis are interconnected, but they do not follow a unitary logic. As John Foster (2010) reminds us, in contrast to ecological crisis, economic crises are of their nature cyclical. Short of an exit from capitalism, economic crises eventually resolve themselves, on the backs of workers and other subordinates, as conditions for robust accumulation are re-established or invented; a case in point being neoliberalism’s own success in disassembling many of the impediments to accumulation that Fordist regulation and the Keynesian welfare state eventually presented. The deepening ecological crisis, on the other hand, has no bottom, in the sense of an anticipated ‘recovery’. Without timely and radical intervention, ecological overshoot portends only a downward spiral, giving new meaning to the choice Rosa Luxemburg posed between humanity’s exit from capitalism and its likely descent into barbarism (Angus 2010). The global character of ecological crisis, and the growing consciousness of that global character, add a new element to the organic crisis, and to the project of counter-hegemony.

**Capitalism is the root cause of global environmental destruction—we need to change the system or face planetary extinction.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm 6/6/2006).

As a result of human overpopulation, and capitalism’s inherent greed, virtually all of the world’s great ecosystems are in decline or collapse. The earth’s ability to replenish herself and to sustain her immense biological diversity (biological capital) is being diminished. So we are living in the midst of one of the planet’s great extinction episodes and it is human induced. Every plant and animal that exists has an impact on the planet. It is therefore imperative that we live gently and with minimal environmental impact, lest we impair the earth’s ability to sustain life. The concept of the private ownership of nature simply does not produce a sound and responsible land ethic.

**It is try or die for the alternative—capitalism will annihilate the planet.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm 6/6/2006).

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.

**Capitalism makes total ecological destruction inevitable.**

**McGarr, 2000** (Paul, socialist historian, political activist, and author, “Why Green is Red: Marxism and the Threat to the Environment,” International Socialism Journal, Autumn 2000, http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj88/mcgarr.htm)

The aim of this article has been to argue that environmental destruction can only be fully understood as one part of a wider social crisis. That has been true in previous class societies, and it flows from the way that ruling classes lock society into specific ways of organising production which eventually eat into the very material and environmental basis they depend on. The same pattern is true, with some important specific characteristics, under capitalism. Only today with a global system the threat of crisis and environmental destruction is global too. I have tried to show how two of the most important environmental threats we face today, global warming and GMOs, flow from the logic of capitalism. The problem is not industry or science, but the organisation of production under the control of a minority which lives by the creed of profit before all else. This dogma threatens environmental and social catastrophe on a scale previous generations could not have imagined, and could even threaten the viability of civilisation itself. The answer to this terrible threat is to build on the spirit of the revolts against capitalism and its institutions that have erupted so wonderfully over the last year. Such revolts have, and must, involve a diverse range of social groups and movements. But to go from protest and revolt into a social revolution that ends the threat of human and environmental disaster demands that the class on whose labour the whole system depends is at the centre of the fight. The future of society, and the environment, depends on whether such a fight, one in which the global working class, alongside peasants, students and many more, wrests control of society and production from those who control it now. If we do not succeed in doing that the future is bleak indeed. If we do then we have the chance to reorganise production, using the fruits of a scientific understanding of the world of which we are part, and so build a world whose beauty we can enjoy today and safeguard for future generations.

Capitalism destroys the environment

Parenti 11 (Michael, PhD in political science from Yale, one of the nations’ leading political analysts, “Profit Pathology and Disposable Planet”, Michael Parenti political archive, http://www.michaelparenti.org/capitalism%20apocalypse.html)

It was a familiar argument: the company had no choice. It was compelled to act that way in a competitive market. The mill was not in the business of protecting the environment but in the business of making a profit, the highest possible profit at the highest possible rate of return. Profit is the name of the game, as business leaders make clear when pressed on the point. The overriding purpose of business is capital accumulation.

To justify its single-minded profiteering, Corporate America promotes the classic laissez-faire theory which claims that the free market---a congestion of unregulated and unbridled enterprises all selfishly pursuing their own ends---is governed by a benign ìinvisible handî that miraculously produces optimal outputs for everybody.

The free marketeers have a deep all-abiding faith in laissez-faire for it is a faith that serves them well. It means no government oversight, no being held accountable for the environmental disasters they perpetrate. Like greedy spoiled brats, they repeatedly get bailed out by the government (some free market!) so that they can continue to take irresponsible risks, plunder the land, poison the seas, sicken whole communities, lay waste to entire regions, and pocket obscene profits.

This corporate system of capital accumulation treats the Earth's life-sustaining resources (arable land, groundwater, wetlands, foliage, forests, fisheries, ocean beds, bays, rivers, air quality) as disposable ingredients presumed to be of limitless supply, to be consumed or toxified at will. As BP has demonstrated so well in the Gulf-of-Mexico catastrophe, considerations of cost weigh so much more heavily than considerations of safety. As one Congressional inquiry concluded: "Time after time, it appears that BP made decisions that increased the risk of a blowout to save the company time or expense."

Indeed, the function of the transnational corporation is not to promote a healthy ecology but to extract as much marketable value out of the natural world as possible even if it means treating the environment like a septic tank. An ever-expanding corporate capitalism and a fragile finite ecology are on a calamitous collision course, so much so that the support systems of the entire ecosphere---the Earth's thin skin of fresh air, water, and topsoil---are at risk. It is not true that the ruling politico-economic interests are in a state of denial about all this. Far worse than denial, they have shown outright antagonism toward those who think our planet is more important than their profits. So they defame environmentalists as "eco-terrorists," "EPA gestapo," "Earth day alarmists," "tree huggers," and purveyors of "Green hysteria."

**Capitalism is the root cause of environmental destruction.**

**Trainer, 96**

(Ted, University of New South Wales, “Towards a Sustainable Economy”, Jon Carpenter Oxford Publishing, pages 42-43)

Our way of life is ecologically unsustainable Our resource-affluent way of life also causes many serious environmental problems. We are destroying vital ecological systems. Consider, for example, the greenhouse problem, acid rain, the destruction of forests, the spread of deserts and the loss of plant and animal species. At the present rate, more than a million species will disappear in the next 25 years, because the expansion of human economic activity is destroying habitats. We farm in ways that lose 5 tonnes of topsoil for each person on earth every year (that is 15 times the amount of food we eat), we are destroying the protective ozone layer in the atmosphere, and we are polluting the ground waters and seas. One ofthe most unsustainable aspects of our society is the way we continually take large quantities of nutrients from the soil, eat them and then throw them away. We are depleting our soils at a rapid rate. In Chapter 12 it will be argued that we can only have a sustainable agriculture if we change to highly localised economic systems in which most of our food is produced close to where we live and all food wastes can be recycled. Most of these ecological problems are direct consequences of the sheer amount of producing and consuming going on. There is, for example, no way of solving the greenhouse problem without drastically reducing the amount of fuel being burnt, and therefore the volume of production taking place. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has concluded that in order to keep the carbon content ofthe atmosphere from increasing, let alone reduce it (as we should be doing) we will have to cut carbon input to the atmosphere by 60-80 per cent. If by 2060 we achieve a 60 per cent reduction and share the energy among 11 billion people then world average fossil fuel use would be about one-eighteenth the present Australian average. How can we do anything like this unless we drastically reduce energy use and therefore fossil fuel use? One of the most disturbing recent observations is the fact that in the last decade a number ofcrucial biological and ecological indices seem to be approaching or to have passed their peaks. This is true of world cropland area, irrigated area, fertiliser use, and meat, timber, wool and grain production. Some key yields such as rice and wheat seem to be tapering towards upper limits. World fish catch has clearly fallen from levels that will not be attained again. Yet we are only providing well for one billion people, and we might soon have 11 billion on the planet. Now add to this analysis the implications of continued economic growth. Fig 6.la represents the present volume of world economic output, distributed across its 5.4 billion people. Figure 6.lb represents output assuming that all the people living in the Third World in 2060 have risen to the living standards the rich countries have now, and incomes in rich countries rise by 3 per cent p.a. until then. World output would be about 19 times as great as it is now. Anyone assuming that all the world's people can be as rich as the rich world's people would be by 2060, given only 3 per cent annual growth until then, must believe that the world's resources and ecosystems can sustain 88 times present annual volumes ofoutput. And 3 per cent growth rate is not sufficient to make our economy healthy! In the 1980s Australia averaged 3.2 per cent annual growth and just about all its economic and social problems became worse. Unemployment at least doubled and the foreign debt multiplied by 10. Prime Minister Keating has emphasised that we need 4.5 per cent growth to start bringing unemployment down. Let us assume we were to average 4 per cent annual growth until 2060, and that by then all the world's people had risen to the 'living standards' we would have then. Total world economic output would be 220 times what it is today. There is no chance whatsoever of reaching even a 19-fold increase in present output. Yet conventional economists proceed as if we can rise to and beyond these levels; they never acknowledge any need to worry about there being any limits to the growth of production and consumption. The environmental problem is basically due to overproduction and overconsumption, yet we have an economy in which there must be constant and limitless increase in production and consumption. Again, the problem is due to our economy and cannot be solved until we develop a quite different economy.

**Capitalism is the root cause of war, famine and ecological collapse.**

**McGarr, 2000** (Paul, socialist historian, political activist, and author, “Why Green is Red: Marxism and the Threat to the Environment,” International Socialism Journal, Autumn 2000, http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj88/mcgarr.htm)

Unlike previous societies capitalism is not simply based on preserving the old ways of producing. It is based on preserving the essential class relationship of exploitation at the heart of production. But the competitive drive for profit at the heart of the system means there is a built in pressure to constantly innovate and expand production. This explains why capitalism is the most dynamic and revolutionary form of society in human history up until now. It has produced the most immense strides forward in production, knowledge, communication and much more. For the first time in human history there is no reason, other than the class organisation of society, why all the world's people cannot enjoy the fruits of that progress, and live healthy and fulfilled lives. Marx and Engels wrote 150 years ago, 'The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce 100 years has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together...what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?'226 A century and a half later such progress has been amplified a thousandfold. And yet, the very organisation of society produces alongside such immense progress almost unimaginable horror--economic and social crisis, famine, war and the threat of barbarism on a scale which no 'earlier century' could have had 'even a presentiment of'. The 20th century saw giant leaps forward in human understanding and ability to create a decent world, but also two world wars, the Holocaust and Hiroshima and, today, famine amid plenty and the threat of global climate disaster. Marx and Engels captured the picture in a famous metaphor: 'Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world who he has called up by his spells'.227 They argued that the repeated crises capitalism produced as a result had a peculiar feature, one that will ring true for many in the world today: In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but of the previously created productive forces are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity--the epidemic of overproduction. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism... And why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce.228 Such crises are built into the logic of a system based on the relentless competitive drive for profit. They are the particular form in capitalist society in which the relations of production, the exploitation of the labour of the majority by a ruling class competing among themselves to accumulate and to profit, become a block on the very production it has developed and is based on. Instead of using the development of knowledge to produce in such a way as to satisfy the needs of society and ensure its further development we get repeated crises, and the attendant horror of war, famine and the rest. Part of this horror is, as in previous societies, that this organisation of production also threatens the material basis of all production, the environment. Yet, as Engels pointed out, this environmental threat happens in ways particular to capitalism too.

### Nuke War

**The capitalist drive for resources will ensure that wars grow bigger and more intense over time.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 886)

The crisis we face, then, is not simply a political crisis, but the general structural crisis of the capitalistic institutions of social control in their entirety. Here the main point is that the institutions of capitalism are inherently violent and aggressive: they are built on the fundamental premise of ‘war if the “normal” methods of expansion fail.’ (Besides, he periodic destruction—by whatever means, including the most violent ones—of over-produced capital, is an inherent necessity of the ‘normal’ functioning of this system: the vital condition of its recovery from crisis and depression.) The blind ‘natural law’ of the market mechanism carries with it that the grave social problems necessarily associated with capital production and concentration are never solved, only postponed, and indeed—since postponement cannot work indefinitely—transferred to the military plane. Thus, the ‘sense’ of the hierarchically structured institutions of capitalism is given in its ultimate reference to the violent ‘fighting out’ of the issues, in the international arena, for the socioeconomic units—following the inner logic of their development—grow bigger and bigger, and their problems and contradictions increasingly more intense and grave. Growth and expansion are immanent necessities of the capitalist system of production and when the local limits are reached there is no way out except by violently readjusting the prevailing relation of forces.

**Capitalism makes mass nuclear annihilation inevitable.**

**Webb, 04** (Sam Webb, National Chairman, Communist Party USA. “War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush.” 4-20-04. http://www.pww.org/article/view/ 4967/1/207/O)

Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty. Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead. Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind’s ability to solve these problems. Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation. With the end of the Cold War, most of us thought that the threat of nuclear war would fade and with it the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But those hopes were dashed. Rather than easing, the nuclear threat is more palpable in some ways and caches of nuclear weapons are growing. And our own government possesses the biggest stockpiles by far. Much like previous administrations, the Bush administration has continued to develop more powerful nuclear weapons, but with a twist: it insists on its singular right to employ nuclear weapons preemptively in a range of military situations. This is a major departure from earlier U.S. policy – the stated policy of all previous administrations was that nuclear weapons are weapons of last resort to be used only in circumstances in which our nation is under severe attack. Meanwhile, today’s White House bullies demonize, impose sanctions, and make or threaten war on states that are considering developing a nuclear weapons capability. Bush tells us that this policy of arming ourselves while disarming others should cause no anxiety because, he says, his administration desires only peace and has no imperial ambitions. Not surprisingly, people greet his rhetorical assurances skeptically, especially as it becomes more and more obvious that his administration’s political objective is not world peace, but world domination, cunningly couched in the language of “fighting terrorism.” It is well that millions of peace-minded people distrust Bush’s rhetoric. The hyper-aggressive gang in the Oval Office and Pentagon and the absolutely lethal nature of modern weapons of mass destruction make for a highly unstable and explosive situation that could cascade out of control. War has a logic of its own. But skepticism alone is not enough. It has to be combined with a sustained mobilization of the world community – the other superpower in this unipolar world – if the hand of the warmakers in the White House and Pentagon is to be stayed. A heavy responsibility rests on the American people. For we have the opportunity to defeat Bush and his counterparts in Congress in the November elections. Such a defeat will be a body blow to the policies of preemption, regime change, and saber rattling, and a people’s mandate for peace, disarmament, cooperation, and mutual security. The world will become a safer place. In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war. This doesn’t mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king. Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle within and between classes and social movements at the national and international level.

### Warming

**Capitalism is the root cause of global warming. The effects of warming will be devastating poverty and further oppression of women.**

**Angus, 07** (Ian, Professor of Humanities at Simon Fraser University, “Savage Capitalism—the Ecosocialist Alternative (Summary),” Climate and Capitalism, August 27, http://climateandcapitalism.com/?p=175)

Global warming is already underway. The real issue is whether and how we can manage and minimize its impact. If capitalism continues, the impact of global warming will be similar to the impact of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans, where the poor were the main victims and the rich used the catastrophe to improve their own situation. Capitalism always rations resources in short supply towards the rich. Its weapons are military repression and the market – both are brutal killers. Environmental crisis will make security, health, food, water and adequate housing in extremely short supply – and the poor will go the wall unless they fight back. That’s why we shall see increasingly that class struggles in the third world and beyond will take the form of struggles to get and to defend basic resources like food, food and housing. Privatisation will be deepened to make all resources difficult to obtain by the poor – and always available to the rich. For the rich, everything is cheap.” “… it will be particularly women and children who pay the price. Children because they are more vulnerable to disease, and less able to defend themselves from violence; and women because they have the main responsibility for childcare and child raising in nearly all poor societies – urban and rural, third world and first world. In the third world, it will be overwhelmingly women who have to try to find water, firewood and food for families. Climate catastrophe is not only a class question, it is also a gender question.” “A world of environmental catastrophe opens up the danger of massively increased militarism, repression and war. Ecological collapse may be survived by the rich minority, but it will devastate the poor. The fight against it is a vital part of the class struggle for socialism.”

**Even if the aff decreases emissions, structural barriers ensure capitalism is incapable of dealing with climate change**

**Foster 11** (John Bellamy; professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review; 8/27/11; ‘Capitalism cannot respond to climate change’; http://climateandcapitalism.com/2011/08/27/john-bellamy-foster-capitalism-cannot-respond-to-climate-change/)//RSW

**What will be some of the effects of the ongoing global financial crisis and the global bank bailouts on capitalism’s response to the climate change crisis?**

What we know as the global financial crisis has turned now into a global stagnation that is affecting the economies of the triad (the United States, Europe and Japan) and much of the rest of the world — with China as the main question mark. Under these circumstances, the system is unlikely to respond to climate change at all. As in every economic crisis, there will be a tendency toward increased environmental deregulation, not environmental regulation. The only good news from an environmental standpoint is that the slowdown in economic growth diminishes the rate of impact on the environment. Nevertheless, to the extent that public attention is diverted from climate change as an issue, necessary actions are not taken while the overall problem gets worse. The truth is that the capitalist system is unable to respond to climate change: either in periods of prosperity or stagnation, and in the latter case everything but the latest stock quotes and profit figures recede into the background.

**Do you anticipate a deepening of the main contradictions in the system over the next 12 months?**

Yes, in terms of the economy that much is now clear. Production and employment are now headed down again, long before a full recovery from the Great Recession. We are basically at zero growth and slowing, with growing fears of a deep plummet. The underlying problem (of which financialisation is only a symptom) is the overaccumulation of capital, reflected in the inability to absorb the potential surplus generated in production. This contradiction now exists on a global level. Matters are being made worse by neoliberal cutbacks in government spending in Europe and the United States, eliminating the one potential source of stimulus for the economy at present, and even turning it into a negative factor. Recognition that we are now in a period of long-term economic stagnation is now widespread, even within mainstream economics, which has long avoided the issue. Nouriel Roubini at New York University said recently: “Karl Marx had it right. At some point capitalism can self-destroy itself. That’s because you cannot keep on shifting income from labor to capital without not having an excess capacity and a lack of aggregate demand. “We thought that markets work. They are not working. What’s individually rational … is a self destructive process.” Roubini is clearly beginning to grasp some of the deeper contradictions, until recently only perceived by Marxists and a few radical Keynesians. When you look beyond the economy to other factors, matters are even worse. The United States with and without NATO is involved in one war after another in the Middle East and North Africa, in what is seen as an attempt to “stabilise” access to strategic resources and secure key geopolitical regions for capitalism. In Libya, incidentally, the issue is not only oil, but also the world’s largest fossil underground aquifer system, which Libya had started exploiting in the south-east part of the country, in what is perhaps the world’s largest irrigation project. The way in which this aquifer is utilised will be crucial importance to Africa’s future. It will now fall under the control of private French water companies. We are in a period of growing imperial wars aimed at strategic resources and the geopolitical bases for leveraging economic power. Here economic and ecological issues converge. Environmentally, the entire planet is threatened on an ever increasing scale, while planetary systems have proven themselves to be vulnerable in ways that we previously failed to appreciate. At one time, we could afford to ignore what humanity could do to the Earth in a mere 12 months. Those days are now gone. Changes that previously defined geological history are now occurring on the level of decades. The further we go down the path of “business as usual” the greater the social and ecological revolution we will need to pull the planet out of this impending disaster.

**What are the main climate change costs in the US governments deficit reduction drive?**

The deficit reduction drive will pull the economy down further, at the same time it means that the state cannot be a force for carrying out the kinds of changes that would help the environment. For example, the budget deal reportedly slashed $1.5 billion dollars from Obama’s high speed train project (designed to reduce dependence on cars). Since this was the only really important positive climate change measure that the Obama administration put through the slashing of it is quite symbolic.

**Has consciousness on the climate change emergency in the US retreated or advanced during the recent years of economic crisis?**

It is hard to say anything about consciousness. I haven’t looked at the recent poll numbers, which in any case are only of limited value. Politics, however, has moved to the right in the United States. The Tea Party, which is of course the right-wing of the Republican Party, campaigned heavily on the basis of climate denial, as well as on the basis of deficit-reduction and anti-government policies. In the current campaign for the Republican nomination climate denial is widespread, with Rick Perry, the Governor of Texas, declaring that climate change was a hoax drummed up by a conspiracy of scientists. In terms of the wider population in the United States, I would say that the primary issue in the country is jobs, and climate change is a political non-issue, so that while denialism is considered a political asset on the right, liberals see no percentages in pursuing the matter and are inclined to downplay it, except when directly addressing environmentalist audiences. The Obama administration of course has no policy at all to speak of with respect to climate change and now seldom mentions it at all. More important for Obama is expanding energy sources: oil from deep sea drilling, coal, nuclear, shale oil, etc, as a means of leveraging economic growth, and, more immediately, gaining corporate backing. In other words, the situation in the United States seems to confirm that there is no hope to be found at present anywhere in the system where climate change is concerned.

**Capitalism accelerates global warming – even massive changes in infrastructure cannot fix the problem. Only a massive over-haul of consumption itself can save humanity**

**Li 10** Department of Economics, University of Utah (Minqi,

“The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity”, Science & Society, Vol. 74, Symposium: Capitalism and Crisis in the 21st Century, pp. 290-305, http://www.econ.utah.edu/~mli/Economics%207004/Li\_The%20End%20of%20the%20End%20of%20History.pdf SW)

Climate change is probably the single most important symptom of the global environmental crisis. The global average temperature is now about 0.8 degrees Celsius higher than in pre-industrial times. If the global average temperature rises to two degrees higher than the pre-industrial benchmark, there is likely to be widespread drought and desertification in Africa, Australia, Mediterranean Europe, and western North America. Summer monsoons will likely fail in Northern China. 15-40% of plant and animal species may become extinct. Substantial ocean and land carbon cycle feedbacks may be initiated that could release massive amount of greenhouse gases, taking climate change out of human control (Spratt and Sutton, 2007). If global warming rises to three degrees, then the global sea level could rise by 25 meters, submerging must of the world’s present coastal areas and destroying the Amazon rainforests. If global warming rises to four degrees, much of the world will likely be no longer suitable for human habitation and the world population may eventually fall to less than 10% of the present level (Lovelock, 2009). According to IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) models, an atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide equivalent (a measure of the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere) of 450 ppm (parts per million) is roughly associated with global warming of two degrees. However, James Hansen, one of the world’s leading climate scientists, recently argued that the IPCC models seriously underestimate the long-term “climate sensitivity” (the responsiveness of the earth’s climate to certain amounts of change of greenhouse gases). Hansen estimates that to prevent long-term global warming by more than two degrees, the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide equivalent must be stabilized at less than 350 ppm (Hansen, et al., 2008). Using Hansen’s climate sensitivity, an atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide equivalent of 450 ppm is likely to result in eventual global warming of four degrees. Currently the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide equivalent is at about 380 ppm. A recent scientific paper points out that since 2000, the world’s greenhouse gas emissions have grown far more rapidly than what has been assumed by the IPCC models. After making allowances for nonScarbon dioxide greenhouse gas emissions and carbon dioxide emissions from deforestation, Anderson and Bows (2008) estimate that to have any chance of stabilizing the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide equivalent at below 450 ppm, the world’s carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels must peak no later than 2015 and then rapidly decline at an annual rate of 6-8%.As discussed earlier, nuclear and renewable energies are subject to many technical and economic limits. In addition, a major problem is that the entire modern economy’s energy, transportation, industrial, and residential infrastructure is built on fossil fuels. It takes many decades to replace a society’s economic infrastructure. Without fundamental transformation of the infrastructure, short-term conservation measures and minor technical changes are unlikely to achieve substantial, sustained reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Consider, for example, a society which each year replaces 5% of its infrastructure. 7Compared to the old infrastructure, the new infrastructure has an emission intensity that is lower by 50% (alternatively stated, economic output per unit of greenhouse gas emissions rises by 100%). This is equivalent to assuming that all of the new power plants plus half of the new transportation infrastructure is completely emission free. With such **heroic assumptions** and assuming there is no economic growth, the economy’s emissions would only fall by **2.5 percent,** far short of the 6-8% annual reduction that according to Anderson and Bows is required for an acceptable outcome of climate stabilization. Now suppose the world economy grows at 3% per year, so that each year the new infrastructure would represent 8% of the old infrastructure (5% replacement +3% growth). Assuming again that the emission intensity of the new infrastructure is 50% lower than that of the old, then the world economy’s average emission intensity (taking into account both the new infrastructure and the not-yet-replaced old infrastructure) would fall by 4%. However, taking into account 3% economic growth, world emissions would fall by only 1%. In reality, since 2000, the world’s carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels have grown at about 3% per year. Thus, to have any hope of preventing major climate catastrophes, the world needs to undertakea massive, coordinated, and planned **transformation of the entire economic infrastructure**. Moreover, to the extent that technical changes by themselves are quite insufficient to achieve the desired conditions of climate stabilization, the world’s total material consumption needs to be adjusted downwards in accordance with the stabilization requirements. For the downward adjustment to take place without undermining the general population’s basic needs, there must be a radical equalization of the world population’s consumption standards. It is completely inconceivable that these goals could be achieved within the historical framework of the existing social system**.**  Instead, they would require a new social system based on social ownership of the means of production (at global, national, and community levels), democratic planning, and global cooperation.

**Even if the aff cuts emissions in half, ecological devastation is still inevitable under capitalism**

**Li 10** (Minqi; Ph.D. of economics at UMass, B.A. in economics at U of Delaware, Associate professor at the Dept. of economics at the University of Utah; Science & Society, Vol. 74, No. 3, July 2010; “The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity”; Pg.290)//RSW

As discussed earlier, nuclear and renewable energies are subject to many technical and economic limits. In addition, a major problem is that the entire modern economy’s energy, transportation, industrial, and residential infrastructure is built on fossil fuels. It takes many decades to replace a society’s economic infrastructure. With-out fundamental transformation of the infrastructure, short-term conservation measures and minor technical changes are unlikely to achieve substantial, sustained reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Consider, for example, a society which each year replaces 5% of its infrastructure. 7 Compared to the old infrastructure, the new infrastructure has an emission intensity that is lower by 50% (alternatively stated, economic output per unit of greenhouse gas emissions rises by 100%). This is equivalent to assuming that all of the new power plants plus half of the new transportation infrastructure is completely emission free. With such heroic assumptions and assuming there is no economic growth, the economy’s emissions would only fall by 2.5%, far short of the 6–8% annual reduction that according to Anderson and Bows is required for an acceptable outcome of climate stabilization. Now suppose the world economy grows at 3% per year, so that each year the new infrastructure would represent 8% of the old infrastructure (5% replacement + 3% growth). Assuming again that the emission intensity of the new infrastructure is 50% lower than that of the old, then the world economy’s average emission intensity (taking into account both the new infrastructure and the not-yet-replaced old infrastructure) would fall by 4%. However, taking into account 3% economic growth, world emissions would fall by only 1%. In reality, since 2000, the world’s carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels have grown at about 3% per year. Thus, to have any hope of preventing major climate catastrophes, the world needs to undertake a massive, coordinated, and planned transformation of the entire economic infrastructure. Moreover, to the extent that technical changes by themselves are quite insufficient to achieve the desired conditions of climate stabilization, the world’s total material consumption needs to be adjusted downwards in accordance with the stabilization requirements. For the downward adjustment to take place without undermining the general population’s basic needs, there must be a radical equalization of the world population’s consumption standards. It is completely inconceivable that these goals could be achieved within the historical framework of the existing social system. Instead, they would require a new social system based on social ownership of the means of production (at global, national, and community levels), democratic planning, and global cooperation. In the coming decades, the global class struggle will determine how the current structural crisis of world capitalism will eventually be resolved. There are three possible outcomes. First, the crisis will end with another successful restructuring of the capitalist system. The global economy will continue to be dominated by production for profit and the endless accumulation of capital. In that event, global ecological catastrophes will be in-evitable and humanity will in effect have committed its own collective suicide. Second, the global class struggle will lead to the overthrow of the capitalist world system. But humanity will nevertheless fail to construct an ecologically and socially viable new social system. Human civilization will then sink into permanent chaos and barbarism. Third, the global class struggle will pave the way for the rise of a new global system based on ecological sustainability and production for the general population’s basic needs, characterized by a high level of economic, social, and political democracy. To paraphrase Marx (1978), we will make our own history. But we will not make it just as we please; we will not make it under circumstances chosen by ourselves, but under circumstances directly found, given, and transmitted from the capitalist past.

### Ethics

**The commoditization and production mentality of capitalism destroys ethics – only an end to capitalism solves**

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

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. 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.

### Slavery/VTL

**Capitalism turns workers into slaves, their very consciousness turned into a means for profit while money takes precedent over the value of human life**

**Marsh 95**, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, PhD from Northwestern University

(James, Critique Action and Liberation, p 277)

Ideally, nature, workers' own bodies, and the world around them, should be the vehicle of their conscious self-expression. In estranging human beings from object and process, capitalism estranges them from their own consciousness. It turns consciousness into a means of individual life or mere physical existence. Rather than living to work the worker works in order to live, to keep body and soul together. That which should be a means becomes an end, and that which should be the end becomes a means. Rather than nature being the environment in which human beings freely, consciously express themselves and realize themselves, nature is turned against them. Consciousness ceases to be an end and becomes a means to the realization of profit. Use value, the capacity of products for fulfilling real human needs, in capitalism becomes subordinate to the product's exchange value, the abstract labor time as measured in money. The consciousness of everyone, even the capitalist, is alienated in the pursuit of profit. Money becomes an all-consuming god devouring everything in its path. In this institutionalized reification in which things become more important than consciousness, what Marx calls the fetishism of commodities arises. Human beings forget that they are the source of value in their wealth and think that it is the source of their value.

**Corporate dominated governments will allow elites to create a neo-feudal system of exploitation.**

**Moore, 96** (Richard K., political scientist, “The Fateful Dance of Capitalism & Democracy,” September-October, *New Dawn*, http://quaylargo.com/rkm/ND/sep96FatefulDance.shtml, Accessed 07-14-08)

The fact is that the modern nation state is the most effective democratic institution mankind has been able to come up with since outgrowing the small-scale city-state. With all its defects and corruptions, this gift from the Enlightenment -the national republic -is the only effective channel the people have to power-sharing with the elites. If the strong nation-state withers away, we will not -be assured -enter an era of freedom and prosperity, with the "shackles of wasteful governments off our backs". No indeed. If you want to see the future -in which weak nations must deal as-best-they-can with mega-corporations -then look at the Third World. The last thing you see in Third-World countries is freedom and prosperity. What you in fact see are governments which increasingly specialize in two functions: suppressing the population, on the one hand, while on the other hand they negotiate with the international financial community and corporate investors. When all nations have been whittled down and made weak, then the world will have become essentially a patchwork of plantation-states. We'll have a neo-feudal system where the corporate elite act as a kind of global royalty, extracting tribute from all the little competing nation-fiefdoms. There is a brief window of opportunity -while modern democracies continue to survive -in which the people can wake up and peacefully seize control of their governments. After those governments have been devolved/downsized, it will be too late. And with modern weaponry under the command of the elite, there will be no possibility of the people arising anew in revolution. If the people in any of the little fiefdoms try it, they'll be dealt with as Iraq has been in the Gulf War and its aftermath. It won't be nice to mess with Earth Inc! Preservation of strong national sovereignty in the modern democracies is the rock-bottom foundation needed by the people -without it democracy will without doubt disappear from the world.

### Democracy

**Capitalism means that the needs of private enterprise will be positioned above the people—making democracy increasingly impossible.**

**Kovel 02** (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, p. 74-76)

Global capitalism exists along a continuum extending from the good grey Alan Greenspan and his Federal Reserve Bank to the most vicious Russian mobster and Colombian drug lord. All are mandated by the great force field and under its spell. In a recent stunning article, the French commentator Christian de Brie describes ‘a coherent system closely linked to the expansion of modern capitalism and based on an association of three partners: governments, transnational corporations and mafias ... . [in which] financial crime is first and foremost a market, thriving and struc­tured, ruled by supply and demand’. Each partner needs the other, even if the need must be vigorously denied. In short, an honest look at the system takes us light years from the glowing promises of neoliberalism. Contrary to the official imagery, the actual corporate culture breeds a swarm of pathogens: restrictive practices, cartels, abuse of dominant position, dumping, forced sales, insider dealing and speculation, takeovers and dismembering of com­petitors, fraudulent balance sheets, rigging of accounts and transfer prices, the use of offshore subsidiaries and shell companies to avoid and evade tax, embezzlement of public funds, bogus contracts, corruption and back­handers, unjust enrichment and abuse of corporate assets, surveillance and spying, blackmail and betrayal, disregard for regulations on employment rights and trade union freedoms, health and safety, social security, pollution and the environment. Not to mention what goes on in the world’s growing number of free zones, including those in Europe and in France, where the ordinary rule of law does not apply, especially in social, tax and financial matters. An incredible plunder, the full extent of which will never be known’ arises, conditioned on one side by state connivance, and on the other by seepage into the underworld. Throughout the planet, but especially in the South, ‘workers have to contend with thugs hired by the bosses, blackleg trade unions, strike-breakers, private police and death squads’. There is a hidden synergy, in sum, between the shady practices of corporate capital and the organized criminality of gangsterdom: banks and big business are keen to get their hands on the proceeds —laundered — of organised crime. Apart from the traditional activities of drugs, racketeering, kidnappings, gambling, procuring (women and children), smug­gling (alcohol, tobacco, medicines), armed robbery, counterfeiting and bogus invoicing, tax evasion and misappropriation of public funds, new markets are also flourishing. These include smuggling illegal labour and refugees, com­puter piracy, trafficking in works of art and antiquities, in stolen cars and parts, in protected species and human organs, forgery trafficking in arms toxic waste and nuclear products, etc. Occasionally a sign of this appears in some scandal over campaign contribu­tions, in the washing ashore of illegal immigrants from China, or of a submarine purchased by the Russian mafia from disaffected naval officers. There will never be a complete reckoning of the iceberg beneath this tip, although its magnitude can be estimated as an annual ‘gross criminal product’ of one trillion dollars.30 Setting aside the moral implications, the presence of this vast shadowland signifies capitalism’s fundamental uncontrollability, and therefore its inability to overcome its crises of ecology and democracy. From this standpoint, the ecological crisis is the effect of globalization viewed from the standpoint of ecosystems, as great waves of capital batter against and erode ecological defences. Similarly, democracy, and not government, is the great victim of globalization. As global capital works its way, the popular will is increasingly disregarded in the effort to squeeze ever more capital out of the system. In the process, the instruments of global capital begin to take on political functions, breaking down local jurisdictions and constituting themselves as a kind of world governing body. But the regime lacks what normal states, even despotic ones, require, namely, some means of legitimation. In the post-aristocratic, post-theocratic world of modernity, democratic advances, even the pseudo-democracy that passes for normal these days, are the necessary glue that holds societies together. Capital’s inability to furnish this as it moves toward its realization in the global society has made its operation increasingly look like a global coup d’etat. This is the great political contradiction of our time, and drives the present surge of resistance.

**Capitalism enables elites to dominate politics—it does not foster real democracy.**

**Reich, 07** (Robert B., former Harvard University professor, “How capitalism is killing democracy,” *Foreign Policy*, September-October, accessed online using General OneFile, 07-17-08)

It was supposed to be a match made in heaven. Capitalism and democracy, we've long been told, are the twin ideological pillars capable of bringing unprecedented prosperity and freedom to the world. In recent decades, the duo has shared a common ascent. By almost any measure, global capitalism is triumphant. Most nations around the world are today part of a single, integrated, and turbocharged global market. Democracy has enjoyed a similar renaissance. Three decades ago, a third of the world's nations held free elections; today, nearly two thirds do. Conventional wisdom holds that where either capitalism or democracy flourishes, the other must soon follow. Yet today, their fortunes are beginning to diverge. Capitalism, long sold as the yin to democracy's yang, is thriving, while democracy is struggling to keep up. China, poised to become the world's third largest capitalist nation this year after the United States and Japan, has embraced market freedom, but not political freedom. Many economically successful nations--from Russia to Mexico--are democracies in name only. They are encumbered by the same problems that have hobbled American democracy in recent years, allowing corporations and elites buoyed by runaway economic success to undermine the government's capacity to respond to citizens' concerns. Of course, democracy means much more than the process of free and fair elections. It is a system for accomplishing what can only be achieved by citizens joining together to further the common good. But though free markets have brought unprecedented prosperity to many, they have been accompanied by widening inequalities of income and wealth, heightened job insecurity, and environmental hazards such as global warming.

**Capitalism encourages rule by economic elites, not democracy.**

**Reich, 07** (Robert B., former Harvard University professor, “How capitalism is killing democracy,” *Foreign Policy*, September-October, accessed online using General OneFile, 07-17-08)

Why has capitalism succeeded while democracy has steadily weakened? Democracy has become enfeebled largely because companies, in intensifying competition for global consumers and investors, have invested ever greater sums in lobbying, public relations, and even bribes and kickbacks, seeking laws that give them a competitive advantage over their rivals. The result is an arms race for political influence that is drowning out the voices of average citizens. In the United States, for example, the fights that preoccupy Congress, those that consume weeks or months of congressional staff time, are typically contests between competing companies or industries. While corporations are increasingly writing their own rules, they are also being entrusted with a kind of social responsibility or morality. Politicians praise companies for acting "responsibly" or condemn them for not doing so. Yet the purpose of capitalism is to get great deals for consumers and investors. Corporate executives are not authorized by anyone--least of all by their investors--to balance profits against the public good. Nor do they have any expertise in making such moral calculations. Democracy is supposed to represent the public in drawing such lines. And the message that companies are moral beings with social responsibilities diverts public attention from the task of establishing such laws and rules in the first place. It is much the same with what passes for corporate charity. Under today's intensely competitive form of global capitalism, companies donate money to good causes only to the extent the donation has public-relations value, thereby boosting the bottom line. But shareholders do not invest in firms expecting the money to be used for charitable purposes. They invest to earn high returns. Shareholders who wish to be charitable would, presumably, make donations to charities of their own choosing in amounts they decide for themselves. The larger danger is that these conspicuous displays of corporate beneficence hoodwink the public into believing corporations have charitable impulses that can be relied on in a pinch. By pretending that the economic success corporations enjoy saddles them with particular social duties only serves to distract the public from democracy's responsibility to set the rules of the game and thereby protect the common good. The only way for the citizens in us to trump the consumers in us is through laws and rules that make our purchases and investments social choices as well as personal ones. A change in labor laws making it easier for employees to organize and negotiate better terms, for example, might increase the price of products and services. My inner consumer won't like that very much, but the citizen in me might think it a fair price to pay. A small transfer tax on sales of stock, to slow the movement of capital ever so slightly, might give communities a bit more time to adapt to changing circumstances. The return on my retirement fund might go down by a small fraction, but the citizen in me thinks it worth the price. Extended unemployment insurance combined with wage insurance and job training could ease the pain for workers caught in the downdrafts of globalization. Let us be clear: The purpose of democracy is to accomplish ends we cannot achieve as individuals. But democracy cannot fulfill this role when companies use politics to advance or maintain their competitive standing, or when they appear to take on social responsibilities that they have no real capacity or authority to fulfill. That leaves societies unable to address the tradeoffs between economic growth and social problems such as job insecurity, widening inequality, and climate change. As a result, consumer and investor interests almost invariably trump common concerns.

**Capitalism makes real democracy impossible. Economic elites are given greater freedom to exploit the rest of the population.**

**CRAWFORD 04** (Gordon – The European Union and Democracy Promotion in Africa: The Case of Ghana) February 04

<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/polis/research/pdf/wp10crawford.pdf>

The third explanation again questions the motives and intent of EU democracy promotion, but points to the perceived interrelationship between economic and political liberalization. This argument suggests that multilateral and bilateral development agencies, as the arms of Western governments extending into developing countries, are less interested in democracy and good governance in Africa as an end in itself, but more as a means to ongoing economic liberalization and the continued dominance of neoliberalism (Abrahamsen 2001, Barya 1993). It is claimed that Western governments are promoting a limited form of democracy that is not only compatible with economic liberalization, but constitutes the political dimension of the neo-liberal development model. The continued hegemony of neo-liberalism in its hold over development policy is generally acknowledged, including within such initiatives as NEPAD (Owusu 2003). Over the past two decades most attention has been placed on the economic aspects of neo-liberalism, notably structural adjustment programmes. But critics remind us that neoliberalism is both an economic and political theory. Ronaldo Munck (1994: 35, in Sklair), notes that, “The neo-liberal conception of freedom virtually equates political democracy and the ‘free’ market”, while Adrian Leftwich (1994: 368) comments that “neo-liberalism is not only an economic theory but a political one as well”. The accuracy of such statements is confirmed by looking at the work of Milton Friedmann, the guru of contemporary neo-liberalism, who wrote in *Capitalism and Freedom* that: “Historical evidence speaks with a single voice on the relation between political freedom and a free market. I know of no example in time or place of a society that has been marked by a large measure of political freedom, and that has not also used something comparable to a free market to organize the bulk of economic activity” (Friedmann 1962: 9). Similarly, in declaring the ‘end of history’, Francis Fukuyama (1992: 125) stated that “there is an unquestionable relationship between economic development and liberal democracy, which one can observe simply by looking around the world”. Thus the development model advocated by such (neo ) liberal theorists and, it is claimed, by Western governments emphasizes “democratic politics and a slim, efficient and accountable public bureaucracy [as] not simply desirable but *necessary* for a thriving free market economy, and vice versa” (Leftwich 1994: 368-69). Thus, this form of democracy is less interested in strengthening popular control over public decision-making and removing an elite monopoly (Beetham et al. 2002: 13), but is more oriented to challenging the power of the state, with democratic politics perceived as a means to: a) limit state power and its sphere of decision-making, including its ability to intervene in the economy and regulate capital; and b) bring residual state power under formal democratic control, through elections for instance, as a safeguard against any tendencies towards the arbitrary exercise of that power. The democratic state is conceived as having a very limited role, in which the economic sphere, comprising the market, private property and macroeconomic policy, is “insulated from control by the *demos*” (Pierson 1993: 179).23 It is a conception of liberal democracy where the tension and struggle between its liberal and democratic components, to limit or extend the spheres of democratic control (Beetham 1993: 56-8), has been emphatically won by the former.

**The global spread of capital takes power from the hands of people and gives it to corporations – this is counter to real democracy**

**Heron, 08** (Taitu, “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, January, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 85-101, Springerlink SW)

Ideologically, the forces of globalization, seek to reshape the world in accordance with a new global imaginary that serves the interests of some far better than most. A triumphant account of globalization sees it as the imminent unification of the world when in reality it is their vision of the world as their market (Pérez Lara 1999). The ideologues of globalization, may promise plenty for all, but the actual forecast of what globalization spells for the future could be seen as pessimistic, depending on your location. Box 2 demonstrates, however, that poverty and inequality continues to be a feature of global capitalism and its manifestations have been arguably more acute since the onset of contemporary globalization. Economic marginalisation also implies political marginalisation as in the midst of spreading democracy; the most important decisions about human life are progressively removed beyond the reach of electorates. Women and the poor in particular who are often not adequately represented in the upper echelons of political power where the decisions that affect so many are made, will increasingly have less access to these avenues of power and decision-making.

### Genocide

**Capitalism reduces all of humanity to their ability to produce monetary value—making genocide inevitable.**

**Kovel 02** (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, p. 140-141)

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

**Capitalism reduces human beings to mere economic value and therefore enables genocide.**

**Internationalist Perspective, 2000** (“Capitalism and Genocide”, Issue #36, Spring 2000, http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html)

The real domination of capital is characterized by the penetration of the law of value into every segment of social existence. As Georg Lukács put it in his History and Class Consciousness, this means that the commodity ceases to be "one form among many regulating the metabolism of human society," to become its "universal structuring principle." From its original locus at the point of production, in the capitalist factory, which is the hallmark of the formal domination of capital, the law of value has systematically spread its tentacles to incorporate not just the production of commodities, but their circulation and consumption. Moreover, the law of value also penetrates and then comes to preside over the spheres of the political and ideological, including science and technology themselves. This latter occurs not just through the transformation of the fruits of technology and science into commodities, not just through the transformation of technological and scientific research itself (and the institutions in which it takes place) into commodities, but also, and especially, through what Lukács designates as the infiltration of thought itself by the purely technical, the very quantification of rationality, the instrumentalization of reason; and, I would argue, the reduction of all beings (including human beings) to mere objects of manipulation and control. As Lukács could clearly see even in the age of Taylorism, "this rational mechanisation extends right into the worker's `soul'." In short, it affects not only his outward behavior, but her very internal, psychological, makeup. The phenomenon of reification, inherent in the commodity-form, and its tendential penetration into the whole of social existence, which Lukács was one of the first to analyze, is a hallmark of the real domination of capital: "Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a `phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people." Reification, the seeming transformation of social relations into relations between things, has as one of its outcomes what the German-Jewish thinker H.G.Adler designated as "the administered man" [Der verwaltete Mensch]. For Adler, when human beings are administered, they are treated as things, thereby clearing the way for their removal or elimination by genocide. The outcome of such a process can be seen in the bureaucractic administration of the Final Solution, in which the organization of genocide was the responsibility of desk killers like Adolf Eichmann who could zealously administer a system of mass murder while displaying no particular hatred for his victims, no great ideological passion for his project, and no sense that those who went to the gas chambers were human beings and not things. The features of the desk killer, in the person of Eichmann, have been clearly delineated by Hannah Arendt. He is the high-level functionary in a vast bureaucratic organization who does his killing from behind a desk, from which he rationally plans and organizes mass murder; treating it as simply a technical task, no different than the problem of transporting scrap metal. The desk killer is the quintessential bureaucrat functioning according to the imperatives of the death-world. As a human type, the desk killer, that embodiment of the triumph of instrumental reason, has become a vital part of the state apparatus of late capitalism.

**Capitalism encourages endless war and violence – Genocides are justified in the name of wealth**

**Jalata 11 -** Professor of Sociology & Global Studies

(Asafa, January 24th 2011, “Terrorism from Above and Below in the Age of

Globalization”, Sociology Mind, Vol 1 No 1 1-15 SW)

We learn from history that political violence has increased as different societies with improved techniques of production have produced surplus wealth, developed their organizational capacity, and attained further technological innovations. In the 16th century, with such economic and technological advancements countries such as England, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands formed the nation-states (Frank, 1978: 51-52). The emergence of the nation-state with the development of capitalism in Europe created the organizational and technological capacity to engage in more lethal violence and war. In the 16th century, capitalism had “witnessed the first long, sustained, and widespread quantitative and qualitative development . . . in its mercantile stage and the first period of concentrated capital accumulation in Europe” (Frank, 1978: 52). As competition increased among individuals, groups, and states overscarce and valued resources, political violence, terrorism, and war increased. As capitalism developed in Western Europe, the need for raw materials, minerals such as gold and silver, markets, and free or cheap labor expanded due to the desire to minimize the cost of production and to increase the accumulation of capital or wealth. “The treasures captured outside of Europe by undisguised looting, enslavement, and murder,” Karl Marx (1967: 753-754) writes, “floated back to the mother-country and were there turned to capital.” Most liberal and leftist scholars have failed to identify and explain the role of state-sponsored or state terrorism that colonial officials, European companies, and expeditionary forces used during the expansion of the racialized capitalist world system to transfer the economic resources of the indigenous peoples to European colonial forces or settlers and their collaborators. The development of the nation-state and the capitalist world system occurred through war making, violence and organized crime (Tilly, 1985: 170). We cannot clearly understand the essence and meaning of global terrorism without comprehending the essence and characteristics of state terrorism since states were born and consolidated through violence. Under the guises of “free markets,” “civilization,” and Chris- tianity, forces of European states or state-sponsored companies committed acts of terrorism and genocide that were, more or less, ignored. In fact, the issue of terrorism only started to be addressed when, after World War I, colonized peoples in Africa and Asia began their liberation struggles against European colonial states. The terrorist attack on the life and liberty of American indigenous peoples by European colonial powers and their collaborators destroyed existing institutions and economies and exposed the conquered peoples to poverty and fa- mine-induced “holocausts” (Davis, 2001). Discussing how the cultural destruction of indigenous peoples resulted in massive deaths, Karl Polanyi (1944: 159-160) argues, “The catastrophe of the native community is a direct result of the rapid and violent disruption of the basic institutions of the victim. These institutions are disrupted by the very fact that a market economy is foisted upon an entirely differently organized community; labor and land are made into a commodity, which, again, is only a short formula for the liquidation of every ... cultural institution in an organic society.” The capitalist world economy that in the 19th century was permanently eliminating famine from Western Europe was simultaneously accelerating famine and famine-induced deaths in the rest of the world: “Millions died, not outside the „modern world system,‟ but in the very process of being forcibly incorporated into its economic and political structures. They died in the golden age of Liberal Capitalism; indeed, many were murdered by the theological application of the sacred principles of [Adam] Smith” (Davis, 2001: 9). Today, mainstream Euro-American scholars gloss over such crimes and refer to them as actions of “discovery” and “civilization.” State terrorism, genocide, and the destruction of indigenous institutions and the devastating consequences of famine have been closely interconnected in the global capitalist world system. In addition, the international community rarely holds accountable its members that engage in state terrorism and genocide. Kurt Jonassohn (1998: 24) recently noted that terrorist state leaders in developing countries “not only go unpunished, they are even rewarded. On the international scene they are accorded all the respect and courtesies due to government officials. They are treated in accordance with diplomatic protocol in negotiations and are treated in the General Assembly of the United Nations. When they are finally ousted from their offices, they are offered asylum by countries that lack respect for international law, but have a great deal of respect for the ill-gotten wealth that such perpetrators bring with them.” Despite the fact that some government elites claim that the state provides protection from domestic and external violence, “governments organize and, wherever possible, monopolize the concentrated means of violence. The distinction between „legitimate‟ and „illegitimate‟ force makes no difference” (Tilly, 1985: 171). Political violence has always been involved in producing and maintaining structures, institutions, and organi- zations of privileged hierarchy and domination in society. Those who have state power, which incorporates the power to define terrorism, deny their involvement in political violence or terrorism and confuse abstract theories about the state with reality. Based on an idealized relationship between the state and society, philosophers and thinkers such as Hobbes, Hegel, Rousseau, and Plato have identified three functions of the state that would earn it legitimacy. According to state theories, the state protects and maintains internal peace and order in society; it organizes and protects national economic activities; it de- fends national sovereignty and national interests (Bushnell, et al., 1991: 6). In reality, most states violate most of these theo- retical principles by engaging in political repression and state terrorism in order to defend the interests of a few powerful elites. Furthermore, the revolutionary theories of the state by Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin (1971) remain a dream because states failed to introduce revolutionary social transformations that would eliminate oppression, repression, state terrorism, and the exploitation of people (Maguire, 1978). The occurrence of political repression, oppression, state terrorism, and dictatorship in the former Soviet Union, China and other former revolutionary countries demonstrate that the state has remained the site of violence despite its legitimating discourse. As Charles Tilly (985: 18-19) puts it, political violence is closely related to the art of statecraft, and most of the time, “the state, like an unchained beast, ferociously [attacks] those who claim to be its master, its own citizens” (Tilly, 1985: 7). Annamarie Oliverio (1998) criticizes scholars who produce definitions of terrorism on behalf of the state and promote outmoded concepts, analyses, and theories in state bureaucracy, the media, and in academia. The motivations of those who hold state power and engage in state terrorism are to maintain the global economy, structures of politics, and hierarchies of cultures and peoples in order to extract economic resources. The main objective of those who engage in non-state terrorism is mainly to politically respond to economic, political, and cultural inequalities. One common denominator of the theories of non-state terrorism is that it is mainly caused by grievances of one kind or another. These grievances involve national/religious/cultural oppression, eco- nomic exploitation, political repression, massive human rights violations, attacks on life and liberty, state terrorism, and various forms of social injustices. Yet, whilst it is acknowledged that revolutions, social movements, and non-state terrorism generally involve grievances, all grievances do not result in revolutionary or social movements, nor do they all cause subversive terrorism. There must therefore be some intervening structural, conjunctural, and behavioral factors particularly that act to transform some grievances into non-state terrorism through some agencies of the aggrieved population. The combination of factors such as collective grievances, the continued oppressive and exploitative policies of state elites, the refusal of state actors to address longstanding grievances peacefully and fairly, the development of extreme ideologies in the form of religion or another ideology, and the emergence of leaders, ideologues, and cadres in aggrieved populations can facilitate the emergence of subversive terrorism. We cannot adequately grasp the essence and characteristics of modern terrorism without understanding the larger cultural, social, economic, and political contexts in which it takes place**.** Since terrorism has been conceptualized, defined, and theorized by those who have contradictory interests and objectives and since the subject matter of terrorism is complex and elusive, there currently is a wide gap in establishing a common understanding of terrorism among scholars of terrorism studies. Most experts on the subject look at this issue from a narrow perspective by ignoring what I argue to be the reality: that terrorism is a social cancer for all human groups affected by it.

### Atrocities

**The capitialist state blurs the lines between war and business making human rights atrocities inevitable**

**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. Why should we be surprised, then, that although Boot has called himself a "hard Wilsonian," the Prometheans as a whole would undo the entire legacy of internationalism from Woodrow Wilson onward? Why should we be surprised that many members of the administration actually belong to the Federalist Society, which has a rabid antipathy to international law? (Garbus 2003; Raskin 2003). Those who wrote the torture memos, John Yoo, Viet Dinh, Jay Bybee, Attorney General John Ashcroft, Michael Chertoff, and several other lawyers appointed to senior positions in the Bush Administration at Defense, Justice, and the White House are intimately associated with it. In that context, Abu Ghraib cannot be regarded as tangential or aberrant. Instead, it appears completely symptomatic of both ideology and organization at the highest levels. Abu Ghraib reveals that behind the rhetoric of the liberation of people lies the reality of the disciplining of populations—mass detentions, evacuations of cities, torture, and terror bombing. The military and civilian leadership are fully aware of this. If they rewrite and minimize the significance of Abu Ghraib, it is precisely to deflect attention from the confluence of developments in both government and military that have given rise to it, not by chance but deliberately. A state that strives for omniscience, a state that seeks and creates gaps or provocations to justify its own limitless expansion, an ideology of a civilizing mission in a barbaric country, a culture of secrecy, the usurpation of total power by a handful contemptuous of existing laws, a theory of defense built on terror, a relentless rationality set apart from the flesh—how could torture not be the logical outcome?

**Capitalism has inherent tendencies towards militarism and war, only anti-capitalist movements can solve.**

**Webb, 04** (Sam Webb, National Chairman, Communist Party USA. “War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush.” 4-20-04. http://www.pww.org/article/view/ 4967/1/207/O/)

In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war. This doesn’t mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king. Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle within and between classes and social movements at the national and international level. In the 20th century, the world community escaped a nuclear Armageddon, but will we be so lucky in this century? No one knows for sure. What will improve our chances immeasurably is the skill with which socialist and left forces link the immediate struggles for peace in the election arena and elsewhere with the longer-term task of transcending capitalism and constructing a socialist society, in which the drive to accumulate capital and maximize profits and, in turn, the tendency to aggression, militarism and war, is completely absent.

### Resource War

**Growth inevitably causes global resource wars.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability”, pg. 162)

Peaceful world order in which all can feel secure is totally impossible if there is a determination to pursue affluence and growth. Everyone wants peace and security, but what the peace movement has almost entirely overlooked is the fact that if everyone continues to pursue higher material living standards and GNP then in the long run there can be no other outcome than more and more conflict of various kinds. This is simply because there is no possibility of people living as affluently as the few in rich countries do now, let alone living at the levels we insist on growing to as the years go by. There is a gigantic struggle going on over the distribution of resources, and this can only become more intense in future years. Following are some of the types of conflict and violence that inevitably result. First there is the vicious class conflict that occurs when desperate peasants finally try to hit back at their exploiters and are met with state violence. About 3 per cent of Third World people own about 80 per cent of Third World land. They leave much of it idle, and grow crops like carnations for American supermarkets on the rest. Cattle are air freighted into Haiti, fattened up and air-freighted out to hamburger outlets, while the infant death rate in Haiti is over twenty times the rate in the rich countries. When people eventually rebel against conditions like this they usually encounter brutal repression from state forces operating on behalf of tiny, wealthy and powerful ruling elites.

**Famine is the result of capitalist agriculture—the elite can buy exotic foods year round while poor farmers starve.**

**Meszaros 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, 1995, Beyond Capital, p. 175-176. Section—Second)

In the same way, on another plane, the advancement of the powers of agricultural production did not bring with it the eradication of famine and malnutrition. For doing so would, again, contradict the imperative of 'rational' capital expansion. 'Sentimental' considerations concerning the health — and even the mere survival — of human beings cannot possibly be allowed to disturb or disrupt the 'market-oriented' system's 'hard-headed decision making pro­cesses'. The spontaneous rhythm and recalcitrance of nature are no longer credible excuses for justifying the living conditions of countless millions who had to perish in misery in the last few decades, and so continue to perish today. The priorities that must be pursued, in the interest of capital-expansion and accumulation are fatefully biased against those who are condemned to famine and malnutrition, mostly in the 'Third World' countries. But it is by no means simply the case that the rest of the world population has nothing to fear in this regard in the future. The productive and distributive practices of the capital system in the field of agriculture — from the irresponsible but highly profitable use of chemicals which accumulate as poisonous residues in the soil to the destruction of water tables, and to large scale interference with global weather cycles in vital regions of the planet, by exploiting and destroying the resources of rain forests, etc. — do not promise much good to come for anybody. Thanks to science and technology in their alienated subservience to profitable global marketing strategies, in our times exotic fruits are made available all year round for those, that is, who can afford to buy them, and not for those who produce them under the rule of a handful of transnational corporations. But all this happens against the background of the highly irresponsible productive practices we all watch powerless. The costs involved are nothing short of endangering — in the interest of short-sighted profit maximization only — tomorrow's potato harvests and rice crops for all. Besides, already today the 'advanced productive practices' pursued endanger even the meagre staple food of those who are compelled to labour for 'exportable cash crops', and have to go hungry for the sake of maintaining the health of a crippling 'globalized' economy.

### Terror

**Terrorism is inevitable in a capitalist world.**

**Foster and Clark ’04** (Foster, John Bellamy and Clark, Brett 12/04 Monthly Review: Empire Of Barbarism)

As Business Week declared "A new age of barbarism is upon us." But it is a mistake to attribute such barbarism simply or in the main to social forces and nations in the periphery. Just as Marx came to invert the historical treatment of barbarism as he condemned the colonial systems of his day, we need to recognize the barbarism of the strong and their culpability in creating this new age. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, the voice of the new barbarism, recently stated: "At some point the Iraqis will get tired of getting killed" (USA Today, September 16, 2004). Presumably he was referring to Iraqis killed by suicide bombers. Nevertheless, his statement remains inhuman in its implications in the context of the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq. Once declared there is no end to "The Global War on Terror," which ought to be called the Global War of Terror. Only the transcendence of capitalism, in the direction of socialism, offers the possibility to escape from the current state of barbarism that is paving the way to new global holocausts and a worsening ecological collapse. Daniel Singer wrote at the end of his Whose Millennium? "Socialism may be a historical possibility, or even necessary to eliminate the evils of capitalism, but this does not mean that it will inevitably take its place." We should heed his warning. The choice that we confront and that we will ultimately decide through our struggles is whether "socialism" or "the ruins of imperialistic barbarism" is to be the future of humankind.

**Capitalism breeds the extreme poverty and inequality that is the root cause of terrorism.**

**Slater, 06** (Philip, A.B. and Ph. D. from Harvard and taught sociology at Harvard, Brandeis, and UCSC, “The Root Causes of Terrorism and Why No One Wants to End Them”, October 25th, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/philip-slater/the-root-causes-of-terror\_b\_32466.html)

The people who do most to foment terrorism are not the fundamentalist imams and ayatollahs, who only exploit the hopelessness around them. The people who do the most are those who create that hopelessness in the first place--the oil monarchies, for example. For of all capitalist enterprises, the extractive industries are probably the most deserving of the abuse heaped on them over the years. The possessors of the earth's treasures believe, apparently, that the luck, wealth, or political corruption that allowed them to own land containing such riches is a sign of divine favor, while the poverty of those around them indicates celestial disgust. Terrorists are people who have lost hope--hope for the possibility of peacefully creating a better world. They may be middle-class and educated, as many terrorist leaders are, but their despair is one of empathy for the plight of their people as a whole. The root causes of terrorism are pathological inequalities in wealth--not just in Saudi Arabia but all over the Third World. Even in our own country Republican policies have in recent decades created inequalities so extreme that while a few have literally more money than they can possibly use, the vast majority are struggling to get by. A society that impoverishes most of its population in order to enrich a few neurotically greedy individuals is a sick society. As Jared Diamond has shown, societies in which a few plunder the environment at the expense of the many are headed for collapse. Fundamentalist religions and radical ideologies are the common refuge of people without hope. Christianity has played this role for centuries. The rich encourage the poor to accept the misery of this world as a passport to heaven, despite the fact that according to Jesus they don't have a prayer of getting in themselves. This isn't really surprising. The rich wouldn't be caught dead in a place where they let poor people in. Islamic fundamentalism is the latest drug being offered the poor and desperate. It has the added appeal that you can not only get into heaven but also take vengeance at the same time. Terrorism will never end until caps are placed on inequality.

### Colonialism

**Capitalism is inherently violent and imperialistic. Their refusal to question to system drives the wars they are trying to prevent.**

**Callicinos, 03** (Alex, BA and DPhil from the University of Oxford, and was Professor of Politics at the University of York before being appointed Professor of European Studies at King's College London, “An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto”, p.51-53)

The view, put forward by Third Way ideologues such as Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck, that globalization was transforming the liberal democratic state into 'the state without enemies' now seems simply ludicrous in the light of George W. Bush's proclamation of a global state of war on 20 September 2001: 'Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other that we have ever seen ... Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.v" One of globalization's more vulgar boosters, the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman, proved much more realistic than Beck and Giddens when he declared in a much-quoted passage: The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist. Marxist ring about it; moreover, it implies that American military might serves to maintain capitalist property relations irrespective of where they are located, or of the nationality of the capitalists who benefit from them. Such at any rate is the view expressed by Michael Hardt and Toni Negri in one of the influential texts of the anti-capitalist movement, Empire. For Hardt and Negri, imperialism has been supplanted by Empire, a novel form of capitalist domination that 'establishes no territorial centre of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries and barriers ... In this smooth space of Empire, there is no place of power - it is everywhere and nowhere.v" Conse¬quently, according to Negri, it is no longer possible to talk about 'American imperial¬ism'. Quite simply there exist groups, elites that control the keys of exploitation and thus the keys to the war machine, and who attempt to impose themselves at the world level. Naturally, this process is highly contradictory and will necessarily be so for a long time to come. For the moment, it is above all the North American bosses who exercise this domination. Immediately behind them, there are the Euro¬peans, the Russians, the Chinese: they are there to support them, or to undermine them, or even to be ready to take over a change of leadership - but this change remains superficial since at the basis what is still and always at work is capital, collective capital. 66 Though formulated in Marxist language, Hardt's and Negri's analysis bears a striking resemblance to more mainstream theories of political globalization. According to such theories, the post-Cold War era has seen the emergence of forms of 'global governance' that transcend national interests, even those of the strongest state." Contemporary perceptions of US power indeed seem to oscillate between the frustration and fear expressed at evidence of American 'unilateralism', especially since the younger Bush entered the White House, and the belief that this power is progressively becoming the agent of an imper sonal structure, whether that structure be conceptualized as the emerging forms of 'cosmopolitan democracy' or as the global domination of 'collective capital'. The great difficulty for the theorists of global governance is that the world distribution of political and military power both is highly unequal and closely corresponds to the also grossly unequal distribution of economic power. Indeed, neo-liberal ideologues are increasingly willing openly to acknowledge the necessity of a unilateral assertion of Western power vis-a-vis the rest of the world, in other words, of imperialism.

**Capitalism drives militaristic imperialism.**

**Foster ‘05** (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon in Eugene, September, http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm).

Even as a massive antiglobalization movement was emerging, notably with the protests in Seattle in November 1999, the U.S. establishment was moving energetically toward an imperialism for the twenty-first century; one that would promote neoliberal globalization, while resting on U.S. world dominance. “The hidden hand of the market,” Thomas Friedman, the Pulitzer-prize-winning foreign policy columnist for the *New York Times*, opined, “will never work without a hidden fist—McDonald’s cannot flourish without a McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley’s technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps” (*New York Times Magazine*, March 28, 1999). The “hidden fist,” however, was only partly hidden, and was to become even less so in the ensuing years. To be sure, the shift toward a more openly militaristic imperialism occurred only gradually, in stages. For most of the 1990s the U.S. ruling class and national security establishment had waged a debate behind the scenes on what to do now that the Soviet Union’s disappearance had left the United States as the sole superpower. Naturally, there was never any doubt about what was to be the main economic thrust of the global empire ruled over by the United States. The 1990s saw the strengthening of neoliberal globalization: the removal of barriers to capital throughout the world in ways that directly enhanced the power of the rich capitalist countries of the center of the world economy vis-à-vis the poor countries of the periphery. A key development was the introduction of the World Trade Organization to accompany the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as organizations enforcing the monopoly capitalist rules of the game. From the standpoint of most of the world, a more exploitative economic imperialism had raised its ugly head.

**The logic of colonialist sacrifice makes extinction inevitable.**

**Santos, 03** Professor of Sociology at the School of Economics, University of Coimbra (Portugal), Distinguished Legal Scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School, Director of the Center for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra, [Boaventura de Sousa, “Collective Suicide?” *Bad Subjects*, Issue 63, April, http://www.ces.uc.pt/opiniao/bss/072en.php]

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

**Imperialism is rooted in capitalism.**

**Robinson 7** (William I., Professor of Sociology, Global and International Studies, Latin American and Iberian Studies at the University of California-Santa Barbara, “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)

The principal goal Wood sets out to achieve is to ‘bring into relief the speciﬁcity of capitalist imperialism’ in distinction to earlier forms. For Wood, what makes capitalist imperialism speciﬁcally capitalist is ‘the predominance of economic, as distinct from direct “extra-economic” – political, military, judicial – coercion’. By itself, this proposition is logically coherent insofar as market coercion reproduces through its ‘normal’ functioning the class relations of economic exploitation, once primitive accumulation has separated producers from the means of production. The problem is that the ‘normal’ functioning of the market is hardly normal to capitalism. All class relations of exploitation are ultimately backed up by direct coercion and any conception of imperialism cannot dispense with coercion as immanent to the concept itself. Wood is aware of this: ‘Capitalist imperialism even in its most mature form’ – she notes – ‘requires extra-economic support. Extra economic force is clearly essential to the maintenance of economic coercion itself’.

Capitalism is imperialist

Parenti 11 (Michael, PhD in political science from Yale, one of the nations’ leading political analysts, “Imperialism 101”, Michael Parenti political archive, http://www.michaelparenti.org/Imperialism101.html)

Imperialism is older than capitalism. The Persian, Macedonian, Roman, and Mongol empires all existed centuries before the Rothschilds and Rockefellers. Emperors and conquistadors were interested mostly in plunder and tribute, gold and glory. Capitalist imperialism differs from these earlier forms in the way it systematically accumulates capital through the organized exploitation of labor and the penetration of overseas markets. Capitalist imperialism invests in other countries, transforming and dominating their economies, cultures, and political life, integrating their financial and productive structures into an international system of capital accumulation. A central imperative of capitalism is expansion. Investors will not put their money into business ventures unless they can extract more than they invest. Increased earnings come only with a growth in the enterprise. The capitalist ceaselessly searches for ways of making more money in order to make still more money. One must always invest to realize profits, gathering as much strength as possible in the face of competing forces and unpredictable markets. Given its expansionist nature, capitalism has little inclination to stay home. Almost 150 years ago, Marx and Engels described a bourgeoisie that "chases over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. . . . It creates a world after its own image." The expansionists destroy whole societies. Self-sufficient peoples are forcibly transformed into disfranchised wage workers. Indigenous communities and folk cultures are replaced by mass-market, mass-media, consumer societies. Cooperative lands are supplanted by agribusiness factory farms, villages by desolate shanty towns, autonomous regions by centralized autocracies. Consider one of a thousand such instances. A few years ago the Los Angeles Times carried a special report on the rainforests of Borneo in the South Pacific. By their own testimony, the people there lived contented lives. They hunted, fished, and raised food in their jungle orchards and groves. But their entire way of life was ruthlessly wiped out by a few giant companies that destroyed the rainforest in order to harvest the hardwood for quick profits. Their lands were turned into ecological disaster areas and they themselves were transformed into disfranchised shantytown dwellers, forced to work for subsistence wages—when fortunate enough to find employment. North American and European corporations have acquired control of more than three-fourths of the known mineral resources of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But the pursuit of natural resources is not the only reason for capitalist overseas expansion. There is the additional need to cut production costs and maximize profits by investing in countries with cheaper labor markets. U.S. corporate foreign investment grew 84 percent from 1985 to 1990, the most dramatic increase being in cheap-labor countries like South Korea, Taiwan, Spain, and Singapore. Because of low wages, low taxes, nonexistent work benefits, weak labor unions, and nonexistent occupational and environmental protections, U.S. corporate profit rates in the Third World are 50 percent greater than in developed countries. Citibank, one of the largest U.S. firms, earns about 75 percent of its profits from overseas operations. While profit margins at home sometimes have had a sluggish growth, earnings abroad have continued to rise dramatically, fostering the development of what has become known as the multinational or transnational corporation. Today some four hundred transnational companies control about 80 percent of the capital assets of the global free market and are extending their grasp into the ex-communist countries of Eastern Europe. Transnationals have developed a global production line. General Motors has factories that produce cars, trucks and a wide range of auto components in Canada, Brazil, Venezuela, Spain, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Nigeria, Singapore, Philippines, South Africa, South Korea and a dozen other countries. Such "multiple sourcing" enables GM to ride out strikes in one country by stepping up production in another, playing workers of various nations against each other in order to discourage wage and benefit demands and undermine labor union strategies.

### Agency/Freedom

**Capitalism reduces actual freedom and agency**

**Heron, 08** (Taitu, “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, January, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 85-101, Springerlink SW)

Inequality or equality is highly dependent upon the amount of opportunities that are afforded to an individual or group of individuals to improve their lives. Exercising agency therefore, can either contribute to inequality or enhance equality. Where inequality exists, human agency is diminished. Where equality is promoted based the design in social policy, human agency is also enhanced. Reducing inequality and enhancing human agency is entirely dependent on the policy environment and whether or not the state considers its population as central to development, however defined. According to the UN (2005) World Situation Report, Globalization has exacerbated world inequality insofar as the wealthiest 20% of the planet Earth account for 86% of all private consumption while the poorest account for just above 1%. Furthermore, the poorest 20% of the world's population saw their share of world income decline from 2.3% to 1.4% in the past three decades; while that of the richest 20% grew from 70% (Human Development Report 1996, cited in Girvan 2000). Since national policies have been reduced to neoliberal policy reform, social inequality among and between countries have risen. Social inequalities and gaps in income and wealth have reached levels which provoke social unrest. Human agency translates increasingly into human despair as inequality and the ability to do something about it, reduces with each generation. With less and less investment in human capital by the state, individuals have less opportunity and access to contribute to the betterment of their own lives. In short, the human agency is diminished by the reduction of access to and quality of social services. In the Caribbean for instance, reduction in social spending has meant that large segments of the low-income population are excluded from many areas of public welfare. This exclusion increases the likelihood of intergenerational poverty (World Bank 1999). Restrictive fiscal policy environment can make poor families and communities vulnerable in their ability to absorb and recover from market shocks demanded by neoliberal policy reform. The poor, and women in particularly who are most vulnerable to those market shocks, will carry increased burden. Women for instance, will carry the primary burden of providing unpaid care in efforts to sustain the family, where as big corporations will be subsidised by governments through tax breaks and other incentives. Policy environments become increasingly hostile to social development and do not facilitate the average human being's agential capacity. Indeed, it basically reduces human beings to living a life of insecurity and tension, resorting to survivalist strategies. Class relations become more combustible as income disparities and class differences become more pronounced. Increasingly more people may choose to become involved in illicit income generating activities in order to survive. In such instances, the neoliberal policy environment saps human agency. An example from Indonesia and Malaysia demonstrate the opposite: that inequality has been reduced because of government efforts aimed at redistribution and employment generation since 2000 (UN 2005, p. 17). With a reduction in inequality, human agency is enhanced. Nevertheless, in reference to South Asia in particular, Kamal Pasha (1999, pp. 234–250), argues that the major losers of the results of neoliberal policy reform in the developing world, has been small scale producers, state workers, agricultural workers, small farmers, small business entrepreneurs and industrial workers, especially women. In the context of the pervasive trading and financial arrangements brought on by human agency can be diminished at various levels. First, agency is diminished internally, through the relationship with patriarchal nature of political systems, notably the overall economic subordination and inadequate participation of women in decision-making processes at the national level. Second, human agency also diminishes through the interplay between internal and external relations of domination. Internally sapping human agency of women and other marginalised groups enables to a large extent the perpetuation of the inequitable trading and financial arrangements, and subsequently the domination of powerful countries' interests and the perpetuation of aggressive-materialist agency (Randriamaro 2002, p. 10).

**Capitalism’s simplifying of human relations reduces human agency and naturalizes exploitation – the market is seen as the ultimate value**

**Heron, 08** (Taitu, “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, January, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 85-101, Springerlink SW)

The ideological weight of globalization, suggests that market-driven economic policies, and privatizing social services such as education, health, water, electricity and telecommunications, and trade arrangements based on the purchase of cheap raw materials from the third world and opening up third world markets to first world products will allow for social development. Continuing this basic economic relation established with fifteenth century imperialism from imperial power to colony, to date has not proved beneficial for the developing world. Instead what has occurred has been the exacerbation of existing structures of inequality, thereby linking neoliberal policies to new forms of social exclusion. The neoliberal policy package draws its social power from the political and economic power of those whose interests it expresses: stockholders, financial operators, industrialists, conservative politicians and high-level financial officials. Bourdieu (1998, p. 3) similarly emphasizes that neoliberalism “to favour severing the economy from social realities and thereby constructing, in reality, an economic system conforming to its description in pure theory that is a sort of logical machine that presents itself as a chain of constraints regulating economic agents.” Bourdieu carries this role of ideology further by elaborating on it as a form of ‘symbolic violence’ by which he explains as the manner in which those who wield power exert their domination with the tacit consent of the dominated. This particular world order, being promoted as ‘logic’ and ‘natural’ indeed amounts to no more than parochial ‘truths’ being elevated as universal (cited in Rist 2006, pp. 78–79) and negatively affects the functioning of the world capitalist system and the exercise of human agency embedded in the web of social relations within.

**Capitalism restricts individual freedom – freedom is a guise for oppression**

**Harvey 10** (David, Professor at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY) and Director at the Center for Place, Culture, and Politics,

paper prepared for the American Sociological Association Meetings in Atlanta, August 16th, 2010, “The Enigma of Capital and the Crisis this Time”, Google Books)

The central problem to be addressed is clear enough: compound growth for ever is not possible: capital accumulation can no longer be the central force impelling social evolution. The troubles that have beset the world these last thirty years signal that a limit is looming that cannot be transcended. Add to this the fact that so many people in the world live in conditions of abject poverty, that environmental degradations are spiraling out of control, that human dignities are everywhere being offended even as the rich are piling up more and more wealth at the expense of everyone. Meanwhile, in most places the levers of ideological, political, institutional, judicial, military and media power are under tight political control. This serves to perpetuate the political status quo and frustrate opposition even as the economy and living standards deteriorate. “Freedom” then becomes just another word to justify repression. A revolutionary politics that can grasp the nettle of endless compound capital accumulation and eventually shut down the class power that propels it forwards, requires an appropriate theory of social change. Marx’s account of how capitalism arose out of feudalism in fact embodies such a “co-revolutionary theory.”[16](http://davidharvey.org/2010/08/the-enigma-of-capital-and-the-crisis-this-time/#fn-585-16) Social change arises, he argues, through the dialectical unfolding of relations between seven moments within the social body politic: a) technological and organizational forms of production, exchange and consumption b) relations to nature c) social relations between people d) mental conceptions of the world, embracing knowledges and cultural understandings and beliefs e) labor processes and production of specific goods, geographies, services or affects f ) institutional, legal and governmental arrangements g) the conduct of daily life and the activities of social reproduction.

### Patriarchy

**Western feminism enables capitalist domination because 1) they ignore the role of class in gender oppression and 2) hard won economic freedom turns into exploitation.**

**Gordon 96**

(April A. Gordon, Transforming Capitalism and Patriarchy: Gender and Development in Africa. Publisher: Lynne Rienner. Place of Publication: Boulder, CO. Publication Year: 1996.http://www.questia.com/read/96895144# Page Number: pg 80)

One reason liberal feminism in the West fails to address such oppressions as imperialism, classism, and racism is that this would require feminists to acknowledge that their own privileges are tied to the oppression of poor, nonwhite, and Third World women ( A. Russo 1991:299-307). Indeed, liberal feminism is compatible with liberal capitalism and what some view as the paternalistic, women in development (WID) economic strategy in the Third World, which will be discussed in Chapter 4. Liberal feminism's emphasis on legal reforms and equal rights is not only the most acceptable version of feminism to the First World, it has also gained the most support among Third World feminist politicians, jurists, and academics.It was liberal feminism that inspired the UN Decade for Women, which won support from male-dominated governments all over the world. The reasons for this support are obvious. Liberal feminism's reformism is more politically acceptable because it leaves unchallenged the underlying structural causes of gender inequality and its relationship to other systems of oppression such as the inequitable world economic order and internal systems of social and political inequality (see Stamp 1989; Cagatay et al. 1986; Barrow 1985; Steady 1985). Apfel-Marglin and Simon ( 1994: 35 - 36 ) criticize the entire ideological underpinnings of the development of women feminist project, which, they claim, descends from Victorian colonial feminism. WID posits the white Western independent woman integrated into a commodified world as the norm. Rather than questioning the development process, WID identifies the barriers (i.e., tradition and social constraints) to women's access to the market. WID sees women as oppressed victims of societies in need of transformation to liberate women. If Third World women's self-perception is not one of an autonomous, independent self, but one embedded in kinship and other social bonds, such perceptions are invalidated. "Cognitive authority" belongs to the experts who know what women need to be "developed." Not surprisingly, the modern, developed individual/self with rights (to its own labor with the rights to sell it), equality, and autonomy is a reality created by and functional for industrial capitalism.

**Genuine advances for women are impossible under capitalism.**

**Gordon 96**

(April A. Gordon, Transforming Capitalism and Patriarchy: Gender and Development in Africa. Publisher: Lynne Rienner. Place of Publication: Boulder, CO. Publication Year: 1996. http://www.questia.com/read/96895144# Page Number: 14.)

A basic criticism is that liberal feminism uncritically accepts the capitalist system, assuming that patriarchy and sexism are not intrinsic to it. For example, Eisenstein ( 1981:231) contends that liberal feminism ignores the reality that within the capitalist class system equal opportunity does not exist for men or women because of structures of inequality based on race, class, and sex. Socialist feminists add that gender as well as class exploitation are functional, even necessary, for capitalism. As Mies ( 1988: 2 - 5 ) argues, women are a means of production and reproduction to be controlled in capitalism (they reproduce labor power); therefore, sexism is not a vestige of backwardness or patriarchal history that can be overcome by the reformist measures advocated by liberal feminists.In her earlier work, Eisenstein ( 1979) considered capitalism and patriarchy so inextricably linked that they comprised not two systems but one, which she called "capitalist patriarchy." Eisenstein ( 1981: 42 - 49, 81, 187 - 188 ) also asserts that the liberal ideology of equal opportunity in the marketplace is inherently patriarchal.In reality, this applies to men only; the ascribed status of women as child rearers remains intact. This ascribed status is then used to relegate women to the "private arena" of the family.While stressing the importance of the individual, merit, and so on, the patriarchal family that needs to keep women passive and dependent goes unchallenged. Furthermore, the sex-class oppression of women rooted in the sexual division of labor within the family is protected by government, which sees the family as private rather than public. As long as the notion of equality before the law fails to address the problems of inequality in everyday life within the family, legal reform by government is no solution to patriarchy.

### Exploitation

**Capitalism leads to human rights abuses**

**Heron, 08** (Taitu, “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, January, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 85-101, Springerlink SW)

Similarly, human beings are increasingly being commodified and traded as sex slaves, prostitutes or trafficking victims' as globalization has seen an unprecedented growth in the underground sex industry (Poulin 2004, p. 3). More women and children are made vulnerable to the already structurally discriminating environment and the hierarchical relationships that exist between the developed countries and dependent countries and between men and women. In recent years under the impact of structural adjustment and neoliberal policies in numerous developing countries as well as in the ex-USSR and Eastern Europe, poor women and children have become “new raw resources” within the framework of national and international business development. According to Poulin (2004, p. 2)“globalization has created a market of sexual exchanges in which millions of women and children have been converted into sexual commodities”. This sex market has been generated through the massive deployment of prostitution (one of the effects of the presence of military forces engaged in wars and/or territorial occupation in particular in the emerging economies), the unprecedented expansion of the tourist industry, and the growth and normalization of pornography (see Box 2). This industry is based on the systematic violation of human rights, for it requires a market in commodified human beings and the complicity of pimps and clients who are prepared to buy and sell women and children. It is only one among many varied instances of the commodification of all of life which is a defining characterization of current neoliberalism, a pattern which hits at the core of human agency and robs one of the dignity inherent in each human being on one hand, and diminishes positive use of agency on the other.

**Capitalism is based on specific actions and can be resisted – portraying the system as natural legitimizes exploitation**

**Heron, 08** (Taitu, “Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Exercise of Human Agency”, January, International Journal of Politics, Culture & Society, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-4, pp. 85-101, Springerlink SW)

Policies are directed by thought and followed through by action/agency. No action or idea is fixed unless one wants it that way and makes a decision about it. As an inevitable force, globalization is promoted as something out there that has no agency when indeed there is. Actors, whether government officials, chief executive officers (CEOs) of multinational corporations, or International Financial Institution (IFI) officials are mostly responsible for the process of globalization but this agency is exceptionally individualistic, that does not acknowledge that there is more to life than material wealth and individual pursuit. Grumberg and Khan point out that the main engine of globalization, “technology and the expansion and integration of markets, it is not a force of nature but the result of processes driven by human beings” (Cited in UN 2005). The Western universalism implicit in the neoliberal approach assumes that application of these policies will amount to economic success in every country which undergoes neoliberal policy reform. Rooted in neoclassical economics, neoliberal policies assumes that implementation of privatization, liberalization and deregulation will always guarantee very specific results regardless of the social and cultural contexts within which they may be subjected to (Girvan 2000, p. 71). At another level, universalism may be a diplomatic mask which government officials, IFI officials, statesmen and leading transnational elites of the G7 wear to disregard the power dimensions involved in the politics of neoliberalism. As such, this could be argued as aggressive-materialist agency aimed at protecting and maximizing the profits of a neoliberal project, at the expense of mounting social exclusion of people; and further limiting more positive expressions of human agency. This issue of social exclusion is important in understanding the destructive nature of aggressive-materialist behaviour and how it can deprive persons of agency and overburden others unnecessarily. These changes in the capitalist world economy have been exercised by the power of governments and corporations, and far from being inevitable, uncontrollable or positively integrating, they reflect concrete acts of human agency with specific goals and interests to defend and uphold. This idea of governments as powerless to the forces of modern capitalism/globalization serves only to mythologize the workings of the system itself. What a policy has created another policy can alter. This assertion of inevitability, approaches development in a very linear fashion, where each period is a culmination of the changes that preceded it and therefore touted as a very ‘natural’ progression in the order of things (Weeks 1999). Any prior policy is now deemed anachronistic and irrelevant to the ‘new times and more advanced stage of society that we are supposed to be living in. And we must ask advanced for whom? And this leads us to ponder on the classism in such a materialist approach that is by its very nature, devoid of seeing the history and the development of human society as cyclical and transformative processes. We would do well to recall the triumphalist call of imperial dominance of capital over labour in the nineteenth century, when its ideologues proclaimed the dawning of a new era and that domination would be eternal. That period ended in a devastating war among various European nations and the Russian Revolution (Weeks 1999).

### Oppression

**Capitalism creates an urban underclass – the impact is complete dehumanization and alienation of minorities from society and only the alt solves**

**Wilson 10** (Carter, professor of political science at the University of Toledo, The Dominant Class and the Construction of Racial Oppression: A Neo-Marxist/Gramscian Approach to Race in the United States, Google Scholars)

In the final analysis, several additional points need to be made about a neo-Marxist analysis of contemporary racial oppression and racist culture. First, the urban underclass is the product of advanced capitalism, post-Fordism. Marx referred to a reserve army of labor and a surplus population arising out of the accumulation process: The greater the social wealth, the functioning capital, the extent and energy of its growth, and, therefore, also the absolute mass of the proletariat and the productiveness of its labour, the greater is the industrial reserve army. The same causes which develop the expansive power of capital, develop also the labour-power at its disposal…The more extensive, finally, the lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism. This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation….55 Capital accumulation thus produces the reserve army of labor or surplus populations. Today’s counterpart to this reserve army is the so-called urban underclass. Marx adds: The law by which a constantly increasing quantity of means of production, thanks to the advance in the productiveness of social labour, may be set in movement by a progressively diminishing expenditure of human power, this law in a capitalist society – where the labourer does not employ the means of production, but the means of production employ the labourer – undergoes a complete inversion and is expressed thus: the higher the productiveness of labour, the greater is the pressure of the labourers on the means of employment, the more precarious, therefore, becomes their condition of existence, viz., the sale of their own labour-power for the increasing of another’s wealth, or for the self-expansion of capital.56 Second, the urban underclass is the victim. Marx refers to the surplus population or reserve army of labor as victims of industry: “… the demoralized and ragged, and those unable to work, chiefly people who succumb to their incapacity for adaptation, due to the division of labour; people who have passed the normal age of the labourer; the victims of industry, whose number increases with the increase of dangerous machinery…”57 Third, the immorality of capitalism comes not from the bottom but from the top. This point is more clearly expressed in the early writings of Marx, particularly in his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts. Charles Derber expands on this idea in a chapter entitled “A Fish Rots from the Head First,” in his book The Wilding of America. The book responds to the racist stereotype of poor inner city black males as engaging in wildings, having no regard for human life, taking pride in gang culture, and preying on the weak and helpless.58 The concept of wildings came from the arrest of five black juveniles in the summer of 1989 on charges of brutally assaulting and raping a 28-year-old jogger and investment broker. The jogger was so severely beaten that she was not expected to live. Her face was disfigured, her skull fractured and her eye destroyed. For years the case exemplified the pathology of the urban underclass and the need for police repression of inner city black males. Twelve years later, DNA tests proved the five black males innocent. A serial rapist was then arrested. But the stereotypical image of young black male predators remained a part of the dominant racist culture.D erber’s point is that the worst values found in the underclass – the violence, the greed, the frenzy to acquire material wealth, the disregard for the welfare of others, the predatory spirit – were values that did not originate at the bottom. Where these values exist among a few members of the urban underclass, they originated from the top. They are the same values found among members of the dominant class; they are just imitated by members of the underclass. These values were exhibited when Ford Motors released the Pinto knowing that it would explode on contact, when the tobacco industry increased the nicotine content in cigarettes knowing that it was addictive and lethal, when the mining industry released arsenic into rivers and streams, when Enron executives joked openly about the shock the elderly would experience with the doubling of their electric bills, when the US apparel industry and retail companies relocated abroad to exploit child labor, when the deregulated savings and loans industry in the 1980s and the deregulated finance industry in the first decade of the 21st century reaped billions in profit before going bust. All of these industries were engaging in wildings. The gangterism and disregard for human life exhibited by members of the dominant class is far more destructive and pernicious than anything conceivable among drug dealers or street criminals in any inner city. Derber adds:In capitalism, as Marx conceives it, wilding is less a failure of socialization than an expression of society’s central norms. To turn a profit, even the most humane capitalist employer commodifies and exploits employees, playing by the market rules of competition and profit-maximization to buy and sell their labor power as cheaply as possible.59 The point here is that the characterization of the urban underclass as criminal, irrational, greedy, overly materialistic, devoid of any regard for human life is part of the new racism. It shifts attention from the immoral behavior of those at the top to the victims at the bottom. This new racism not only alienates poor blacks from the larger society. It dehumanizes them. It desensitizes the larger society to the suffering and victimization of the poor inner city blacks, just as earlier forms of racist culture rationalized slavery and segregation. Moreover, this racist culture provokes contempt and hostility toward them. It encourages and legitimizes the warehousing of black males in the prison system.60 A Marxist approach shifts the focus to the capitalist system and to the dominant class. It interrogates the dominant ideology that dehumanizes and demonizes the lower classes. This approach offers a deeper and richer analysis of contemporary racism.

**Capitalism is co-productive with other forms of oppression; sexism and racism can only be addressed within an alternative economy.**

**Dyer-Witheford, 99** (Nick, Professor — University of Western Ontario, *Cyber-Marx* p. 9-12)

The major source of practical, brutally effective reductionism and totalization at work on the planet today is not Marxism, but the world market, now enabled by computer networks, satellite broadcasts, just-in-time production, and high-tech weaponry. This is a system based on the imposition of universal commodification, including, centrally, the buying and selling of human life-time. Its tendency is to subordinate all activity to the law of value – the socially imposed law of exchange. It relates a monological master-narrative in which only money talks. Such a system operates by process of massive reduction – Marx called it “abstraction” – that perceives and processes the world solely as an array of economic factors. Under this classificatory grid – this “classing” of the world – human subjects figure only as so much labor power and consumption capacity, and their natural surroundings as so much raw material. This reductionism – the reductionism of capital – has today a totalizing grip on the planet. Other dominations, too, are reductive – sexism reduces women to objects for men, racism negates the humanity of people of color. But neither patriarchy nor racism has succeeded in knitting the planet together into an integrated, coordinated system of interdependencies. This is what capital is doing today, as, with the aid of new technologies, it globally maps the availability of female labor, ethno-markets, migrancy flows, human gene pools, and entire animal, plant, and insect species onto its coordinates of value. In doing so, it is subsuming every other form of oppression to its logic.

**Capitalism is inimical to race and gender equality—oppression will continue anywhere that it is deemed profitable.**

**Dyer-Witheford, 99** (Nick, Professor — University of Western Ontario, *Cyber-Marx* p. 9-12)

Patriarchal and racist logics are older than capital, mobilize fears and hatreds beyond its utilitarian economic understanding, and are virulently active today. But they are now compelled to manifest themselves within and mediated through capital’s larger, overarching structure of domination: as market-racism, commodity-sexism. Class- capital’s classification of its human resources – does tend to assert itself as definitive of social power. It is “privileged” in all senses of the world’ not because of any essential, ontological priority of economics over gender, ethnic, or ecological relations, but because of society’s subordination to a system that compels key issues of sexuality, race, and nature to revolve around a hub of profit. Looked at in this way, the conventional division between “old” class politics and “new” social movements seems profoundly mistaken. Capital is a system inimical not only to movements for higher wages, more free times, or better working conditions – classic labor movement objectives – but also to movements for equality-in-difference, peace, and the preservation of nature. This is not because it creates racism, sexism, militarism, or ecological despoliation, phenomena whose existence handsomely predates its appearance, but rather because it treats them only as opportunities for or impediments to accumulation. Because capital’s a priori is profit (its own expanded replication), its logic in regard to the emancipation of women, racial justice, or the preservation of the environment is purely instrumental. The prevention of male violence toward women, the saving of rain forests, or the eradication of racism is a matter of bottom line calculus: tolerated or even benignly supported when costless, enthusiastically supported when profitable, but ruthlessly opposed as soon as they demand any substantial diversion of social surplus. Hence capitalism is antithetical to any movements for whom these goals are affirmed as fundamental, indispensable values. In this respect, the 1980s and 1990s have been perversely illuminating. Any belief that the advent of the new social movements marked a transition from the “old” struggle over social surplus must crumble away in the face of neoliberalism’s doctrinaire reaffirmation of the market, attack on the welfare state, and unconstrained expansions of commodity exchange. Over this period virtually every objective of social movements – wilderness preservation, equal pay for women, funding for day-care, battered-women’s shelters, or AIDS education – has had to be fought for, often lost, in the teeth of governmental and corporate insistence on the primacy of austerity, restraint, cutbacks required by global competition, and the reestablishment of wavering profit rates. Insofar as there have been victories, cracks in the reductive logic of capital, it is usually only because movements have been prepared to challenge the overriding priorities of corporate growth in the name of other, differing visions of societal good.

**Capitalism views women as property so it encourages sexist violence.**

**Goodman, 05** (Donna, co-chair of the Mid-Hudson National People's Campaign, “Sexism’s logical outcome:

capitalism breeds violence against women,” *Socialism and Liberation*, July, http://socialismandliberation.org/mag/index.php?aid=408, Accessed 07-16-08)

Despite the many advances made by women over decades of struggle, violence against women remains pervasive worldwide. This violence cuts across culture, class, education, income, ethnicity and age. It may take the form of domestic abuse or murder. It may take the form of female infanticide, genital mutilation, dowry burning, sexual assault, kidnapping, murder, forced suicide of widows, honor killing, or rape within marriage. It takes place in the United States as well as in exploited countries like India or Mexico. But in every case, violence against women is a vestige of women’s historic status as property—a product of the division of society into exploited and exploiting classes. It is a symptom of their continued subordinate status in class society. Global capitalism, far from solving the historic inequality of women, has incorporated violence against women into its business practices and its imperialist military strategies. Worldwide, one out of three women has been beaten, forced into sex or abused in her lifetime. Up to 70 percent of female murder victims are killed by their male partners. In the most oppressed countries, structural adjustment programs are forcing governments to privatize resources and eliminate social services. This has lead to increased inequality and an accompanying upsurge of violence against women. For example, in the transnational sweatshops doing business under free trade agreements like NAFTA, young women working for slave wages are routinely abused at work. In a dramatic case, more than 300 girls and women have been killed since 1993 in Juarez, Mexico. Most were workers in the “maquiladora” factories in the free trade zone on the U.S.-Mexico border. The formerly socialist countries in Eastern Europe have seen capitalism destroy their economic safety nets and shatter their many gains in gender equality. Sexist violence has been a dramatic result. War causes massive suffering to women. Civilian casualties of today’s wars far outnumber those of armed combatants, and 80 percent of those are women and children. Women and girls are routinely the target of sexual violence, especially rape.

**The subordination of women is rooted in class inequality.**

**Goodman, 05** (Donna, co-chair of the Mid-Hudson National People's Campaign, “Sexism’s logical outcome:

capitalism breeds violence against women,” *Socialism and Liberation*, July, http://socialismandliberation.org/mag/index.php?aid=408, Accessed 07-16-08)

But in a world economy dominated by capitalism—production for private profit—special oppression against women has an economic basis. Having whole groups of people subject to terror and insecurity in their personal lives erodes the possibilities for organizing for better living conditions—and, consequently, lower rates of profit. So every legal gain made by women under capitalism is under constant attack. For every success, there is a setback. For example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development now requires detailed information on battered women to be collected from domestic violence shelters that receive HUD funding. This information is computerized and available to other government agencies. Over 40,000 women each year use shelters financed by HUD. The Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act of 2005, now in the Senate, will spend $1.6 billion to “promote marriage” and force poor women to accept low-wage, dead-end jobs, leaving their children in inadequate childcare. The government is already spending over $100 million on marriage promotion, taking funds from other social programs. These “marriage promotion” laws do nothing to provide the foundation for providing families with adequate wages, health care or childcare. Rather, they provide incentives for women to enter into relationships that may be abusive or unstable. Anti-imperialism and the struggle against sexism The sheer magnitude of the problem of violence against women around the world, including in the most advanced capitalist countries, shows that it is not a random or an individual crime. It is a tool of oppression that keeps women subordinate. Ideologically, sexist violence in the United States—the most advanced capitalist state in the world—is a symbol of the glorification of war, violence and the male “hero” that pervades U.S. culture. Imperialist expansion and war have intensified the exploitation and suffering of women here and in other countries. The women’s movement has won important reforms in the political, economic and social spheres. Every victory was won because women and their allies took to the streets and lit a fire under legislatures, courts and police. The causes of women’s oppression are rooted in class society. The ongoing struggle for women’s equality and freedom from violence is an international one, integral to the struggle against imperialism and war. The renewal of activism in response to the Iraq war and capitalist globalization presents an excellent opportunity to unite in fighting women’s oppression, capitalist exploitation and militarism.

### Poverty

**Abandoning capitalism is the only way that poorer peoples can survive.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability”, pg.5)

The Third World problem has many causes but it is primarily due to the way the global economy distributes wealth, the overconsumption of the rich countries and the disastrously mistaken conception of develop­ment that has been pursued. Development has been defined essentially as an increase in business turnover, i.e., as indiscriminate economic growth. This inevitably results in the allocation of the lion's share to the rich few, inappropriate development, the neglect of the urgent needs of the poor majority, and in the application of most Third World produc­tive capacity to the interests of the rich. There cannot be satisfactory, appropriate development in the Third World unless the rich countries move down to much lower per capita resource use, allow drastic redistribution of world wealth, and enable most Third World land, labour and capital to produce what Third World people need. In other words, 'The rich must live more simply so that the poor may simply live.'

**Capitalism is structurally incapable of addressing poverty—the argument that free markets help the poor is a self-serving myth.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. xiii)

The attempt at divorcing effects from their causes goes hand in hand with the equally fallacious practice of claiming the status of a rule for the exception. This is how it can be pretended that the misery and chronic underdevelopment that necessarily arise from the neo-colonial domination and exploitation of the overwhelming majority of humankind by a mere handful of capitalistically developed countries—hardly more than the G7—do not matter at all. For, as the self-serving legend goes, thanks to the (never realized) ‘modernization’ of the rest of the world, the population of every country will one fine day enjoy the great benefits of the ‘free enterprise system.’ The fact that the rapacious exploitation of the human and material resources of our planet for the benefit of a few capitalist countries happens to be a non-generalizable condition is wantonly disregarded. Instead, the universal viability of emulating the development of the ‘advanced capitalist’ countries is predicated, ignoring that neither the advantages of the imperialist past, or the immense profits derived on a continuing basis from keeping the ‘Third World’ in a structural dependency can be ‘universally diffused,’ so as to produce the anticipated happy results through ‘modernization’ and ‘free-marketization.’ Not to mention the fact that even if the history of imperialism could be re-written if a sense diametrically opposed to the way it actually unfolded, coupled with the fictitious reversal of the existing power relations of domination and dependency in favour of the underdeveloped countries, the general adoption of the rapacious utilization of our plant’s limited resources—enormously damaging already, although at present practiced only be the privileged tiny minority—would make the whole system instantly collapse.

**Arguing that growth helps the poor ignores that it helps rich countries MUCH more.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 77)

In opposition to the defenders of unlimited economic growth, I would argue that it is they who are the real elitists. They argue in favor of economic growth as the only policy to improve absolutely but not relatively (which would hurt the rich's comparative standing), the gains of the poor. This is predicated upon the omission or even suppression of the alternative policy of redistribution. An alternative policy, of course, would harm the elite members (probably in both absolute and relative senses). Furthermore, the social policy of solving the problem of poverty through economic growth actually helps the rich increase their advantages as indicated by distribution data in both advanced and developing industrial countries.

**Capitalism makes poverty inevitable—African states are chronically underdeveloped to ensure the flow of cheap resources.**

**FOSTER 2007**

John Bellamy Foster, Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, Monthly Review, May 2007 “The Imperialist World System” http://www.monthlyreview.org/0507jbf.htm

The recognition that there was a much more fundamental problem of development—what we would now call the “development of underdevelopment”—was thus slow to emerge even amongst socialist thinkers. It is true that European countries had colonized much of the world in the early centuries of the capitalist era, but systematic, persistent discrepancies in economic development were not as evident as they would be later on. In 1830, in Marx’s youth, the countries that make up what we now call the third world accounted for 60.9 percent of the world’s industrial potential. By 1860, the decade in which Marx’s Capital was written, this had fallen to 36.7 percent. By 1953, around the time Baran was writing The Political Economy of Growth,it had declined to a low of 6.5 percent. China’s share of world industry fell from 33.3 percent in 1800 to 6.3 percent in 1900 and 2.3 percent in 1953. As historian David Christian has noted, “The twentieth century term *the third world* could have made no sense in 1750, when today’s third world countries accounted for almost 75 percent of global industrial production. By the late twentieth century, they counted for less than 15 percent.”4 Following the Second World War, new nations were rapidly emerging as a result of the breakdown of the colonial system. Under the pressure of the Cold War it became necessary for the leading capitalist states to promise development to these newly liberated countries. The 1949 Chinese revolution raised a major challenge to the imperialist system. A whole new industry of development economics and political-sociological modernization theory emerged replacing the old colonial civilizational discourse. The best known mainstream work on development to be published in the early post-Second World War period was W. W. Rostow’s *Stages of Economic Growth*, significantly subtitled *A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Rostow described five stages that all countries had to pass through: (1) traditional society, (2) the preconditions for take-off, (3) the take-off, (4) the drive to maturity, and (5) the age of high mass consumption. The key stages in this process were of course the preconditions for take-off, during which the cultural and technological foundations for an industrial revolution were laid, and the take-off itself, which in Rostow’s theory could be explained primarily by the sudden increase in savings from 5 percent to 10 percent.5 The final result was not in question; the only real issue was when countries would pass through these various stages. The conditions allowing for a take-off could be speeded up, Rostow argued, through the diffusion of Western culture, know-how, and capital, overcoming legacies of economic and cultural stagnation. Paul Baran’s *Political Economy of Growth* challenged such dominant views, arguing that the way in which imperialism had penetrated underdeveloped countries had destroyed earlier social formations and distorted their subsequent development, creating lasting conditions of dependency. Underdeveloped countries in this argument were systematically subordinated to the developed countries in the international division of labor. Baran was not of course the first to make such arguments. Traces of such views could be found as we have seen in Marx and Lenin. The Peruvian Marxist José Carlos Mariátegui had developed ideas along these lines in the 1920s to explain the distorted capitalism of Peru beginning in its guano export period in the early nineteenth century, and the need for a revolution on indigenous-nationalist foundations. The development of a fairly systematic liberal Latin American dependency theory can be traced to the work of Argentine economist Raúl Prebisch and the UN Economic Commission for Latin America in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Prebisch pointed to the external dependence of peripheral countries on the countries at the center of the world economy and on the systematic imbalances in trade that this produced. Underdeveloped countries were, in this view, bound to an international division of labor where they exported low-value primary commodities and imported high-value manufactured goods placing them at a structural disadvantage. Underdevelopment, it was argued, was not the same as original undevelopment, i.e., the mere absence of development. The 1955 Bandung Conference in Indonesia established the non-aligned movement, marking the emergence of a distinct third world view on imperialism and underdevelopment. Baran brought to all of this a systematic Marxian critique aimed at the bourgeois economic ideology of development, but also departing from earlier preconceptions within Marxism. “The question that immediately arises,” he stated, “is, why is it that in backward capitalist countries there has been no advance along the lines of capitalist development that are familiar from the history of other capitalist countries, and why is it that forward movement there has been either slow or altogether absent?” In Asia, as well as Europe, pre-capitalist orders were already in “disintegration and decay” during the opening of the modern era. “The general *direction* of the movement [toward development] was everywhere the same.” If it were not for the distorting effect of imperialism, Baran argued, along the same lines as Marx, “the country that is more developed industrially” would have shown “to the less developed the image of its own future.” Yet, the glaring fact was that the peoples and territories in the periphery had not advanced along the path of autonomous capitalist development. Baran’s answer was that this result was “determined by the nature of Western European development itself....[by] the effects of Western European capitalist penetration of the outside world.” This penetration was not everywhere the same. It took two forms: (1) the type of penetration associated with the European settler colonies of North America and Australia, which led to their autonomous development, and (2) the type that occurred in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, where there were larger, more populous, and often more developed indigenous cultures. In the latter the Western European countries “engaged in outright plunder or in plunder thinly veiled as trade, seizing and removing tremendous wealth from the places of their penetrations,” leading to intercontinental resource flows that were enormously detrimental to the subject peoples. The economies of these “donor” countries fed the industrial revolution in Europe, while themselves being systematically underdeveloped. Immense obstacles to development were thus erected by the very nature of the capitalist expansion into the periphery and the emergence of a self-perpetuating, imperialist world system.6

### Racism

**Material inequalities between races demonstrate that the root cause of racism is capitalism.**

**Young 06** (Chair @ NYU; Robert, “Putting Materialism Back into the Race Theory: Toward a Transformative Theory of Race”, redcritique.org )

In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, the transformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression.

**Racism cannot be addressed without uprooting capitalism first. Any other approach just masks the material inequalities produced by the economic base.**

**Young 06** (Chair @ NYU; Robert, “Putting Materialism Back into the Race Theory: Toward a Transformative Theory of Race”, redcritique.org )

In this regard, postmodernists collude with the humanists in legitimating the sanctity of the local. Both participate in narrowing cultural intelligibility to questions of (racial) discourse or the (black) subject and, in doing so, they provide ideological immunity for capitalism. It is now very difficult to even raise the issue of class, particularly if you raise the issue outside of the logic of supplementarity—today's ruling intellectual logic which provides a theoretical analog to contemporary neo-liberal political structures. In one of the few recent texts to explore the centrality of class, bell hooks' Where We Stand, we are, once again, still left with a reaffirmation of capitalism. For instance, hooks argues for changes within capitalism: "I identify with democratic socialism, with a vision of participatory economics within capitalism that aims to challenge and change class hierarchy" (156). Capitalism produces class hierarchy and, therefore, as long as capitalism remains, class hierarchy and antagonism will remain. Hence, the solution requires a transformation of class society. However, hooks mystifies capitalism as a transhistorical system and thus she can assert that the "poor may be with us always" (129). Under this view, politics becomes a matter of "bearing witness" to the crimes of capitalism, but rather than struggle for its replacement, hooks call for strategies of "self-actualization" and redistributing resources to the poor. She calls for the very same thing—collectivity—that capitalism cannot provide because social resources are privatized under capitalism. Consequently, Hooks' program for "self-esteem" is an attempt to put a human face on capitalism. Whether one considers the recent work by African-American humanists, or discourse theorists, or even left-liberal intellectuals, these various groups—despite their intellectual differences—form a ruling coalition and one thing is clear: capitalism set the limit for political change, as there is no alternative to the rule of capital. In contrast to much of contemporary race theory, a transformative theory of race highlights the political economy of race in the interests of an emancipatory political project. Wahneema Lubiano once wrote that "the idea of race and the operation of racism are the best friends that the economic and political elite have in the United States" (vii). Race mystifies the structure of exploitation and masks the severe inequalities within global capitalism. I am afraid that, at this point, many contemporary race theorists, in their systematic erasure of materialism, have become close (ideological) allies with the economic and political elites, who deny even the existence of classes. A transformative race theory pulls back into focus the struggle against exploitation and sets a new social priority "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Marx 31).

**Capitalistic practices – especially those of construction – are rooted in racism**

**Wilson 10** (Carter, professor of political science at the University of Toledo, The Dominant Class and the Construction of Racial Oppression: A Neo-Marxist/Gramscian Approach to Race in the United States, Google Scholars)

Contemporary scholars explain the racially exclusionary behavior of white workers in terms of either the advantage of whiteness or the impact of racist culture. Roediger, in Wages of Whiteness, insists that white workers gain status and prestige in defining themselves as white.20 He argues that white working-class consciousness emerged as white labor was contrasted with black labor. White labor was free; black labor was enslaved. White labor had privileges and advantages; black labor had none. It is these advantages that constitute the wages of whiteness, an expression Roediger borrows from Du Bois. Labor scholars insist that the greatest barrier to hiring blacks into the skilled trades had been white workers. These scholars present examples of white unions excluding black workers. Indeed, many white union constitutions contained language which explicitly excluded blacks.21 Other scholars blame uneducated, low-income whites for racism and racial violence. They see racial violence as operating on the fringe of society, executed by ignorant social misfits, alienated from the mainstream.22 In either case, scholars insist that white workers created the form of racism associated with industrial capitalism.

**Racism is expressed through wealth inequalities**

**Wilson 10** (Carter, professor of political science at the University of Toledo, The Dominant Class and the Construction of Racial Oppression: A Neo-Marxist/Gramscian Approach to Race in the United States, Google Scholars)

Within the neo-Marxist framework, the current period is no different from the previous eras. Racial oppression persists today. Although there are signs of dramatic progress in some areas, there is severe regression in others. Racism has not declined; it has simply changed form. Today, racial oppression overlaps with class oppression more than ever before. Whereas dominative-aversive racism, the old Jim Crow system, excluded all blacks of all social classes, meta-racism impacts low-income blacks most severely, particularly those living in concentrated poverty areas of inner cities. New racial stereotypes focus on the urban poor or urban underclass. New economic arrangements correspond with the new form of racial oppression. The new economic arrangements can best be classified Gramscian terms as post-Fordism. These arrangements have produced enormous surplus labor and substantial inequalities. The new racial oppression is characterized by concentrated urban poverty, by the warehousing of black males in the criminal justice system, by high infant mortality rates, and by diminishing political power.

## \*\*ALTS\*\*

### Reject

**Alternative text: Reject the affirmative as a means of refusing complicity with capitalism.**

**Rejecting capitalism is key to opening up new alternatives. Only complete refusal, not piecemeal reform, can prevent otherwise inevitable slavery and extinction.**

**Herod, 04** (James, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm, Getting Free, 4th Edition

A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004

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

### Moral ob

**Regardless of our alternative’s solvency, we have an ethical obligation to reject capitalism – our utopian thinking is key to resistance.**

**Marsh 95** (james l, critique, action, and liberation p. 334-335)

Denial of utopia mutilates freedom and reason. We can appreciate this point more deeply by focusing phenomenologically on my experience of myself as an incarnate subject in the world. First of all, questioning is essential to the life of reason, and any questioning points beyond the data to a future answer arrived at in a future insight and judgment. A scientist hit on the head by an apple asks questions that point toward a future answer. Any question negates the given set of facts and anticipates a new future.7> Next, on the level of insight and conceptualization we arrive at a universal that is not exhausted by any particular manifestation or instance. ''Triangle'' is not exhausted by this particular triangular thing, "justice" by this particular example of justice, "beauty" by this particular painting. Moreover, no particular, sensible incarnation matches the perfection of the ideal. These instances of "triangle," "justice," "beauty," respectively, are not perfect; they have cracks, blemishes, and impurities.8 Further, on a reflective, ethical level I constitute through reflection and choice myself as an end in a community of ends. This ethical norm has the same inexhaustibility and perfection as any universal, but in addition is the ethical obligation to realize the ideal. If, therefore, I am essentially and eidetically an experiencing, understanding, judging, and choosing subject and the current social situation is irrational and unjust in not respecting that reality, I have three choices. I can capitulate to the situation and in so doing reduce or renounce my humanity, or I can live a double life in thinking utopian thoughts and pursuing a nonutopian life, or I can pursue the utopia of a full economic, social, and political democracy that is worthy of such a rational, free subject and incarnates in its institutions full respect for such a subject. Only the last option is fully consistent with the life of incarnate reason and freedom Finally, we may affirm a threefold exteriority to the irrational, exploitative capitalist system: exteriority as past, present, and future. Exteriority as past is the laborer initially confronting capital as deprived of means of production, land, and means of consumption; as present exteriority is labor confronting capital as nothing, poor, more and more deprived of skill, surplus value, and even of employment; and as future exteriority is the utopia of liberation that is suggested by, demanded by, and called for by the alienated present. Such utopia as norm and goal calls into question our alienated bourgeois present. "Exteriority" or "the other" in this book has at least five moments or stages of articulation: as phenomenologically described, as ethically evaluated, as hermeneutically interpreted, as critically judged, and as anticipated in an utopian manner. Our affirmation of "utopia" as essential and implied by ''rationality" in the full sense just completes and fills out our affirmation of exteriority as linked to rationality. A rationality and freedom and ethics and hermeneutics and critique and praxis not open to exteriority are incomplete, truncated, mutilated. Exteriority is the positive ground enabling us to go fully beyond a merely negative dialectic. We affirm, then, the ethical necessity of pursuing ethical community and democratic socialism as the rational embodiment of that vision. Here it is important to be clear about the difference between acquisitive, empirical reason and constitutive, ethical reason. Ethical community as utopia is not primarily something I stand back and predict objectively and scientifically; it is something to which I commit myself ethically and politically. An example from the sphere of personal morality should make the difference clear. When a friend, relative, teacher, or minister counsels an alcoholic to confront her habit, she is not making a prediction. Indeed, it may seem unlikely, given this particular person's past history, that she will lick her habit. Nonetheless, the moral obligation to get over her habit remains. Similarly, an obligation exists to get over our capitalism as a social equivalent of drunkenness. If the argument of this chapter is correct, we cannot renounce such an attempt at transcendence without giving up on the ethical project or curtailing that project by confining it to the sphere of intimate, interpersonal relations. I am a good father or husband or lover in my private life, but I remain exploitative, cruel, and inhumane in my public, capitalistic life. Such ethical renunciation or curtailment is the death or mutilation of the human; denial of utopia is a living death. … To think in a utopian manner, then, about community and socialism is to free ourselves from the excessive hold that science and technology exert over our minds and imaginations. We begin to see that science and technology and expertise, even though they are legitimate within their own proper domains, do not exhaust or monopolize the definition of reason and other forms of reason and knowledge that are more informative, profound, and fundamental. Indeed, compared to certain expressions of art or ethics or philosophy or religion, science and technology are relatively superficial. What revelatory power does a scientific equation have compared to Hamlet's "To be or not to be" speech? What does an empirical study of human populations show me about human life compared to the insight of Marx's Capital? What can a factual study of war show about its horrors compared to Picasso's Guernica ?11To the extent, therefore, that science and technology dominate in the twentieth century as not only the highest forms of reason but the only forms of reason, they shove other, more profound, more reflective, more fundamental forms of reason to the side and twentieth-century industrial society emerges as an inverted, topsy-turvy, absurd world. What seems normal, factual, rational, and sane in such a world is in fact abnormal, apparent, irrational, and absurd. We begin to suspect and see that science and technology appear as the highest and only forms of reason because capitalism has appropriated science and technology for its own ends as productive force and ideology. In science and technology capitalism has found the forms of rationality most appropriate for itself, perfectly manifesting it, mirroring it, and justifying it. In such an absurd, inverted, topsy-turvy world, fidelity to the life of reason demands critique, resistance, and revolutionary transcendence. One has to pierce the veil of such a world, see through it as absurd rather than accepting it as normal and sane. The prevailing rationality is profoundly irrational.

### Try or die

The choice is revolution or nuclear war, capitalism must be destroyed to preserve humanity.

Callinicos 4 [Alex, Director of the Centre for European Studies at King’s College, The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx, 2004 pg. 196-197]

Capitalism has not changed its spots. It is still based on the exploitation of the working class, and liable to constant crises**.** The conclusion that Marx drew from this analysis, that the working class must overthrow the system and replace it with a classless society, is even more urgent now than in his day. For the military rivalries which are the form increasingly assumed by competition between capitals now threaten the very survival of the planet. As Marx’s centenary approached, the fires of war flickered across the globe—in Lebanon, Iran and Iraq, Kampuchea, southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, Afghanistan and the South Atlantic. The accumulation of vast armouries of nuclear destruction by the superpowers, missilerattling in the Kremlin, talk of ‘limited’ and ‘protracted’ nuclear war in Washington—these cast a shadow over the whole of humanity**.** Socialist revolution is an imperative if we are to change a world in the grip of economic depression and war fever, a world where 30 million rot on Western dole queues and 800 million go hungry in the Third World. To that extent, Marx’s ideas are more relevant today than they were 100 years ago**.** Capitalism has tightened its grip of iron on every portion of the planet since 1883, and is rotten-ripe for destruction, whether at its own hands through nuclear war, or at the hands of the working class. The choice is between workers’ power or the ‘common ruination of the contending classes’—between socialism or barbarism. Many people who genuinely wish to do something to remedy the present state of the world believe that this stress on the working class is much too narrow. The existence of nuclear weapons threatens everyone, whether workers or capitalists or whatever. Should not all classes be involved in remedying a problem which affects them all? What this ignores is that what Edward Thompson has called ‘exterminism’— the vast and competing military apparatuses which control the arms race—is an essential part of the working of capitalism today. No sane capitalist desires a nuclear war (although some insane ones who believe that such a war would be the prelude to the Second Coming now hold positions of influence in Washington). But sane or insane, every capitalist is part of an economic system which is bound up with military competition between nation-states**.** Only a class with the interest and power to do away with capitalism can halt the march to Armageddon. Marx always conceived of the working class as the class whose own self-emancipation would also be the liberation of the rest of humanity. The socialist revolution to whose cause he devoted his life can only be, at one and the same time, the emancipation of the working class and the liberation of all the oppressed and exploited sections of society. Those who accept the truth of Marx’s views cannot rest content with a mere intellectual commitment. There are all too many of this sort around, Marxists content to live off the intellectual credit of Capital, as Trotsky described them. We cannot simply observe the world but must throw ourselves, as Marx did, into the practical task of building a revolutionary party amid the life and struggles of the working class. ‘The philosophers have interpreted the world,’ wrote Marx, ‘the point, however, is to change it.’ If Marxism is correct, then we must act on it.

**It is try or die—capitalism will inevitably destroy the planet.**

**Callinicos 03** – Professor of European Studies – (Alex, “An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto”)

Human intervention in the physical world is inherently liable to the dialectic of unintended consequences portrayed by Engels.' He imagined that humans would, with the help of the natural sciences, be able to remedy these consequences when they proved to be damaging. But this process is greatly inhibited by the current domination of capitalist relations of production, which encourage the employment of scientific knowledge to render the physical world (including such abstract properties as genes) as comprehensively fungible and usable. The logic of competitive accumulation thus not merely causes profound economic crises; it is the main force behind the increasingly threatening process of environmental destruction. Trapped in the competitive struggle to gain an edge over their rivals, capitals are driving collectively towards an outcome that portends planetary disaster. Susan George has powerfully evoked this logic: It is also chimerical to think that the transnationals and the rich countries will change their behaviour in the least when they finally understand that they will destroy the life of the planet on which we must all live. In my view they couldn't stop even if they wanted to, even for the future of their own children. Capitalism is like the famous bicycle that must always go forwards or fall over and firms are competing to see who can pedal faster before smashing against the wall."

**The alternative is try or die – capitalism will inevitably collapse – only a transition now prevents extinction.**

**Monbiot, 04** (George Monbiot, Professor of Philosophy at Bristol and Professor of Politics at Keele. Author, columnist, and political activist. “Manifesto for a New World Order.” p. 238)

None of the measures proposed in this book are sufficient, however, to address a far bigger question, that of the curtailment of the world-eating and mathematically impossible system we call capitalism, and its replacement with a benign and viable means of economic exchange. But I hope that, if implemented, they might begin to establish some of the preconditions in which a global debate about the world's economic and ecological destiny could begin. Because capitalism is built upon the lending of money at interest, capitalist economies are driven by the need to repay debt, which is why survival within this system is contingent upon endless growth. Endless growth is physically impossible. As Heinrich Haussmann has shown, a single pfennig (about half a US cent) invested at five per cent compound interest in the year AD 0 would have yielded, by 1990, a volume of gold 134 billion times the weight of the planet Interest repayments, in other words, are feasible only in the short term. As debt can be paid only by generating value, capitalism seems destined to destroy the planet.

### Problematize

**The alternative is to reject the aff to problematize capitalism. Applying critical globalization studies to local arenas reveals the inter-workings of power and creates movements against them**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

CGS = critical globalization studies

In the tradition of critical studies, a CGS is subversive insofar as it explicitly seeks to replace predominant power structures and social hierarchies with what are seen as more just and equitable social arrangements. A CGS involves exposing the ideological content of theories and knowledge claims often put forward as social scientiﬁc discourse, the vested interests before the façade of neutral scholarship, and how powerful institutions really work. This means challenging the dominant mythologies of our age, such as that ecologically sound development is possible under capitalism, that ‘‘democracy’’ exists where tiny minorities control wealth and power, or that we are moving toward an ‘‘ownership society’’ when in fact we live in a usurped society in which the lot of the majority is one of increasing dispossession. In this sense, a CGS is a counterhegemonic practice that seeks to rebuild public discourse by ‘‘speaking truth to power.’’ It involves making visible and unmasking power relations in our institutions and professional associations, in our locales and in the larger— ultimately global—society. While the substantive agenda of a CGS must be open, the underlying enterprise involves applying our training and experience to elucidating the real inner workings of the social order and the contradictions therein. This must include putting forward a cogent and systematic critique of global capitalism that exposes injustices, makes invisible problems visible, and reveals pressure points in the system. Rendering visible what Paul Farmer (2003) terms the ‘‘pathologies of power’’ means ‘‘bearing witness,’’ but more than that it means showing how suffering is a consequence of the structural violence that is immanent to the prevailing system and that links together apparently disconnected aspects of that system. We should recall, in this regard, Sartre’s admonition, in his ‘‘A Plea for Intellectuals,’’ that ‘‘the exploited classes do not need an ideology so much as the practical truth of society; they need knowledge of the world in order to change it’’ (1974). As regards a CGS, we would do well to follow Susan George’s advice to study not so much the oppressed as the powerful: Those that genuinely want to help the movement should study the rich and powerful, not the poor and powerless. Although wealth and power are in a better position to hide their activities and are therefore more difﬁcult to study, any knowledge about them will be valuable to the movement. The poor and powerless already know what is wrong with their lives and those who want to help them should analyze the forces that keep them poor and powerless. Better a sociology of the Pentagon or the Houston country club than of single mothers or L.A. gangs (2005: 8). In the end, a CGS involves questioning everything, deconstructing everything, interrogating every claim to knowledge, yet it also means reconstructing what we have deconstructed and contributing to the construction of an alternative future. Engagement with Everyday Concerns To engage in a CGS means to maintain contact with everyday concerns, a connection with social forces from below, in its theoretical and empirical research concerns. Such engagement with everyday concerns is the ‘‘act locally’’ of the oft-cited aphorism. People experience global capitalism in their localities and everyday lives. For a CGS, the local–global link means identifying how global processes have penetrated and restructured localities in new ways, organically linking local realities to global processes. Burawoy et al. have shown in their diverse locally situated studies what they call a ‘‘global ethnography,’’ how ‘‘ethnography’s concern with concrete, lived experience can sharpen the abstractions of globalization theories into more precise and meaningful conceptual tools’’ (2000: xiv). It is at this local, experienced level of global capitalism that intellectuals engage in active participation in everyday life, acting as agents or organizers, or in Gramsci’s words, as ‘‘permanent persuaders’’ in the construction of hegemonic social orders (1971: 9–10). The intellectual in this case contributes to the active construction of hegemony by particular social forces that construct and maintain a social order on an ongoing basis. But such intellectual labor can also entail a connection with opposing initiatives, with forces from below and their attempts to forge a counterhegemony by drawing out the connections, through theoretical reﬂection, that link the distinct lived realities, everyday spontaneous and organized forms of struggle. By propagating certain ideas, intellectuals play an essential mediating function in the struggle for hegemony, Gramsci reminds us, by acting as ‘‘deputies’’ or instruments of hegemony, or by performing a valuable supporting role to subordinate groups engaged in promoting social change (5–23; 52–55).

### Reject Commodification

**The alternative is to reject the commodification of life. Viewing controlled spaces as commons opens up news ways of relating to humanity – previous movements prove**

**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, SW)

MST exemplifies a third theme in contemporary counter-hegemonic politics. In response to neoliberalism’s dynamic of accumulation by dispossession, multifarious movements and campaigns have arisen to protect and reclaim the commons from privatization and commodification (Harvey 2005b 166-172). Initially reactive and protective, harkening back to much earlier resistances to enclosure (Linebaugh 2008), indigenous struggles for land, agrarian struggles for seeds, crops and biodiversity, political campaigns against privatization and the like open a “political dynamic of social action across the whole spectrum of civil society” (Harvey, 2005b: 166, 168, 172) that often (as with MST) combines struggles for self-determination with ecological sustainability (Klein 2001: 88). In providing a communal way of regulating activity without the state or market, ‘the commons’ presents a rich counter-hegemonic template (Wall 2005), but raises challenges as to how it will articulate with ‘whatever states also claim authority over the resource or territory in question’ (McCarthy 2005: 24).Notwithstanding such issues, the vision of a global commons ‘defended by a multiplicity of state and non-state actors in the name of human survival’ (Watts 2010:22 ) – visible beyond the cabal of hegemonic state, inter-state and NGO actors that dominated formal negotiations at the 2009 Copenhagen Conference on Climate Change (COP15) – offers a radical imaginary for emerging counterhegemonic sensibilities worldwide. This strong image can be applied not only to political-economic matters, but to ideological struggles against enclosure of the moral field within economistic and legal-bureaucratic frameworks (Smith 1997). On matters ranging from biopiracy and intellectual property rights to the idea of a global commons, ‘“the commons” can work as a unifying signifier – of resistance, community, collective action and common values’ (Holder and Flessas 2008:299). Indeed, as Bakker (2007) shows in her study of struggles against water privatization in the global south, whereas human rights discourse frames issues individualistically and in ways compatible with commodification, the ‘commons’, in championing a collective property right creates space for radical strategies of ecological democracy to decommodify public services, resource management, etc. A contemporary reworking of a very old theme, anti-enclosure offers, in response to the ‘dictatorship of no alternative’ (Unger 2009), the germ of a left response to neoliberalism beyond ‘narrow (and conservative) social democracy’ (Watts 2010:24). The key is to find, or create, the ‘organic link’ between reclaiming the commons and opposing capital’s domination of labour (Harvey 2005a:203), thereby connecting the struggle to decommodify land, intellectual property, public utilities and the like with the struggle to decommodify labour.

### Generic solvency

**Rejecting capitalism is the first step—a refusal to believe in the system can topple empires.**

**Monbiot, 04** (George Monbiot, Professor of Philosophy at Bristol and Professor of Politics at Keele. Author, columnist, and political activist. “Manifesto for a New World Order.” p. 249)

It costs nothing to agree that something should be done; indeed people like us have been accepting this proposition for decades, and waiting for someone else to act on it. Constitutional change will begin only when we reach the more dangerous conclusion that 'I must act'. There have been many occasions over the past few years on which we have won the argument and lost the war. The campaigners who have exposed the injustices of the current global system often succeed in generating a widespread demand for change, and just as often discover that this demand has no outlet. Our opinions, in these circumstances, count for nothing until we act upon them. Until we present a direct constitutional challenge to its survival, or, through such measures as a threatened conditional default, alter the circumstances in which it operates, those who maintain the dictatorship of vested interests will read what we write and listen to what we say without the slightest sense of danger. In 16-19, after recoiling from the satisfaction he felt upon completing one of his revolutionary pamphlets, Gerrard Winstanley noted 'my mind was not at rest, because nothing was acted, and ... words and writings were all nothing. and must die, for action is the life of all, and if thou dost not act, thou dost nothing'. This manifesto, and all the publications like it, is worthless unless it provokes people to action. There are several reasons why we do not act. In most cases, the personal risk involved in the early stages of struggle outweighs the potential material benefit. Those who catalyse revolution are seldom the people who profit from it. In this struggle, most of us are not yet directly confronting armed force (though this may well change as we become effective), so the risks to which we expose ourselves and our families are, as yet, slighter than those encountered by other revolutionaries. Nor, of course, are the potential benefits of resistance as obvious, for those activists who live in the rich world, as the benefits of overthrowing Nazi occupation or deposing an indigenous tyrant, or breaking away from a formally constituted empire. While most of the people of the poor world have an acute need to change the circumstances which govern the way they live, the problems the protesters in rich nations contest belong to the second order of concern: we are not confronted by imminent starvation or death through waterborne disease, but by distant wars, economic instability, climate change and the exhaustion of resources; issues which seldom present immediate threats to our survival. But while the proposals in this manifesto offer little by way of material self-advancement to activists in the rich world, there is, in collective revolutionary action, something which appears to be missing from almost every other enterprise in modern secular life. It arises, I think, from the , intensity of the relationships forged in a collective purpose concentrated by adversity. It is the exultation which Christians call 'joy', but which, in the dry discourse of secular politics, has no recognized equivalent. It is the drug for which, once sampled, you will pay any price. All those with agency are confronted by a choice. We can use that agency to secure comfortable existence. We can for ourselves a safe and use our life, that one unrepeatable product of four billion years of serendipity and evolution, to earn a little more, to save a little more, to win the approval of our bosses and the envy of our neighbours. We can place upon our walls those tombstones which the living erect to themselves: the framed certificates of their acceptance into what Erich Fromm has called the 'necrophiliac' world of wealth and power. We can, quite rationally, subordinate our desire for liberty to our desire for security. Or we can use our agency to change the world, and, in changing it, to change ourselves. We will die and be forgotten with no less certainty than those who sought to fend off death by enhancing their material presence on the earth, but we will live before we die through the extremes of feeling which comfort would deny us. I do not presume to lecture those who have little agency -among them the majority who live in the poor world on how to manage their lives. Over the past five years in many of the countries of the poor world -though this is seldom reported in the West - people have tried to change their circumstances through explosive demonstrations of grief, anger and hope. I have sought, with this manifesto, simply to enhance that hope, by demonstrating that there may be viable alternatives to the systems that subjugate them. But for most of the people of the rich world, and the more prosperous people of the poor world, revolution offers the possibility of freedom from the constraints we impose upon ourselves. Freedom is the ability to act upon our beliefs. It expands, therefore, with the scope of the action we are prepared to contemplate. If we know that we will never act, we have no freedom: we will, for the rest of our lives, do as we are told. Almost everyone has some sense that other people should be treated as she would wish to be. Almost everyone, in other words, has a notion of justice, and for most people this notion, however formulated, sits somewhere close to the heart of their system of beliefs. If we do not act upon this sense of justice, we do not act upon one of our primary beliefs, and our freedom is restricted accordingly. To be truly free, in other words, we must be prepared to contemplate revolution. Another reason why we do not act is that, from the days of our birth, we are immersed in the political situation into which we are born, and as a result we cannot imagine our way through it; we cannot envisage that it will ever come to an end. This is why imagination is the first qualification of the revolutionary. A revolutionary is someone who recognizes the contingency of power. What sustains coercive power is not force of arms, or even capital, but belief. When people cease to believe -to believe in it as they would believe in a god, in its omnipotence, its unassailability and its validity -and when they act upon that belief, an empire can collapse, almost overnight. Those who possess power will surrender it only when they see that the costs -physical or psychological –of retaining it are higher than the costs of losing it. There have been many occasions on which rulers possessed the means of suppressing revolt -the necessary tanks and planes or cannons and cavalry divisions -but chose not to deploy them, because they perceived that the personal effort of retaining power outweighed the effort of relinquishing it. One of the surprises of history is the tendency of some of the most inflexible rulers suddenly to give up, for no evident material reason. They give up because they are tired, so tired that they can no longer sustain the burning purpose required to retain power. They are tired because they have had to struggle against the unbelief of their people, to reassert, through a supreme psychological effort, the validity of their power.

**Our intellectual act is organic – it is a social act that itself can legitimize or challenge the systems of capital**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

I believe that all intellectual labor is organic, in the sense that studying the world is itself a social act, committed by agents with a deﬁnite relationship to the social order. The role of intellectuals in society is, of course, a very old and recurrent theme. To talk of public sociologies today is to underscore both the social role and responsibility of intellectuals and academics. Scholars are indeed public intellectuals, whether or not we identify ourselves as such. By teaching, publishing, and participating in the administration of our universities and other social institutions, we engage in forms of social communication that inﬂuence the development of public consciousness, public understanding of social processes and political life, appraisals of the purpose and potential of social action, and imageries of alternative futures. But there is more to the intellectual enterprise than this. Intellectual production is always a collective process. By collective I do not just mean collaborative projects among scholars or ongoing research programs. I want to foreground here the social and the historical character of intellectual labor. All those who engage in intellectual labor or make knowledge claims are organic intellectuals in the sense that all such labor is social labor, its practitioners are social actors, and the products of its labor are not neutral or disinterested. We must ask ourselves, what is the relationship between our intellectual work and power? What is the relationship between our research into globalization, and power in global society? To what ends and whose interests does our intellectual production serve? In short, as academics and researchers examining globalization, we must ask ourselves, whose mandarins are we?

### Critique solves

**Critiquing assumptions is the best way to leverage change.**

**Reinsborough, 03** (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03 (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

Direct action— actions that either symbolically or directly shift power relations— is an essential transformative tool. Direct action can be both a tactic within a broader strategy or a political ethic of fundamental change at the deepest level of power relations. Every direct action is part of the larger story we are re-telling ourselves about the ability of collaborative power to overcome coercive power. As we endeavor to link systemic change with tangible short term goals we must seek out the points of intervention in the system. These are the places where when we apply our power— usually through revoking our obedience — we are able to leverage change. Direct action at the point of production was one of the original insights of the working people’s labor union movement. Labor radicals targeted the system where it was directly effecting them and where the system was most fetishisticly concerned to make its profits at the expense of the dignity and rights of working people. Modern resistance movements have continued to target the system at its most blatant— the “point of destruction”. We become the frontline resistance by placing our bodies in the way of the harm that is happening. Whether its plugging the effluent pipes that dump poison on a neighborhood, forest defenders sitting in trees marked for cutting or indigenous peoples defending their ancestral homelands, direct action at the point of destruction embodies values crisis. It polarizes the debate in an effort to attract the spotlight of public attention to a clear injustice. But tragically the point of destruction is often times far out of the public eye and the values confrontation is made invisible by distance, imbedded patterns of bias or popular ignorance. Frequently the impacted communities have little political voice so in order to provide support we must find other points of intervention. Inspiring “point of consumption” campaigns have been used by many movements as ways to stand in solidarity with communities fighting at the point of destruction. This is the realm of consumer boycotts, attacks on corporate brand names and other campaigns which target the commercial sector as a way to shut down the markets for destructive products. Activists have confronted retailers selling sweatshop products and forced universities to cancel clothing contracts. Likewise forest activists have forced major chains to stop selling old growth forest products by doing direct actions aimed at companies media profiles and market share. Attacking the point of consumption expands the arena of struggle to mobilize consumers made complicit in the injustice of the globalized economy by their own purchasing decisions. These strategies can be based on a very shallow analysis of “ethical shopping” or a more profound rejection of the consumer identity altogether. The “point of decision” has always been a common and strategic venue for direct action. Whether its taking over a slumlord’s office, a corporate boardroom or the state capital many successful campaigns have used direct action to put pressure on the decision makers they are targeting. Much of the mass action organizing of the past few years has been largely aimed at re-defining popular perceptions of the “point of decision”. The actions at WTO and World Bank meetings, G8 summits and Free Trade negotiating sessions have helped reveal the corporate take-over by showing that it is these new institutions of corporate rule that have usurped decision making power. All of these points of intervention in the system are important and the best strategies unite efforts across them. Increasingly as the global financial sector has becoming the “operating system” for the planet the pathological logic of doomsday economics has replaced specific points of decision in driving the corporate take over. We aren’t just fighting acts of injustice or destruction but rather we are fighting a system of injustice and destruction. In recognizing this we must expand our efforts to intervene in physical space with similar initiatives in cultural and intellectual space. How can we side step the machine and challenge the mentality behind the machine? In other words we need to figure out how to take direct action at the “point of assumption”. Targeting assumptions— the framework of myths, lies, and flawed rationale that normalize the corporate take over— requires some different approaches from actions at the other points of intervention. “Point of assumption” actions operate in the realm of ideas to expose pathological logic, cast doubt and undermine existing loyalties. Successful direct action at the point of assumption identifies, isolates and confronts the big lies that maintain the status quo. A worthy goal for these types of actions is to encourage the most important act that a concerned citizen can take in an era defined by systematic propaganda – QUESTIONING! Direct action at the point of assumption is a tool to de-colonize people’s revolutionary imaginations by linking analysis and action in ways that re-frame issues and create new political space. Whether we’re radically deconstructing consumer spectacles, exposing the system’s propaganda or birthing new rhetoric we need actions that reveal the awful truth— that the intellectual underpinnings of the modern system are largely flawed assumptions. Direct action at the point of assumption is an effort to find the rumors that start revolutions and ask the questions that topple empires**.**

**Critique is fundamental to social change. Only by first realizing the systems of oppression that we have internalized can we challenge the political realm.**

**Reinsborough, 03** (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03 (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

Analysis is the most import tool in the social change toolbox. It is this process of analysis— the work to find the points of intervention and leverage in the system we are working to transform— that suggests why, where and how to use the other tools. Many of us are impatient in our desire for change and particularly, those of us from privileged backgrounds, are often times unschooled in the realities of long-term struggle. I often recall the Buddhist saying “The task before us is very urgent so we must slow down.” This essay is my effort as an organizer who has been deeply involved in a number of recent global justice mass actions, to “slow down” a bit and explore some new analytical tools. My hope is that this essay will incite deeper conversations about strategies for building movements with the inclusiveness, creativity and depth of vision necessary to move towards a more just and sane world. To do so, let’s begin by asking why aren’t more global north movements coming forward with systemic critiques? Why despite the increasingly obvious nature of the crisis, isn’t there more visible resistance to the corporate take over of the global political system, economy and culture? The answer to this question lies in our exploration of how pathological values have shaped not only the global system but also our ability to imagine true change. The system we are fighting is not merely structural it’s also inside us, through the internalization of oppressive cultural norms which define our worldview. Our minds have been colonized to normalize deeply pathological assumptions. Thus often times our own sense of self-defeatism becomes complicit with the anesthetic qualities of a cynical mass media to make fundamental social change unimaginable.

**Criticism is key to global movements—liberation begins with critical emancipation.**

**Reinsborough, 03** (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03 (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

In facing the global crisis, the most powerful weapon that we have is our imaginations. But first we must liberate ourselves from the conceptual limitations we place on social change. As we expand the realm of the possible we shape the direction of the probable. This means directly confronting the myths and assumptions that make a better world seem unattainable. To that end this essay endeavors to explore some tools to help us unshackle our imaginations and deepen the momentum of the global justice movements into a political space to fundamentally re-design the global system. On a final note of introduction I wish to clarify that most of the ideas presented in this essay are neither new nor truly my own. Ideas by their nature quickly cross-pollinate and grow beyond any individual's role in their articulation. All activists owe a great debt to shared experience. I personally owe a great debt to many seasoned activists and theorists from across numerous movements who have shared their thoughts and helped me deepen my analysis. Likewise all of these ideas are a work in progress. They are intended to be tools to spark discussion, encourage debate and it is my sincerest hope that they will generate more questions than they answer. Questions are always more radical than answers.

### Comparatively better

**Claiming that the alternative is not real world is ridiculous in the face of the hopeless utopianism required by continued faith in capitalism.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, Beyond Capital, pg. xiv)

The self-serving slogan of ‘there is no alternative’ is often coupled with an equally tendentious clause of self-justification which proclaims that ‘in the real world’ there can be no alternative to the advocated course of action (or inaction). This proposition is supposed to be a self-evident truth, automatically exempting all those who continue to assert it from inconveniencing themselves with the burden of proof. Yet, the moment we ask the question, what sort of ‘real world’ are they talking about, it becomes clear that it is an utterly fictitious one. For the structural defects and explosive antagonisms of the world in which we actually happen to live are apologetically denied or blindly disregarded by those who expect us to believe that in the ‘real world’ there is no alternative to the meek acceptance of the conditions necessary for the trouble-free functioning of the global-capital system. In the name of reason, common sense, and ‘real politics’ we are invited to resign ourselves to the existing state of affairs, no matter how destructive its antagonisms. For within the parameters of the established order—eternalized as the rational framework of the fundamentally unalterable ‘real world,’ with ‘human nature’ and its corresponding ideal reproductive instrumentality: the ‘market mechanism,’ etc.—no solutions can be envisaged to the ubiquitous contradictions. Thus we are expected to pretend to ourselves that classes and class contradictions no longer exist or no longer matter. Accordingly, the only viable course of action in the thus postulated ‘real world’ is supposed to be to ignore, or to ‘explain away’ the evidence of structural instability provided by our own eyes, wishfully sweeping under an imaginary carpet the chronic problems and crisis symptoms of growing severity with which our social order confronts us every day.

### Academics key

**Academic and intellectual arenas are a critical space in which to contest capital**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

Where do scholars and academics ﬁt in all of this? Where ought they ﬁt in? Universities are centers for the production and reproduction of knowledge and culture. As all social institutions, they internalize the power relations of the larger society to which they belong. Over the past decades, and in tandem with the spread of capitalist globalization, we have witnessed relentless pressures worldwide to commodify higher education, the increasing privatization of universities and their penetration by transnational corporate capital. If the university is to pull back from such a course it must fulﬁll a larger social function in the interests of broad publics and from the vantage point of a social logic that is inevitably at odds with the corporate logic of global capitalism.

### Local movements solvency

**Local movements can gain international traction**

**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, SW)

Such alliances, however, must be grounded in local conditions and aspirations. Eli Friedman’s (2009) case study of two affiliated movement organizations in Hong Kong and mainland China, respectively, illustrates the limits of transnational activism that radiates from advanced capitalism to exert external pressure on behalf of subalterns in the global South. Friedman recounts how a campaign by the Hong Kong-based group of Students and Scholars Against Corporate Misbehavior to empower Chinese mainland workers producing goods for Hong Kong Disneyland failed due to the lack of local mobilization by workers themselves. Yet the same group, through its support for its ally, the mainland-based migrant workers’ association, has helped facilitate self-organization on the shop floor. In the former case, well-intentioned practices of solidarity reproduced a paternalism that failed to inspire local collective action; in the latter, workers taking direct action on their own behalf, with external support, led to ‘psychological empowerment’ and movement mobilization (Friedman 2009: 212). As a rule, ‘the more such solidarity work involves grassroots initiatives and participation, the greater is the likelihood that workers from different countries will learn from each other’, enabling transnational counter-hegemony to gain a foothold (Rahmon and Langford 2010: 63)

### Individual rejection solves

**Individual transformations matter—capitalism depends upon personal acquiescence and so radical social change is possible with individual refusals.**

**Roszak 92** (Theodore, History Professor @ CSU, The Voice of the Earth, pgs. 316-317)

The powers that run the urban-industrial world are well advised to see the personalistic style of the times as threatening. No well-oiled, efficient system can coexist with such a riot of personal improvisations. Self-discovery is the death of the industrial megamachine in the same way that democracy was the death of feudalism. But the disintegration we see impending is a creative disintegration, one that opens a generous place for difference and diversity. Political equality was the beginning of this historical current; personal uniqueness is its destination. And both-the demand for equality, the demand for uniqueness-began inside, in the depths of the private psyche before either became a revolutionary movement in the world. Long before there was a political cause, there were people secretly hurting, needing, wanting. For the first time in human history, every odd and outcast member of our race will be able to step forward without shame and tell his or her story. If we are a culture of narcissists, we seem to find everybody's narcissism as fascinating as our own. Images of the outlandish and bizarre fill the media of modern times. The daily audience participation and talk shows on television probe every kink and twist of human nature. Pausing at the checkout counter of the supermarket, I come upon a small library of tawdry newspapers, each vying with the other to lay a more grotesque freak show before its readers. Yet even these exercises in tasteless sensationalism tell us something important. They reveal how very interested in one another we have become, how we crave to learn of the oddness and eccentricity of people everywhere. Simple animal curiosity may finally come to our rescue; there may be a saving wisdom hidden in this fascination with everyman's and everywoman's story. We will need all these personal histories to do even minimal justice to whatever the rerum natura is. Ecologically speaking, the music of the spheres is neither a solo nor a massed chorus carrying a single melody, but a jazz improvisation where each player has a rift. There is something more we can learn from basic ecology besides the value of variety. The urban revolution was the beginning of the interval of disequilibrium in whose latter days we now live. By human standards, the five thousand years of that interval may seem enormously long; but in the Gaian chronicles of the planet it is a minor, recent fluctuation still playing out its full implications. Now we begin to see with benefit of historical perspective how very ruthless this experiment has been in the regimentation of mental and physical energy. In the industrial period, machines of metal and chemical fuels have taken the place of muscle and animal metabolism, but the massification of people that began with the pharaoh's work-gang continues in the form of the assembly line, the white collar office force, the consumer market, the conscript army. Industrialism demands massification for its extraordinary power over nature: mass production, mass media, mass marketing. Our complex global economy is built upon millions of small, private acts of psychological surrender, the willingness of people to acquiesce in playing their assigned parts as cogs in the great social machine that encompasses all other machines. They must shape themselves to the prefabricated identities that make efficient coordination possible. If Gaia is to moderate the planet-punishing thrust of world industrialism, that capacity for self-enslavement must be broken. And the rock on which it founders is self-discovery, your conviction and mine that we are each a remarkable, unrepeatable event in the universe, a life shaped around an idea that happens only once and never again. The ecological ego is born of a narcissism that boldly asserts love and fascination with the self, not as a competitive agent, but as a freely created being demanding attention, recognition, respect.

**Individual resistance is revolutionary—the existing order only has power as long as we support it.**

**Monbiot, 04** (George Monbiot, Professor of Philosophy at Bristol and Professor of Politics at Keele. Author, columnist, and political activist. “Manifesto for a New World Order.” p. 260)

All political systems are ephemeral, and we can expect any new means of governance we design to collapse eventually and be succeeded by others, perhaps even to age as rapidly as the deceased systems of the past century or so. But there is also a possibility that, rather than merely replacing one set of institutions with another, we might call forth something else, something much bigger, more menacing and more persistent: the metaphysical mutation which transforms the way in which human beings perceive themselves, and which nothing but another metaphysical mutation can halt. This transformation will not bring oppression to an end, or alter any of the basic human instincts which make us the flawed and dangerous creatures we are, but, if it occurs, it will establish a framework of perception which permits us to cooperate in resolving our common problems. None of these upheavals will happen spontaneously. The existing institutions cannot reform themselves. Their power relies upon the injustice of the arrangements which gave rise to them, and to tackle that injustice would be to accept their own dissolution. Governments will not act on our behalf until we force them to do so. The political classes from which most governing parties are drawn have no interest in this revolution. This shift, in other words, depends not on an amorphous them, but on a specific you. It depends on your preparedness to abandon your attachment to the old world and start thinking like a citizen of the new; to exchange your security for liberty, your comfort for elation. It depends on your willingness to act.

**Personal rejection is critical to moving away from capitalism—the system is only inevitable if we treat it as such.**

**Holloway, 05** (John, Ph.D in Political Science from the University of Edinburgh, “Can we change the World without taking power”, A debate between Holloway and Alex Callinicos, August 16th, http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616)

I don't know the answer. Perhaps we can change the world without taking power. Perhaps we cannot. The starting point: for all of us, I think: 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, 'No, you will not tell us what to do, we shall decide for ourselves what we must do.' 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.

### Econ collapse solves

**A financial crisis could facilitate a transition away from capitalism**

**Harvey 10** (David, Professor at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY) and Director at the Center for Place, Culture, and Politics,

paper prepared for the American Sociological Association Meetings in Atlanta, August 16th, 2010, “The Enigma of Capital and the Crisis this Time”, Google Books)

There are abundant signs, however, that capital accumulation is at an historical inflexion point where sustaining a compound rate of growth is becoming increasingly problematic. In 1970 this meant finding new profitable global investment opportunities for $0.4 trillion. Resumption of three percent growth right now would mean finding profitable investment opportunities for $1.5 trillion. If that rate of growth were to be sustained by 2030 or so we would be looking at $3 trillion. Put in physical terms, when capitalism in 1750 was about everything going on around Manchester and Birmingham and a few other hot spots in the global economy then three percent compound growth posed no problem. But we are now looking at compounding growth on everything going on in North America, Europe, much of East Asia, Latin America and increasingly South Asia, the Middle East and Africa….The implications socially, politically and environmentally are nothing short of gargantuan. Note that the operative term here is *profitable* investment opportunities as opposed to socially necessary and socially valuable investment opportunities. So where, then, are the potential limits to this profitability? Since capital is a process not a thing, then the continuity of the process (along with its speed and geographical adaptability and mobility) becomes a crucial feature to sustaining growth. Any slow-down or blockage in capital flow will produce a crisis. If our blood flow stops then we die. If capital flow stops then the body politic of capitalist society dies. This simple rule was most dramatically demonstrated in the wake of the events of 9/11. Normal processes of circulation were stopped dead in and around New York City with huge ramifications for the global economy. Within five days, then Mayor Guiliani was pleading with everyone to get out their credit cards and go shopping, go to the restaurants and the Broadway shows (seats are now available!) and shortly thereafter the President of the United States did an unprecedented thing: he appeared in a collective commercial for the airlines pleading with people to start flying again. When the banks stopped lending and credit froze in the wake of the Lehman collapse on September 15th, 2008, the survival of capitalism was threatened and political power went to extraordinary lengths to loosen the constrictions. It was a matter of life or death for capital as everyone in power recognized. Inspection of the circulation of capital reveals, however a series of potential blockage points any one of which could induce a crisis by constricting capital flow. Let us consider each of these.

### Solves envt

**The alternative is key to achieving environmental justice. The poor can only survive in a sustainable world.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism,* p 87-89)

Rejecting the higher immorality, this new ecological conscience says that being green is about having enough, not always more. This does not however mean the abandonment of those populations at the bottom of the world system – for whom genuine economic development, insofar as it benefits the poorest segments of society, remains essential. Indeed, as Tom Athanasiou has remarked in his *Divided Planet,* “History will judge Greens by whether they stand with the world’s poor.” Ecology and social justice, as the environmental justice movement of recent years has taught us, cannot be separated. What genuine hope there is for the continuing development of a collective ecological conscience under these circumstances derives ironically from the very globalizing trend of the system and the “acceleration of history” that it has brought with it. Since 1950 the world economy has grown by a factor of five, from $4 trillion to $20 trillion. Despite the fact that only 8 percent of the world’s population have cars, carbon dioxide emissions, primarily from automobiles, have grown to a level that threatens the stability of the world’s climate. Under these circumstances it is obvious to more and more people throughout the world that the entire planet has become vulnerable to the expansion of the most threatening biosphere culture of all, one that now has reached a scale that rivals the basic biochemical cycles of the planet. The manifestations of this are all around us with the advent of such planetary ecological threats as destruction of the ozone layer, global warming, rapid extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, impending food and water shortages, the proliferation of toxic wastes, and the decline of ecosystems throughout the earth. The ecological consciousness that this crisis has generated is not merely confined to the global level, however, but is giving rise to an ever more fervent commitment on the part of radical environmentalists to struggle on the behalf of individual ecosystems and the communities attached to them – in opposition to the current world economy, with its “sea of utilitarian brutality” (William Morris).

**The alternative is the best means to achieve social justice—the end of capitalism is key to equality.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism,* p 131-132)

The direct route to the creation of a mass environmental movement is one that seeks to break the seemingly intractable conflict between jobs and environmental protection (a conflict symbolized nowadays by owls versus jobs) by placing ecological conversion – the planning of new ways of working with nature while fulfilling social needs – at the very core of each and every ecological struggle. This necessarily means moving away from the attitude that environmentalism can somehow stand above and beyond the class struggle. A shift toward a broad movement for ecological conversion and the creation of a sustainable society also means that the partnership between the state and the capitalist class, which has always formed the most important linchpin of the capitalist system, must be loosened by degrees, as part of an overall social and environmental revolution. This partnership must be replaced, in the process of a radical transformation of the society, by a new partnership between democratized state power and popular power.

### Solves poverty

**Abandoning capitalism is the only way to alleviate the worst effects of poverty—human needs can all be met if consumption at the top is dramatically decreased.**

**Mészáros, 07** (Professor Emeritus in Philosophy and Political Theory, University of Sussex. “The Only Viable Economy” http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm)

That is where the incorrigible divorce of capitalistic growth from human need and use -- indeed its potentially most devastating and destructive counter-position to human need -- betrays itself. Once the fetishistic mystifications and arbitrary postulates at the root of the categorically decreed false identity of growth and productivity are peeled away, it becomes abundantly clear that the kind of growth postulated and at the same time automatically exempted from all critical scrutiny is in no way inherently connected with sustainable objectives corresponding to human need. The only connection that must be asserted and defended at all cost in capital's social metabolic universe is the false identity of -- aprioristically presupposed -- capital expansion and circularly corresponding (but in truth likewise aprioristically presupposed) "growth," whatever might be the consequences imposed on nature and humankind by even the most destructive type of growth. For capital's real concern can only be its own ever enlarged expansion, even if that brings with it the destruction of humanity. In this vision even the most lethal cancerous growth must preserve its conceptual primacy over (against) human need and use, if human need by any chance happens to be mentioned at all. The characteristically self-serving false alternative of "growth or no growth" is evident even if we only consider what would be the unavoidable impact of the postulated "no growth" on the grave conditions of inequality and suffering in capital's social order. It would mean the permanent condemnation of humanity's overwhelming majority to the inhuman conditions which they are now forced to endure. For they are now in a literal sense forced to endure them, by their thousands of millions, when there could be created a real alternative to it. Under conditions, that is, when it would be quite feasible to rectify at least the worst effects of global deprivation: by putting to humanly commendable and rewarding use the attained potential of productivity, in a world of now criminally wasted material and human resources.

### Solves inevitability

**Capitalism is only inevitable if we support it – rejection solves**

**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, SW)

Counter-hegemony, as distinct from defensive forms of subaltern resistance, strives to shape those ‘anticipating elements’, so that they may become lasting features of social life. For counter-hegemony, the challenge is to seek out in the present the preconditions for a post-capitalist future and to develop political strategy based on an analysis of those immanent possibilities (Ollman 2003). Gramsci captured this dialectic with the metaphor of welding the present to the future: How can the present be welded to the future, so that while satisfying the urgent necessities of the one we may work effectively to create and ‘anticipate’ the other (1977: 65)?The new is no mere ‘fashion’, the latter being a preferred trope of modernity (Blumer 1969), closely integrated with consumer-capitalist accumulation strategies, and thus with reproducing the status quo. Often the new reworks the old, with radical effects. Viewed dialectically, the new preserves yet transforms extant reality, as in the incorporation of indigenous ways as alternatives to neoliberal practices that have grown decidedly old (cf. Bahn 2009). This dialectic between what already exists and what might be constructed out of that is integral to any project of purposeful socio-political change. Movements, as Melucci (1989) has emphasized, are laboratories for social invention. They are carriers of the ‘new means and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships’ that Williams (1977: 123) identified with cultural emergence; ‘emergent publics’ that create possibilities for a more democratic way of life (Angus 2001). Movements succeed in creating change when political and cultural opportunity structures open up (Tarrow 1998). But which movements, which practices and which alignments of movements and practices, in short which ‘new combinations’ (Dyer-Witheford 2001) might already carry the new – and under what contemporary conditions might they have efficacy? These are more concrete questions of counter-hegemony. Theorists of agency and structure note that, although social structures are sustained solely through the practices that reproduce them, such practices, precisely because they are structurally reproductive, do not produce much that is new; only transformative practices have that capacity (Bhaskar 1989; Fraser 1995). Indeed, a well-established hegemonic structure naturalizes social cleavages and contradictions, securing the active, agentic consent of subalterns to their subordination (De Leon, Desai and Tuğal 2009: 216; Joseph 2002). Organic crisis Gramsci, following Marx and anticipating Bourdieu, recognized crisis as a necessary condition for undoing the doxa that is perhaps the most salient feature of well-entrenched hegemony. In Gramsci’s formulation, organic crisis is a crucial element in creating the new. In this kind of crisis, the structures and practices that constitute and reproduce a hegemonic order fall into chronic and visible disrepair, creating a new terrain of political and cultural contention, and the possibility (but only the possibility) of social transformation. Such a situation entails a crisis of authority: If the ruling class has lost its consensus, i.e., is no longer ‘leading’ but only ‘dominant’, exercising coercive force alone, this means precisely that the great masses have become detached from their traditional ideologies…. The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear (1971: 275-6).

## \*\*A2\*\*

### Perm

**Single-issue movements will be co-opted by capitalism—only complete structural challenges have any hope.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 39-40)

To aggravate the situation, everything is further complicated by the fact that it is not feasible to find partial solutions to the problems that must be faced. Thus, no ‘single issue’ can be realistically considered a ‘single issue.’ If nothing else, this circumstance has been forcefully highlighted by the disconcerting marginalization of the Green movement on the success of which so much hope has been placed in recent times, even among former socialists. In the past up to a few decades ago it was possible to squeeze out of capital what appeared to be significant concessions—such as relative gains for the socialist movement (which later turned out to be reversible both as legislative measures for working class action and as gradually improving standard of living), obtained through the defensive organizations of labour: its trades unions and parliamentary parties. These gains could be conceded by capital so long as they could be assimilated and integrated by the system as a whole and turned to its productive advantage in the course of its self-expansion. Today, by contrast, confronting even partial issues with any hope of success implies the necessity of challenging the capital system as such. For in our own historical epoch, when productive self-expansion is no longer a readily available way out of the accumulating difficulties and contradictions (hence the purely wishful thinking of getting rid of the black hope of indebtedness by ‘growing out of it’), the global capital system of necessity frustrates all attempts at interfering even to a minimal extent with its structural parameters. In this respect the obstacles to be overcome are actually shared by labour—that is, labour as the radical alternative to capital’s social metabolic order—and the ‘single issue’ movements. For the historic failure of social democracy clearly underlined that only integrable demands can gain legitimacy under the rule of capital. Environmentalism by its very nature—just like the great historic cause of women’s liberation—is non-integrable. Consequently no such cause will for the capital system conveniently fade way, irrespective of how many setbacks and defeats the politically organized forms of ‘single issue’ movements might have to suffer in the foreseeable future. However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naïve. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable issue, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but—precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital—can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

**Reform movements must be systemic to solve—single-issue protests inhibit change.**

**Reinsborough, (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03** (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

This is the domain of post-issue activism— the recognition that the roots of the emerging crisis lie in the fundamental flaws of the modern order and that our movements for change need to talk about re-designing the whole global system— now. Post-issue activism is a dramatic divergence from the slow progression of single-issue politics, narrow constituencies and band-aid solutions. Traditional single-issue politics, despite noble and pragmatic goals, is not just a strategic and gradualist path to the same goal of global transformation. Rather the framework of issue-based struggle needs to affirm the existing system in order to win concessions and thus inhibits the evolution of more systemic movements. Too often we spend our time campaigning against the smoke rather than clearly alerting people to the fact that their house is on fire. Post-issue activism is the struggle to address the holistic nature of the crisis and it demands new frameworks, new alliances and new strategies. We must find ways to articulate the connections between all the “issues” by revealing the pathological nature of the corporate take over. To do so we must rise to the challenge of going beyond (rather than abandoning) single-issue politics. We have to learn to talk about values, deepen our analysis without sacrificing accessibility and direct more social change resources into creating political space for a truly transformative arena of social change.

**Reforming capitalism fails—rejection’s key.**

**Foster, Clark, and York, 08** (John Bellamy Foster, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology at North Carolina State University. Richard York, coeditor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology at the University of Oregon. “Ecology: The Moment of Truth - An Introduction.” July 2008. http://www.monthlyreview.org/080701foster-clark-york.php)

According to environmentalist Lester Brown in his Plan B 3.0, “We are crossing natural thresholds that we cannot see and violating deadlines that we do not recognize. Nature is the time keeper, but we cannot see the clock....We are in a race between tipping points in the earth’s natural systems and those in the world’s political systems. Which will tip first?”6 As the clock continues to tick and little is accomplished it is obvious that the changes to be made have to be all the more sudden and massive to stave off ultimate disaster. This raises the question of more revolutionary social change as an ecological as well as social necessity.Yet, if revolutionary solutions are increasingly required to address the ecological problem, this is precisely what the existing social system is guaranteed not to deliver. Today’s environmentalism is aimed principally at those measures necessary to lessen the impact of the economy on the planet’s ecology without challenging the economic system that in its very workings produces the immense environmental problems we now face. What we call “the environmental problem” is in the end primarily a problem of political economy. Even the boldest establishment economic attempts to address climate change fall far short of what is required to protect the earth—since the “bottom line” that constrains all such plans under capitalism is the necessity of continued, rapid growth in production and profits.

**The state is inevitably capitalist and any efforts at reform will be doomed. Refusals that exist wholly outside the power of the state are the only means of overthrowing capitalism.**

**Holloway, 05** (John, http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=8520, Can We Change The World Without Taking Power? A debate between John Holloway and Alex Callinicos World Social Forum, 27 January

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 pivot, 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.

**Capitalism is inherently driven by profits, not social welfare. We need to radically change course, not attempt to reform it.**

**Sweezy, 04** (Paul M. Sweezy, Marxist economist and founder of Monthly Review magazine. “Capitalism and the Environment.” October 2004. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1132/is\_5\_56/ai\_n6338575)

Since there is no way to increase the capacity of the environment to bear the burdens placed on it, it follows that the adjustment must come entirely from the other side of the equation. And since the disequilibrium has already reached dangerous proportions, it also follows that what is essential for success is a reversal, not merely a slowing down, of the underlying trends of the last few centuries. We have seen that at the heart of these trends is an economic system driven by the energy and inventiveness of entities--individuals, partnerships, in the last hundred years corporations--out to advance their own economic interests with little thought and less concern for the effects on either society as a whole or the natural environment which it draws on for the essentials of its existence. Already a century and a half ago Marx and Engels, in a memorable passage from the Communist Manifesto, paid a remarkable tribute to the energy and achievements of the then young capitalist mode of production: The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man's machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground--what earlier century had even a presentiment that such forces slumbered in the lap of social labor? Actually, when this was written in 1847 the rule of the bourgeoisie extended to only a small part of the earth's surface, and the new sciences and technologies harnessing the forces of nature to human purposes were still in their infancy. Since then capitalism has spread to become a truly global system, and the development and application of science and technology to industry and agriculture have progressed beyond anyone's wildest dreams a hundred and fifty years ago. Despite all the dramatic changes, however, the system remains in essence what it was at its birth, a juggernaut driven by the concentrated energy of individuals and small groups single-mindedly pursuing their own interests, checked only by their mutual competition, and controlled in the short run by the impersonal forces of the market and in the longer run, when the market fails, by devastating crises. Implicit in the very concept of this system are interlocked and enormously powerful drives to both creation and destruction. On the plus side, the creative drive relates to what humankind can get out of nature for its own uses; on the negative side, the destructive drive bears most heavily on nature's capacity to respond to the demands placed on it. \* Sooner or later, of course, these two drives are contradictory and incompatible. And since, as argued above, the adjustment must come from the side of the demands imposed on nature rather than from the side of nature's capacity to respond to these demands, we have to ask whether there is anything about capitalism as it has developed over recent centuries to cause us to believe that the system could curb its destructive drive and at the same time transform its creative drive into a benign environmental force. The answer, unfortunately, is that there is absolutely nothing in the historic record to encourage such a belief. The purpose of capitalist enterprise has always been to maximize profit, never to serve social ends. Mainstream economic theory since Adam Smith has insisted that by directly maximizing profit the capitalist (or entrepreneur) is indirectly serving the community. All the capitalists together, maximizing their individual profits, produce what the community needs while keeping each other in check by their mutual competition. All this is true, but it is far from being the whole story. Capitalists do not confine their activities to producing the food, clothing, shelter, and amenities society needs for its existence and reproduction. In their single-minded pursuit of profit, in which none can refuse to join on pain of elimination, capitalists are driven to accumulate ever more capital, and this becomes both their subjective goal and the motor force of the entire economic system. It is this obsession with capital accumulation that distinguishes capitalism from the simple system for satisfying human needs it is portrayed as in mainstream economic theory. And a system driven by capital accumulation is one that never stands still, one that is forever changing, adopting new and discarding old methods of production and distribution, opening up new territories, subjecting to its purposes societies too weak to protect themselves. Caught up in this process of restless innovation and expansion, the system rides roughshod over even its own beneficiaries if they get in its way or fall by the roadside. As far as the natural environment is concerned, capitalism perceives it not as something to be cherished and enjoyed but as a means to the paramount ends of profit-making and still more capital accumulation. Such is the inner nature, the essential drive of the economic system that has generated the present environmental crisis.

**Half measures have no hope—we need to cut consumption by about 90% to create a sustainable world.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 127)

The reason why we have an environment problem is simply because *there is far too* *much producing and consuming going on*. (For a detailed argument see Trainer, 1998.) Our way of life involves the consumption of huge amounts of materials. More than 20 tonnes of new resources are used by each American every year. To produce one tonne of materials can involve processing 15 tonnes of water, earth or air. (For gold the multiple is 350,000 to 1.) All this must be taken from nature and most of it is immediately dumped back as waste and pollution. One of the most serious environmental problems is the extinction of plant and animal species. This is due to the destruction of habitats. Remember our footprint; if all 9 billion people soon to live on earth were to have rich-world “living stan- dards”, humans would have to use about ten times all the productive land on the planet. Clearly our resource-intensive lifestyles, which require so much land and so many resources, are the basic cause of the loss of habitats and the extinction of species. Most green and sustainability rhetoric totally fails to grasp the significance of this magnitude, proceeding as if it is possible to make manufacturing and lifestyles and the economy sustainable without any need to reduce the volume of production and consumption, “living standards”, or the GDP. It ignores the glaring fact that perhaps 90% cuts in resource use are required and these cannot possibly be made without phasing out most industrial activity, trade, travel and commerce...without, in other words, extreme and historically unprecedented social change.

### Perm- Reform tradeoff

**Systemic critique is the only hope—single-issue reform and the politics of crisis management distracts from the need for fundamental change.**

**Reinsborough, (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03** (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

One of the biggest pitfalls activists face to effectively articulating the values crisis is the fact that the category of protester has been constructed to be highly marginal by the establishment. Within the pathological logic of corporate capitalism dissent is de-legitimized to be unpatriotic, impractical, naïve or even insane. Unfortunately radicals are all too often complicit in our own marginalization by accepting this elite depiction of ourselves as the fringe. The reality is that the neoliberal policy writers and corporate executives who think the world can continue on with unlimited economic growth in a finite biological system are the wackos, not us. We are not the fringe. We can frame the debate. In fact as Paul Rey’s research has shown us a sizable percentage of the population already shares our commitment to cultural transformation, all we need to do is reach them. The significance of the recent mass actions against corporate globalization has not been our tactics. Movements aren’t about tactics – take this street corner, blockade that corporate office – movements are about ideas. Movements are about changing the world. When we say a better world is possible – we mean it. We want a world that reflects basic life centered values. We’ve got the vision and the big ideas and the other side doesn’t. We’ve got biocentrism, organic food production, direct democracy, renewable energy, tree free alternatives, people’s globalization, justice and what have they got? Styrofoam? Neo-liberalism? Eating disorders? Designer jeans and manic depression? In a context where the elites hold so much power, almost all our actions are symbolic. Accepting this can be one of our greatest strengths and help us realize that the most important aspects of our actions are the messages they create. We must exploit the power of the narrative structure and weave our ideas and actions into compelling stories. Inevitably our broadest audience will start their interaction with new ideas as spectators. Thus our campaigns and actions must tell inclusive inciting stories that create more and more space for people to see themselves in the story. We must tell the story of values crisis. Stories which make people take sides – are you part of the sickness or are you part of the healing? Are you part of the life affirming future or are your part of the doomsday economy? The first step is to separate dissent from the self-righteous tone which many people associate with protest. This tone can be particularly strong in activists from privileged background who are invested in visible "defection" as a way to validate their resistance. These politics of defection by their very nature create obstacles to communicating with the mainstream and frequently rely on symbols of dissent and rebellion that are already marginalized. We need new symbols of inclusive resistance and transformation. We need new memes – the basic units of information – to convey the values crisis. Memes are viral by nature, they move easily through our modern world of information networks and media saturation. We need to be training ourselves to become “meme warriors” and to tell the story of values crisis in different ways for different audiences. We must get a better sense of who our audiences are, and target our messages to fit into their existing experiences. We need to be media savy and use the corporate propaganda machine. Not naively as the exclusive means of validating our movements, but as a tool of information self defense to oppose the information warfare being waged against us. The corporate media is another tool to name the system and undermine the grip of the dominant mythology. While we spin we simultaneously need to promote media democracy and capitalize on the alternative and informal media and communication networks as a means to get our message out. Our movements must become the nervous systems of an emerging transformative culture. It’s essential that we frame our ideas in such a way that as people wake up to the crisis they have the conceptual tools to understand the systemic roots of the problem. Over the next decade as the global crisis becomes more visible we won’t have to do much to convince people about the problem. Rather our job will be to discredit the elite’s band-aid solutions and build popular understanding of the need for systemic solutions. Whether we are talking about genetic pollution, financial meltdowns or nuclear accidents if we haven’t framed the issue in advance even the most dramatic breakdowns in the system can be “crisis-managed” away without alerting the public to the system’s fundamental failings. If we do the work to challenge the control mythology and undermine the flawed assumptions then people will know whom to blame. As we build a public awareness of the values crisis it helps shift the debate away from reform and towards re-designing the global system. This is the strategy of leap frogging, a way of dealing with the political road-blocks we find crippling almost any basic progress on confronting the glaring problems of our times. Leap-frogging is one way of confronting colonized imaginations and entrenched power holders by defining issues in such a way that public consciousness leap-frogs over limiting definitions and elite solutions. This means having the skill and courage to articulate design flaws and avoiding concessions that dead end in inadequate reforms. It is essential that as the crisis becomes self- evident we are building mass awareness of the system’s design-flaws. This process of leap-frogging the elite framing of the problem prepares people to accept the dramatic changes necessary to make another world possible. There are any number of macro-issues that when framed correctly can help us name the system. Global warming, commodification of basic human needs from health care to water, the rate of technological change, increasing racism, the spread of genetic pollution, ongoing violence against women - are just a few examples which can tell the story of values crisis. The challenge is not what issue we work on but how we avoid being pulled into the regulatory and concessionary arenas that dictate single issue politics.

**Using the state to reform capitalism fails—the permutation will get coopted**

**Holloway, 05** (John, Ph.D in Political Science from the University of Edinburgh, “Can we change the World without taking power”, A debate between Holloway and Alex Callinicos, August 16th, http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616)

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 channeled 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.

### Perm- Other instances

**The configuration of infrastructure is a key point of contestation of global capital – expansion of infrastructure creates the condition of possibility for rapid capital accumulation**

**Derickson, 11** Ph.D in Geography and Womens Studies (Kate Driscoll, “NEOLIBERALISM AND THE POLITICS OF LAND USE IN POST-KATRINA MISSISSIPPI”, Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University The Graduate School College of Earth and Mineral Science https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/paper/11630/7208 SW)

Major reconfigurations of the built environment, as moments of creative destruction, can provide a particularly telling window into neoliberal capitalist social relations.1 Indeed, given Marxism‟s materialist lineage, it is quite surprising that geographers with roots in that tradition have paid so little attention to the built environment and its reconfiguration in the course of their many efforts to analyze neoliberalism. It is all the more surprising given the strong emphasis on private property that runs through the liberal philosophical tradition, neoliberalism, and contemporary struggles over the built environment alike. The politics, processes, and discourses associated with major reconfigurations of the built environment should be critical sites for the investigation and analysis of neoliberalism because they contain and represent the implementation of ideologically driven imaginations of the city, involve extensive justification and debate, and contain intricate land use decisions and political battles that play out as the larger project itself is debated. Moreover, whatever is eventually built inscribes current social relationships into the material environment in ways that often make them long-lasting, resistant to change, and distant from the social relations and process which created them. Thus, as I flesh out further below, major reconfigurations of the built environment and the associated politics and processes provide great promise for gaining a deeper understanding of the interconnection between large scale macroeconomic shifts, the ways in which capital, the state, and labor position themselves relative to those shifts, and the ways in which citizen subjectivities and cultural politics are articulated in and through the politics of the built environment. As Kathryne Mitchell (2004) has argued, “documenting in detail the transformation of space and consciousness in a particular urban environment makes it possible to understand the tightly interwoven relationship between socio- economic change, urban spatial transformation, and the narratives and practices of contemporary regimes of governance” (5). The term “built environment” refers to all human-made structures and their configuration. This includes infrastructure such as roads, bridges, highways, subdivisions, and public housing projects, as well as ports, wharves, and train yards. Examples are endless, of course. The built environment encapsulates sites of both production and reproduction, and its configuration is shaped largely by the interplay between the two. Workforce housing, road configuration, and public transportation – to name just a few – are designed to facilitate labor‟s access to work, commerce, and the transportation of goods. Each of these elements of the built environment exists in relation to the others – for example, sites of production and reproduction are in a particularly important relationship with one another and their relative location can be manipulated based on available transportation routes. Indeed, the tension between the needs and interests of labor and capital with respect to the built environment are often at the heart of struggles over land use. Capital accumulation requires particular configurations of the built environment insofar as the means of production are part and parcel of the built environment itself, **as are supporting facilities such as ports, industrial parks, and other infrastructure**. The cost of construction and maintenance, as well as the management of these features of the built environment is often borne by the state, at times with the explicit purpose of facilitating capital accumulation, and at other times with the stated purpose of improving quality of life (though often there are profit motives and opportunities attached). The recent allocation of $600 million dollars by the state of Mississippi to the redevelopment and enhancement of the Port of Gulfport to facilitate larger produce shipments with shorter turnaround times and improved handling of produce and access to transportation networks is one such example of the state facilitating and managing infrastructure for the explicit purpose of capital accumulation (Gidwani and Chari 2004; Harvey 2007 [1982]). The built environment is not only a venue in which capitalist social relations play out, it also provides another window into the internal logic of capitalism. The creation and organization of the built environment represents a contradictory moment for capital. Its development is necessary for further accumulation and innovation, yet it freezes, for a short time at least, a particular configuration that is often outmoded by the dynamic needs of capital. This tension, between the built environment and its material resistance to change and the fluid and dynamic nature of capital, creates **friction** that is recognizably played out in neighborhoods, city centers, suburbs, and downtowns. There are two important ways in which the built environment provides a window into the internal logic of capitalism in cities. First, major reconfigurations of the built environment are largely funded by and mediated through the state. As the geographies of production and manufacturing have evolved, so have the place-specific needs of capital. These needs are communicated by capitalists to the state in the form of political pressure to promote change. This evolution can be seen clearly and is well described by Wilson (2007) as he documents the shifting needs of deindustrializing cities seeking their new fortunes by reinventing themselves as “global cities.” By examining these efforts we can understand how the needs of capital are changing and how its relationship with the state is evolving. Second, favorable configurations of the built environment can drive down labor costs and increase relative surplus value. By lowering the cost of social reproduction in the form of housing and transportation, capitalists stand to increase their relative surplus value. In Biloxi, where rising insurance costs threaten the affordability of housing for nearby casinos, business leaders are concerned about travel time to work and the labor market‟s access to affordable housing. Of course, the extent to which housing is “affordable” is directly related to regional wages. Thus, any responsibility that the state takes relative to providing affordable housing functions, in part, to allow local employers to decrease the social wage. To paraphrase Harvey (1989b), capital thus creates artifacts which create a sort of friction with which it must contend in the future. In the case of this study, these artifacts with which capital must contend include established minority and low-income neighborhoods in currently inconvenient locations, and wide swaths of waterfront real estate littered with industrial ruins and **outmoded infrastructure**. Interestingly, however, it is not just capital that must contend with these things, but also the state. And to some degree, these outmoded or inconvenient configurations are the state‟s problem, as it looks to attract capital and develop the regional economy. Still, place-based capitalists with assets in the region, or existing investment, must contend with them as well. Hence we see “growth machine politics” (Molotch 1976; Logan and Molotch 1987) advocating state investment and spending in infrastructure in order to offset capital investment and expenditure and enhance relative surplus value. Finally, insofar as capital must contend with existing configurations of the built environment that are slow to change, these configurations necessarily shape the possibilities available to capital for accumulation. The built environment is stubbornly material. Perhaps even more than social service programs, institutions, or modes of governance, the built environment is materially resistant to change. Of course, material change to the built environment is possible, and happens all the time. Buildings can be torn down, remodeled, or gentrified – converted from mills to artist “live/work” space. Highways can be torn down, and new ones can be built. But major remakings of the built environment take time, cost money, and confront the vexing challenge of private property ownership, all of which must be dealt with in and through the state. Thus, struggles over the built environment are a relevant but under-explored sphere for understanding the logic of capital accumulation in a given period insofar as they encompasses, to a degree, the evolving relationship between the state, civil society and capital.

**Challenging infrastructure policy is key site for struggle because it is the backdrop of our entire economic model.**

**Edwards, 03** (Paul School of Information & History @ Michigan “Infrastructure and Modernity” in *Modernity and Technology* eds. Misa Brey & Feenberg p. 191)

Thus infrastructure is the invisible background, the substrate or support, the technocultural/natural environment, of modernity. Therefore, the question of infrastructure seems to me better posed than Heidegger’s rather ill-formed “question concerning technology,” which he, like most others, understood chiefly as “artifact” (Heidegger 1977). To paraphrase Langdon Winner, infrastructures act like laws (Winner 1986). They create both opportunities and limits; they promote some interests at the expense of others. To live within the multiple, interlocking infrastructures of modern societies is to know one’s place in gigantic systems that both enable and constrain us. The automobile/road infrastructure, for example, allows us to move around at great speed, but also defines where it is possible to go; only a few modern people travel far on foot to places where there are no roads. When they do, it is chiefly as recreation (“being in nature”). Telephones, electric power, television, and other basic infrastructures offer many services, but also ensnare subscribers in webs of corporate bureaucracy, government regulation, and the constant barrage of advertising. Control, regularity, order, system, technoculture as our nature: not only are all of these fundamental to modernism as *Weltanschauung,* ideology, aesthetic, and design practice, but they are also **(**I want to argue) basic to **modernity as lived reality**. This combination of systemic technologically supported social possibilities and lawlike constraints leads to my first answer to the questions that motivate this book: Building infrastructures has been constitutive of the modern condition in almost every conceivable sense. At the same time, ideologies and discourses of modernism have helped define the purposes, goals, and characteristics of those infrastructures. In other words, the co-construction of technology and modernity can be seen with exceptional clarity in the case of infrastructure.

**Capitalism is driving us to extinction. Reform is impossible. We must struggle against the system to survive.**

**Townsend Managing Editor, 08** (Terry, managing editor, Individual Versus Social Solutions to Global Warming)

We have to convince millions of people and build a mass movement for emission-reductions that genuinely address the real problem. For Australia, that’s at least 90% by 2030 — not Labor’s anaemic 60% by 2050. A movement that demands that governments impose far-reaching measures that force giant industrial polluters to rapidly and massively slash their emissions, at the risk of massive fines. And if they refuse, they should be nationalized and run in the interests of the workers and consumers. All public subsidies and tax concessions for the giant fossil fuel industries and resource corporations — which amount to billions — should be redirected to research the development of publicly owned renewable energy sources. We could help ordinary people implement individual actions, by supplying free or at a massive subsidy to all households solar waters heaters and water tanks. There should be a massive reorganization of society to move away from private-car-based transportation to free and frequent mass public transport, and, redesign our cities to put people’s homes close to work and shops. We need to think about ways of linking these wider demands with our more immediate campaigns, for example as we fight to stop the Tasmanian pulp mill, oppose power privatization, end coal and uranium mining, and to stop the building of new freeways and toll roads, we have to also convince people that the workings of capitalism itself is both responsible for the crisis and also the main obstacle to its solution. The real source of the problem Through struggles for immediate and broader demands, masses of people can come to understand that the source of the problem lies with capitalism itself. The scientific analysis of capitalism first made by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, illustrates how, despite the assertions of many environmental movement theorists over the years, Marxism not only provides essential insights into the fundamental cause of the environmental crisis, but also offers a political guide to its solution. Capitalism’s fundamentally anti-ecological trait is captured by Marx’s analysis of the working of capitalism. Capitalists buy or produce commodities only in order to sell them for a profit, and then buy or produce yet more to sell more again. There is no end to the process. Competition between capitalists ensures that each one must continue to increase their production of commodities and continue to expand in order to survive. Production tends to expand exponentially until interrupted by crises (depressions and wars) and it is this dynamic at the very core of capitalism that places enormous, unsustainable pressure on the environment. Capitalism is a system that pursues growth for its own sake, whatever the consequences. This is why all schemes based on the hope of a no-growth, slow-growth or a sustainable-growth forms of capitalism are pipe dreams. As too are strategies based on a critical mass of individual consumers deciding to go “green” in order to reform the system. People are not “consumers” by nature. A multi-billion-dollar capitalist industry called advertising constantly plays with our minds to convince us that happiness comes only through buying more and more “stuff,” to keep up with endless wasteful fads, fashions, upgrades, new models and built-in obsolescence. The desire for destructive and/or pointless goods is manufactured along with them. In 2008, an estimated $750 billion will be spent on corporate advertising and public relations in the US alone. In Australia, such spending is now well in excess of $12 billion a year. Many in the environmental movement argue that with the right mix of taxes, incentives and regulations, everybody could be winners. Big business would have cheaper, more efficient production techniques, and therefore be more profitable, and consumers would have more environment-friendly products and energy sources. In a rational society, such innovations would lower the overall environmental impact of production. Unfortunately, we don’t live in a rational society. Any energy and money savings made through efficiency are used to make and sell more commodities, cheaper than their competitors. Capitalism approaches technology — in the production process or in the final product — in the same way as it does everything else. What will generate the most profits? Whether it is efficient, clean, safe, environmentally benign or rational has little to do with it. The technologies that could tackle global warming have long existed. Even though research into them has been massively underfunded, renewable energy sources are today competitive with coal and nuclear power (if the negative social and environmental costs are factored in). Public transport systems have been around since the late 1800s. Fundamental to capitalism’s development has been its power to shift the cost of its ecological and social vandalism onto society as whole. More profits can accrue if the big capitalists don’t have to bother themselves with the elimination, neutralization or recycling of industrial wastes. It’s much cheaper to pour toxic waste into the air or the nearest river. Rather than pay for the real costs of production, society as a whole subsidizes corporate profit-making by cleaning up some of the mess or suffering the environmental and/or health costs. Or the whole messy business can simply be exported to the Third World. It is becoming abundantly clear that the Earth cannot sustain this system’s plundering and poisoning without the humanity sooner or later experiencing a complete ecological catastrophe. To have any chance of preventing this, within the 10- to 30-year window that we have in relation to global warming, humanity must take conscious, rational control of its interactions with the planet and its ecological processes, in ways that capitalism is inherently incapable of doing.

### Cede the political

**They might win that the alternative would be difficult but that does not alter the fact that it is necessary—half measures will doom the planet.**

**Trainer 96** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “Towards a Sustainable Economy”, pg. 163)

Many would regard the account given in this chapter as attractive but quite unrealistic, because people in general would not be willing to make the changes involved. It might therefore be said that what we need are far less radical proposals which we would have more chance of getting people to accept. It is important to be clear about the argument here. This book has explained that whether we like it or not, we cannot define a sustainable society other than in terms of the principles discussed in this chapter. We will either make it to a society based on simpler lifestyles, a high level of self-sufficiency, cooperation, and a zero growth economy - or we will not achieve a sustainable society. Whether or not it is unrealistic to ask people in general at this point in time to endorse such a society is not the focal issue. The crucial point is that we have no choice about these matters; either we manage to go down the path this chapter advocates, or we will not achieve a sustainable society.

**Single-issue campaigns prevent change because activists get overwhelmed and nihilistic in the face of all of the issues that need attention. Criticism must be systemic to offer hope.**

**Reinsborough, 03**  (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03 (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

The 18th century political frameworks of left vs. right no longer fully capture the political fault lines of our era. Perhaps a better description of the real debate is flat earth vs. round earth. The corporate globalizers program of ever expanding corporate industrial exploitation of the earth is in such deep denial of the ecological realities of the planet that it is akin to maintaining the earth is flat. Fortunately more and more people understand that the Earth is in fact round and that we need some big changes to both the global system and the way we think of our relationship with the planet. Now we need social movements with the vision and strategy to capture their belief in a better world. The ability to choose your issue is a privilege. Most people involved in resistance are communities struggling for survival. They didn't choose their issue any more then they choose their skin color or their proximity to extractable resources. Activists from more privileged backgrounds have the luxury of choosing what they work on and have to be aware of the dynamics which privilege creates. To expand the base of struggle and support front line resistance with systemic work we need to confront the silent (and frequently uninformed) consent of the comfortable. **Unfortunately all too often we are still talking in the language of single issue campaigns** and are thus competing with ourselves for over-worked, over-stimulated people’s limited amount of time and compassion. The pool of aware concerned people not immersed in front line struggle are constantly having to choose between issues. Do I work on global warming or labor rights? World Bank or deforestation? Health care of campaign finance reform? One result is that a lot of people who sense the wrongness of modern society get overwhelmed by the range of issues and retreat into apathy or defeatism. One of the strengths of the emerging global justice movement has been to **create a new framework which goes beyond the age of single issue politic**s to present the corporate take over as a unifying cause of many of the planet’s ills.

**The refusal of immediate choice is precisely what gives the critique the power to force us to re-consider our options and question the nature of the political. This will invigorate creative politics.**

**Brown, 05** (*Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics*, Wendy, Professor of Poli Sci, UC Berkeley).

On the one hand, critical theory cannot let itself be bound by political exigency; indeed, it has something of an obligation to refuse such exigency. While there are always decisive choices to be made in the political realm (whom to vote for, what policies to support or oppose, what action to take or defer), these very delimitations of choice are often themselves the material of critical theory. Here we might remind ourselves that prying apart immediate political constraints from intellectual ones is one path to being "governed a little less" in Foucault's sense. Yet allowing thinking its wildness beyond the immediate in order to reset the possibilities of the immediate is also how this degoverning rearticulates critical theory and politics after disarticulating them; critical theory comes back to politics offering a different sense of the times and a different sense of time. It is also important to remember that the "immediate choices" are just that and often last no longer than a political season (exemplified by the fact that the political conundrums with which this essay opened will be dated if not forgotten by the time this book is published). Nor is the argument convincing that critical theory threatens the possibility of holding back the political dark. It is difficult to name a single instance in which critical theory has killed off a progressive political project. Critical theory is not what makes progressive political projects fail; at worst it might give them bad conscience, at best it renews their imaginative reach and vigor.

**Their cede the political argument is empirically denied—main stream environmental movements have failed across the globe—capitalism itself must be confronted.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 39-40)

In the last few decades, by contrast, protest movements—notably the various shades of environmentalism—emerged from a very different social setting, even with far from socialist value orientation. These movements attempted to gain a foothold in the field of politics in several capitalist countries through the agency of reform-oriented Green parties. They appealed to individuals concerned about the ongoing environmental destruction, leaving undefined the underlying socioeconomic causes, as well as their class connotations. This they did precisely in order to broaden their own electoral appeal, in the hope of successfully intervening in the reform process for the purpose of reversing the identified dangerous trends. The fact that within a relatively short space of time all such parties became marginalized, despite their spectacular initial successes almost everywhere, underlines that the causes manifesting in environmental destruction are much more deep-seated than it was assumed by the leaders of these programmatically non-class oriented reform movements, including the people who imagined that they could institute a viable alternative to the socialist project by inviting its adherents to move ‘From Red to Green.’ No matter how important—indeed literally vital—as a ‘single issue’ around which varieties of the Green movement tried to articulate their reform programmes, so as to make an inroad into the power structure and decision making processes of the established order, the incontestable imperative of environmental protection turned out to be quite intractable on account of the corresponding prevailing production processes. The capital system proved to be unreformable even under its most obviously destructive aspect. Today the difficulty is not only that the dangers inseparable from the ongoing development are much greater than ever before, inasmuch as the global capital system had reached its contradictory zenith of maturation and saturation. The dangers now extend over the whole planet, and consequently the urgency of doing something about them before it is too late happens to be particularly acute.

**So-called liberal movements are equally dangerous if they buy into the self-annihilating logic of capitalism—we have a moral obligation to reject capitalism at all costs.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm 6/6/2006).

Capitalists come in all sizes and shapes, some of them Republican, some Democrats; some conservative, some liberal. Future generations, whether human beings or polar bears, means nothing to them. They cannot see the world in its incomprehensible biological complexity, but only in terms of dollars and cents and profit margins. The world’s largest financial institutions are run by gluttonous robber barons that have hijacked most of the world’s governments and set us on an irreversible course of self-destruction. They are literally consuming the earth, exploiting the world’s poor and altering complex ecological processes that provide habitat, a livable climate, clean air, potable water and abundant food for perhaps 30 million or more species. These are processes that have evolved over eons of time. They are a gift, a right of birth that belongs equally to all beings, not just to those who can convert them into private wealth. Only the most maniacal and perverted thinkers could conceive of the idea of private ownership of the earth’s life processes. Monsanto and DuPont do not have a legitimate claim to the world’s genetic library. Any economic system that adversely affects the planet’s ability to sustain life is not only wrong; it is criminally insane and must be subverted at all cost.

**A sustainable economy cannot be created within capitalism. Their appeals to being “realistic” demand that we turn away from an unworkable system.**

**Revolution, 07** (US Communist Party newspaper. “Capitalism and the Consequences of Biofuels.” 3-27-07. http://rwor.org/a/083-special/biofuels-en.html)

Capitalism cannot deal with the environment in a sustainable and economically rational way for three basic reasons: First, its logic is “expand-or-die”: to cheapen cost and to expand in order to wage the competitive battle and gain market share. Companies like BP are locked in fierce competition with other companies. An article in the business section of the New York Times writes, “For investors in alternatives to oil and gas, the driving force has been the belief that whoever develops the next great energy sources will enjoy the spoils that will make the gains from creating the next Amazon.com or Google seem puny by comparison.” (3/16/2007) Second, the horizons of capitalism tend to be short term. They seek to maximize returns quickly. They don’t think about the consequences in 10, 20, 30 years. In the development of biofuels this means that they do not pay attention to long-term effects like soil depletion, water usage, and cutting down ancient forests, or even increasing global warming. Third, capitalist production is by its nature private. The economy is broken up into competing units of capitalist control and ownership over the means of production. And each unit is fundamentally concerned with itself and its expansion and its profit. The economy, the constructed and natural environment, and society cannot be dealt with as a social whole under capitalism. In the article “Capitalism, the Environment, and Ecology Under Socialism” in Revolution #52 (6/25/2006) Raymond Lotta wrote, “So capitalism is incapable of addressing environmental issues outside its framework of private ownership and production for profit, and its blind logic of expansion. And on a world scale, we see the effects. But socialism can address environmental issues in a sustainable, rational, and socially just way: because ownership of the means of production is socialized as expressed through the proletarian state and this makes it possible to consciously plan development; and because economic calculation is radically different.” The debate over these issues—how the world has gotten to the point where the very survival of our species and the planet is being called into question, and what must be done to change this—is too often ruled out of order. In the name of realism, opponents of the system too often end up in debate over how to work within a system that is itself the problem. The debate over these issues needs to be pried open as a crucial part of the struggle to save the planet.

**Their “cede the political” argument would only make sense if it were possible to survive in a capitalist world. Reform contributes to the illusion that only quick fixes are needed. We need to admit that rejecting capitalism is our only hope.**

**Duchrow, 95** (Ulrich Duchrow, professor of systematic theology at the University of Heidelberg specialising in ecumenical theology and theology-economy issues. “Alternatives to Global Capitalism,” p. 230-234)

If one affirms life and life-bringing economic systems, then one must reject economic systems and structures which bring about death. One objection often raised in this respect says that total dissent would mean losing all political credibility, and that the political possibilities of relative improvement can no longer be seized when tone rejects certain basic elements of the capitalist economy. This argument presupposes that the changes in the world economic system that are necessary for survival can be achieved with the existing political institutions. Only when the fundamental, death-inducing mechanisms have been recognised and eliminated can a political strategy be formulated which may be able to help avoid the predictable catastrophes. It is not the desire to constantly criticise bur the necessity avoid illusion when dealing with life-sustaining alternatives for life which compels us to specify what must be rejected, so that the best can be achieved from this basis. Exactly what is it that has to be rejected on principle in the present global system, and to which we have to find alternatives for life's sake? It is the mechanisms which, uncontrolled and unimpeded, gear economic activity to the accumulation of money by those who already have it, with the aid of the absolute principle of competition in the global market. Nature and people are, accordingly, subordinated to this end, as far as possible. In concrete terms, the mechanisms referred to are: the transnational money matkets, in so far as they can and do escape national and international institutions, provided they tolerate or favor the pure capitalist market; and also the ideological instruments connected with science, the media, schools, universities and churches, which orient people towards achieving this goal or whose potential for resistance to the deadly wealth accumulation market is not used. But because the money mechanism only functions with the inclusion of the commodity-money relationship, all people, provided they have the money and are consumers with purchasing power, are actively caught up in the machinery of wealth accumulation (incidentally, so are those without much purchasing power, in so far as they – understandably – strive for a share in consumption rather than seeking alternatives to the commodity-money system). That means, however, that although the totalitarian character of the money-oriented system originates from the power of the world market, the market can only exercise this power because so many players, right down to individual human beings, facilitate its operation. Rejection in this case is, therefore, not an attitude adopted with external reference only to identifiable players in the world market. It involves a fundamental change at all levels, including that of the individual. Before we examine this dimension of rejection more closely, we should consider once more the need for it. From a social point of view, the totalitarian character of the deregulated and competitive world market, centred around wealth accumulation, is leading to dramatic levels of pauperisation and exclusion of more and more people, not only in the South but increasingly in the East and also in the West. Today we have reached a point where at least two thirds of the world's population are either dying of hunger or living on or below the poverty line. These people are subsequently excluded from the formal economy. From an environmental point of view, our planet and the basic conditions for life will be destroyed if the transformation of nature into commodities-money for the purpose of wealth accumulation continues to accelerate. It is, therefore, imperative that the focus of the economy be shifted from money accumulation to the people's needs. A mere 'taming' of the system is not sufficient, although this must be considered when reflecting upon the question of relative political opinions. The only satisfactory solution can be one that takes into account the lives of' not just a few privileged Northerners or even of all people alive today but also of future generations, and ensures that they have the renewable natural resources necessary for survival and procreation. Such a solution would result in the elimination of the money-accumulation economy and its associated structures. This must be recognised before embarking upon any attempt to find concrete alternatives and new regulatory instruments. Any other starting point would be potentially dangerous because it would only create illusions. E. Altvatet was right when he said that anybody who maintains that within the framework of a capitalist economy, the environmental catastrophe can be held at bay in the long run is either opportunistic or naive. The same conclusion was also reached by R. Kurz and L. Mayer, who have been quoted already, and, indirectly – As a result of what started with the "cut-throat competition" between the northern Italian city-states, the whole of humanity is degenerating into a mass of competing individuals, who no longer accept their mutual limitations and dependence, instead striving endlessly for profit and success without considering the rising tide of violence and the effects on the weak. Competitiveness for unlimited money accumulation is the objective and subjective basic structure, the "god" of our market society, which determines the whole. Accordingly, the core of what we must reject is the absolute value attributed to competition and the total absence of limits set on the cancerous growth of capital. The liberation must, therefore, be comprehensive, just as the 'spirit' of capitalism is comprehensive. In other words, the spiritual side is not one of many dimensions but decisive for the whole.

**Systemic change is the only hope for reform. Pragmatism invests resources in failed strategies of single-issue politics that leaves oppression intact.**

**Reinsborough, 03** (Organizer, Rainforest Action Network and Wake Up America Campaign) 03 (Journal of Aesthetics and Protest, August 2003, Volume 1, Issue 2, Patrick).

The worst thing that can happen to our movements right now is to settle for too little. But tragically that is exactly what is happening. We are failing to frame the ecological, social and economic crisis as a symptom of a deeper values crisis and a pathological system. **Too many of our social change resources are getting bogged down in arenas of struggle that can’t deliver the systemic shifts we need. Most of the conventional venues for political engagement** – legislation, elections, courts, single issue campaigns, labor fights – **have been so co-opted by elite rule** that its very difficult to imagine how to use strategies that name the system, undermine the control mythology or articulate values crisis from within their limited parameters. One of the most telling symptoms of our colonized imaginations has been the limited scope of social change institutions. Most social change resources get directed towards enforcing inadequate regulations, trying to pass watered-down legislation, working to elect mediocre people or to win concessions that don’t threaten the current corporate order. One of the main reasons that so many social change resources get limited to the regulatory, electoral and concessionary arenas is the fact that much of social change has become a professionalized industry. The NGO – non-governmental organization – a term made popular by the United Nations policy discussion process have become the most familiar social change institution. These groups are frequently made up of hard working, under-paid, dedicated people and NGOs as a group do lots of amazing work. However we must also acknowledge that generally the explosion of NGO's globally is a loose attempt to patch the holes that neoliberalism has punched in the social safety net. As government cedes its role in public welfare to corporations, even the unlucrative sectors have to be handed off to someone. A recent article in the Economist revealingly explains the growth of NGO's as "… not a matter of charity but of privatiziation." 21 My intention is not to fall into the all too easy trap of lumping the thousands of different NGOs into one dismissable category but rather to label a disturbing trend particularly among social change NGO's. Just as service oriented NGO's have been tapped to fill the voids left by the state or the market, so have social change NGO's arisen to streamline the chaotic business of dissent. Let's call this trend NGOism, that terrifyingly widespread conceit among professional "campaigners" that social change is a highly specialized profession best left to experienced strategists, negotiators and policy wonks. NGOism is the conceit that paid staff will be enough to save the world. This very dangerous trend ignores the historic reality that collective struggle and mass movements organized from the bottom up have always been the springboard for true progress and social change. The goal of radical institutions – whether well funded NGOs or gritty grassroots group – should be to help build movements to change the world. But NGOism institutionalizes the amnesia of the colonized imagination and presents a major obstacle to moving into the post-issue activism framework. After all who needs a social movement when you've got a six figure advertising budget and “access” to all the decision makers? A professional NGO is structured exactly like a corporation, down to having employee payroll and a Board of Directors. This is not an accident. Just like their for-profit cousins this structure creates an institutional self-interest which can transform an organization from being a catalyst for social change into being a limit. NGOism views change in reference to the status quo power relations by accepting a set of rules written by the powerful to insure the status quo. These rules have already been stacked against social change. NGOism represents institutional confusion about the different types of power and become overly dependant on strategies that speak exclusively to the existing powers – funding sources, the media, decision makers. As a consequence strategies get locked in the regulatory and concessionary arenas – focused on “pressure” – and attempt to re-direct existing power rather than focusing on confronting illegitimate authority and revealing systemic flaws. **Frequently political pragmatism is used as an excuse for a lack of vision**.

### Cap Sustainable

**Capitalism is ecologically and economically unsustainable – the system accelerates global crisis**

**Li 10** Department of Economics, University of Utah (Minqi,

“The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity”, Science & Society, Vol. 74, Symposium: Capitalism and Crisis in the 21st Century, pp. 290-305, http://www.econ.utah.edu/~mli/Economics%207004/Li\_The%20End%20of%20the%20End%20of%20History.pdf SW)

In 2001, the U. S. stock market bubble started to collapse, after years of “new economy” boom. The Bush administration took advantage of the psychological shock of 9/11, and undertook a series of “preemptive wars” (first in Afghanistan and then in Iraq) that ushered in a new era of intensified inter-state conflicts. Towards the end of 2001, Argentina, which was regarded as a neoliberal model country, was hit by a devastating financial crisis. Decades of neoliberalism had not only undermined the living standards of the working classes, but also destroyed the material fortunes of the urban middle classes (which remained a key social base for neoliberalism in Latin America until the 1990s). After the Argentine crisis, neoliberalism completely lost political legitimacy in Latin America. This paved the way for the rise of several socialist-oriented governments on the continent. After the 2001 global recession, the global economy actually entered into a mini-golden age. The big semi-peripheral economies, the so-called “BRICs” (Brazil, Rbussia, India, and China) became the most dynamic sector. The neoliberal global economy was fueled by the super-exploitation of the massive cheap labor force in the semi-periphery (especially in China). The strategy worked, to the extent that it generated massive amounts of surplus value that could be shared by the global capitalist classes. But it also created a massive “realization problem.” That is, as the workers in the “emerging markets” were deprived of purchasing power, on a global scale, there was a persistent lack of effective demand for the industrial output produced in China and the rest of the semi-periphery. After 2001, the problem was addressed through increasingly higher levels of debt-financed consumption in the advanced capitalist countries (especially in the United States). The neoliberal strategy was **economically and ecologically unsustainable**. Economically, the debt-financed consumption in the advanced capitalist countries could not go on indefinitely. Ecologically, the rise of the BRICs greatly accelerated resource depletion and environmental degradation on a global scale. The global ecological system is now on the verge of **total collapse**. The world is now in the midst of a prolonged period of economic and political instability that could last several decades. In the past, the capitalist world system had responded to similar crises and managed to undertake successful restructurings. Is it conceivable that the current crisis will result in a similar restructuring within the system that will bring about a new global “New Deal”? In three respects, the current world historical conjuncture is fundamentally different from that of 1945. Back in 1945, the United States was the indisputable hegemonic power. It enjoyed overwhelming industrial, financial, and military advantages relative to the other big powers and, from the capitalist point of view, its national interests largely coincided with the world system’s common and long-term interests. 4 On the decline of American hegemony, see Arrighi, 2007; Li, 2008, 113S138; Wallerstein, 2006. Now, U. S. hegemony is in irreversible decline. But none of the other big powers is in a position to replace the United States and function as an effective hegemonic power. Thus, exactly at a time when the global capitalist system is in deep crisis, the system is also deprived of effective leadership.4 In 1945, the construction of a global “New Deal” involved primarily accommodating the economic and political demands of the western working classes and the non-western elites (the national bourgeoisies and the westernized intellectuals). In the current conjuncture, any new global “New Deal” will have to incorporate not only the western working classes but also the massive, non-western working classes. Can the capitalist world system afford such a new “New Deal” if it could not even afford the old one? Most importantly, back in 1945, the world’s resources remained abundant and cheap, and there was still ample global space for environmental pollution. Now, not only has resources depletion reached an advanced stage, but the world has also virtually run out of space for any further environmental pollution.

**Capitalism is unsustainable and the whole thing collapses by 2015– oil peak and fiscal crisis**

**Li 10** Department of Economics, University of Utah (Minqi,

“The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity”, Science & Society, Vol. 74, Symposium: Capitalism and Crisis in the 21st Century, pp. 290-305, http://www.econ.utah.edu/~mli/Economics%207004/Li\_The%20End%20of%20the%20End%20of%20History.pdf SW)

The rapid expansion of the global capitalist economy over the second half of the 20th century rested upon the exploitation of cheap resources, and especially cheap oil. Oil accounts for about one-third of the world’s total energy supply and nearly all of the world’s transportation fuel. Oil also provides indispensable inputs for chemical industries which produce chemical fertilizers, plastic products, and modern medicine. Now there is a growing body of evidence suggesting that the world oil production either has already peaked or will peak very soon. Among the world’s largest producers, U. S. oil production peaked in 1970. Britain and Norway, the two most important European producers, peaked in 1999 and 2001, respectively. Mexico, which used to be the world’s fifth largest oil producer, peaked in 2004. Russia, the world’s second largest oil producer, peaked in 2007. Current evidence suggests that Saudi Arabia’s crude oil production is likely to have peaked in 2005 (The Oil Drum, 2009). The Association of Peak Oil and Gas now suggests that world oil production is likely to have peaked in 2008 (ASPO, 2008). Oil is an **indispensable** resource for the global capitalist economy. Other fossil fuels, such as natural gas and coal, are also nonrenewable resources and their production is likely to peak in a few decades. Converting natural gas or coal into liquid fuels substantially reduces energy efficiency and increases greenhouse gas emissions. Nuclear energy is nonrenewable and has serious pollution and safety concerns. It can only be used to generate electricity. Solar and wind are intermittent resources and cannot provide more than a limited proportion of the world’s electricity use, absent some major breakthroughs in electricity storage technologies. 5 Moreover, they can only be used to generate electricity and therefore cannot directly substitute for liquid fuels. Many other renewables, such as hydro, geothermal, tide, and wave, have limited physical potentials and cannot substitute for fossil fuels on large scales. Biomass is the only renewable energy that can be used to make liquid fuels or chemical inputs. But biomass production is limited by the availability of land and fresh water. Recent research finds that biomass production could actually result in more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional fossil fuels.6 After the 2001 recession, global oil demand grew rapidly, led by the surging demand of China and India. After 2005, despite surging oil prices, world oil production was unable to grow and in effect stayed on a high plateau from 2005 to 2008. The surge in the oil price was one of the factors that precipitated the global economy into the current crisis. In response to the crisis, capitalist governments, led by the United States, have attempted to stabilize the situation through massive increases in government deficits. In effect, governments are substituting public borrowing for private borrowing and public debt for private debt. While these measures will help to keep the global capitalist economy afloat for a few years**,** in the medium and long term mostcapitalist governments will have to confront **an overwhelming fiscal crisis**. A recent research paper finds that the United States will likely run a cumulative fiscal deficit of over ten trillion dollars in the coming decade. And this is based on a set of optimistic assumptions. It assumes that there will be an orderly recovery from the current recession and the current fiscal stimulus package will expire in two years. It takes no account of new spending for financial stability, the housing plan, and health care reform. Worse, in the long run, the USA faces a fiscal gap of 7-9% of GDP. That is, to stabilize the long-term debt-to-GDP ratio, the USA must either raise taxes by 7-9% of GDP or reduce spending by the same amount (Auerbach and Gale, 2009). Until now, the Chinese capitalist economy has suffered only limited damage. The Chinese government is committed to spending hundreds of billions of dollars on infrastructure investment to sustain economic growth. The Chinese economy and China’s demand for energy are likely to continue to grow at relatively rapid pace for a few more years. By about 2015, however, the irreversible decline in world oil production will become apparent. As the decline of the energy supply takes place against the contin- uing growth of demand in China and possibly in other large semi-peripheral states, world energy prices will again rise rapidly, generating global inflationary pressure. Squeezed between shrinking export markets (as the advanced capitalist countries suffer from economic stagnation) and rising energy costs, China’s trade surpluses will likely disappear and China may be forced to sell some of its foreign exchange reserves to stave off economic crisis. The combination of China’s dollar sales, global inflationary pressure, and the U. S. fiscal crisis will greatly increase the likelihood of a general dollar collapse that will take the global economic crisis into a second, more violent and more destructive phase. Chinese capitalism will not be able to postpone the crisis forever. In perhaps five to ten years from now, China will likely be hit by an insurmountable economic crisis as its export-oriented manufacturing industries suffer from the shrinking of the global market and its massive demand for energy and materials can no longer be sustained. The third and final phase of the global economic crisis is likely to see the general collapse of the Chinese, and with it the global, **capitalist economy.**

**Capitalism no longer sustainable – the recession was not a blip but a product of a structural deficient system that will collapse.**

**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](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0,9" \t "_blank),]

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.

**Capitalism isn’t sustainable –rich-poor gaps mean that the system will collapse – failure to transition causes catastrophe by resource exploitation**

**Hart 01** Faculty of University of Aberdeen, Scotland(Keith, “Money in an unequal world”, 9/1/01, Anthropological Theory 1:307, Sage SW)

One method for an anthropology of the contemporary human condition would thus be to conceive of world society as a single population divided into rich and poor or, if you like, polarized between a remote elite and the undifferentiated masses. This society is humanly insupportable, in that most of its members must routinely endure poverty and violence, while a few enjoy the beneﬁts of wealth in forms that were unimaginable before the industrial revolution. Moreover, a society so cruel and indifferent to the general human interest is heading for ecological disaster. Ours is a corrupt ancien régime (de Tocqueville, 1955 [1856]) that must soon ﬁnd a new democratic revolution, if human intervention in the life of this planet is not to end in catastrophe.

**Capitalism will inevitably collapse. The faster we change course, the better our chances will be to survive.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm 6/6/2006).

Any economic system based upon greed rather than the public good and the ruthless exploitation of nature is not only wrong, it is a prescription for disaster. Capitalism not only embodies this self destructive ideology, it depends upon endless growth (the ideology of the cancer cell) for its continuation. Endless growth, regardless how well it is managed, is an ecological impossibility on a finite planet. Thus the perceived success of capitalism is short-lived at best. Because it is based upon a cycle of voracious consumption and waste, capitalism will inevitably collapse. This is not idle speculation or wishful thinking on my part; it is a mathematical certainty based upon the most elementary precepts of ecological science. Meanwhile, the ecological consequences of unbridled capitalism will be dire. The collapse of the world’s great ecosystems, driven by capital’s insatiable lust for material wealth, is already well under way and is almost certainly irreversible. To continue down this path will surely make things orders of magnitudes worse than if we change direction and begin to live responsibly and sustainably.

**Their representation of capitalism as an unalterable reality is precisely what creates its inevitability—the first step is to remember that economies are localized, historically dependent social formations that can be changed.**

**Gibson-Graham, 06** (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Graham is Professor of Geography, Associate Department Head for Geography, B.A., Smith College, Ph.D., Clark University, 1984 , Gibson has a BSc (Hons) (Sydney), MA, PhD (Clark), (Pen Name is J.K. Gibson-Graham), ,“A Postcapitalist Politics”, p. 53-54)

Why has Economy become an everyday term that denotes a force to be reckoned with existing outside of politics and society-a force that constitutes the ultimate arbiter of possibility? How is it that waged labor, the commodity market, and capitalist enterprise have come to be seen as the only "normal" forms of work, exchange, and business organization? When was it that capitalism assumed dis-cursive dominance, becoming the only present form of economy and all that. could be imagined as existing in the proximate future? And why do we have little to say these days about an expansive and generative politics of noncapitalist construction ?l We are convinced that the answers to these questions are connected to the almost total naturalization of "the economy" that has taken place in public discourse over recent decades, coinciding with the demise of socialism as an actually existing "alternative" and growing alarm that, with globalization, the autonomy of national economies, and therefore their manageability, is being undermined, This shift from an understanding of the economy as something that can be transformed, or at least managed (by people, the state, the IMF), to something that governs society has involved a hegemonic move by which representations of economy have slipped from their locations in discourse and landed "on the ground," in the "real," not just separate from but outside of society. In these postmodern times, the economy is denied the discursive mandate given to other social spheres and the consequences for the viability of any political project of economic innovation are dire. If we are to enact new economies, we need to imagine "the economy" differently-as something that is created in specific geographical contexts and in historically path-dependent ways, but this is not an easy or straightforward project. As Timothy Mitchell argues, we are up against an already existing eco¬nomic object materialized in socio-technical networks of calculation that have, since the 1930s, produced the economy as a "singular and self-evident totali¬ty" (forthcoming)." The economic landscape has been molded according to the imaginary functionings of a "self-contained and dynamic mechanism" known as "the economy," and this representation is difficult to dislodge.

**Capitalism is not inevitable—it can only be imposed and maintained through patterns of violence that could be changed.**

**Kovel 02** (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, p. 115-16)

For example, it is a commonly held opinion that capitalism is an innate and therefore inevitable outcome for the human species. If this is the case, then the necessary path of human evolution travels from the Olduvai Gorge to the New York Stock Exchange, and to think of a world beyond capital is mere baying at the moon. It only takes a brief reflection to demolish the received understanding. Capital is certainly a potentiality for human nature, but, despite all the efforts of ideologues to argue for its natural inevitability, no more than this. For if capital were natural, why has it only occupied the last 500 years of a record that goes back for hundreds of thousands? More to the point, why did it have to be imposed through violence wherever it set down its rule? And most importantly, why does it have to be continually maintained through violence, and continuously re-imposed on each generation through an enormous apparatus of indoctrination? Why not just let children be the way they want to be and trust that they will turn into capitalists and workers for capitalists — the way we let baby chicks be, knowing that they will reliably grow into chickens if provided with food, water and shelter? Those who believe that capital is innate should also be willing to do without police, or the industries of culture, and if they are not, then their arguments are hypocritical. But this only sharpens the questions of what capital is, why the path to it was chosen, and why people would submit to an economy and think so much of wealth in the first place? These are highly practical concerns. It is widely recognized, for example, that habits of consumption in the in­dustrial societies will have to be drastically altered if a sustainable world is to be achieved. This means, however that the very pattern of human needs will have to be changed, which means in turn that the basic way in which we inhabit nature will have to be changed. We know that capital forcibly indoctrinates people to resist these changes, but only a poor and superficial analysis would stop here and say nothing further about how this works and how it came about. Capital’s efficient causation of the ecological crisis establishes it as the enemy of nature. But the roots of the enmity still await exploration.

**Capitalism isn’t inevitable–that is just an excuse to do nothing.**

**Martin, 01** (Brian, associate professor in Science, Technology & Society at the University of Wollongong, Australia, *Nonviolence versus Capitalism*, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/01nvc/nvcall.html#ch7fns, Accessed 07-14-08)

Actually, it is absurd to say that capitalism is inevitable. This is really just an excuse for doing nothing to examine and promote improvements and alternatives. The way society is organised is due to the actions of people, and these actions can change. History shows a tremendous range of possibilities for human patterns of interaction. Furthermore, technological development is creating new options for the structuring of work, communication and interaction. Considering that capitalism is only a few hundred years old and continues to change, and that there is nothing approaching agreement that the current system is ideal, the assumption of inevitability is very weak indeed. Defenders of capitalism assume that there are only two basic options: either capitalism or some sort of system based on authoritarian government, either state socialism or some other sort of dictatorship. (Capitalism is assumed to go hand in hand with representative government, but this ignores those countries with capitalist economies and authoritarian politics, including fascism and military dictatorship.) But of course there are more than these two options.

**Capitalism is as inevitable as we make it—breaking its hegemonic domination by denying its extra discursive “reality” is the first step.**

**Gibson-Graham, 06** (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Graham is Professor of Geography, Associate Department Head for Geography, B.A., Smith College, Ph.D., Clark University, 1984 , Gibson has a BSc (Hons) (Sydney), MA, PhD (Clark), (Pen Name is J.K. Gibson-Graham), ,“A Postcapitalist Politics”, p. 53-56)

Politics involves the continual struggle to fix meaning, to close the totality and stem the infinite processes of signification within language. Hegemony entails the persuasive ex¬pansion of a discourse into widely shared values, norms, and perceptions such that meaning appears to be fixed, even naturalized (Torfing 1999,89, 302).5 The fixings attempted by hegemonic politics include techniques of negoti¬ating equivalence and difference appropriate to the task of strong theorizing. Condensation is a kind of conflation that fuses "a variety of significations and meanings into a single unity," thereby concentrating meaning by eliminating dif¬ference (Torfing 1999, 98). Displacement extends and transfers "the signification of meaning of one particular moment to another moment," producing contiguity and equivalence between what had been quite different meanings (98). Ultimately the partial fixings of meaning achieved through condensation and displacement establish nodal points, or dense knots of definite meaning that sustain the hege¬monic discourse and the subjects it interpellates (303) . This theory of politics helps us to see the way in which a certain discourse of the economy (as real, as capitalist) has become hegemonic, and how alternative and different understandings of economy have been enrolled into the hegemonic project or outlawed as a threat to the hegemonic discourse. The representation of the capitalist economy as extradiscursive, as the ultimate real and natural form of economy, has gained additional ideological force since the demise of capitalism's "other." This is not to say that with the "disappearance" of communism and so¬cialism social antagonisms that constitute the unity of neoliberal global capitalist discourse (and thus its hegemony) have been eliminated. The locus of antagonism has simply shifted and is now made up of multiple threats to the "free market," such as remnant public sector involvement in the economy, "democratic welfare statism" (Torfing 1999,299), and the insistent "failures" of development-spaces where abject poverty and social disintegration have increased during the "age of development" and now harbor "terrorist threats" to wealthy nations. In its current hegemonic articulation as neoliberal global capitalism, capitalocentric discourse has now colonized the entire economic landscape and its universalizing claims seem to have been realized. A distinctive social imaginary-a ,heady mix of freedom, individual wealth, unfettered consump¬tion, and well-being trickled down to all-convenes a series of myths that con¬stitute the (illusory) fullness and positivity of "capitalist" society, masking the social antagonisms on which this presence is posited. We have come to accept that "the economy" establishes the bottom line for action and "it" makes us perform in certain ways. This ideological fantasy has become safe and even enjoyable, directing and limiting politics to certain channels, blinding us without realizing it to the possibility of other options.

**The argument that there is no alternative to capitalism is both false and designed to keep elites in power.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, Beyond Capital, pg. xiii)

To many people the present state of affairs seems to be fundamentally unalterable, corresponding to Hegel’s characterization of thinking and acting as right and proper—or ‘rational’ in his sense—only in submission to the requirements of ‘universal permanent capital.’ Moreover, this impression of fateful unalterability seems to be reinforced by the fact that one of the most often repeated political slogans offered by our decision makers as the justification of their actions is: ‘there is no alternative.’ Such wisdom continues to be uttered without any concern for how bleak it would be if this proposition were really true. It is much easier to resign oneself to the finality of the predicament asserted in this blindly deterministic political slogan of our times—without even attempting to assess, let alone question, its grievous implications—than to devise the necessary challenge to it. Curiously, however, the politicians who never tire of repeating that there is no alternative to the existing order of affairs do not hesitate to describe at the same time their own trade as ‘the art of the possible.’ They refuse to notice the latent contradiction between the traditional self-justification of politics, as the socially beneficial ‘art of the possible,’ and the uncritically advocated resignation to the rule of capital to which, in their view—claimed to be the only rationally tenable view in ‘the real world’—there cannot be an alternative. For what on earth could be the meaning of politics as the ‘pursuit of the socially commendable possible’ if the viability of any alternative to the imperatives of the ruling order is apriori excluded as worse than hopeless because impossible? To be sure, the fact that so many decision makers—in the East and West alike—embrace the idea that there can be no alternative to the prevailing determinations cannot be considered simply a corrigible personal aberration of those who advocate it. On the contrary, this bleak idea emanates from the present stage of development of the global capital system as such, with all its paralyzing interdependencies and objectively narrowing margins of action. For in the ascending phase of development of commodity society a whole range of meaningful alternatives could be contemplated (and successfully implemented) in the interest of profitable capital accumulation and expansion by the dominant (as a rule also empire-building) capitalist countries.

**Resource limits make capitalism unsustainable.**

**Trainer, 07** (Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales. “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society” p. 125)

The foregoing argument has been that *the present* levels of production and consumption are grossly unsustainable. They are far too high to be kept going for long or to be extended to all people. Yet we are determined to *increase* present living standards and levels of output and consumption, as much as possible and without any end in sight. Our supreme national goal is economic growth. It is not just that people want more and more income, wealth, property and possessions, without any amount in view with which they will be satisfied. The core problem is that we have an economic system which needs and cannot function without constant growth in production and consumption. For instance as technology advances fewer workers are needed, so unless consumption rises all the time the unemployment problem increases. More importantly, new money comes into existence as debt which is created when banks make loans, and this has to be repaid with interest. This absurd process cannot continue unless there is constant growth in production and earnings to enable repayment of the ever increasing debt. Above all, capital is constantly accumulating in the hands of corpo- rations and banks, which are then determined to find or create more opportunities for investing it. Few people seem to recognise the absurdly impossible consequences of unlimited economic growth. If we have a 3% p.a. increase in output, by 2070 our economy will be producing eight times as much every year. (For 4% growth the multiple is 16.) If by then all the expected 9 billion people have risen to the living standards we in rich countries would have then given 3% p.a. growth, the total world economic output will be *more than 60 times*as great as it is today! Yet the *present* level is unsustainable.

**Economic collapse is inevitable—we need to accomplish it quickly to move to a sustainable society before it is too late to avoid extinction.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 35-36)

Despite the fact that industrial civilization has brought so much dissatisfaction and danger to human survival, most of its inhabitants and policy makers deny the existence of an industrial crisis in the fundamental normative sense discussed earlier, wherein the admission of such a crisis would entail a change in basic values, such as limitless economic growth. Instead, we continue to avidly maintain industrialism's central value tenets including, of course, unlimited economic growth. This is demonstrated by the continuation of the universal policy objective of economic growth by policymakers in virtually all existing social orders as well as transnational public support for the social value of economic growth by most of the world's populace. "Grow or die" seems to be the watchword of industrial values setting up a grim alternative to limitless growth that both leads to industrial pessimism and (disappointment- and disillusionment avoiding) denial of the challenge presented by the limits-to-growth position. Those who refuse to admit that industrialism is currently undergoing a crisis and who defend the industrial values advocate the progrowth view. They have generated the large number of writings in rejoinder to industrial civilization's deprecators within the economic growth debate, thereby avoiding the radical implications of the disturbing reassessment of industrial preferences and priorities. By denying the existence of the crisis and the resulting disappointment, they negate the need for any normative reassessment of the industrial social order's present so-called advanced stage. "Disappointment [Hirschman writes] frequently will have to pass a certain threshold before it is consciously avowed-but then, just because of the earlier delaying actions, it may well be experienced 'with a vengeance.' "11 This assertion is important for our discussion in two respects. First, it may explain the paralyzing and overwhelming despair of terminal pessimism associated with the industrial crisis. Second, it may explain the limits-to-growth advocates' urgent (and sometimes understandably extreme) efforts to achieve a greater public awareness about the nature and severity of the industrial crisis. These advocates fear that we might easily reach the threshold limit where public recognition of the existing limits to growth would be **too late to spur the necessary value reassessments and social changes: the damage incurred would then be irreversible**. In that event, disabling despair for the entire human species and all of the planet's living creatures would be appropriate because it would indeed be too late to do anything useful about our misguided priorities; "the **fatal plunge into the abyss**" would be at hand. We would be left with Woody Allen's unhappy choice between hopelessness and extinction. Hopefully-and all social inquiry, especially political philosophy, may be considered to be an optimistic enterprise presupposmg that the diagnosis of social ills will have some beneficial social impact-the current industrial crisis will rouse people and policymakers from their disappointment-denying deceptions and delays in acting before it is too lake. Moreover, it may inspire political philosophical examination and transformation of the values and thereby along with the other components of social transformation (like social movements) fundamentally change the way of life of industrial society.

**The collapse of capitalism is inevitable—enormous resource gaps have rendered the entire system unstable.**

**Meszaros, 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, *Beyond Capital*, pg. 37-8)

Things have significantly changed in the last few decades, as compared to the expansionary past. The displacement of capital’s inner contradictions could work with relative ease during the phase of the system’s historical ascendancy. It was possible to deal under such conditions with many problems by sweeping them under the carpet of unfulfilled promises, like modernization in the ‘Third World’ and ever greater prosperity and social advancement in the ‘metropolitan’ countries, predicated on the expectation of producing an endlessly growing cake. However, the consummation of capital’s historical ascendancy radically alters the situation. It is then not only no longer possible to make plausible new sets of vacuous promises but the old promises too must be wiped out of memory, and some real gains of the working classes in the privileged capitalist countries must be ‘rolled back’ in the interest of the survival of the ruling socioeconomic and political order. This is where we stand today. The triumphalist celebrations of a few years ago now sound very hollow indeed. The slanted development of the last century brought no solutions on the model of ‘mobile property’s civilized victory’ (Marx), in that it simply multiplied the privileges of the few and the misery of the many. However, a radically new condition has emerged in the course of the last few decades, gravely affecting the prospects of development in the future. For what is particularly grave today from the point of view of the capital system is that even the privileges of the few cannot be sustained any longer on the backs of the many, in sharp contrast to the past. As a result, the system as a whole is being rendered quite unstable, even if it will take some time before the full implications of this systemic instability transpire, calling for structural remedies in place of manipulative postponement. Thus Marx’s alternative perspective is coming into its own only in our own times. Not so long ago the accumulated problems could be ignored or minimized by indulging in self-complacent talk about more or less easily manageable ‘dysfunctions.’ However, when even the privileges of the small minority are unsustainable despite the ever-intensified exploitation of the overwhelming majority, such talk must sound problematical even to its formerly most uncritical practitioners. In fact, the same people who still yesterday wanted us to be satisfied with their explanatory discourse on merely ‘technical difficulties’ and ‘temporary dysfunctions,’ recently started to talk about ‘shared problems’ and the need for a ‘common effort’ for solving them, within the confines of the established order, confessing at times their bewilderment as to what seems to be happening everywhere. What baffles them more than anything else is that the collapse of the Soviet system not only removed their favourite self-justifying alibi but, to make things worse, failed to deliver the hoped for beneficial results to their own side. For the expected revitalization of the Western capital system through its ‘victory’ over the East, and the concomitant ‘natural’ and happy marketization of the postrevolutionary part of the world stubbornly failed to materialize. The ideologists of ‘advanced capitalism liked to think of the Soviet system as the diametrical opposite of their own. They had to be awakened to the disconcerting truth that it was only the obverse side of the same coin. It is a sobering fact that the carpet which could sufficiently hide for far too long even the gravest problems swept under it is becoming very difficult to walk on. Indeed, it is a matter of great importance that the wantonly ignored problems affecting the very survival of humanity must now be faced under circumstances when the capital system as a whole had entered its structural crisis.

**Seeking endless growth on a finite planet is impossible—capitalism will inevitably collapse. The faster we change course, the better our chances will be to survive.**

**Sullivan, 06** (Charles free lance writer for Information Clearing House. “Scared Ecology and Capitalism” http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13515.htm 6/6/2006).

Any economic system based upon greed rather than the public good and the ruthless exploitation of nature is not only wrong, it is a prescription for disaster. Capitalism not only embodies this self destructive ideology, it depends upon endless growth (the ideology of the cancer cell) for its continuation. Endless growth, regardless how well it is managed, is an ecological impossibility on a finite planet. Thus the perceived success of capitalism is short-lived at best. Because it is based upon a cycle of voracious consumption and waste, capitalism will inevitably collapse. This is not idle speculation or wishful thinking on my part; it is a mathematical certainty based upon the most elementary precepts of ecological science. Meanwhile, the ecological consequences of unbridled capitalism will be dire. The collapse of the world’s great ecosystems, driven by capital’s insatiable lust for material wealth, is already well under way and is almost certainly irreversible. To continue down this path will surely make things orders of magnitudes worse than if we change direction and begin to live responsibly and sustainably.

**Environmental reform will only delay the inevitable decline of capitalism and intensify the crisis—rejection of the system now is the only hope.**

**Sweezy, 04** (Paul M. Sweezy, Marxist economist and founder of Monthly Review magazine. “Capitalism and the Environment.” October 2004. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1132/is\_5\_56/ai\_n6338575)

And during the present century conservation movements have emerged in all the leading capitalist countries and have succeeded in imposing certain limits on the more destructive depredations of uncontrolled capital. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that without constraints of this kind arising within the system, capitalism by now would have destroyed both its environment and itself. Not surprisingly, such constraints, while sometimes interfering with the operations of individual capitalists, never go so far as to threaten the system as a whole. Long before that point is reached, the capitalist class, including the state which it controls, mobilizes its defenses to repulse environmental-protection measures perceived as dangerously extreme. Thus despite the development of a growing environmental consciousness and the movements to which it has given rise in the last century, the environmental crisis continues to deepen. There is nothing in the record or on the horizon that could lead us to believe the situation will significantly change in the foreseeable future. If this conclusion is accepted--and it is hard to see how anyone who has studied the history of our time can refuse, at the very least, to take it seriously--it follows that what has to be done to resolve the environmental crisis, hence also to insure that humanity has a future, is to replace capitalism with a social order based on an economy devoted not to maximizing private profit and accumulating ever more capital but rather to meeting real human needs and restoring the environment to a sustainably healthy condition. This, in a nutshell, is the meaning of revolutionary change today. Lesser measures of reform, no matter how desirable in themselves, could at best slow down the fatal process of decline and fall that is already so far advanced.

### Heg Solves

**Hegemonic peace is impossible in a capitalist world.**

**Meszaros 95** (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, 1995, Beyond Capital, p. 54-56. Section—Second)

On the international plane, by contrast, the national state of the capital system has no interest whatsoever in restraining the boundless monopolistic drive of its dominant economic units. Quite the contrary. For in the domain of international competition the stronger and the less restrained is the politically (if needed also militarily) supported economic enterprise, the more likely it is to succeed against its actually given or potential rivals. This is why the relationship between the state and the relevant economic enterprises in this field is primarily characterized by the state quite unashamedly assuming the role of the facilitator of as monopolistic as possible capital expansion abroad. The ways and means of this facilitating role are, of course, altered with the change in the internal and external relation offers due to the changing historical circumstances. But the monopolistic orienting principles of all states which occupy a dominant position in capital's global pecking order remain the same, despite the ideas of 'free trade', 'fair competition', etc., which were at first genuinely believed (by people like Adam Smith) but later turned into cynical camouflage or the object of ritualistic lip service only. The state of the capital system must assert with all means at its disposal the monopolistic interests of its national capital — if need be through the imposition of 'gunboat diplomacy' — *vis-a-vis* all rival states involved in competition for the markets needed for capital-expansion and accumulation. This is the case with regard to the most varied political practices, from early modern colonialism (with the role assigned in it to monopolistic trading com­panies)59 to full blown imperialism as well as to the post-colonial 'disengagement from empire' by securing new forms of neo-colonial domination, not to mention the aggressive neo-imperialist aspirations and practices of the U.S. and its subservient allies in the recently decreed 'New World Order'. However, even though the interests of particular national capitals can be distinguished from, and in the case of the dominant states to a large extent also protected against, encroachment by other national capitals, such a protection cannot remove the antagonisms of *total social capital,* i.e. the inner structural determination of capital as *a global* controlling force. This is because in the capital system all 'harmonization' can only take the form of a strictly temporary *balancing* — and not the proper *resolution* — of conflict. It is by no means accidental, therefore, that in bourgeois social and political theory we find the glorification of the concept of 'balance of powers' as the unsurpassable ideal, when in fact at any given time it can only amount to the imposition/acceptance of the prevailing relation of forces, envisaging at the same time its overturning when circumstances permit. The axiom of *helium omnium contra omnes* is the unsurpassable *modus operandi* of the capital system. For as a system of social metabolic control it is *antagonistically structured* from the smallest to the most comprehensive socioeconomic and political units. Moreover, the capital system — as indeed all conceivable forms of global social metabolic control, including the socialist — is subject to the absolute law *of uneven development* which prevails under the rule of capital in an ultimately destructive form, because of its antagonistic inner structuring principle.60 Thus, to envisage the genuine and sustainable resolution of the capital system's antagonisms at the global level it would be necessary first to believe in the fairy tale of eliminating forever the law of uneven development from human affairs. This is why the 'New World Order' is either an absurd fantasy or a cynical camouflage designed to project the hegemonic interests of the preponderant capitalist powers as the morally commendable and universally beneficial aspiration of mankind. Nothing would be resolved here by setting up a 'World Government' — and the state system corresponding to it — even if it were feasible at all. For no global system can be other than explosive and ultimately self-destructive if it is antagonistically structured all the way to its inner core.

**The way that they frame their harms is not politically neutral. Their abhorrence of disorder is a product of liberal governance itself—the end goal is to have all of humanity ordered, cleaned up, ready to be counted and controlled.**

**Dillon & Reid, 2000** (Michael and Julian, Lecturer at the University of Lancaster and Lecturer on International Politics at University of London, Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance, Vol. 25 Ish. 1, January-March).

No political formulation is therefore innocent. None refers to a truth about the world that preexists that truth's entry into the world through discourse. Every formula is instead a clue to a truth. Each is crafted in the context of a wider discursive economy of meaning. Tug at the formula, the pull in the fabric begins to disclose the way in which it has been woven. The artefactual design of the truth it proclaims then emerges. We are therefore dealing with something much more than a mere matter of geopolitical fact when encountering the vocabulary of complex emergency in the discourse of global governance and liberal peace. We are not talking about a discrete class of unproblematic actions. Neither are we discussing certain forms of intractable conflicts. The formula complex emergency does of course address certain kinds of violent disorder. That disorder is not our direct concern. Recall with Foucault and many other thinkers that an economy of meaning is no mere idealist speculation. **It is a material political production integral to a specific political economy of power**. We do not therefore subscribe to the view championed, for example, by Adam Roberts that the formula complex emergency is merely a way of giving a new name to an old problem.[12] We are talking instead about a particular understanding of (inter)national politics that leads to such **disorder being bracketed** and addressed **in terms of complex emergency**. For it is only in the context of a certain political rationality, in this instance the global governance of liberal peace, that the formula occurs at all.[13] It is in relation to that political rationality and its hybrid practices of power that the formula not only makes sense but also does certain kinds of work. So-called humanitarian emergencies are always therefore profoundly political events concerned above all with the responses to the advent of violent change induced by the constant interplay between the local and the global.

### Utopian

**The affirmative is utopian—their faith in capitalism will drive us to extinction.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 165)

The reader might (prematurely) conclude at this point that any limits-to-growth theorist who predicts the death of industrial civilization and prescribes the establishment of a transindustrial society is guilty of utopian naivete. On the contrary, advocates of limits-based, postindustrial social transformation would reply (as I think Milbrath would) that it is those members of the faithful who accept the gospel of industrialism and its dependence upon the continuation of both unlimited economic growth and the postindustrial status quo, who are utopian. Their naivete will become increasingly evident as the limits to growth get closer and the dangers to society increase; when the apocalyptic consequences of growth-addiction begin to materialize and the flawed normative foundations of postindustrialism are exposed. Time is running out, as some popular media have begun to suggest with regard to several environmental threats recently made prominent: global warming, stratospheric ozone depletion, acid rain, deforestation, ocean pollution, and so on.

**Our intellectual act is intrinsically tied to the realities of the system – intellectual criticism supplements social movements**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

CGS = critical globalization studies

What the popular church recognized in the 1960s and 1970s for the Catholic Church—namely, that it is part of a larger society, reﬂects the divisions, struggles, and power relations of that society, and that members of the church are not neutral in the face of the battles that rage in society—holds true for the university. I want to call for scholars and intellectuals in the twenty-ﬁrst century to exercise a preferential option for subordinate majorities of emergent global society. What does it mean to exercise a preferential option for the majority in global society? In my view, what is required in global society, seen from the needs and aspirations of the poor majority of humanity, for whom global capitalism is nothing short of alienation, savagery, and dehumanization, are organic intellectuals capable of theorizing the changes that have taken place in the system of capitalism, in this epoch of globalization, and of providing to popular majorities these theoretical insights as inputs for their real-world struggles to develop alternative social relationships and an alternative social logic—the logic of majorities—to those of the market and of transnational capital. In other words, a critical globalization studies has to be capable of inspiring emancipatory action, of bringing together multiple publics in developing programs that integrate theory and practice. This does not mean that practicing a CGS is reduced to running out and joining mass movements. It is, to be sure, a good idea to do so, although academics must be careful not to impose their ‘‘knowledge power’’ on these movements. Great scholars throughout the ages, those that have truly had an impact on history, have also been social activists and political agents. But the key thing here is to bring our intellectual labor—our theorizing and systematic research—to bear on the crisis of humanity. This involves critical thinking. The distinction between critical and noncritical ways of thinking is what Max Horkheimer (1972) ﬁrst called ‘‘traditional’’ versus ‘‘critical’’ thinking, and what Robert Cox (1995) more recently has referred to as ‘‘problem solving’’ versus ‘‘critical’’ thinking. The critical tradition in the social sciences, not to be confused with the related but distinct critical theory as ﬁrst developed by the Frankfurt School in Western Marxist thought, refers in the broadest sense to those approaches that take a critical view of the prevailing status quo and explicitly seek to replace the predominant power structures and social hierarchies with what are seen as more just and equitable social arrangements. Critical thinking therefore cannot take place without linking theory to practice, without a theoretically informed practice. Praxis is at the core of a CGS.

### Too radical

**Inclusion of an alternative makes our critique fundamentally hopeful—not paralyzing.**

**Kassiola, 90** (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 15)

We must be careful not to have the limits-to-growth critiques of industrial values exist in isolation with their fearful and depressing message only. They must be combined with discussions of alternative social orders and proposals for the design and transformation processes by which these alternative societies might be realized; in short, an account of how social transformation of advanced industrial society may occur. I shall attempt to begin to do this in part 4 and thereby provide insight to and appreciation of the following crucial encouraging fact: the end of the industrial civilization does not necessarily mean the end of human civilization in toto. The concern by supporters that the limits-to-growth attack might be viewed so cataclysmically as to induce inaction either because of shock or despair is illustrated by a story told by William Sloane Coffin about a Harvard scientist flying over the lake country in northern Alabama using technical instruments in an experiment measuring fish population. When the scientist discovered two fishermen out on the lake that he had just determined had no fish, he thought he would inform them of his recent finding as a friendly gesture. They were outraged, instantly, and told the scientist in rich Southern expletives where he could take his plane and his instruments and what he could do with them, whereupon they baited their lines once again and kept on fishing. The scientist flew off, much puzzled. "I expected their disappointment," he said later, "but not their anger."33 Similarly, as students of industrial society knowledgeable of the requirements for social action and change, we need to be cognizant of the possible reactions of both the public and policymakers in advanced industrial societies, no matter how accurate we consider the claims about the crisis of industrial culture to be; as Krauthammer noted, the law of diminishing returns applied to repeated apocalyptic accounts might set in. Happily, this will not mean ignoring aspects of the crisis for fear of such overkill. There is a socially significant, encouraging element to the most gloomy analysis of the threats to postindustrial society in the recognition that the death of industrial civilization need not mean the end of the world. Formulations of the industrial crisis should be as accurate as possible and should reflect the social implications and consequences of this crisis.

### Movements fail

**Social movements against capitalism can succeed—they are growing and uniting.**

**Foster, 02** (John Bellamy, Professor of environmental sociology, Marxism, and political economy at the University of Oregon, *Ecology Against Capitalism,* p 40-41. )

Ultimately the defense of the environment therefore requires a break with the tyranny of the bottom line and a long revolution (it is hoped not too long given the acceleration of history associated with ecological change) in which other, more diverse values not connected to the bottom line of the money-driven economy have a chance of coming to the fore. What is needed is a system of production organized democratically in accordance with the needs of the direct producers and reflecting an emphasis on the fulfillment of the totality of human needs (extending beyond the Hobbesian individual). These have to be understood as connected to the sustainability of nature, i.e., the conditions of life as we know them. Production can be said to be nonalienating only if it promotes the welfare of all, and only if it fulfills the human need for a sustainable, and in that sense nonexploitative, relation to nature. Since environmental costs under capitalism tend to be externalized while the benefits of avaricious disregard of environmental necessity feed the wealth of the few, environmental depredations lead to struggles for environmental justice. The struggle for material welfare among the great mass of the population, which was once understood mainly in economic terms, is increasingly taking on a wider, more holistic environmental context. Hence, it is the struggle for environmental justice – the struggle over the interrelationship of race, class, gender, and imperial oppression and the depredation of the environment – that is likely to be the defining feature of the twenty-first century. The universalization of a capitalism that knows no bounds is unifying all that seek to exist in defiance of the system. Historic struggles for social justice are becoming united, as never before, with struggles for the preservation of the earth. The solution to the environmental problem, our own struggles will teach us, lies beyond the bottom line. It is here that the main resources for hope in the twenty-first century are to be found.

### Self-correcting

Capitalism is not self-correcting

Parenti 9 (Michael, PhD in political science from Yale, one of the nations’ leading political analysts, “Capitalism’s Self-Inflicted Apocalypse”, Michael Parenti political archive, http://www.michaelparenti.org/capitalism%20apocalypse.html)

The capitalist state has two roles long recognized by political thinkers. First, like any state it must provide services that cannot be reliably developed through private means, such as public safety and orderly traffic. Second, the capitalist state protects the haves from the have-nots, securing the process of capital accumulation to benefit the moneyed interests, while heavily circumscribing the demands of the working populace, as Debs observed from his jail cell. There is a *third* function of the capitalist state seldom mentioned. It consists of preventing the capitalist system from devouring itself. Consider the core contradiction Karl Marx pointed to: the tendency toward overproduction and market crisis. An economy dedicated to speedups and wage cuts, to making workers produce more and more for less and less, is always in danger of a crash. To maximize profits, wages must be kept down. But someone has to buy the goods and services being produced. For that, wages must be kept up. There is a chronic tendency—as we are seeing today—toward overproduction of private sector goods and services and underconsumption of necessities by the working populace. In addition, there is the frequently overlooked self-destruction created by the moneyed players themselves. If left completely unsupervised, the more active command component of the financial system begins to devour less organized sources of wealth. Instead of trying to make money by the arduous task of producing and marketing goods and services, the marauders tap directly into the money streams of the economy itself. During the 1990s we witnessed the collapse of an entire economy in Argentina when unchecked free marketeers stripped enterprises, pocketed vast sums, and left the country’s productive capacity in shambles. The Argentine state, gorged on a heavy diet of free-market ideology, faltered in its function of saving capitalism from the capitalists. Some years later, in the United States, came the multi-billion-dollar plunder perpetrated by corporate conspirators at Enron, WorldCom, Harkin, Adelphia, and a dozen other major companies. Inside players like Ken Lay turned successful corporate enterprises into sheer wreckage, wiping out the jobs and life savings of thousands of employees in order to pocket billions. These thieves were caught and convicted. Does that not show capitalism’s self-correcting capacity? Not really. The prosecution of such malfeasance— in any case coming too late—was a product of *democracy’s* accountability and transparency, not capitalism’s. Of itself the free market is an amoral system, with no strictures save *caveat emptor*.

### Alt slow

**The refusal to be guided by the crisis of the time is exactly what allows the critique to disrupt the political order.**

**Brown, 05** (*Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics*, Wendy, Professor of Poli Sci, UC Berkeley).

The rebuff of critical theory as untimely provides the core matter of the affirmative case for it. Critical theory is essential in dark times not for the sake of sustaining utopian hopes, making flamboyant interventions, or staging irreverent protests, but rather to contest the very senses of time invoked to declare critique untimely. If the charge of untimeliness inevitably also fixes time, then disrupting this fixity is crucial to keeping the times from closing in on us. It is a way of reclaiming the present from the conservative hold on it that is borne by the charge of untimeliness. To insist on the value of untimely political critique is not, then, to refuse the problem of time or timing in politics but rather to contest settled accounts of what time it is, what the times are, and what political tempo and temporality we should hew to in political life. Untimeliness deployed as an effective intellectual and political strategy, far from being a gesture of indifference to time, is a bid to reset time. Intellectualand political strategies of successful untimeliness therefore dependon a close engagement with time in every sense of the word.They are concerned with timing and tempo. They involve efforts tograsp the times by thinking against the times. They attempt, as Nietzsche put it, to "overcome the present" by puncturing the present's "overvaluation of itself," an overcoming whose aim is to breathe new possibility into the age. If our times are dark, what could be moreimportant?

**Every move away from capitalism decreases the chances of global extinction.**

**Foster** **08** (John Foster PhD at New York University professor of Sociology and Marxist Theory at The University of Oregon. “Capitalism versus the planet” http://www.greenleft.org.au/2008/747/38655)

Is humanity going to pull through this environmental crisis? If it is, what are the changes that are necessary? Well, I think there are a couple of ways you could answer that question — one way would be that, as Noam Chomsky has answered it, it’s a question of optimism or pessimism, and in some way that’s a psychological issue. The really important thing is not what we think the chances are, but what we’re going to do. So if you think that there’s a 1% chance that we’re not going to destroy the planet, and practically speaking, all living species, what matters is not that you think there’s only a 1% chance, but whether you’re on the side of the 1% or not. So what matters is what we do. Certainly there are ways that we can get out of this crisis. I do think that under capitalist system, if the logic of capital is predominant — that our society has as its primary motivation the accumulation of capital and profits at the expense of nearly everything else — the chances of the world getting out of this alive are very, very dim. But it’s within the power of humanity to pull us away from the logic of capital. This invites the question of a social system which is something quite different. We won’t get there all at once, but every radical thrust away from it gives us more of a chance, so we need to prioritize human needs and decrease human waste. We have to prioritise human access to water, food and those basic things that human beings really need. And we have to move away from those goods and processes and commodities that exist only so that corporations can make a profit. Eventually, we have to politically transform our system and transform our production. The reason we have to transform production is because that is the human relation to nature, its metabolism with nature. The only way we can deal with the ecological problem is to change the way in which we relate to nature through our production, and that is precisely what the existing system won’t allow us to address.

**Even if the alternative cannot accomplish a complete transition, each step matters.**

**Trainer 95** (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability”, pg.110)

Although there are some very important political reasons why it will be difficult to change to the sort of economy required (at present many powerful people, corporations, governments and consumers do not want to change), there is nothing to prevent us from starting to build the alternative economy right now. If we can gradually get more alternative ways going we will create more opportunities for people to opt out of the high-income and high-consumption mainstream economy. This would increasingly bring us closer to the point in time when there was sufficient awareness and support to enable the really big and difficult structural changes to be made.

**Capitalism does not have to be dismantled in one bold move. The alternative will be effective as fragmented, individual resistance that will add up to transformation.**

**Gibson-Graham, 96** (J.K., Katherine Gibson = professor of human geography at Australian National University and Julie Graham = professor of geography at University of Massachusetts, The End of Capital (As We Knew It), pg. 263-265)

The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could begin to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see or theorize as consequential in so-called capitalist social formations. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism is large, other things appear small and inconsequential. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conditions under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes a “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian future goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change. In the absence of Capitalism, I might suggest a different object of socialist politics. Perhaps we might be able to focus some of our transformative energies on the exploitation and surplus distribution that go on around us in so many forms and in which we participate in various ways. In the household, in the so-called workplace, in the community, surplus labor is produced, appropriated, and distributed every day by ourselves and others. Marx made these processes visible but they have been obscured by the discourse of Capitalism, with its vision of two great classes locked in millennial struggle. Compelling and powerful though it might be, this discourse does not allow for a variety of forms of exploitation and distribution or for the diversity of class positions and consciousness that such processes might participate in creating. If we can divorce our ideas of class from systemic social conceptions, and simultaneously divorce our ideas of class transformation form projects of systemic transformation, we may be able to envision local and proximate socialisms.

### State key

**Appealing to the state only further entrenches global capitalism – the only way to challege new imperialism is to weaken the state**

**Bamyeh, 2000**, TEACHER OF COMPARATIVE CIVILIZATIONS AND POLITICAL THEORY AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, 2000 [MOHAMMED A., “THE NEW IMPERIALISM: SIX THESES” *Social Text,* 18:1, projectmuse]

It is in the light of such a magnificent transformation that certain old habits and myopias must be reexamined. In particular, I am referring to the old leftist habit of focusing on global capitalism as the worst enemy of humanity, and in that focus ignoring the problem of the state. Thus it is not uncommon for leftist critics of globalization to call for strengthening the state, so that it can regulate global capitalism. How this is supposed to work, no one ventures to tell. Nor do any of those commentators venture to consider the totalitarian prerequisites entailed in such a cavalier proposal. If global capitalism has become much more flexible, entrenched, and widespread, then a regulatory state would be expected to be equally entrenched and even more far-reaching in its power than has ever been attempted. You might fantasize that that might not be a problem if *you* were the state. But "you" are not the state, and you are unlikely to know how to use such a state in the highly improbable event that it is handed over to you. There is no guarantee, instrumental or otherwise, that under current or conceivable conditions the state can or would use such enhanced power to govern on behalf of some "common interest," especially since there is *no common interest against globalization*. This lack means precisely that the state will use any enhanced power to play the only game available to it now, namely that of the new imperialism in the international arena if it has the means, or that of symbolic power domestically. Indeed, if there is an adequate response to the new imperialism and concomitant new forms of power deployment, it is to *weaken* the state. When global capitalism was more closely associated with imperial politics, it succeeded to a great extent in disciplining imperialism, since conquests and interventions had to have a calculable benefit. Also, *refrainment from* **[End Page 23]** *conquest* and decolonization were connected to the subordination of imperial logic to economy. This subordination was usually expressed in the political field by the rationalizing capitalist ethos, mandating the confinement of expensive political adventures to the realm of absolute necessity, especially where capitalism had become already established, or could continue to thrive just as well without the conquest. That disciplinary impulse suddenly disappears once the capitalist entrepreneur opens his eyes with amazement at how open the world has become. He packs his belongings and begins traversing charming and distant lands--no longer dangerous--multiplying profits here and there. In his frenzy, he unfortunately forgets to tell the state that while the teacher is away, it should continue to abide by the same old dictum: the need for its exercise of power to be guided by a coherent notion of profitability. Perhaps he does not even care whether the dictum is followed or not, especially if he has reason to believe that in neither case will his business be affected, or that only the world is truly his stage, or that he may never return. This is not to say that there is no hope for imposing any sense of order, regulation, or control over such a vast system. My argument is simply that existing state structures are not suitable, capable, or desirable agents of such control.

## \*\*FRAMEWORK\*\*

### Epistemology

**Prefer our epistemological method – we must have a systemic view of critical globalization studies that recognizes the interconnectedness of social relations– to do otherwise creates binaries**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

CGS = critical globalization studies

A CGS therefore requires dialectical thought at the level of epistemology**,** as a way of knowing. In epistemological terms, dialectics means a dialogue seeking truth through exploration of contradictions and through identifying the internal relations that bind together diverse and multifaceted dimensions of social reality into an open totality. In the dialectical approach the different dimensions of our social reality do not have an ‘‘independent’’ status insofar as each aspect of reality is constituted by, and is constitutive of, a larger whole of which it is an internal element. An internal relation is one in which each part is constituted in its relation to the other, so that one cannot exist without the other and only has meaning when seen within the relation, whereas an external relation is one in which each part has an existence independent of its relation to the other (Ollman, 1976). Viewing things as externally related to each other inevitably leads to dualist constructs and false dichotomies (e.g., political economy versus culture, the local/national and the global). The distinct levels of social structure—in this case, global social structure—cannot be understood independent of each other, but neither are these levels reducible to any one category. They are internally related, meaning that they can only be understood in their relation to each other and to the larger social whole.

**Intellectual resistance to capitalism creates a critical pedagogy that is a necessary precondition for real world change.**

Giroux 6/19 [Henry, Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism” June 6, 2012 <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>]

While a change in consciousness does not guarantee a change in either one's politics or society, it is a crucial precondition for connecting what it means to think otherwise to conditions that make it possible to act otherwise. The education deficit must be seen as intertwined with a political deficit, serving to make many oppressed individuals complicit with oppressive ideologies. As the late Cornelius Castoriadis made clear, democracy requires "critical thinkers capable of putting existing institutions into question.... while simultaneously creating the conditions for individual and social autonomy."[(41)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a41) Nothing will change politically or economically until new and emerging social movements take seriously the need to develop a language of radical reform and create new public spheres that support the knowledge, skills and critical thought that are necessary features of a democratic formative culture. Getting beyond the big lie as a precondition for critical thought, civic engagement and a more realized democracy will mean more than correcting distortions, misrepresentations and falsehoods produced by politicians, media talking heads and anti-public intellectuals. It will also require addressing how new sites of pedagogy have become central to any viable notion of agency, politics and democracy itself. This is not a matter of elevating cultural politics over material relations of power as much as it is a rethinking of how power deploys culture and how culture as a mode of education positions power. James Baldwin, the legendary African-American writer and civil rights activist, argued that the big lie points to a crisis of American identity and politics and is symptomatic of "a backward society" that has descended into madness, "especially when one is forced to lie about one's aspect of anybody's history, [because you then] must lie about it all."[(42)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a42) He goes on to argue "that one of the paradoxes of education [is] that precisely at the point when you begin to develop a conscience, you must find yourself at war with your society. It is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person."[(43)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a43) What Baldwin recognizes is that learning has the possibility to trigger a critical engagement with oneself, others and the larger society - education becomes in this instance more than a method or tool for domination but a politics, a fulcrum for democratic social change. Tragically, in our current climate "learning" merely contributes to a vast reserve of manipulation and self-inflicted ignorance. Our education deficit is neither reducible to the failure of particular types of teaching nor the decent into madness by the spokespersons for the new authoritarianism. Rather, it is about how matters of knowledge, values and ideology can be struggled over as issues of power and politics. Surviving the current education deficit will depend on progressives using history, memory and knowledge not only to reconnect intellectuals to the everyday needs of ordinary people, but also to jumpstart social movements by making education central to organized politics and the quest for a radical democracy.

### Ev indicts

Be skeptical of their evidence – the government pays off academics in order to wage epistemological war on those who challenge capitalism’s hegemony.

Giroux 6/19 [Henry, Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism” June 6, 2012 <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>]

Anti-Public Intellectuals and the Conservative Re-Education Machine The conservative takeover of public pedagogy with its elite codifiers of neoliberal ideology has a long history extending from the work of the "Chicago Boys" at the University of Chicago to the various conservative think tanks that emerged after the publication of the Powell memo in the early seventies.[(16)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a16) The Republican Party will more than likely win the next election and take full control over all aspects of policymaking in the United States. This is especially dangerous given that the Republican Party is now controlled by extremists. If they win the 2012 election, they will not only extend the Bush/Obama legacy of militarism abroad, but likely intensify the war at home as well. Political scientist Frances Fox Piven rightly argues that, "We've been at war for decades now - not just in Afghanistan or Iraq, but right here at home. Domestically, it's been a war [a]gainst the poor [and as] devastating as it has been, the war against the poor has gone largely unnoticed until now."[(17)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a17) And the war at home now includes more than attacks on the poor, as campaigns are increasingly waged against the rights of women, students, workers, people of color and immigrants, especially Latino Americans. As the social state collapses, the punishing state expands its power and targets larger portions of the population. The war in Afghanistan is now mimicked in the war waged on peaceful student protesters at home. It is evident in the environmental racism that produces massive health problems for African-Americans. The domestic war is even waged on elementary school children, who now live in fear of the police handcuffing them in their classrooms and incarcerating them as if they were adult criminals.[(18)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a18) It is waged on workers by taking away their pensions, bargaining rights and dignity. The spirit of militarism is also evident in the war waged on the welfare state and any form of social protection that benefits the poor, disabled, sick, elderly, and other groups now considered disposable, including children. The soft side of authoritarianism in the United States does not need to put soldiers in the streets, though it certainly follows that script. As it expands its control over the commanding institutions of government, the armed forces and civil society in general, it hires anti-public intellectuals and academics to provide ideological support for its gated communities, institutions and modes of education. As Yasha Levine points out, it puts thousands of dollars in the hands of corporate shills such as Malcolm Gladwell, who has become a "one man branding and distribution pipeline for valuable corporate messages, constructed on the public's gullibility in trusting his probity and intellectual honesty."[(19)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a19) Gladwell (who is certainly not alone) functions as a bought-and-paid mouthpiece for "Big Tobacco Pharma and defend[s] Enron-style financial fraud ... earning hundreds of thousands of dollars as a corporate speaker, sometimes from the same companies and industries that he covers as a journalist."[(20)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a20) Corporate power uses these "pay to play" academics, anti-public intellectuals, the mainstream media, and other educational apparatuses to discredit the very people that it simultaneously oppresses, while waging an overarching war on all things public. As Charles Ferguson has noted, an entire industry has been created that enables the "sale of academic expertise for the purpose of influencing government policy, the courts and public opinion [and] is now a multibillion-dollar business."[(21)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a21) It gets worse, in that "Academic, legal, regulatory and policy consulting in economics, finance and regulation is dominated by a half dozen consulting firms, several speakers' bureaus and various industry lobbying groups that maintain large networks of academics for hire specifically for the purpose of advocating industry interests in policy and regulatory debates."[(22)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a22) Such anti-public intellectuals create what William Black has called a "criminogenic environment" that spreads disease and fraud in the interest of bolstering the interests, profits and values of the super wealthy.[(23)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a23) There is more at work here than carpet bombing the culture with lies, deceptions and euphemisms. Language in this case does more than obfuscate or promote propaganda. It creates framing mechanisms, cultural ecosystems and cultures of cruelty, while closing down the spaces for dialogue, critique and thoughtfulness. At its worst, it engages in the dual processes of demonization and distraction. The rhetoric of demonization takes many forms: for example, calling firefighters, teachers, and other public servants greedy because they want to hold onto their paltry benefits. It labels students as irresponsible because of the large debts they are forced to incur as states cut back funding to higher education (this, too, is part of a broader effort by conservatives to hollow out the social state). Poor people are insulted and humiliated because they are forced to live on food stamps, lack decent health care and collect unemployment benefits because there are no decent jobs available. Poor minorities are now subject to overt racism in the right-wing media and outright violence in the larger society.

**Our government has coopted academia to provide intellectual backing for capitalism and to distract us from the atrocities it facilitates so that they can sustain the dominance of the 1%.**

Giroux 6/19 [Henry, Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism” June 6, 2012 http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism]

The late Tony Judt stated that he was less concerned about the slide of American democracy into something like authoritarianism than American society moving toward something he viewed as even more corrosive: "a loss of conviction, a loss of faith in the culture of democracy, a sense of skepticism and withdrawal" that diminishes the capacity of a democratic formative culture to resist and transform those antidemocratic ideologies that benefit only the mega corporations, the ultrawealthy and ideological fundamentalists.[(32)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a32) Governance has turned into a legitimation for enriching the already wealthy elite, bankers, hedge fund managers, mega corporations and executive members of the financial service industries. Americans now live in a society in which only the thinnest conception of democracy frames what it means to be a citizen - one which equates the obligations of citizenship with consumerism and democratic rights with alleged consumer freedoms. Antidemocratic forms of power do not stand alone as a mode of force or the force of acting on others; they are also deeply aligned with cultural apparatuses of persuasion, extending their reach through social and digital media, sophisticated technologies, the rise of corporate intellectuals and a university system that now produces and sanctions intellectuals aligned with private interests - all of which, as Randy Martin points out, can be identified with a form of casino capitalism that is about "permanent vigilance, activity and intervention."[(33)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a33) Indeed, many institutions that provide formal education in the United States have become co-conspirators with a savage casino capitalism, whose strength lies in producing, circulating and legitimating market values that promote the narrow world of commodity worship, celebrity culture, bare-knuckle competition, a retreat from social responsibility and a war-of-all-against-all mentality that destroys any viable notion of community, the common good and the interrelated notions of political, social and economic rights. University presidents now make huge salaries sitting on corporate boards, while faculty sell their knowledge to the highest corporate bidder and, in doing so, turn universities into legitimation centers for casino capitalism.[(34)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a34) Of course, such academics also move from the boardrooms of major corporations to talk shows and op-ed pages of major newspapers, offering commentary in journals and other modes of print and screen culture. They are the new traveling intellectuals of casino capitalism, doing everything they can to make the ruthless workings of power invisible, to shift the blame for society's failures onto the very people who are its victims and to expand the institutions and culture of anti-intellectualism and distraction into every aspect of American life.The politics of distraction should not be reduced merely to a rhetorical ploy used by the wealthy and influential to promote their own interests and power. It is a form of market-driven politics in which educational force of the broader culture is used to create ideologies, policies, individuals and social agents who lack the knowledge, critical skills and discriminatory judgments to question the rule of casino capitalism and the values, social practices and power formations it legitimates. Politics and education have always mutually informed each other as pedagogical sites proliferate and circulate throughout the cultural landscape.[(40)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a40) But today, distraction is the primary element being used to suppress democratically purposeful education by pushing critical thought to the margins of society. As a register of power, distraction becomes central to a pedagogical landscape inhabited by rich conservative foundations, an army of well-funded anti-public intellectuals from both major parties, a growing number of amply funded conservative campus organizations, increasing numbers of academics who hock their services to corporations and the military-industrial complex, and others who promote the ideology of casino capitalism and the corporate right's agenda. Academics who make a claim to producing knowledge and truth in the public interest are increasingly being replaced by academics for hire who move effortlessly among industry, government and academia. Extreme power is now showcased through the mechanisms of ever-proliferating cultural/educational apparatuses and the anti-public intellectuals who support them and are in turn rewarded by the elites who finance such apparatuses. The war at home is made visible in the show of force aimed at civilian populations, including students, workers, and others considered disposable or a threat to the new authoritarianism. Its most powerful allies appear to be the intellectuals, institutions, cultural apparatuses and new media technologies that constitute the sites of public pedagogy, which produce the formative culture necessary for authoritarianism to thrive.

**Politics has been coopted – be skeptical of their responses, they come from sources who have an incentive to sustain the most dangerous forms of global capitalism**

**Marsh 95**, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, PhD from Northwestern University (James, Critique Action and Liberation, p 296-7)

(D) We witness the development of the culture industry in mediasuch as newspapers, magazines, radio, movies, and television**.** A capitalist "identity logic" extends its sway over more and more of national and social reality, incorporating or denying or completely absorbing or obliterating the noncapitalist or precapitalistother. Such industries are genuine industries owned by big corporate giants such as CBS' or ABC and, therefore, interested in making money and in legitimizing money-making as a way of life. They play**,** therefore, the economic role of selling products and the ideological role of encouraging attitudes serving corporate objectives in advertising, programming, and reporting. Chomsky, as we have seen, shows the biased way U.S. media reported on the elections in EI Salvador, Nicaragua, and Guatemala in the 1980s. By all the reasonable standards of a free, democratic election, such as multiplicity of candidates, free press, lack of pressure to vote, and absence of terror, Nicaragua's was far more democratic than either Guatemala's or El Salvador's. Yet according to media like The New York Times or CBS, Nicaragua's election approached being totalitarian and EI Salvador and Guatemala were virtual showplace exercises in democracy. (E)Politics is progressively commodified**.** More and more, rather than being an enterprise of communicative praxis**,** politics becomes an exercise of selling the president**.** Rather than being a discussion of issues, politics becomes an exercise in public relations and marketing;good looks become more important than good ideas. Nixon's bad appearance in the 1960 debates with Kennedy was as significant or more significant than Nixon's bad ideas**. (F)** We note the explosion of new information technologies such as computers,data banks, and VCRsinteracting with other mediasuch as television, radio, and moviesin such a way as to enhance these and give them new life.Here again**,** the same double economic and ideological roles are played out. IBM and Apple are businesses selling products, inviting each one of us to purchase a very expensive home computer. The information available through computers becomes useful to buying and selling, and stock market transfers are rendered efficient, expanded, and centralized in a way that they were not before.Computers contribute to a process of automation in which human beings are replaced with technology, production rendered more profitable, and capitalist control more efficient. Relative surplus value arises in a new guise. Old friends, or enemies, come dressed in new clothes bearing gifts.

**Their claim to ‘objective’ or non-biased knowledge mystifies their role as scholars and allows dominant ideologies to slip in – question their knowledge claims**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

Does such a CGS imply that scholarship and the academic profession become comprised by ‘‘politicizing’’ them in this way? There is no value-free research, and there are no apolitical intellectuals. (This is not to say that our research should not adhere to the social science rules of logic and empirical veriﬁcation; indeed it must be lest it is reduced to propaganda.) We know from the philosophy and the sociology of knowledge that knowledge is never neutral or divorced from the historic context of its production, including from competing social interests (see, inter alia, Therborn, 1985; Fray, 1987; Chalmers, 2000; Sartre 1974; Robinson, 1996). Intellectual production always parallels, and can be functionally associated with, movement and change in society. There is no such thing as an intellectual or an academic divorced from social aims that drive research, not in the hard sciences, and much less in the social sciences and humanities. The mainstream scholar may ‘‘well believe in an independent, ‘suprasocial,’ detached knowledge as in the social importanlce of his expertise,’’ observes Horkheimer. ‘‘The dualism of thought and being, understanding and perception is second nature to the scientist. . . . [such mainstream scholars] believe they are acting according to personal determinations, whereas in fact even in their most complicated calculations they but exemplify the working of an incalculable social mechanism’’ (1972: 196–97). Many ‘‘mainstream’’ academics, shielded by the assumptions of positivist epistemologies, would no doubt take issue with this characterization of intellectual labor as, by deﬁnition, a social act by organic social agents. There are those who would posit a free-ﬂoating academic, a neutral generator of knowledge and ideas. But few would disagree that scholars and intellectuals are knowledge producers and that ‘‘knowledge is power.’’ Hence it is incumbent on us to ask, Power for whom? Power exercised by whom? Power to what ends? The theoretical and research trajectories of social scientists, policy makers, and others within the academic division of labor are inﬂuenced by their social position as shaped by class, as well as by gender, race, and culture. But many academics are linked to the state, to other social institutions, and to dominant groups in a myriad of ways, from corporate and state funding of research, to status, prestige, job security, and social approval that comes from integration into the hegemonic order, in contrast, as Ollman shows, to the well-known sanctions one risks in committing to a counterhegemonic project (1976: 119–32). Academics who believe they can remain aloof in the face of the conﬂicts that are swirling about us and the ever-higher stakes involved are engaged in a self-deception that is itself a political act. The claim to nonpolitical intellectual labor, value neutrality, and so forth, is part of the very mystiﬁcation of knowledge production and the ideological legitimation by intellectual agents of the dominant social order. Such intellectuals, to quote Sartre following Gramsci, are ‘‘specialists in research and servitors of hegemony’’ (1974: 238). The prevailing global order has its share of intellectual defenders, academics, pundits, and ideologues. These ‘‘functionaries of the superstructure’’ (Sartre, 1974: 238) serve to mystify the real inner workings of the emerging order and the social interests embedded therein. They become central cogs in the system of global capitalism, performing not only legitimating functions but also developing practical and particularist knowledge intended to provide technical solutions in response to the problems and contradictions of the system. In short, whether intended or not, they exercise a ‘‘preferential option’’ for a minority of the privileged and the powerful in global capitalist society.

### Framing key

**The way that policies are framed deeply implicates how they are carried out.**

**The Frameworks Institute, 03 (**“The FrameWorks Perspective: Strategic Frame Analysis”, http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/strategicanalysis/perspective.shtml)

By framing, we mean how messages are encoded with meaning so that they can be efficiently interpreted in relationship to existing beliefs or ideas. Frames trigger meaning. The questions we ask, in applying the concept of frames to the arena of social policy, are as follows: How does the public think about a particular social or political issue? What is the public discourse on the issue? And how is this discourse influenced by the way media frames that issue? How do these public and private frames affect public choices? How can an issue be reframed to evoke a different way of thinking, one that illuminates a broader range of alternative policy choices? This approach is strategic in that it not only deconstructs the dominant frames of reference that drive reasoning on public issues, but it also identifies those alternative frames most likely to stimulate public reconsideration and enumerates their elements (reframing). We use the term reframe to mean changing "the context of the message exchange" so that different interpretations and probable outcomes become visible to the public (Dearing & Rogers, 1994: 98). Strategic frame analysis offers policy advocates a way to work systematically through the challenges that are likely to confront the introduction of new legislation or social policies, to anticipate attitudinal barriers to support, and to develop research-based strategies to overcome public misunderstanding. What Is Communications and Why Does It Matter? The domain of communications has not changed markedly since 1948 when Harold Lasswell formulated his famous equation: *who says what to whom through what channel with what effect?* But what many social policy practitioners have overlooked in their quests to formulate effective strategies for social change is that communications merits their attention because it is an inextricable part of the agenda-setting function in this country. Communications plays a vital role in determining which issues the public prioritizes for policy resolution, which issues will move from the private realm to the public, which issues will become pressure points for policymakers, and which issues will win or lose in the competition for scarce resources. No organization can approach such tasks as issue advocacy, constituency-building, or promoting best practices without taking into account the critical role that mass media has to play in shaping the way Americans think about social issues. As William Gamson and his colleagues at the Media Research and Action Project like to say, media is "an arena of contest in its own right, and part of a larger strategy of social change." One source of our confusion over communications comes in not recognizing that each new push for public understanding and acceptance happens against a backdrop of long-term media coverage, of perceptions formed over time, of scripts we have learned since childhood to help us make sense of our world, and folk beliefs we use to interpret new information. As we go about making sense of our world, mass media serves an important function as the mediator of meaning — telling us what to think about (*agenda-setting*) and how to think about it (*media effects*) by organizing the information in such a way (*framing*) that it comes to us fully conflated with directives (*cues*) about who is responsible for the social problem in the first place and who gets to fix it (*responsibility*). It is often the case that nonprofit organizations want communications to be easy. Ironically, they want soundbite answers to the same social problems whose complexity they understand all too well. While policy research and formulation are given their due as tough, demanding areas of an organization's workplan, communications is seen as "soft." While program development and practice are seen as requiring expertise and the thoughtful consideration of best practices, communications is an "anyone can do it if you have to" task. It is time to retire this thinking. Doing communications strategically requires the same investment of intellect and study that these other areas of nonprofit practice have been accorded. A Simple Explanation of Frame Analysis In his seminal book Public Opinion (1921:16), Walter Lippmann was perhaps the first to connect mass communications to public attitudes and policy preferences by recognizing that the "the way in which the world is imagined determines at any particular moment what men will do." The modern extension of Lippmann's observation is based on the concept of "frames." People use mental shortcuts to make sense of the world. Since most people are looking to process incoming information quickly and efficiently, they rely upon cues within that new information to signal to them how to connect it with their stored images of the world. The "pictures in our heads," as Lippmann called them, might better be thought of as vividly labeled storage boxes - filled with pictures, images, and stories from our past encounters with the world and labeled youth, marriage, poverty, fairness, etc. The incoming information provides cues about which is the right container for that idea or experience. And the efficient thinker makes the connection, a process called "indexing," and moves on. Put another way, how an issue is framed is a trigger to these shared and durable cultural models that help us make sense of our world.

**Confining discourse to only policy debates constructs a regime of truth that masks the constructed nature of their harms and solvency; this undermines their entire explanation of the world.**

**Smith, professor of political science at the University of Wales, 97** (Steve, Review of International Studies, Cambridge journals online)

By focusing on the policy debate, we restrict ourselves to the issues of the day, to the tip of the political iceberg. What politics seems to me to be crucially about is how and why some issues are made intelligible as political problems and how others are hidden below the surface (being defined as ‘economic’ or ‘cultural’ or ‘private’). In my own work I have become much more interested in this aspect of politics in the last few years. I spent a lot of time dealing with policy questions and can attest to the ‘buzz’ that this gave me both professionally and personally. But I became increasingly aware that the realm of the political that I was dealing with was in fact a very small part of what I would now see as political. I therefore spent many years working on epistemology, and in fact consider that my most political work. I am sure that William Wallace will regard this comment as proof of his central claim that I have become scholastic rather than scholarly, but I mean it absolutely. My current work enquires into how it is that we can make claims to knowledge, how it is that we ‘know’ things about the international political world. My main claim is that International Relations relies overwhelmingly on one answer to this question, namely, an empiricist epistemology allied to a positivistic methodology. This gives the academic analyst the great benefit of having a foundation for claims about what the world is like. It makes policy advice more saleable, especially when positivism’s commitment to naturalism means that the world can be presented as having certain furniture rather than other furniture. The problem is that in my view this is a flawed version of how we know things; indeed it is in fact a very *political* view of knowledge, born of the Enlightenment with an explicit political purpose. So much follows politically from being able to present the world in this way; crucially the normative assumptions of this move are hidden in a false and seductive mask of objectivity and by the very difference between statements of fact and statements of value that is implied in the call to ‘speak truth to power’. For these reasons, I think that the political is a far wider arena than does Wallace. This means that I think I am being very political when I lecture or write on epistemology. Maybe that does not seem political to those who define politics as the public arena of policy debate; but I believe that my work helps uncover the regimes of truth within which that more restricted definition of politics operates. In short, I think that Wallace’s view of politics ignores its most political aspect, namely, the production of discourses of truth which are the very processes that create the space for the narrower version of politics within which he works. My work enquires into how the current ‘politics’ get defined and what (political) interests benefit from that disarming division between the political and the non-political. In essence, how we know things determines what we see, and the public realm of politics is itself the result of a prior series of (political) epistemological moves which result in the political being seen as either natural or a matter of common sense.

**Assuming the role of the legislator lets us off the hook for our own responsibility in shaping social change and reinforces powerlessness.**

**Kappeler, 95** (Susanne, The Will to Violence, p. 10-11)

`We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society - which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival­ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility - leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe­nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens - even more so those of other nations - have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia - since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the respons­ibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or­ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all**,** any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what *I could* do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN - finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' - our readiness, in other words, to build ident­ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence.