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# LINKS

### Transportation

#### Transportation infrastructure and industry are intrinsically capitalist in that they add value to commodities produced by laborers, giving no benefit to the worker

Worker’s Bush Telegraph, 11

(3/22/2011, “Railways and Capitalism,” <http://workersbushtelegraph.com.au/2011/03/22/railways-and-capitalism/>, accessed 7/7/2012, bs)

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

#### Increasing transportation infrastructure causes the global spread of neoliberal ideologies-increased mobility of people and goods ensures efficiency of capital

Lakshmanan and Chatterjee, 5

(T.R., Boston University Center for Transportation Studies Director; and Lata R., Boston University Center for Transportation Studies Resaerch Professor of Geography and Environment, Spring 2005, Transportation Research at the University of California, “Economic Consequences of Transport Improvements,” <http://www.uctc.net/access/access26.pdf>, p. 33, accessed 7/7/2012, bs)

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

#### Public infrastructure favors suburban communities over city residents- this creates closed opportunity, limited mobility, economic disinvestment, social isolation, and urban disparity.

Bullard 4 (Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, “Addressing Urban Transportation Equity in the United States,” Fordham Urban L.J. 31, 2003-2004, p. 1201-2 http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2193&context=ulj) ALG

In Sprawl City: Race, Politics and Planning in Atlanta, the authors documented that government-subsidized sprawl has substantial social equity, civil rights, and health implications. 6 8 Suburban sprawl is fueled by the "iron triangle" of finance, land use planning, and transportation service delivery. 169 Sprawl-fueled growth is widening the gap between the "haves" and "have-nots.' 170 Suburban sprawl has clear social and environmental effects. 171 The social effects of suburban sprawl include concentration of urban core poverty, closed opportunity, limited mobility, economic disinvestment, social isolation, and urban/suburban disparities that closely mirror racial inequities. 172 The environmental effects of suburban sprawl include urban infrastructure decline, increased energy consumption, automobile dependency, threats to public health and the environment, including air pollution, flooding, and climate change, and threats to farm land and wildlife habitat. 173 Many jobs have shifted to the suburbs and communities where public transportation is inadequate or nonexistent. 174 The exodus of low-skilled jobs to the suburbs disproportionately affects central-city residents, particularly people of color, who often face more limited choice of housing location and transportation in growing areas.' 75 Between 1990 and 1997, jobs on the fringe of metropolitan areas grew by 19% versus 4% job growth in core areas. 176 While many new jobs are being created in the suburbs, the majority of job opportunities for low-income workers are still located in central cities.' 77 Suburbs are increasing their share of office space, while central cities see their share declining.' 78 The suburban share of the metropolitan office space is 69.5% in Detroit, 65.8% in Atlanta, 57.7% in Washington, D.C., 57.4% in Miami, and 55.2% in Philadelphia. 179 Getting to these suburban jobs without a car is next to impossible. It is no accident that Detroit leads in suburban "office sprawl." Detroit is also the most segregated big city in the United States 18° and the only major metropolitan area without a regional transit system."' 1 Detroit really is the Motor City-only about 2.4% of metropolitan Detroiters use transit to get to work. 182 Transportation-related sources account for over 30% of the primary smog-forming pollutants emitted nationwide and 28% of the fine particulates. 183 Vehicle emissions are the main reasons 121 Air Quality Districts in the United States are in noncompliance with the 1970 Clean Air Act's National Ambient Air Quality Standards. 184 Over 140 million Americans, of whom 25% are children, live, work, and play in areas where air quality does not meet national standards. 85 Emissions from cars, trucks, and buses cause 25-51% of the air pollution in the nation's non-attainment areas. 8 6 Transportation related emissions also generate more than a quarter of the greenhouse gases. 187

### Hegemony

#### U.S hegemony exploits and opens markets, coerce nations to follow western trade and globalization of capitalism

Moon 04 “The United States and Globalization: Struggles with Hegemony” Bruce E. Moon, Lehigh University, USA B.A. Ohio State University (1972) Major: Political Science (Political Theory) Minor: Economics Ph.D. Ohio State University (1977) Major Fields: International System and Process Comparative Foreign Policy Minor Fields: Formal/Analytic Theory Philosophy of Social Science International Economics *23Jul04 11:29 am The U.S. and Globalization* http://www.lehigh.edu/~bm05/research/US&globalization7.pdf

At the end of World War II, the United States exhibited the two most important characteristics required of a candidate to champion global liberalism.2 First, it possessed the dominance that affords a hegemon both the greatest incentive and the greatest capacity to advance globalization. As the most productive economy, it was the most likely to benefit from open goods markets. As the largest source of both supply and demand for capital it was also the most likely to exploit open capital markets. Its power could be used to persuade or coopt a majority of nations, compel most of the remainder, and isolate the few dissenters. Second, the liberalism of the American domestic economy demonstrated that “its social purpose and domestic distribution of power was favorably disposed toward a liberal international order”.3 However, America’s dominance is accompanied by a profound isolationism that induces episodic and inconsistent unilateralist impulses. Furthermore, American liberalism is colored by unique circumstances that make the U.S. commitment to it only skin-deep. The effects of these eccentricities were discernible in the Bretton Woods design but eventually became dominant in both American policy and the global regime it sponsored. Today they threaten the continued viability of the international architecture that has governed the process of globalization for more than half a century.

#### U.S uses its hegemony to promotes and protect U.S capitalism and exploits and hurts other countries

Moon 04 “The United States and Globalization: Struggles with Hegemony” Bruce E. Moon, Lehigh University, USA B.A. Ohio State University (1972) Major: Political Science (Political Theory) Minor: Economics Ph.D. Ohio State University (1977) Major Fields: International System and Process Comparative Foreign Policy Minor Fields: Formal/Analytic Theory Philosophy of Social Science International Economics *23Jul04 11:29 am The U.S. and Globalization* http://www.lehigh.edu/~bm05/research/US&globalization7.pdf

Aggressive unilateralism As the U.S. stake in the global economy has grown, American policy has followed a dual strategy. Efforts to promote opportunities for American exporters and foreign investors remain concentrated in its multilateral drive to remove the barriers of others, while its unilateral and bilateral policies have increasingly erected such barriers to protect American firms that compete with imports. While other nations have criticized this pattern as hypocritical, the U.S. justifies its unilateral actions as consistent with its systemic philosophy because they are designed to compensate for the unfair trade practices of others.26 Indeed, while the tariff rates that apply to most favored nations have remained quite low, non-tariff barriers (NTBs) targeted against particular nations have risen. They have taken several forms, some fully in accord with GATT rules and even consistent with liberal principles. Section 201 of the Trade Reform Act of 1974 implemented GATT’s Article 19 escape clause, which permits nations to suspend tariff reductions in industries suffering from sudden increases in imports, regardless of cause. This escape clause has not been frequently used, no doubt because it undermines the American case for systemic liberalism. After all, it permits a nation to protect its own industries through a so-called “safeguard action” even when no wrong-doing by foreign competitors is even alleged. Article 19 also requires that competitors be compensated for the suspension of tariff benefits. The U.S. has felt more free to employ Section 301 (and its extension in the 1988 Trade Act dubbed “Super 301") because it is designed to target particular countries found to be engaging in “unjustifiable, unreasonable or discriminatory” trading practices. It authorizes countervailing duties to offset illegal dumping by foreign manufacturers or to compensate for unlawful subsidies by foreign governments. As such, these actions can be squared with the idea of “fair trade” even if their consistency with “free trade” is more dubious. Competitors object to these actions for many reasons. They contend that these provisions are often invoked not in pursuit of any defensible principles, but for protectionist or even outright political purposes. They cite the Bush administration’s imposition of 30% tariff rates on steel imports from selected countries in the spring of 2002. They were narrowly targeted on certain categories of steel products in order to generate electoral support in key steel-producing states. Even though the tariffs were imposed pursuant to Section 201, many of the public justifications for it were couched in the accusatory language of Section 301. The action itself was based on such flimsy legal ground that its eventual rejection by a WTO dispute resolution panel was regarded as a foregone conclusion by almost all experts. The subsequent withdrawal of the tariffs was accompanied by political rhetoric that again implied that foreign cheating was involved.

#### **US dominance of the globe is an attempt to secure resources-your oil and Middle East scenarios only secure new markets for the smooth functioning of capital**

Foster 6 (John Bellamy Foster, January 2006, a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review. “[The New Geopolitics of Empire](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire)” <http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire>) MB

Geopolitics was to owe its resurrection as an explicit, even official, doctrine of U.S. foreign policy in the 1970s to the influence of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Faced with the debacle in Vietnam and the need to restore U.S. power in the context of a growing imperial crisis, Kissinger and President Nixon reached out to the concept of geopolitics. The thawing of the Cold War relations with China following the Sino-Soviet split and the initiation of détente with the Soviet Union were both presented as “geopolitical necessities.” Kissinger’s references to geopolitics were pervasive throughout his 1979 memoirs, The White House Years.[22](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en22) The 1970s witnessed along with the Vietnam defeat, economic stagnation and declining U.S. economic hegemony. By 1971 the U.S. empire had created such a huge dollar overhang abroad that Nixon was forced to decouple the dollar from gold, weakening the position of the dollar as the hegemonic currency. The energy crisis associated with the Arab oil boycott in response to the 1973 Yom Kippur War and the rise of the OPEC oil cartel demonstrated the growing dependence of the U.S. automobile-petroleum complex on Persian Gulf oil. The recession of 1974–75 initiated a secular slowdown of the U.S. economy that has continued with minor interruptions for three decades. With the entire U.S. empire in crisis beginning in the 1970s, and with its war machine effectively immobilized due to what conservatives labeled the “Vietnam Syndrome” (the unwillingness of the U.S. population to support military interventions in the periphery), countries throughout the third world sought to break out of the system. Much of the attention during this period was directed at Washington’s attempts to counter revolutions and revolutionary movements in Central America and the Caribbean, the “backyard” of the U.S. empire. But the biggest defeat experienced by the U.S. empire in the years following the Vietnam War was the 1979 Iranian Revolution, which overthrew the Shah of Iran, hitherto the lynchpin of U.S. strategy in the Persian Gulf. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan—against which the CIA immediately launched the greatest covert war in history, recruiting fundamentalist Islamic forces (including Osama Bin Laden) for a modern jihad—only served to reinforce the view within U.S. national security circles that control over the Middle East and its oil was in jeopardy. A massive attempt was therefore made in the 1980s and ’90s to reconstitute overall U.S. hegemony, especially the position of the United States in the Persian Gulf. The signal event was the Carter Doctrine, issued by President Carter in his State of the Union speech in January 1980, in which he declared that, “An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.” Modeled after the Monroe Doctrine, the Carter Doctrine was meant to extend the umbrella of direct U.S. military hegemony over the Persian Gulf. All of this was intended to meet the geopolitical imperatives of U.S. multinational corporations. For Business Week in January 28, 1980, it was crucial that the United States develop a “geopolitics of minerals,” in response to the forces challenging U.S. power around the world: “In the 1980s, beset by demands among the post-colonial regimes for a ‘new international economic order’ and a related antagonism toward the multinational resource corporations,” the United States was increasingly “vulnerable” to loss of strategic materials and “world oil and raw material routes.” This, Business Week contended, would “force Washington to make some painful compromises between idealistic foreign policy goals and the revival of geopolitics.”[23](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en23) In 1983 the Reagan administration responded to such demands by establishing the U.S. Central Command (Centcom). Centcom is one of five regional “unified commands” governing U.S. combat forces around the globe. Its authority covers twenty-five nations in south-central Asia (including the Persian Gulf) and in the Horn of Africa. Its primary responsibility from the start was to keep the oil flowing. In the two decades of its existence, Klare notes, “Centcom forces have fought in four major engagements: the Iran-Iraq War of 1980-88, the Persian Gulf War of 1991, the Afghanistan War of 2001, and the Iraq War of 2003[—].”[24](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en24) The New Geopolitics But it was the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 that was to constitute the sea change for the U.S. empire. The U.S. assault on Iraq during the 1991 Gulf War, following Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, was made possible by the erosion of the balance of power in the Middle East in the wake of the weakening of Soviet power. At the same time, the Soviet meltdown and signs of its possible breakup constituted one of the chief reasons why the United States refrained from invading and occupying Iraq during the Gulf War. Geopolitical uncertainties associated with the collapse of the Soviet bloc were such that Washington could not afford to pin down large numbers of troops in the Middle East. Nor could it risk the possibility that an invasion and occupation of Iraq might serve to revive Soviet concerns about U.S. imperialism, and thus delay or reverse the massive changes then occurring in that country. The Soviet Union’s demise came only months later in the summer of 1991. The “new world order” that followed was soon dubbed a “unipolar world” with the United States as the sole superpower. The Department of Defense lost no time in initiating a strategic review known as the Defense Planning Guidance, directed by Paul Wolfowitz then undersecretary of defense for policy. Parts of this classified report, leaked to the press in 1992, stated in Spykman-like language that “Our strategy [after the fall of the Soviet Union] must refocus on precluding the emergence of any potential future global competitor.” Wolfowitz also took a leaf from the Heartland doctrine, arguing that “Russia will remain the strongest military power in Eurasia and the only power in the world with the capability of destroying the United States.”[25](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en25) The Defense Planning Guidance proposed a global geopolitical goal for the United States of permanent military hegemony through preemptive actions. Yet, strong objections from U.S. allies forced Washington to back off from the draft report’s explicit commitment to unilateral domination of the globe.

#### Hegemonic advances are only imperialistic goals driven by a need to stabilize and dominate world resources – the war on terror and in Iraq proves the inadequacy of this approach

Foster 6 (John Bellamy Foster, January 2006, a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review. “[The New Geopolitics of Empire](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire)” <http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire>) MB

Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter’s national security adviser, emerged in this period as one of the most avid proponents of the geopolitics of U.S. empire. In his Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives (1997) he alluded directly to the Heartland doctrines promoted by Mackinder and Haushofer (and what he called “the much vulgarized echo” of this in “Hitler’s emphasis on the German people’s need for ‘Lebensraum’”). What had changed was that, “geopolitics has moved from the regional to the global dimension, with preponderance over the entire Eurasian continent serving as the central basis for global primacy. The United States…now enjoys international primacy, with its power directly deployed on three peripheries of the Eurasian continent”—in the West (Europe), the South (south-central Eurasia, including the Middle East) and the East (East-Asia Pacific Rim). “America’s global primacy,” Brzezinski argued, “is directly dependent on how long and how effectively its preponderance on the Eurasian continent is sustained.” The goal, he argued, was to create a “hegemony of a new type,” which he called “global supremacy,” establishing the United States indefinitely as “the first and only truly global power.”[29](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en29) During the Clinton administration both neoliberal globalization and imperial geopolitics governed foreign policy, but the former often took precedence. In the George W. Bush administration the double commitment remained, but the emphasis was reversed from the start, with more direct attention given to strengthening U.S. global primacy through the exercise of geopolitical/military as opposed to economic power. This shift can be seen in two key position statements issued at the time of the 2000 elections. The first was a foreign policy paper entitled Rebuilding America’s Defenses released in September 2000, at vice-presidential candidate Dick Cheney’s request, by the Project for the New American Century (a strategic policy group that included Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Lewis Libby, and George Bush’s younger bother Jeb). This report strongly reasserted the overtly imperialist strategy of the Defense Policy Guidance of 1992. The other was a speech entitled “Imperial America,” delivered on November 11, 2000 by Richard Haass, who was soon to join Colin Powell’s state department as director of policy planning. Haass insisted that the time had come for Americans “to re-conceive their role from a traditional nation-state to an imperial power.” The main danger threatening the U.S. global order was not one of “imperial overstretch” as suggested by Paul Kennedy in The Rise and Fall of Great Powers but “imperial understretch.”[30](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en30) The immediate response of the Bush administration to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, was to declare a universal and protracted global war on terrorism that was to double as a justification for the expansion of U.S. imperial power. The new National Security Strategy of the United States, delivered by the White House to Congress in September 2002, at the very same time that the administration was beating the war drums for an invasion of Iraq, was modeled after Wolfowitz’s earlier Defense Planning Guidance of 1992. It established as official U.S. strategic policy: (1) preventing any state from developing military capabilities equal to or greater than the United States; (2) carrying out “preemptive” strikes against states that were developing new military capabilities that might eventually endanger the United States, its friends or allies—even in advance of any imminent threat; and (3) insisting on the immunity of U.S. officials and military personnel to any international war crime tribunals. Once again the language mirrored Spykman’s declaration that the goal should be “directed at the prevention of hegemony”—though in this case the explicit goal was to prevent any future challenges to U.S. global supremacy. Domination of Persian Gulf oil, through an invasion and occupation of Iraq, offered the quickest way of enhancing U.S. imperial power, ensuring that it would have a stranglehold over the world’s major petroleum reserves in a time of growing demand and declining supply of oil worldwide. The fact that the preponderance of long-term oil and natural gas supplies are concentrated in the Persian Gulf, the Caspian Sea basin, and West Africa allows U.S. “vital interests” in this broad region to be dealt with more circumspectly in the language of geopolitics with little mention of the fossil fuels themselves. In May 2004, Alan Larson, under secretary of state for economic, business, and agricultural affairs, issued a report entitled “Geopolitics of Oil and Natural Gas,” which declared that “it is almost an axiom in the petroleum business that oil and gas are most often found in countries with challenging political regimes or difficult physical geography.” Here the geopolitics of oil and natural gas was seen as creating vital U.S. strategic interests in the Persian Gulf, Russia and the Caspian Sea basin, West Africa, and Venezuela.[31](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en31) The new geopolitics shares with classical geopolitics the aim of world domination, but entails a strategic shift aimed in particular at south-central Eurasia. “The purpose of the war in Iraq,” according to Michael Klare, “is to redraw the geopolitical map of Eurasia to insure and embed U.S. power and dominance in the region vis-à-vis…other potential competitors” such as Russia, China, the European Community, Japan, and even India. “The U.S. elites have concluded that the European and East Asian rimlands of Eurasia are securely in American hands or [are] less important, or both. The new center of geopolitical competition, as they see it, is south-central Eurasia, encompassing the Persian Gulf area, which possesses two-thirds of the world’s oil, the Caspian Sea basin, which has a large chunk of what’s left, and the surrounding countries of Central Asia. This is the new center of world struggle and conflict, and the Bush administration is determined that the United States shall dominate and control this critical area.”[32](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en32) In a special July 1999 supplement entitled “The New Geopolitics,” the Economist magazine explicitly adopted Brzezinski’s “grand chessboard” analysis, arguing that the key geopolitical struggle for the “empire of democracy” led by the United States after Kosovo was the control of Eurasia and particularly Central Asia. Both China and Russia were seen as potentially extending their geopolitical influence into the energy rich Caspian Sea basin. U.S. imperial expansion to preempt this was therefore necessary.[33](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en33)

**Hegemonic imperialism is aimed at creating a global space for capitalist development and extracting surplus from peripheral countries**

Foster 6 (John Bellamy Foster, January 2006, a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review. “[The New Geopolitics of Empire](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire)” <http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire>) MB

The unpopularity of geopolitical analysis after 1943 is usually attributed to its association with the Nazi strategy of world conquest. Yet the popular rejection of geopolitics in that period may have also arisen from the deeper recognition that classical geopolitics in all of its forms was an inherently imperialist and war-related doctrine. As the critical geopolitical analyst Robert Strausz-Hupé argued in 1942, “In Geopolitik there is no distinction between war and peace. All states have the urge to expand, and the process of expansion is viewed as a perpetual warfare—no matter whether military power is actually applied or is used to implement ‘peaceful’ diplomacy as a suspended threat.”[35](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en35) U.S. imperial geopolitics is ultimately aimed at creating a global space for capitalist development. It is about forming a world dedicated to capital accumulation on behalf of the U.S. ruling class—and to a lesser extent the interlinked ruling classes of the triad powers as a whole (North America, Europe, and Japan). Despite “the end of colonialism” and the rise of “anti-capitalist new countries,” Business Week pronounced in April 1975, there has always been “the umbrella of American power to contain it….[T]he U.S. was able to fashion increasing prosperity among Western countries, using the tools of more liberal trade, investment, and political power. The rise of the multinational corporation was the economic expression of this political framework.”[36](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en36) There is no doubt that the U.S. imperium has benefited those at the top of the center-capitalist nations and not just the power elite of the United States. Yet, the drive for global hegemony on the part of particular capitalist nations and their ruling classes, like capital accumulation itself, recognizes no insurmountable barriers. Writing before September 11, 2001, István Mészáros argued in his Socialism or Barbarism that due to unbridled U.S. imperial ambitions the world was entering what was potentially “the most dangerous phase of imperialism in all history”: For what is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower….This is what the ultimate rationality of globally developed capital requires, in its vain attempt to bring under control its irreconcilable antagonisms. The trouble is, though, that such rationality…is at the same time the most extreme form of irrationality in history, including the Nazi conception of world domination, as far as the conditions required for the survival of humanity are concerned.[37](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en37) In the present era of naked imperialism, initiated by the sole superpower, the nature of the threat to the entire planet and its people is there for all to see. According to G. John Ikenberry, Professor of Geopolitics and Global Justice at Georgetown University, in his 2002 Foreign Affairs article “America’s Imperial Ambition”: the U.S. “neoimperial vision” is one in which “the United States arrogates to itself the global role of setting standards, determining threats, using force, and meting out justice.” At present the United States currently enjoys both economic (though declining) and military primacy. “The new goal,” he states, “is to make these advantages permanent—a fait accompli that will prompt other states to not even try to catch up. Some thinkers have described the strategy as ‘breakout.’” Yet, such a “hard-line imperial grand strategy,” according to Ikenberry—himself no opponent of imperialism—could backfire.[38](http://monthlyreview.org/2006/01/01/the-new-geopolitics-of-empire#en38) From the standpoint of Marxian theory, which emphasizes the economic taproot of imperialism, such a global thrust will be as ineffectual as it is barbaric. Power under capitalism can be imposed episodically through the barrel of a gun. Its real source, however, is relative economic power, which is by its nature fleeting. The foregoing suggests that interimperialist rivalry did not end as is often thought with the rise of U.S. hegemony. Rather it has persisted in Washington’s drive to unlimited hegemony, which can be traced to the underlying logic of capital in a world divided into competing nation states. The United States as the remaining superpower is today seeking final world dominion. The “Project for the New American Century” stands for an attempt to create a U.S.-led global imperium geared to extracting as much surplus as possible from the countries of the periphery, while achieving a “breakout” strategy with respect to the main rivals (or potential rivals) to U.S. global supremacy. The fact that such a goal is irrational and impossible to sustain constitutes the inevitable failure of geopolitics. Marxian theories of imperialism have always focused on the importance of geoeconomics even more than the question of geopolitics. From this standpoint, uneven-and-combined capitalist development results in shifts in global productive power that cannot be controlled by geopolitical/military means. Empire under capitalism is inherently unstable, forever devoid of a genuine world state and pointing to greater and potentially more dangerous wars. Its long-term evolution is toward barbarism—armed with ever more fearsome weapons of mass destruction.

### Highways/construction

#### Focusing on highways and roads comes at the expense of developing the urban core-this locks populations into poverty and increases class divisions

Bullard 4 (Robert, Ware Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, “Addressing Urban Transportation Equity in the United States,” Fordham Urban L.J. 31, 2003-2004, p.1186-1188 http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2193&context=ulj) ALG

Transportation spending programs do not benefit all populations equally. 27 Follow the transportation dollars and one can tell who is important and who is not. The lion's share of transportation dollars is spent on roads, while urban transit systems are often left in disrepair. 28 Nationally, 80% of all surface transportation funds is earmarked for highways and 20% is earmarked for public transportation. 9 Public transit has received roughly $50 billion since the creation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration over thirty years ago, 30 while roadway projects have received over $205 billion since 1956.31 On average, states spend just $0.55 per person of their federal transportation funds on pedestrian projects, less than 1% of their total federal transportation dollars. 32 Average spending on highways came to $72 per person. 33 Generally, states spend less than 20% of federal transportation funding on transit. 34 The current federal funding scheme is bias against metropolitan areas. The federal government allocated the bulk of transportation dollars directly to state departments of transportation. 36 Many of the road-building fiefdoms are no friend to urban transit. Just under 6% of all federal highway dollars are sub-allocated directly to the metropolitan regions. 37 Moreover, thirty states restrict use of the gasoline tax revenue to fund highway programs only. 38 Although local governments within metropolitan areas own and maintain the vast majority of the transportation infrastructure, they receive only about 10% of every dollar they generate. 39 From 1998-2003, TEA-21 4 1 transportation spending amounted to $217 billion. 41 This was the "largest public works bill enacted in the nation's history. '42 Transportation spending has always been about opportunity and equity. In the real world, costs and benefits associated with transportation developments are not randomly distributed. 43 Transportation justice is concerned with factors that may create and/or exacerbate inequities and measures to prevent or correct disparities in benefits and costs."

#### Private contracts are normal means for infrastructure construction

Grimsey, Partner at Ernst & Young; and Lewis, University of South Australia professor of Banking and Finance; 2k (Darrin and Mervyn, 7/9/2000, International Journal of Project Management, “Evaluating the Risks of Public Private partnerships for Infrastructure Projects,” <http://www.usp.br/procam/govagua/Documentos/Biblioteca/water%20management/WM_GRIMSEY_Evaluating.pdf>, p. 107, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

For most of the post-war period, government has been the principal provider of infrastructure (at least outside of the United States). Over the last decade, that position has begun to change. Faced with pressure to reduce public sector debt and. at the same lime, expand and improve public facilities, governments have looked to private sector finance, and have invited private sector entities to enter into long-term contractual agreements which may take the form of construction or management of public sector infrastructure facilities by the private sector entity, or the provision of services (using infrastructure facilities) by the private sector entity to the community on behalf of a public sector body. These arrangements often take the form of a build- operate-transfer (BOT) arrangement [I]. The acronym BOT was first used in the early eighties by Turkey's Prime Minister Targut Ozal (2). However, the concept itself can be traced back to Hong Kong in the late fifties when a privatised vehicle tunnel was first talked about, and if regarded as a form of concession or franchise arrangement has even earlier origins. According to Monod|3] the first "concession" was granted in 1782 to Perrier in France and concerned water distribution, which in the context of this paper seems entirely appropriate.

#### Highways are constructed according to class lines – only those in the higher class benefit, while the lower class suffers from environmental damage

Parenti, Ph.D. in political science from Yale, 11

(Michael, Michael Parenti political archive, “Profit Pathology and Disposable Planet”, <http://www.michaelparenti.org/capitalism%20apocalypse.html>, accessed 7-5-2012, bs)

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.

### Keynesianism

#### Keynesianism is just an apology to the laborers to prevent an anti-capitalist movement

Wolff 5/10 Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of Massachusetts taught economics at Yale University (1967-1969) and at the City College of the City University of New York (1969-1973).

(Robert, “Economic Democracy, Not Austerity or Keynesian "Growth",” <http://rdwolff.com/content/economic-democracy-not-austerity-or-keynesian-growth>, Accessed 7-2-12, JL)

Keynesianism is capitalists' Plan B when radicalized and organized workers demand systematic entitlement, not charity, and threaten capitalism itself. In the US during the 1930s, successful mass unionization by the Congress of Industrial Organizations and mass radicalization by socialist and communist parties built social movements with strong anti-capitalist components. In response, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) offered a deal. Instead of austerity, he would provide unprecedented government services to people (today perhaps called a "growth" plan). He would establish the Social Security and unemployment compensation systems and create and fill over 12 million federal jobs for the unemployed. Despite three times today's level of unemployment and a worse federal budget crisis, FDR funded greatly expanded government public services. Obama plans to reduce Social Security and never mentions a federal hiring program. Capitalism then faced a powerful threat from below; today it does not (yet). FDR funded his deal by taxing corporations and the rich and partly by borrowing from them (the lesser evil for them). Many of them agreed because they, too, feared the anti-capitalist opposition. FDR persuaded most of the left, in exchange for expanded state services and jobs, to downplay anti-capitalism. Many abandoned "socialism" as a goal; some redefined it to be what FDR proposed. FDR's deal built an alliance that won four consecutive presidential elections. Keynesianism - the formalized theory and policies drawn from John Maynard Keynes' work in 1930s Britain - developed after FDR's deal. It prompted a revised understanding of the Great Depression. Attention shifted away from how anti-capitalist and working-class pressure from below reoriented FDR's policies. Instead, smart economists and astute politicians were depicted using Keynes' "brilliant new economics" to moderate, manage and exit capitalist crises. After 1945, corporations and the rich still supported Keynesian government spending (they feared depression's return), but they got reduced taxes for themselves. They also got some shift in government expenditures from social services to more capitalist-friendly defense and infrastructural improvements. Keynesians also mostly joined neoclassical economists in dismissing Marx's anti-capitalist economics. Capitalism's crises, they insisted, were well understood and managed (by Keynesianism). They were mere temporary blips punctuating capitalism's prosperous growth. Anti-capitalism was theoretically outmoded and politically suspect in cold war times. Keynesian economics was, for enthusiasts, superior to the mainstream orthodoxy that had always endorsed austerity policies for crises. Keynesianism became the new orthodoxy from the 1930s to the 1970s. Then, a capitalist boom returned dominance to neoclassical economics (renamed neoliberalism). Even after the 2007 crisis hit, Keynesians (e.g., Paul Krugman) have so far failed to regain policy-making dominance The "great" debate between neoclassical and Keynesian economists is neither great nor much of a debate. Both sides endorse, celebrate and defend capitalism. Their "debate" - between Plans B and A, more or less government intervention to sustain capitalism - periodically revives as a substitute for seriously engaging with critical economic theories, anti-capitalist social movements and their demands for economic democracy. The debate between austerity and growth policies is a sideshow for the main event: capitalism's weakening battles with its own contradictions and with looming demands for transition beyond capitalism to economic democracy.

#### **Keynesian policies directly support the functioning of capitalism. Failing economies use Keynesianism to pull themselves out of downturns which enables capitalism to pick up where it left off and prevents action against capital**

Wolff 10 (Richard, October 23, 2010. Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Alternative Routes, “The Keynesian Revival, a Marxist Critique” <http://www.rdwolff.com/content/keynesian-revival-marxian-critique>, accessed 7.9.2012, KR)

In the modern history of capitalism, Keynesian counter-recessionary policies (broadly defined) have failed in two major ways. First, those policies have not consistently succeeded as means to end capitalism’s cyclical downturns. They failed, for example, to extract the US from the Great Depression of the 1930s. As this is written, their effectiveness in today’s global capitalist crisis is questionable. Second, the promise that has almost always accompanied each application of Keynesian policies everywhere – that it would also prevent future economic downturns – has never yet been kept. The Keynesian policies have included varying mixtures of monetary (easing) and fiscal (expansionary) policies and market regulations (especially in finance). They have sometimes included controls on capital flows as well as subsidies, bailouts, and outright nationalizations of private enterprises. Different combinations of these components characterize Keynesian policies in different countries and at different historical moments. The chief means that actually ended capitalism’s downturns have been declines in the following: productive laborers’ real wages, finished product inventories, means of production prices, and the associated costs of securing profits (managers and other non-productive workers’ wages and operating budgets, taxes, access to credit, rents, etc.). Once those declines sufficed to reach certain thresholds, capitalists could see profit possibilities and so resumed productive investment. That generated more or less “recovery” via multiplier and accelerator effects particular to each place and time. In short, capitalism is a systematically unstable economic system whose cycles are basic features of its normal functioning. Keynesian policies have never basically altered that systemic instability. Keynesian policies, we propose to argue, have largely provided quite secondary supports to the normal functioning of capitalist cycles. They marginally moderate the cycles’ amplitude and duration. They temporarily impose both costs and constraints on the profit-seeking activities of corporate boards of directors. In these ways, Keynesian policies successfully buy both political space and time for the capitalist cycle to run through its usual downward phase. In the current global capitalist crisis, massive Keynesian deficit spending as well as credit-market bailouts have generated huge increases in many capitalist countries’ national debts. Lenders eventually balk at further loans to the most over-indebted nations, demanding that they raise taxes and/or cut spending to qualify for more loans. If and when that proves politically impossible for lenders to impose on borrowing nations, multilateral agencies offer less onerous terms for loan assistance but with the same demand for austerity conditions. Those conditions – conveniently imposed by others and not the national government – all serve to drive down wages and other costs of business and so once again set the stage for the usual capitalist cycle.

#### Keynesian policy used to distract the public from capitalisms failures. Increases worker exploitation by increasing jobs, which prevents a shift away from capitalism.

Wolff 10 (Richard, October 23, 2010. Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Alternative Routes, “The Keynesian Revival, a Marxist Critique” <http://www.rdwolff.com/content/keynesian-revival-marxian-critique>, accessed 7.9.2012, KR)

Besides their secondary role, Keynesian policies also serve an important diversionary function. Governments appear to be working mightily to “overcome the economic crisis” by implementing those policies with great fanfare. They thereby distract publics from yet another repetition of the normal capitalist’s cyclical downturn. Exploding national debts, like other Keynesian policy programs constitute an elaborate diversionary political theater. As capitalist crises deepen and last, politicians of most persuasions increasingly express concern, compassion, and/or anger about mass unemployment, home foreclosures, bankruptcies, poverty, etc. They engage in heavily publicized debates and legislative contests over the appropriate monetary, fiscal, regulatory, subsidy, bailout, capital control, and private-enterprise- take-over policies to be executed by the state. These theatrics usually absorb the political energies of many left and right forces that might otherwise, separately or together, make the capitalist system itself the object of opposition, struggle, and transformation. Left-tilting inflections of Keynesian policies often include, for example, direct state subsidies to or hirings of un/underemployed workers, controls over private investment flows, and enterprise nationalizations. Right-tilting inflections often include, for example, restrictions on immigration, reduced taxes on small businesses, and spending on business-friendly infrastructure construction. In the context of this argument, Figure 1 below supports the basic irrelevance of Keynesian policies to the basic contours of capitalist exploitation measured roughly by the relation between labor productivity and real wages.[[1]](file:///C:\\Users\\Boris\\Desktop\\The%20Keynesian%20Revival%20revised%20Aug%202010.docx" \l "_edn1" \o ") First, it covers a long period of US economic history: before, during, and after Keynesian interventions occurred in their classic form in the 1930s. Figure 1 reveals trends for manufacturing, in both labor productivity and real wages, that show no systematic sensitivity to either the imposition or the negation of Keynesian policies over the last century. The complex overdeterminations of real wage and productivity movements were not much influenced by the rise and fall of Keynesian policy regimes nor by whether neo-liberal/neo-classical economics or Keynesian macro-economics prevailed in academic and policy-making circles. Figure 1: (Index: 1890 = 100; Sources and details for Figure 1: see Appendix) Indeed, the relatively laissez-faire period before the 1930s saw productivity and real wages rise more or less together, whereas productivity rose somewhat faster than real wages during the 1930s when Keynesian policies were imposed. However, in the second half of the 1960s into the 1970s, during a second spurt of Keynesian policies (Johnson’s “Great Society”, etc.), productivity rose much faster than real wages. Then, driving home the irrelevance of Keynesian policies to the productivity-real wage relation, the extreme laissez-faire, neo-liberal undoing of Keynesian policies after 1980 then saw the last century’s most unequal of productivity to real wage ratios. The end of World War I marks the beginning of a near century of capitalist growth in the US (notwithstanding the Great Depression’s impact) that saw a self-reinforcing divergence between what workers produced for their employers (productivity) and what they were paid by their employers for doing so (real wages). Capitalist cycles punctuated but did not basically alter that growth pattern.[[2]](file:///C:\\Users\\Boris\\Desktop\\The%20Keynesian%20Revival%20revised%20Aug%202010.docx" \l "_edn2" \o ") Keynesian policies punctuated but did not basically alter the cycles, let alone the growth pattern. For the working classes, the alternation between laissez-faire and Keynesian policy regimes made little discernible difference in the long-run relationship between labor productivity and real wages. Put otherwise, both regimes could and did facilitate growing gaps between productivity and wages over the last half century, much as earlier both regimes facilitated minimal gaps between them.

In rough terms, the productivity of labor exceeded the real wage in 1890, the base year used to compute Figure 1 above. That is, in Marxian terms, workers produced a surplus for their employers already then. Thereafter, that surplus grew both absolutely and relative to real wages. Measured in value terms, the Marxian metric, the rate of exploitation rose as US capitalism prospered across its cycles. Alternations between Keynesian and laissez-faire policy regimes, like the accompanying oscillations of theoretical hegemony between neoclassical and Keynesian economics, were secondary side shows to the main event of rising exploitation. If workers in the US hoped that supporting the Keynesian policies of FDR, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and others would alter their basic positions inside US capitalism, they were disappointed. Notwithstanding their rising real wages from the 1940s to the 1970s and all sorts of political and cultural obfuscations (about everyone being “middle class” or the US being a “people’s capitalism”), the workers lived in the growing gap between their real incomes and the wealth of those who took the lions’ share of the surpluses they delivered to employers. Their accumulating disappointment helps to explain some periodic disaffections of workers from the Democrats. After real wages stopped rising in the late 1970s, workers increasingly defected to even to clearly pro-business Republicans (Greenberg 1996). 2. A Critique of Keynesian Theory’s Revival The laissez-faire (neo-liberalist) phase of capitalism that dominated the world economy over the last 30 years has crashed. That, in turn, has now challenged the hegemony of neo-classical economics as the theoretical rationale for celebrating private enterprise and free markets, privatizing public enterprises, and deregulating markets. Keynesian economics is reviving (Skidelsky 2008). As states everywhere again intervene in the "private" economy -- more massively than ever this time -- Keynesian economics provides many of the prescriptions and rationales for state economic interventions. With revival come renewed contestations among different interpretations of Keynes. The differences reflect especially long-standing pressures upon Keynesians from both the left (those who criticize them for "saving" capitalism) and the right (those who attack them for "threatening" capitalism). The most widespread Keynesianism is what prevails in the treatments by most economics textbooks and among advisors to most governments now intervening in their economies to contain and reverse the damages from the current capitalist crisis. This interpretation of Keynesian theory rationalizes state interventions (especially expansionary monetary and fiscal policies and financial market regulations) in an otherwise private capitalism. It represents the predictable first (and quite moderate) phase of a Keynesianism just emerging after 30 years of neoclassical theory’s near total hegemony. This Keynesian theory’s goal is quite clearly to save capitalism from what it understands to be the dangerous consequences of laissez-faire (neo-liberal) policy regimes. Most partisans of another interpretation, the relatively new variant sometimes called Green Keynesianism, want traditional monetary, fiscal, and regulatory policies redesigned to stress ecological goals (Jones 2008). They seem, at least implicitly, to offer an alliance, a political deal to the dominant Keynesians. Green Keynesians will basically support the goal of saving capitalism in exchange for a Keynesian policy package that makes capitalism significantly greener. Thus, for example, Green Keynesians want expansionary deficit government spending to favor energy-saving mass transportation, installation of solar energy facilities, etc., while tax cuts should favor those who undertake pollution reduction, etc.

#### **Keynesianism policies that aim to end economic crisis reestablish capitalism and eventually collapse the Keynesian policies .**

Wolff 10 (Richard, October 23, 2010. Professor of Economics Emeritus, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Alternative Routes, “The Keynesian Revival, a Marxist Critique” <http://www.rdwolff.com/content/keynesian-revival-marxian-critique>, accessed 7.9.2012, KR)

This Marxian theory begins from the historical observations summarized in this paper’s first paragraph.[[5]](file:///C:\\Users\\Boris\\Desktop\\The%20Keynesian%20Revival%20revised%20Aug%202010.docx" \l "_edn5" \o ") Keynesian policies have not overcome the capitalist system’s inherent instabilities. Nor have Keynesian economists seriously measured, let alone found ways to eliminate, the vast and long-lasting social costs of that instability. As we now live through the second great crisis of capitalism in 75 years, we do know that its global social costs are again immense. Between the end of the Great Depression and the onset of today's crisis, the NBER counts an additional eleven "business cycle downturns" that also generated large social costs (<http://www.nber.org/cycles/cyclesmain.html>). So many large and small crises underscore Marxian theory’s advocacy of changing the economic system as a solution for such crises rather than repeated oscillations between neoclassical (private) and Keynesian (state or state-interventionist) forms of capitalism. Modern society can do better than capitalism. From the standpoint of this Marxian theory, the failures of Keynesian policies - and the Keynesian economics that rationalize them – flow from their neglect of the micro-dimensions of capitalism. In short, the unattended contributor to capitalist instability is the relationship inside enterprises between the workers - who produce the surpluses – and the employers (e.g. corporate boards of directors) who appropriate and distribute those surpluses.[[6]](file:///C:\\Users\\Boris\\Desktop\\The%20Keynesian%20Revival%20revised%20Aug%202010.docx" \l "_edn6" \o ") Because Keynesian policies impose costs and constraints on employers in their exploitative relations with workers and in their competitive struggles within and across industries, those employers have great incentives to evade, weaken or end those Keynesian policies. Because employers appropriate the surpluses (and hence the profits) of enterprise, they dispose of the resources needed to respond positively to those incentives. That is what happened to Roosevelt’s 1930s New Deal and what has more recently been happening to much of western European social democracy (Clayton and Ponstusson 1998). In both cases, the employers used the surpluses appropriated from their employees to move their societies back toward a laissez-faire policy regime as soon as they secured the political conditions enabling them to do so.[[7]](file:///C:\\Users\\Boris\\Desktop\\The%20Keynesian%20Revival%20revised%20Aug%202010.docx" \l "_edn7" \o ") Macro-level efforts to control and constrain capitalism’s instability failed because of the capitalists’ continued appropriation and politically effective distributions of the surpluses produced inside enterprises. Marxian theory emphasizes how employers’ decisions about distributing the surpluses are significantly influenced by the struggles between producers and appropriators of surpluses inside capitalist enterprises as well as by the competitive struggles among them. Hence Marxian theory suggests the internal transformation of enterprise structures. Instead of their typical capitalist structures that split employers from employees, a post-capitalist structure would position workers as, collectively, their enterprise's own board of directors -- Marx's "associated workers." The era of capitalist employers (e.g., corporate boards selected by and responsible to major private shareholders) would then have come to an historic end. The capitalist class structure of production would have been superseded by such a collectivization of surplus appropriation inside enterprises (Wolff 2010). For example, consider enterprises newly structured such that the workers produce outputs in the usual way Mondays through Thursdays, but on Fridays, assembled in both plenaries and subgroups, they make decisions previously taken by boards of directors selected by (major) shareholders. That is, the workers democratically decide what, where, and how to produce and how to distribute their realized surpluses. They decide when and how to expand and contract. But they do not do that alone. They enter into co-respective power-sharing agreements with the local and regional communities where their physical production facilities are located. The workers participate in the residential communities’ decision-making processes and vice-versa.[[8]](file:///C:\\Users\\Boris\\Desktop\\The%20Keynesian%20Revival%20revised%20Aug%202010.docx" \l "_edn8" \o ") Such a micro-based level of socialism becomes the necessary new complement to the classic macro-level socialisms that stressed socialization of means of production and planning over markets. Indeed, the micro- and macro-levels of socialism would then support and, just as importantly, constrain one another. Macro-level property socialization and economic planning would emerge from and be accountable to the micro-level collectives appropriating the enterprise-level surpluses they would use to enforce that accountability. At the same time, the micro-level enterprise collectives would have their production and distribution decisions constrained by the macro-level (social) needs, priorities, and planning mechanisms (possibly co-existing with market mechanisms). This micro-level socialism supports genuine democracy inside each enterprise. It also creates the parallel economic partner for democratic political institutions in residential communities. Democratic collectivities inside enterprises and their residential community counterparts would henceforth together reach their interdependent decisions. Likewise, they would share their interdependence with macro-level institutions, both economic and political. Today's reviving Keynesianism once again largely ignores the micro-level issues raised in and by the Marxian criticism and alternative briefly sketched above. Most Keynesian programs now aimed to end the economic crisis, if they actually re-stabilized contemporary capitalism, would thereby initiate their own demise. That is, they would then repeat the historical pattern of oscillating back to a laissez-faire capitalism. The Marxian alternative program that included the micro-level transformation of production sketched above would break, finally, from the repeated oscillations between private and state-interventionist capitalisms and the unnecessary social costs of capitalism’s instability.

### Securitization

#### Global Insecurity is grounded in the process of global commodification

Goodman 9 Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology in Sydney

James Goodman, “Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/4/Global-capitalism-and-the-production-of-insecurity, 7-7-12, JL

To ﬁrst discuss commodiﬁcation, it is important to start with the idea that insecurity is only in the last instance a military matter. Global insecurity is in large part grounded in the process of globalized commodiﬁcation — a process that reproduces the security of the propertied, and deepens the insecurity of the property-less. To understand prevailing security dynamics, attention must focus on the social, cultural, and ecological relations embedded in commodity production and consumption (Van der Pijl 1998; Sklair 2000). Ultimately commodiﬁcation renders exchange value in ﬁnitely ﬂuid. With no independent determination of value, the value of capital becomes tautologous. Its only reference point, as Negri points out, is the quantitative measure of value ﬂow, or “productivity” expressed as units of proﬁt over time (Negri 2003). The key to continued accumulation becomes the construction of seamless and universal time, literally the time of capital, enabling permanent value ﬂow without break or discontinuity. Under neoliberal globalism the capacity to ﬂow across borders — ultimately to achieve global reach — is a paramount concern. Fluidity, the capacity to render assets liquid, and thus escape material contradictions, is a central source of power. Growing capital ﬂuidity is reﬂected in the rise of ﬁnance corporates: in 1989 none of the world’s 50 largest companies were based in the ﬁnance sector; in 2003 there were 14 such companies on the list (UNCTAD 2005: 19). In 2004 the assets of the top ten ﬁnancial globalizing corporations amounted to $13 trillion, whereas the assets of the top ten nonﬁnancial globalizing corporations stood at $3.1 trillion (calculated from UNCTAD, 2006: A.1.14 and A.1.11). There has been a global ﬁnancialization of assets: total international private lending stood at about a tenth of global income in 1980; in 2006 it stood at nearly half of global income (McGuire and Tarashev 2006). In 1978, ﬁnance ﬂows were ten times the value of world trade; in 2000, they stood at about 50 times the value of world trade, with total ﬂows amounting to $1.5 trillion per day while global gross domestic product (GDP) stood at about $40 trillion (Palan 2003).The emergence of “nomadic” capitalism, where circulation speeds up in a casino of accumulated abstract value, imposes new imperatives for structures of protection. Various corporate rights regimes are constructed, treating corporate investors “as an equal subject of international law, on a par with governments” (Gal-Or 2005: 122). Investor protection commitments and rights to sue signatory governments for discriminatory regulation are now routinely written into investment agreements (Cutler 2003). There were fewer than 80 such agreements in 1990; by 2004 there were more than 400. In2006, corporate investors had initiated 255 cases against 70 countries, several leading to large pay-outs, such as in 2006 when Argentina was instructed to pay $165m (UNCTAD 2005; 2006). Financial power is also reﬂected in the emergence and growth of the “oﬀshore” economy, the logical development of capital’s “drive beyond its own barrier” (Marx quoted in Palan 2003:173). Oﬀshore entities now account for the entire foreign-exchange market, and 80 percent of international ﬁnancial transactions: a ﬁfth of the world’s private wealth is now said to be held in tax-havens (Palan 2003: 7). Stocks of monetary value are increasingly disconnected from qualitative values, of for instance coresponsibility or sociality. The role of global credit-ratings agencies exempliﬁes the process. Here, three agencies — Standard &Poor’s, Moody’s, and Fitch — now set the framework for national policy making worldwide. Governments pay the agencies six ﬁgure sums to provide a “sovereign” rating that determines access to international ﬁnance. In 1975, Standard& Poor’s conducted three country ratings; in 2004 it produced more than a hundred (Klein 2004). With intensiﬁed marketization there is a dramatic “extension of command-through-money,” and the “dehumanization of the subject” is taken to new lengths (Holloway 2002: 202). Neoliberalism thus radically disembeds social relations, bringing a “reconﬁguration of civil society, and the re-privatization of aspects of risk (both market risk and credit risk) that were largely socialized” (Gill 2003: 206). With society subordinated to capital ﬂows, exchange value dominates and we see the privatization of use value. Financialization here spells social disarticulation: “the atomization inherent in commodiﬁcation in this way is no longer compensated by socialization” (Van der Pijl 1998: 4). The cash nexus confronts lived materiality, and generates profound crises of legitimacy. “Private – personal” spheres for instance, ecologies and living environments, “nature’s” reproductive and generative capacity, the structures that reproduce political legitimacy such as welfare states, rights regimes, and representative structures, become sites of contestation between commodiﬁcation and decommodiﬁcation. In such contexts use-value becomes the central “active, collective antagonistic element” (Negri 2003: 126). In the face of these challenges maintaining security becomes central to protecting exchange value. Coercive power is called on to protect and promote the security of value. The territorial state — and the United States as the universal state — reach out to widen the realm of control against the realm of uncertainty.

#### Capitalists use securitization to expand itself-risks generate new markets of opportunity

Goodman 9 Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology in Sydney

James Goodman, “Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence,” <http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/4/Global-capitalism-and-the-production-of-insecurity>, 7-7-12, JL

In capitalist societies insecurity is systemic. Capitalism literally produces insecurity. The opportunity to proﬁt and the risk of loss is capitalism’s life-blood. Capitalist security hinges on private property, on “having” rather than “not having” and on the security that possessions provide. As wealth is stratiﬁed, so is security and with the concentration of property ownership comes the concentration of security. Here the question of pursuing security is profoundly political. When security is deﬁned by the powerful, “making safe” tends to serve the status quo. When security is deﬁned by the sub-ordinated, it tends to challenge the social order. Removing sources of insecurity for the subordinated means removing the means to dominate, and under capitalism this means removing the “inalienable right” to private property. With deepening capitalist relations, systemic insecurities are intensiﬁed. The process of commodiﬁcation and ﬁnancialization has gained global reach, deepening the integration of livelihoods and living environments into a universal cash nexus (Rupert 2003). Societies as a result become ever-more vulnerable to volatile ﬂows of liquid assets, rendering them radically insecure. This globalization of insecurity is deeply stratiﬁed, with sharpening divides between those suﬀering under it and those proﬁting from it. Indeed, globalizing capitalism is best understood as a system displacing insecurity from rich to poor across the globe. Such systemic insecurity is socially concentrated at the collision between living environments and marketization, and profoundly exacerbates social divides, including contributing to the feminization of poverty. It is spatially concentrated in a growing range of poorer and vulnerable states, but, as argued here, the side-eﬀects of systemic insecurity rebound on the center. There is increasing anxiety amongst dominant states about vulnerability to refugee ﬂows, to the “contagion” of ﬁnancial instability, to cross-border environmental crises, to subversive information ﬂows, to transnational political violence, to ﬂows of laundered money, to illicit drugs and arms ﬂows. Reﬂecting this, there are increasingly intensive efforts to secure external borders and escalating interventions against “failed” or “rogue” states on the periphery. Against this backdrop, the US-led “War on Terror ” and Powell ’s eﬀorts at the UN become symptomatic of a broader geopolitics of insecurity where the center strikes out to secure itself against an increasingly insecure periphery. Overall, we may perceive three elements in this production of global insecurity. First, intensive commodiﬁcation and ﬁnancialization generate systemic insecurity. Secondly, systemic insecurity is displaced to the social and spatial margins. Thirdly, the resulting side-eﬀects generate militarist interventions from the center, to impose order by command. The chapter explores each of these three elements after ﬁrst charting insecurity dilemmas in the War on Terror.

#### Securitization is always about securing resources and markets for US access- this ensures the smooth functioning and expansion of capital

Goodman 9 Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology in Sydney

James Goodman, “Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/4/Global-capitalism-and-the-production-of-insecurity, 7-7-12, JL

The United States deﬁnes its mission as ﬁrst and foremost a drive for freedom, meaning market freedom. In the opening paragraph of the Preamble to the 2002 US National Security Strategy, the US President asserts the universality of “a single sustainable model for national success: freedom, democracy, and free enterprise,” values that “are right and true for every person, in every society ” (White House 2002a). The 2002 Strategy underlines the sentiment, stating: If you can make something that others value, you should be able to sell it to them. If others make something that you value you should be able to buy it. This is real freedom, the freedom for a person — or a nation — to make a living. (White House 2002a:18). The ideological oﬀensive for market freedom entails a universalizing national absolutism. Despite the high-sounding rhetoric, the Strategy serves the US ﬁrst and foremost: “the purpose of our actions will always be to eliminate a speciﬁc threat to the United States or our allies and friends” (White House2002a: 16). As the reiﬁcation of freedom, the United States acts with impunity and is inviolable: rogue states that “hate the United States and every-thing for which it stands,” are not just enemies of the United States, they are “enemies of civilization,” and must be defeated before they threaten international peace and security (White House 2002a: 14 and Preamble).The drive for “market freedom” is deeply embedded in a form of divine absolutism. On 16 September 2001 the US President portrayed al-Qaida as “evil-doers,” and on 20 September he told Congress that “Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them” (White House 2001ab). The January 2002 State of the Union address alluded to the 1941 Japanese attack on the United States and deployed the concept of the “ Axis of Evil ” to generalize the War on Terror beyond the immediate conﬁnes of al-Qaida and Afghanistan (White House 2002b). A year into the invasion of Afghanistan, in his 2003 State of the Union Address, the President described how the United States had risen to the “call of history,” and asserted “the liberty we prize is not America’s gift to the world, but God’s gift to humanity ” (White House 2003). The rhetoric was infectious: in February 2003 the Australian Foreign Minister described the Saddam dictatorship as “an evil and wicked regime led by an evil and wicked man. We make no apology for him — he is an evil and wicked man” (Australian Commonwealth Senate 2003). In May 2004 the Australian Trade Minister signed-oﬀ on a trade agreement in Washington; in his speech he waxed lyrical, not about trade, but about battle ﬁeld blood ties and defeating evil (Vaile 2004).In the face of “evil,” the rule of law is abandoned. In the 2003 Address the US President estimated “ more than 3,000 suspected terrorists have been arrested in many countries [while] many others have met a diﬀerent fate,” and in a remarkable aside he added that these suspects “ are no longer a problem for the United States and our friends and allies ” (White House2003). Those who remained a problem were held indeﬁnitely as “unlawful combatants” with their own extra-legal detention regime (Achcar 2002: 54). As became clear, this arbitrary counter-terror regime was to be deployed not just against Bin Laden, the ultimate “evil doer,” but also to preempt multiple other threats. The war on “evil” became universal and, as revealed by the Pentagon’s 2006 policy of the “Long War,” potentially unending (Department of Defense 2006).The sheer scale of this war project, its invocation of divine mission, its grounding in marketization, and its resonance across the globe, is suggestive of a deep-seated sense of vulnerability and insecurity at the centers of world power. In this respect, the September 11 terror attacks on the United States were less signiﬁcant than their aftermath in terms of the decisions made by Global capitalism and the production of insecurity by the US Government and its allies. The reaction and ensuing spiral of insecurity is born out of deep-seated systemic insecurity dynamics.

#### Government is dependent of threat to achieve its goals

Niskanen 9, Cato institute Senior Economist and Chairman Emeritus (William A., Fall of 2009, THE UNDEMANDING ETHICS OF CAPITALISM, CATO Journal, Vol. 29 Issue 3, pg. 564, accessed 7/4/12)

The government, of course, is the one institution that is almost completely dependent on the institutions of threat, in the form of taxes or regulations, to accomplish its objectives. Some government enterprises, such as the Postal Service, are financed primarily by the exchange of services for revenue, but even such enterprises are usually dependent on some exercise of threat to raise the revenues for subsidies or to restrict competition. Many government programs may be motivated by some targeted caring by the dominant coalition, but the implementation of these programs requires revenues that are raised by threat or regulations that are enforced by threat. The several health care bills now before Congress, for example, reflect die combination of a targeted caring for those without health insurance and of several types of both taxes and regulations. Moreover, only some competition among government assures that there are any net benefits to those who are not part of the dominant coalition in a specific government. In summary, government has an essential but limited role.

### Competition

#### Competitiveness decides who lives and who dies based on capitalist market performance

Bristow, Cardiff University School of City and Regional Planning, 5

(Gillian, 4/13/2005, “Everyone’s a ‘winner’: problematizing the discourse of regional competitiveness,” Journal of Economic Competitiveness 5, p. 286-287, bs)

Competitiveness is usually used to refer to firm performance. The discourse of firm competitiveness comes from two principal sources. The first of these is the discourse of the economics profession, where competitiveness is regarded as a somewhat abstract quality conferred upon successful firms by the markets within which they operate. Thus, ‘the market is the impartial and ultimate arbiter of right behaviour in the economy and competitiveness simply describes the result of responding correctly to market signals’ (Schoenberger, 1998, 3). The fusion of economics with evolutionary theory has imbued the concept with the notion of ‘survival of the fittest’. Firms, like organisms, are seen as living on the edge, with survivors being those who are able to survive or ‘win’ in a dynamic world of economic competition (Sheppard, 2000). Competitiveness has thus become inescapably associated with ideas of fitness and unfitness, and these in turn with the implied premise of merit, as in ‘deserving to live’ and ‘deserving to die’. Secondly, competitiveness is also the discourse of the business community where it represents the fundamental external validation of a firm’s ability to survive, compete and grow in markets subject to international competition. This provides a pervasive and powerful means of explaining almost any behaviour i.e. a firm ‘must doX in order to be competitive’ (Schoenberger, 1998).

#### Competitiveness refers to the capacity to compete and survive in the capitalist marketplace

Bristow, Cardiff University School of City and Regional Planning, 5

(Gillian, 4/13/2005, “Everyone’s a ‘winner’: problematizing the discourse of regional competitiveness,” Journal of Economic Competitiveness 5, p. 287, bs)

Thus, at the micro (i.e. firm) level, competitiveness has a relatively clear meaning and refers to the capacity of a firm to compete, grow and be profitable in the marketplace. In principle at least, relative firm competitiveness can also be measured on a common scale. This is because it refers to commensurable units (firms) engaged in commensurable activities (competing in a market). Since it is perceived to reflect a firm’s ability to survive competition and to grow, firm competitiveness is generally conceived of in terms of output-related performance indicators. Indeed, according to Michael Porter (1985, 1990) firm competitiveness is simply a proxy for productivity. Porter has argued that firms that are capable of producing more output with fewer units of input than their rivals generate a ‘competitive advantage’ in the markets in which they compete, enabling them to grow and prosper accordingly. A firm’s productivity, he argues, is dependent upon its ‘entrepreneurialism’. This is defined as its capacity to innovate in the production process, to access new and distinctive markets in different and unconventional ways, and to produce new or redesigned goods and services with perceived customer benefit (see also, Spender, 1998). Thus according to Porter, firm competitiveness is not simply centred on a narrow efficiency-based conception of productivity, but also depends on the value of products and services produced i.e. their uniqueness and quality.

#### Competitiveness largely favors neoliberal motives – the 1AC’s focus on increasing competitiveness puts private entities in charge

Bristow, Cardiff University School of City and Regional Planning, 5

(Gillian, 4/13/2005, “Everyone’s a ‘winner’: problematizing the discourse of regional competitiveness,” Journal of Economic Competitiveness 5, p. 297-298, bs)

Ultimately, the language of competitiveness is the language of the business community. Thus, critical to understanding the power of the discourse is firstly, understanding the appeal and significance of the discourse to business interests and, secondly, exploring their role in influencing the ideas of regional and national policy elites. Part of the allure of the discourse of competitiveness for the business community is its seeming comprehensibility. Business leaders feel that they already understand the basics of what competitiveness means and thus it offers them the gain of apparent sophistication without the pain of grasping something complex and new. Furthermore, competitive images are exciting and their accoutrements of ‘battles’, ‘wars’ and ‘races’ have an intuitive appeal to businesses familiar with the cycle of growth, survival and sometimes collapse (Krugman, 1996b). The climate of globalisation and the turn towards neo-liberal, capitalist forms of regulation has empowered business interests and created a demand for new concepts and models of development which offer guidance on how economies can innovate and prosper in the face of increasing competition for investment and resources. Global policy elites of governmental and corporate institutions, who share the same neo-liberal consensus, have played a critical role in promoting both the discourse of national and regional competitiveness, and of competitiveness policies which they think are good for them (such as supportive institutions and funding for research and development agendas). In the EU, for example, the European Round Table of Industrialists played a prominent role in ensuring that the Commission’s 1993 White Paper placed the pursuit of international competitiveness (and thus the support of business), on an equal footing with job creation and social cohesion objectives (Lovering, 1998; Balanya et al., 2000). This discourse rapidly spread and competitiveness policies were transferred through global policy networks as large quasi-governmental organisations such as the OECD and World Bank pushed the national and, subsequently, the regional competitiveness agenda upon national governments (Peet, 2003).

#### Competitiveness discourse is used to legitimize neoliberal actions

Bristow, Cardiff University School of City and Regional Planning, 5

(Gillian, 4/13/2005, “Everyone’s a ‘winner’: problematizing the discourse of regional competitiveness,” Journal of Economic Competitiveness 5, p. 299-300, bs)

The evolutionary, ‘survival of the fittest’ basis of the regional competitiveness discourse clearly resonates with this evaluative culture. The discourse of competitiveness strongly appeals to the stratum of policy makers and analysts who can use it to justify what they are doing and/or to find out how well they are doing it relative to their ‘rivals’. This helps explain the interest in trying to measure regional competitiveness and the development of composite indices and league tables. It also helps explain why particular elements of the discourse have assumed particular significance—output indicators of firm performance are much easier to compare and rank on a single axis than are indicators relating to institutional behaviour, for example. This in turn points to a central paradox in measures of regional competitiveness. The key ingredients of firm competitiveness and regional prosperity are increasingly perceived as lying with assets such as knowledge and information which are, by definition, intangible or at least difficult to measure with any degree of accuracy. The obsession with performance measurement and the tendency to reduce complex variables to one, easily digestible number brings a ‘kind of blindness’ with it as to what is really important (Boyle, 2001, 60)—in this case, how to improve regional prosperity. Thus while a composite index number of regional competitiveness will attract widespread attention in the media and amongst policymakers and development agencies, the difficulty presented by such a measure is in knowing what exactly needs to be targeted for appropriate remedial action. All of this suggests that regional competitiveness is more than simply the linguistic expression of powerful exogenous interests. It has also become rhetoric. In other words, regional competitiveness is deployed in a strategic and persuasive way, often in conjunction with other discourses (notably globalisation) to legitimate specific policy initiatives and courses of action. The rhetoric of regional competitiveness serves a useful political purpose in that it is easier to justify change or the adoption of a particular course of policy action by reference to some external threat that makes change seem inevitable. It is much easier for example, for politicians to argue for the removal of supply-side rigidities and flexible hire-and-fire workplace rules by suggesting that there is no alternative and that jobs would be lost anyway if productivity improvement was not achieved. Thus, ‘the language of external competitiveness. . .provides a rosy glow of shared endeavour and shared enemies which can unite captains of industry and representatives of the shop floor in the same big tent’ (Turner, 2001, 40). In this sense it is a discourse which provides some shared sense of meaning and a means of legitimising neo-liberalism rather than a material focus on the actual improvement of economic welfare.

#### The bioeconomy cannot be separated from neoliberalism – efforts to promote “peace and freedom” around the world are only efforts to spread capitalism

Birch, York University Department of Social Science Assistant Professor, 6

(Kean, December 2006, “The Neoliberal Underpinnings of the Bioeconomy: the Ideological Discourses and practices of Economic Competitiveness,” Genomics, Society and Policy, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 3, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

What this means for the bioeconomy is that the political economy of biotechnology – ie, how it is organised as a market – can be seen as the consequence of the expansion of specific economic discourses and practices. In particular, the bioeconomy is tied to the rise of neoliberalism as the dominant mode of governance. Neoliberalism itself developed as an economic ideology for two major reasons. First, it was a response to the totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Second, it resulted from a concern with the ‘problem of knowledge’ in economic calculation, which meant that a centrally-planned market was not seen as plausible.22 The term itself was coined in 1938 at a meeting in Paris of liberal intellectuals – including the likes of von Mises and Hayek – who focused on “the redefinition of the functions of the state” to ensure the development of freedom and property rights (ie, market ethics) and contrasted with the nineteenth century laissez faire liberal tradition based on removing state intervention altogether.23 It also had a strong international dimension in seeking to promote peace and freedom through international economic exchange. This early movement was cemented after World War II with the establishment of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947, although neoliberalism itself failed to dominate economic discourse during the post-war period, which was instead characterised by a form of Keynesian ‘embedded liberalism.’

#### Policy decisions regarding competitiveness are made only to perpetuate neoliberal motives

Birch, York University Department of Social Science Assistant Professor, 6

(Kean, December 2006, “The Neoliberal Underpinnings of the Bioeconomy: the Ideological Discourses and practices of Economic Competitiveness,” Genomics, Society and Policy, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 7-8, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

The policy discourse around innovation and competitiveness has led to the embedding of a number of specific institutional changes in the US bioeconomy that have had enormous influence on other countries. At least three such components to the competitiveness regime have been naturalised as necessary policy changes intend ensure success in the bioeconomy. First and foremost was the ability to capture returns on the new biotechnologies arising out of public and private laboratories. In particular the clarification of whether living organisms could be patented was crucial and had been an ongoing saga between 1971 and 1980 in relation to the Diamond vs. Chakrabarty case.71 Second, there was a need to enable the capture of public science funded by the US federal government and thereby exclude others from its benefits. Finally there was an increased emphasis on the international dimensions of all these other policies in order to enable the competitiveness of US firms in global markets. Consequently a number of trade-related policies such as the TRIPS agreement at the WTO were vigorously pursued.

#### Competitiveness is intrinsically linked to capitalism – the only reason to increase competitiveness is to be able to survive in the market

Birch, York University Department of Social Science Assistant Professor, 6

(Kean, December 2006, “The Neoliberal Underpinnings of the Bioeconomy: the Ideological Discourses and practices of Economic Competitiveness,” Genomics, Society and Policy, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 9, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

The final component of the competitiveness regime was in some ways the most important because it dealt with the ability of US firms to compete in international markets. Again, a number of policy decisions were made that provided a trading advantage for US firms. In particular the Trade Act established a series of processes called 301 and 301 Special that enabled the US to withdraw favourable trade status from those countries that it deemed not to have fulfilled certain demands on intellectual property rights (IPR).83 Such policies were institutionalised in the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act (1988) when they became public law. These processes meant that countries refusing to adhere to US demands could be threatened with trade restrictions.84 Such international activities designed to promote US interests were pursued through multilateral trade negotiations as well. The most important being the World Trade Organisation (WTO) which introduced the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS) measures. Article 27 of TRIPS meant that all signatories had to enforce biotech patents, whilst Article 33 harmonised patents to a 20-year minimum where non-compliance would entail the loss of trade privileges.85

### Crisis politics

#### Disaster Capitalism uses fear rhetoric created by catastrophe to create new investment opportunities-plan is an example of this phenomenon

Klein 5 (The Nation April 14, 2005) (The Rise of Disaster Capitalism Introduction) http://www.fuckyouusa.com/Writings/The\_Rise\_of\_Disaster\_Capitalism.pdf Naomi Klein is a former Miliband Fellow at the London School of Economics and holds an honorary Doctor of Civil Laws from the University of King’s College, Nova Scotia. She is currently at work on a new book and film on how the climate crisis can spur economic and political transformation. ALG

But if the reconstruction industry is stunningly inept at rebuilding, that may be because rebuilding is not its primary purpose. According to Guttal, "It's not reconstruction at all--it's about reshaping everything." If anything, the stories of corruption and incompetence serve to mask this deeper scandal: the rise of a predatory form of disaster capitalism that uses the desperation and fear created by catastrophe to engage in radical social and economic engineering. And on this front, the reconstruction industry works so quickly and efficiently that the privatizations and land grabs are usually locked in before the local population knows what hit them. Kumara, in another e-mail, warns that Sri Lanka is now facing "a second tsunami of corporate globalization and militarization," potentially even more devastating than the first. "We see this as a plan of action amidst the tsunami crisis to hand over the sea and the coast to foreign corporations and tourism, with military assistance from the US Marines." As Deputy Defense Secretary, Paul Wolfowitz designed and oversaw a strikingly similar project in Iraq: The fires were still burning in Baghdad when US occupation officials rewrote the investment laws and announced that the country's state-owned companies would be privatized. Some have pointed to this track record to argue that Wolfowitz is unfit to lead the World Bank; in fact, nothing could have prepared him better for his new job. In Iraq, Wolfowitz was just doing what the World Bank is already doing in virtually every war-torn and disaster-struck country in the world--albeit with fewer bureaucratic niceties and more ideological bravado."Post-conflict" countries now receive 20-25 percent of the World Bank's total lending, up from 16 percent in 1998--itself an 800 percent increase since 1980, according to a Congressional Research Service study. Rapid response to wars and natural disasters has traditionally been the domain of United Nations agencies, which worked with NGOs to provide emergency aid, build temporary housing and the like. But now reconstruction work has been revealed as a tremendously lucrative industry, too important to be left to the do-gooders at the UN. So today it is the World Bank, already devoted to the principle of poverty alleviation through profit-making, that leads the charge. And there is no doubt that there are profits to be made in the reconstruction business. There are massive engineering and supplies contracts ($10 billion to Halliburton in Iraq and Afghanistan alone); "democracy building" has exploded into a $2 billion industry; and times have never been better for public-sector consultants--the private firms that advise governments on selling off their assets, often running government services themselves as subcontractors. (Bearing Point, the favored of these firms in the United States, reported that the revenues for its "public services" division "had quadrupled in just five years," and the profits are huge: $342 million in 2002--a profit margin of 35 percent.) But shattered countries are attractive to the World Bank for another reason: They take orders well. After a cataclysmic event, governments will usually do whatever it takes to get aid dollars--even if it means racking up huge debts and agreeing to sweeping policy reforms. And with the local population struggling to find shelter and food, political organizing against privatization can seem like an unimaginable luxury. Even better from the bank's perspective, many war-ravaged countries are in states of "limited sovereignty": They are considered too unstable and unskilled to manage the aid money pouring in, so it is often put in a trust fund managed by the World Bank. This is the case in East Timor, where the bank doles out money to the government as long as it shows it is spending responsibly. Apparently, this means slashing public-sector jobs (Timor's government is half the size it was under Indonesian occupation) but lavishing aid money on foreign consultants the bank insists the government hire (researcher Ben Moxham writes, "In one government department, a single international consultant earns in one month the same as his twenty Timorese colleagues earn together in an entire year").

#### The generation of crisis creates new opportunities for private companies to construct public infrastructure. This ensures the transfer of wealth from a public to private good.

Farrell 7 (Paul B. Farrell, Dow Jones Business News, October 16, 2007 Paul B. Farrell has been a MW columnist since 1997 and has published more than 1400 columns plus nine books. War, Terror, Catastrophe: Profiting From 'Disaster Capitalism' http://www.naomiklein.org/shock-doctrine/reviews/profiting-disaster-capitalism) Hot tip: Invest in "Disaster Capitalism.") ALG

Hot tip: Invest in Disaster Capitalism. This new investment sector is the core of the emerging "new economy" that generates profits by feeding off other peoples' misery: Wars, terror attacks, natural catastrophes, poverty, trade sanctions, market crashes and all kinds of economic, financial and political disasters. In this Orwellian future, everything must be seen with new eyes: "Disasters" are "IPOs," opportunities to buy into a new "company." Corporations like Lockheed-Martin are the real "emerging nations" of the world, not some dinky countries. They generate huge profits, grow earnings. And seen through the new rose-colored glasses of "Disaster Capitalism" they are hot investment opportunities. To more fully grasp this new economy, you must read what may be the most important book on economics in the 21st century, Naomi Klein's The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism, whose roots trace back the ideas of three 20th century giants: President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who warned us against the self-perpetuating and ever-expanding economic power of our "military-industrial complex." Nobel economist Milton Friedman, who said economic change never occurs without a crisis shocking the system; whether the crisis is natural, induced or merely perceived, as with enflaming public fears of war and terror threats. Economist Joseph Schumpeter, whose saw "creative destruction" as a healthy process by which new technologies and new products made old ones obsolete. "Disaster Capitalism" is financing a new world economic order says Klein, not just in "the divide between Baghdad's Green and Red zones" but in other disaster zones, from post-tsunami Sri Lanka to post-Katrina New Orleans. Disasters come in many forms: Weapons destroying power plants and hospitals, nature weakening bridges, hurricanes wiping out towns, ideological conflicts turning Africa's farmlands into deserts, global banking systems favoring investors over public works, shopping malls over schools, sewage treatment and power plants, and so on. Yes, this is a hot-button political issue. But for the moment, let's put aside partisan politics, which many will find disturbing for the future of America. Let's look at this strictly as investors and briefly consider what may also be a guide for aggressive investors searching for investment opportunities in "Disaster Capitalism." In a brilliant Harper's excerpt from The Shock Doctrine, Klein makes clear how this new economy is the wave of the future for certain investors: "Today, global instability does not just benefit a small group of arms dealers; it generates huge profits for the high-tech-homeland-security sector, for heavy construction, for private health-care companies, for the oil and gas sectors -- and, of course, for defense contractors." Big bucks This new market is enormous: "Reconstruction is now such a big business that investors greet each new disaster with the excitement of a hot new stock offering: $30 billion for Iraq reconstruction, $13 billion for tsunami reconstruction, $110 billion for New Orleans and the Gulf Coast." Get it? Disasters are "IPOs!" followed by on-going revenues for "projects" like the Blackwater security contracts and constructing the world's largest embassy in the isolated Baghdad Green Zone. Think positive: "Disaster Capitalism" played a major role in bringing America's economy out of the 2000-2002 bear-recession: "The scale of the revenues at stake was certainly enough to fuel an economic boom. Lockheed Martin, whose former vice president chaired the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq, which loudly agitated for the invasion, received $25 billion in U.S. government contracts in 2005 alone." Putting that in perspective, Klein quotes U.S. Rep. Henry Waxman: That sum "exceeded that gross domestic product of 102 countries, including Iceland, Jordan and Costa Rica [and] was also larger than the combined budgets" of the Departments of Interior and Commerce, the SBA and the entire legislature. "Lockheed itself deserved to be characterized as an emerging market. Companies like Lockheed (LMT) (whose stock price tripled between 2001 and 2005) are a large part of the reason why the U.S. stock market was saved" after 9/11, helping the recovery more than the housing boom did! Plus energy: "The oil and gas industry is so intimately entwined with the economy of disaster -- both as a root cause behind many disasters and as a beneficiary from them -- that it deserves to treated as an honorary adjunct of the disaster-capitalism complex." Citing the "outrageous fortunes of the oil sector -- a $40 billion profit in 2006 for ExxonMobil alone (XOM) ... Like the fortunes of corporations linked to defense, heavy construction and homeland security, those of the oil sector improve with every war, terrorist attack and Category 5 hurricane." How to invest in the new 'Disaster Capitalism' It's easy to invest in "Disaster Capitalism" and the new economy. See the Spade Defense Index (DXS) of defense, homeland security and aerospace stocks. Klein says it "went up 76% between 2001 and 2006, while the S&P 500 dropped 5%." You can trade the Spade Index as a PowerShare Aerospace and Defense ETF (PPA) . In addition, the Fidelity Select Defense & Aerospace Fund (FSDAX) offers another opportunity. According to Morningstar data, there are similar stocks in both, including: General Dynamics (GD) , Raytheon (RTN) , Rockwell Collins (COL) , Boeing (BA) , Harris (HRS) , Northrop Grumman (NOC) and United Technologies (UTX) . "The Shock Doctrine" is one of the best economic book of the 21st century because it reveals in one place the confluence of cultural forces, the restructuring of a world economy as growing populations fight over depleting natural resources and the drifting away of America from representative democracy to a government controlled by multiple, competing, well-financed and shadowy special interests.

#### **Capitalism feeds off of war and disaster to generate profits**

Farrell 7 (Paul B. Farrell, Dow Jones Business News, October 16, 2007 Paul B. Farrell has been a MW columnist since 1997 and has published more than 1400 columns plus nine books. War, Terror, Catastrophe: Profiting From 'Disaster Capitalism' http://www.naomiklein.org/shock-doctrine/reviews/profiting-disaster-capitalism) Hot tip: Invest in "Disaster Capitalism.") ALG

Here's an overview of trends from the book and related ideas: 1. Free market competes with government In the past when major catastrophes resulted in economic disruptions and human losses governments responded with "New Deals" and "Marshall Plans," says Klein. Today, "Disaster Capitalism" companies see government agencies (like FEMA) and nonprofits (Red Cross) as "competition" taking away new business. A military draft, for instance, would lower the need for private mercenaries. 2. Privatization of government for the investor class These new forces are screaming to privatize our economy and government: After the Minneapolis bridge collapse Klein saw many calls for more private toll roads and bridges across America. Same with calls to privatize New York's subways after rain closed them temporarily. Ditto with airports and their security. And in New Orleans, reconstruction moneys rebuilt private schools in upscale areas and neglected infrastructure in poor areas. 3. War generates profits, peace hurts free markets "Disaster Capitalism" firms need wars to generate profits. And by sidestepping the draft, Iraq became a privatized war employing over 185,000 (20,000 more than the military), including truck drivers, PX clerks and mercenary soldiers. Blackwater was near bankruptcy before the war. Through secret no-bid contracts the U.S. pays for training centers which the companies now own. Peace does not generate disaster profits. 4. Plutocratic government favoring wealthy over masses "The vast infrastructure of the disaster industry, built up with taxpayer money, is all privately controlled" through special interests favoring the wealth classes during reconstruction. In New Orleans Klein saw the "so-called FEMA-villes: desolate out-of-the-way trailer camps for low-income evacuees [with guards that] treated survivors like criminals;" while the wealthy gated communities quickly received water and power generators, private school and hospital services. 5. Shadow banking system Private equity firms and hedge funds are making our Federal Reserve Bank less and less relevant. Today a private banking system is emerging nationally and globally that operates in relative secrecy outside the established system and beyond the oversight of securities and banking regulators and the legislature, out in a parallel universe beyond the comprehension of the vast majority of American taxpayers and Main Street investors. So folks: Is "Disaster Capitalism" merely a hot short-term investment opportunity for you? Or is it a national "crisis," a warning bell, a "shocking" call to rise above euphemisms like "creative destruction," get into action and rein in the "military-industrial complex" mindset that's pushing America into a disastrous, self-destructive future? Tell us.

### Economic Growth

#### **Returns are key to keeping investors and businesses entrenched in capitalism**

Magnuson 08 ( Joel Magnuson, December 29, 2008, is an internationally recognized economist specializing in non-orthodox approaches to political economy. He is currently a professor of economics in Portland, Oregon; a visiting fellow at the Ashcroft International Business School at Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, England; and is an international advisor to the editorial board of Anglia's journal Interconnections “[Mindful Economics: How the U.S. Economy Works, Why It Matters, and How It Could Be Different](http://www.sevenstories.com/products/mindful-economics)” http://climateandcapitalism.com/2010/02/24/growth-and-consumerism-nature-or-nurture/ MB)

Generating a measurable rate of return for investors is the core element of any capitalist economy. Investors derive their income from percentage returns on stocks, bonds, or other business investments. If investors do not get these expected returns, they will sell their investments and seek returns elsewhere. By disinvesting, or cashing out, investors can drive down the book value of a company, which can ultimately cause the business to fail. To prevent this outcome, the prime directive of a capitalist business is to sustain robust returns and growth of financial wealth for their investors. This is the paramount goal of capitalist enterprise. To provide these returns for their investors, businesses essentially have three choices. One would be to pay investors with money held in their business bank accounts. This choice, however, would amount to self-impoverishment, as businesses would make themselves poorer by drawing down their bank account balances just as a person would become poorer by trying to live on a savings account. Another choice would be to generate profits from sales growth gained by taking market share away from competitors. Although the threat of losing market share in a competitive marketplace can force an individual business to be innovative and create new cost-saving technology, one business’s gain is another business’s loss in a zero-sum strategy. This would ultimately be self-destructive to the interest of the capitalist class as a whole. The third and only viable, long-term choice would be for each business to generate its returns by producing and selling more goods and services for profit. In other words, driven by the financial necessity of providing investors with a robust rate of return, capitalist businesses must also sustain a robust rate of growth in the production and sale of goods and services. Financial growth is the taskmaster that drives growth in real production. To sustain ongoing growth in production and sales, businesses must use a portion of their profits for reinvestment in capital stock (plant, equipment, inventory, etc.). With more capital stock, businesses can increase their production capacity to meet the demands of new growth in output and sales. As the funds for making these capital investments are mostly derived from profits on sales, sales growth and investment are locked into a dynamic relationship: profits from current sales provide financing for new investments, these new investments drive future production and future sales, and future sales and profits will finance yet more investments, and so on. Looking at the system in its entirety, keeping the engine of the economic machine running requires a steady flow in real investments that are derived from a steady rise in production and sales. In other words, the economy has to keep growing. This growth imperative is systemic and extends beyond merely generating returns for investors. Not only are individual businesses driven to grow, but also the entire capitalist system depends on it. If the dynamic relationship between investment and growth were to break down, the economic system would break down as well. For example, if sales growth were to slow down; the source of funds for capital investment would begin to evaporate and new investments in capital stock would begin to fall. Falling investments would lead to an overall slowdown in production and sales. With falling sales. incomes would fall and a downward vicious circle of contraction would follow. Contraction or recession, if sustained over time can turn into a depression; and depression signifies systemic failure of the capitalist system. As the capitalist machine speeds up or slows down, the changes are felt in every corner of the economy. Every institution within the U.S. economy is connected to every other institution as parts in the machine, and all have evolved to be dependent on the growth imperative. Therefore, if the economy grows, there is a chorus of cheers. Consumers look to growth because it means more goods and services available in markets; workers see growing job opportunities and rising incomes; public agencies receive more money from increased sales and income tax revenue to pay for police, schools, and roads; nonprofits receive more donations and grants from rising incomes; bank loans are repaid; and, most importantly, investors’ profits are realized. When growth turns to contraction (recession), however, trepidation is felt by all. Workers experience layoffs and default on their bank loans; falling profits and share prices in the stock markets deplete the value of pension funds; bankruptcies soar along with government budget deficits and budget cuts. Growth is so centrally important that it has shaped the development of America’s most powerful institutions. Without steady growth, the economic system will proceed to wither away like a plant deprived of water and sunlight. For this reason, most observers are very hesitant to question this growth imperative of capitalism. The acceptance of the growth imperative has become deeply infused in American culture and thought. Most Americans would rather ignore the inevitable environmental damage that ongoing growth causes than question it. As long as people are feeling benefits of growth, and that those benefits outweigh the damage it causes, people are likely to accept the idea that ongoing economic growth is benign. If this changes, however, and if it becomes clear that the damage outweighs the benefits, then a crisis in the perception of growth will emerge. This shift in perception is bound to occur at some point because of the scientific fact that ongoing growth is not possible. This is perhaps the single most deleterious consequence of the capitalist system. The system is based on a fundamental contradiction that, on the one hand, it must continue to grow, but on the other hand, it cannot. Many people seem to be more willing to accept even illusions of growth rather than directly face and reconcile this contradiction.

#### Economic growth entreches the capitalist system by quantifying the abstract

Dale 12 (Gareth Dale, 3/27/12, Gareth Dale is Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations. He received his doctorate from the University of Manchester. “The Growth Paradigm: A Critique” http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=798&issue=134 MB)

The growth paradigm, as I use the term, refers to the proposition that economic growth is good, imperative, essentially limitless, and the principal remedy for a litany of social problems. The growth paradigm appears ubiquitous, even natural, but it is uniquely modern. Ancient civilisations such as Mesopotamia or Rome knew commitments to certain types of “growth”. Monarchs expanded their territory and riches, and scholars penned proposals for improving the organisation of agriculture or trade. But even where commercial activity flourished, as in the city-states of Classical Greece, the pursuit of profit for its own sake was regarded as a threat to social order. The god of commerce, Hermes, doubled as the god of theft. For millennia no sense of “an economy” as something separate from the totality of social relations existed, nor was there a compulsion to growth. “Do we never find in antiquity an inquiry into which form of landed property, etc is the most productive, creates the greatest wealth?” asked Marx rhetorically. Although Cato may have investigated the most productive methods of cultivation and Brutus may have lent his money at the optimum rate of interest, the guiding philosophy was “which mode of property creates the best citizens”.14 The ancients, he wrote elsewhere, “never thought of transforming the surplus-product into capital. Or at least only to a very limited extent.” They used much of it for unproductive expenditure on art, religious works and public works. Still less was  production directed to the development of the productive forces: division of labour, technology, the application of science to production.15 In the pre-capitalist world economic growth was seldom considered a subject of study. A signal exception was the Arabian scholar Ibn Khaldun, whose Prolegomena to his history of the world does provide an analytical description of growth: When civilisation [population] increases, the available labour again increases. In turn, luxury increases in correspondence with the increasing profit, and the customs and needs of luxury increase. Crafts are created to obtain luxury products. The value realised from them increases, and, as a result, profits are again multiplied in the town. Production thrives even more than before. And so it goes with the second and third increase.16 Therefore, he continues, people’s wealth “increases and their riches grow”.17 Yet if Khaldun’s work is exceptional it also proves the rule. Nowhere in his narrative is the notion of linear economy ic progress to be found.18 His is strictly a cyclical theory. It centres upon the rise and fall in the fighting spirit of nomad conquerors, but with a political-economic correlate: population and trade growth combine with benevolent rule and low taxation to generate an upward growth curve, following which, after two generations, the dynasty approaches its natural endpoint. “At that time, civilisation has reached the limit of its abundance and growth”.19 In medieval Europe, too, economic interests were generally held to be subordinate to the “real business of life, which was salvation”, and economic activity was but one “aspect of personal conduct upon which, as on other parts of it, the rules of morality are binding”.20 Labour was valued and commercial trade was seen as necessary (albeit potentially “perilous to the soul”), but finance was considered sordid, if not immoral.21 But in mid-second millennium Europe the picture began to change. The reliance of feudal elites upon funds supplied by the “third estate” of merchants and bankers increased, just as Protestantism’s doctrine of “the progressive sanctification of the individual by means of moral improvement” was nourishing a climate “of individualistic religiosity and self-improvement that was congruent with [the emerging] secular values” of material success and money making.22 In the 16th and 17th centuries England witnessed the pursuit of “improvement”, while acquisitiveness—hitherto suffered as an inevitable but regrettable vice—gained respectability. The ideas that accumulation is natural, and that pecuniary gain should not be blocked by legislation, took root.23 In 16th and 17th century Western Europe mercantilism was at its zenith. The concern of mercantilists was not growth in production for use but the increase in products for sale. When trade flourishes, as the English mercantilist Edward Misselden put it, “the income to the crown is augmented, lands and rents are improved, navigation increases and the poor people find work. If trade declines, all these decline with it”.24 The expansion of exports became a state-supported imperative, and the thirst for money, on the part of monarchs, gentry and burghers, became a secular religion. Nevertheless, mercantilists were not under the spell of the growth paradigm. Their principal goal was not economic growth per se but the enrichment of the state. They conceived of wealth essentially in zero-sum distributional terms, not in respect of its creation. Acquisition was what mattered, not production or consumption. For the French mercantilist Antoine de Montchrétien, for example, the assumption was that god had provided plenty, in the shape of nature, people and their aptitude for work.25 Although good government was necessary to marshal and husband these productive resources, and the expansion of trade was to be encouraged, this did not amount to the modern growth imperative. With increasing commodification, quantification—reducing everything to numbers—became an increasingly salient feature of capitalist society. In parallel with the expansion of markets and the legitimation of acquisitive behaviour ideas of time and space underwent a revolutionary change. In the pre-capitalist world time and space were bound into the individual’s location in the natural and social landscape. Most economic activity—agrarian labour—followed daily and seasonal solar cycles, and work was barely distinguished from non-work. In the 17th and 18th centuries these traditional ways of seeing began to dissolve. The mechanical clock universalised time. No longer hooked to the locally-experienced rhythms of the sun and seasons, time came to be measured in fixed ticks, which could be synchronised across the world, turning the individual’s apprehension of time into part of a standardised global experience. Time began to appear as an abstract continuum: uniform, linear and measurable. But the diffusion of the mechanical clock, as Moishe Postone has argued, must itself be understood “with reference to a sociocultural process” that it, in turn, reinforced.26 Postone is referring to the discovery and reification of productivity, for it requires labour that can be “disciplined and coordinated in a regularised fashion”.27 The objectification of time accompanied the segregation of work from the rest of human experience, such that the labour demanded of workers could be imposed and measured.28 In this respect, the conception of time as quantifiable and abstract originated alongside the spread of “the commodity-determined form of social relations”.29 In capitalism, as István Mészáros puts the point, “everything becomes profitably commensurable and manageable for a determinate period of time”; capital “subsumes everything, including living human labour, under abstract quantitative determinations”.30

#### **Steady economic growth is an integral part of social and hegemonic structures**

Dale 12 (Gareth Dale, 3/27/12, Gareth Dale is Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations. He received his doctorate from the University of Manchester. “The Growth Paradigm: A Critique” http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=798&issue=134 MB)

From 1950 to 1973 capitalism experienced its golden age, and in the industrialised world the growth paradigm achieved its complete form. By producing “avalanches of consumer goods” that “progressively raise the standard of life of the masses”, the economist Joseph Schumpeter promised, capitalist growth, if sustained, will surely abolish poverty.59 Steady growth resurrected the belief in progress that had been badly rattled by world wars, depression and the Holocaust. By the mid-1950s these dreadful apparitions, writes Clive Hamilton, were being “supplanted by visions of a new nirvana, of consumer bliss”, and the goal of social action was increasingly formulated in terms of growth, measured in annualised increases in GDP. “This was convenient”, he remarks, in identifying capitalist corporations as “the central agency of progress”.60 Increasing GDP became a key policy objective for states the world over, and governments established targeted growth rates. In East and West alike economic planning was in vogue, accompanied by a ramped-up commitment to economic rationalisation and productivity growth, all lathered in techno-optimism. “Better Living through Chemistry” was a US slogan in the 1950s, mirrored in Soviet Eastern Europe by “Chemistry gives bread, beauty and prosperity!” There was a military angle too, as both Cold War rivals identified growth as the elixir of geopolitical success. John F Kennedy, who had been elected on a campaign promise to hike the growth rate to 5 percent, put it thus: “If we lack a first-rate growing economy, we cannot maintain a first-rate defence”.61 In the US advertising agencies got in on the great growth chase, championing their services as essential for the manufacturing of the new wants that it required. “I see advertising as an educational and activating force capable of producing the changes in demand which we need,” pronounced the head of the J Walter Thompson agency in the early 1950s. “By educating people into higher living standards, it ensures that consumption will rise to a level justified by our production”.62 A similar argument was put, even more candidly, by a marketing consultant in 1955: “Our enormously productive economy demands that we make consumption our way of life, that we convert buying and use of goods into rituals, that we seek our spiritual satisfactions, our ego satisfactions, in consumption… We need things consumed, burned up, worn out, replaced, and discarded at an ever increasing pace”.63 In 1958 the growth paradigm reached its acme. In that year the Republican plutocrats Nelson and Laurence Rockefeller recruited Henry Kissinger to prepare a report on “The Challenge of the Future”. Heading a panel comprised of economists associated with large corporations and major universities, Kissinger produced a book, The Key Importance of Growth to Achieve National Goals, which identified growth as the solution to the continual pressure of competing claims on national income (the arms race, public infrastructure, education, etc). Growth, it argued, not only brings “dignity, freedom, and purpose” but promises to expand “the opportunities for individual fulfilment, multiply the incentives for enterprise, enable us to improve our educational system, permit us to increase our protection against economic hardship, make possible rising standards of national health and open new vistas of cultural achievement”.64 Worldwide, growth came to be seen as a proxy for the profitability of national economies and as a magic wand to achieve all sorts of goals: to abolish the danger of returning to depression, to soothe class tensions, to reduce the gap between “developed” and “developing” countries, to carve a path to international recognition, to contain the USSR, to accelerate “the transition to socialism”, and so on. The greater the growth, it was universally supposed, the smaller the economic, social and political challenges, the weaker the geopolitical threats and the more secure the regime. Growth became an integral part of social life throughout the world and played a decisive part in binding “civil society” into capitalist hegemonic structures.

### **Energy/Fuel Efficiency**

#### Efficiency spurs on more energy use, this causes the spread of capitalism-Jevons Paradox

Foster et al 10 (John Bellamy, is editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology, University of Oregon, Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology, North Carolina State University, Richard York, co-editor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology, University of Oregon, Monthly Review, “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency: The Return of the Jevons Paradox”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/capitalism-and-the-curse-of-energy-efficiency>, July 2, 2012) ALK

Technological optimists have tried to argue that the rebound effect is small, and therefore environmental problems can be solved largely by technological innovation alone, with the efficiency gains translating into lower throughput of energy and materials (dematerialization). Empirical evidence of a substantial rebound effect is, however, strong. For example, technological advancements in motor vehicles, which have increased the average miles per gallon of vehicles by 30 percent in the United States since 1980, have not reduced the overall energy used by motor vehicles. Fuel consumption per vehicle stayed constant while the efficiency gains led to the augmentation, not only of the numbers of cars and trucks on the roads (and the miles driven), but also their size and “performance” (acceleration rate, cruising speed, etc.)—so that SUVs and minivans now dot U.S. highways. At the macro level, the Jevons Paradox can be seen in the fact that, even though the United States has managed to double its energy efficiency since 1975, its energy consumption has risen dramatically. Juliet Schor notes that over the last thirty-five years: energy expended per dollar of GDP has been cut in half. But rather than falling, energy demand has increased, by roughly 40 percent. Moreover, demand is rising fastest in those sectors that have had the biggest efficiency gains—transport and residential energy use. Refrigerator efficiency improved by 10 percent, but the number of refrigerators in use rose by 20 percent. In aviation, fuel consumption per mile fell by more than 40 percent, but total fuel use grew by 150 percent because passenger miles rose. Vehicles are a similar story. And with soaring demand, we’ve had soaring emissions. Carbon dioxide from these two sectors has risen 40 percent, twice the rate of the larger economy. Economists and environmentalists who try to measure the direct effects of efficiency on the lowering of price and the immediate rebound effect generally tend to see the rebound effect as relatively small, in the range of 10 to 30 percent in high-energy consumption areas such as home heating and cooling and cars. But once the indirect effects, apparent at the macro level, are incorporated, the Jevons Paradox remains extremely significant. It is here at the macro level that scale effects come to bear: improvements in energy efficiency can lower the effective cost of various products, propelling the overall economy and expanding overall energy use.31 Ecological economists Mario Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi argue that the Jevons Paradox can only be understood in a macro-evolutionary model, where improvements in efficiency result in changes in the matrices of the economy, such that the overall effect is to increase scale and tempo of the system as a whole

#### Studies prove that increasing efficiency leads to increase use of fossil fuels

York 6 (Richard, Assistant Professor Department of Sociology at the University of Oregon, “Ecological Paradoxes: William Stanley Jevons and the Paperless Office”, <http://www.humanecologyreview.org/pastissues/her132/york.pdf>, July 9, 2012) ALK

The fuel efficiency of automobiles is obviously an issue of substantial importance, since motor vehicles consume a large share of the world’s oil. It would seem reasonable to expect that improvements in the efficiency of engines and refinements in the aerodynamics of automobiles would help to curb motor fuel consumption. However, an examination of recent trends in the fuel consumption of motor vehicles suggests a paradoxical situation where improvements in efficiency are associated with increases in fuel consumption. For example, in the United States an examination of a reasonable indicator of fuel efficiency of automobiles stemming from overall engineering techniques, pound-miles per gallon (or kilogram-kilometers per liter) of fuel, supports the contention that the efficiency of the light duty fleet (which includes passenger cars and light trucks) improved substantially between 1984 and 2001 (the earliest and latest years respectively for which complete data are available), while the total and average fuel consumption of the fleet increased. For the purposes of calculating CAFE (corporate average fuel economy) performance of the nation’s automobile fleet, the light duty fleet is divided into two categories, passenger cars and light trucks (which includes sports utility vehicles [SUVs]), each of which has a different legally enforced CAFE standard7. In 1984 the total light truck fleet CAFE miles per gallon (MPG) was 20.6 (~8.8 kilometers per liter [KPL]) and the average equivalent test weight was 3804 pounds (~1725 kilograms), indicating that the average pound-miles per gallon was 78,364 (20.6 • 3804) (~15,100 kilogram-KPL). By 2001, the total light truck fleet CAFE MPG had improved slightly to 21.0 (~8.9 KPL), while the average vehicle weight had increased substantially, to 4501 pounds (~2040 kilograms). Therefore the pound-miles per gallon had increased to 94,521 (21.0 • 4501) (~18,200 kilogramKPL), a 20.6% improvement in efficiency from 1984. A similar trend happened in passenger cars over this same period. In 1984 the total passenger car fleet CAFE was 26.9 MPG (~11.4 KPL) and the average equivalent test weight was 3170 pounds (~1440 kilograms), indicating that the poundmiles per gallon was 85,273 (26.9 • 3170) (~16,400 kilogramKPL). By 2001, the total passenger car fleet CAFE MPG had improved to 28.7 (~12.2 KPL) while the average vehicle weight had increased to 3446 pounds (~1560 kilograms), making the average fleet pound-miles per gallon 98,900 (28.7 • 3446) (~19,070 kilogram-KPL) — a 16.0% improvement since 1984. Clearly engineering advances had substantially improved the efficiency of both light trucks and passenger cars in terms of pound-miles per gallon (or kilogram-kilometers per liter) between 1984 and 2001. The observation of this fact in isolation might lead one to expect that these improvements in efficiency were associated with a reduction in the fuel consumption of the total light duty fleet. However, this is not what happened. Over this period, light trucks, which on average are heavier and consume more fuel than passenger cars, grew from 24.4% of the light duty fleet to 46.6%. Because of this shift in composition, the CAFE MPG for the combined light duty fleet declined from 25.0 to 24.5 (from ~10.6 to ~10.4 KPL), a 2% decrease. Clearly, engineering advances had improved the efficiency of engines and other aspects of automobiles, but this did not lead to a less fuelthirsty fleet since the size of vehicles increased substantially, particularly due to a shift from passenger cars to light trucks among a large segment of drivers.8 It is worth noting that even if the total fleet MPG had improved, a reduction in fuel consumption would have been unlikely to follow, since over this period the distance traveled by drivers per year increased from little more than 15,000 km (~9300 miles) per car, on average, to over 19,000 km (~11,800 miles) (Smil 2003, 326). And, finally, an increase in the number of drivers and cars on the road drove up fuel consumption even further. For example, between 1990 and 1999, the number of motor vehicles in the U.S. increased from 189 million to 217 million due to both population growth and a 2.8% increase in the number of motor vehicles per 1000 people (from 758 to 779) (World Bank 2005). It appears that technological advances that improved the engineering of cars were in large part put, at least in the U.S., into expanding the size of vehicles, rather than reducing the fuel the average vehicle consumed. The causal explanations for this are likely complex, but the fact that, despite engineering improvements, the U.S. light duty fleet increased its total and average fuel consumption over the past two decades does suggest that technological refinements are unlikely in and of themselves to lead to the conservation of natural resources. Furthermore, it is possible that improvements in efficiency may actually contribute to the expansion of resource consumption, since it is at least plausible that a success at improving the MPG/KPL of a nation’s automobile fleet may encourage drivers to travel more frequently by car, due to the reduction in fuel consumption per mile/kilometer — a situation directly analogous to the one Jevons observed regarding coal use by industry.

### **K Affs**

#### The affirmative rejection of binaries normalizes capitalist relationships of ownership – we must affirm binaries to understand that all social structures are determined by a fundamental division between those that sell their labor power and those that purchase it. The affirmatives alternative results in a class pluralism that makes it impossible to understand these divisions.

Ebert and Zavarzadeh in 2008(Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p. 15-18)

**In materialist theory, class is constructed at the point of production which**, among other things, **means it is based on labor relations in history**. With the rise of private property, ownership of the means of producing commodities-which embody surplus labor-enables some to exploit the labor of others. **The materialist theory** of class **is**, therefore, **a binary theory: it argues that people in class societies are divided between those who sell** (**or are forced to give free**) **their labor power to live, and those who purchase (or appropriate by force) the labor Power of others and profit from it**. In their *Multitude,* Michael **Hardt and** Antonio **Negri call the** classical **materialist theory a "unity" theory** and place it **in opposition to "plurality" theories** of class that "insist on the ineluctable multiplicity of social classes" (103). In their usual manner, **they take an eclectic path out of the binary .and write "that both of these seemingly contradictory positions are true should indicate that the alternative itself may be false"** (104). In the end **they**, **like Derrida, formally concede that class is indispensable for understanding the social (**Derrida, "Marx & Sons"), **but** at the same time they **undermine its very materialist possibility,** **which is the only possibility that actually matters.** Hardt and Negri demolish class, in other words, not by giving up class--in fact they say that the "multitude" is a class concept (l03}-but by the inversion of class from an economic category to a political concept: "Class is determined by class struggle"(l04). It is not the materialism of the relations of property that produce classes, which in turn start class struggle; instead **the subjectivity of people lead them to struggle and through that struggle form classes** (103-104). Hardt and Negri actually find that "the old distinction between economic and political" is an obstacle to understanding class relations (105). Their **dismissal of the binary**, here and in their class theory, **is** in part **based on Negri's call for a "post-deconstructive" ontology** ("The Specter's Smile" 12), **which implies that the binaries are undone by a capitalism that travels on the Internet**. Thus, they can no longer account for its singularities which constitute not only its cultural practices but also its class formations. **There are as many singular classes as there 'are class struggles, and there are as many class struggles as there are subjectivities.** Class, for Hardt and Negri, is an effect of the multitude which is "an irreducible multiplicity; the singular social differences that constitute the multitude must always be expressed and can never be flattened into' sameness, unity, identity, or indifference" (105). **Class in the new capitalism is another name for singularity which is the undoing of the collective**. Using different languages, **the contemporary discourses on class repeat this narrative in which the classical materialist binary theory of class is represented as essentialist and in need of deconstruction. One of the most influential critiques of binary class theory,** as we have already indicated, **is by** Jacques **Derrida**, **whose** general **theory of class and** specifically **his deconstruction of binary class theory we will discuss and critique at several points in this book**. Here, however, we would like to outline what is often called the "class-as-process" theory and point to its underlying logic and class politics, **The class-as-process theory** is the work of Stephen A. Resnick and Richard D. Wolff who, in their groundbreaking book *Knowledge and Class,* **critique the "dichotomous theory of class"** (112) **for its determinism and foundationalism** (109-163) **and propose an anti-essentialist and "overdeterminate"** (I 14, 116) **class theory situated in the multiple processes involved in the extraction and distribution of surplus labor.** Their views are reinterpreted under the strong influence of poststructuralist social theory by J. K. Gibson-Graham in *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it)* (49-56), who repeat their argument for a theory of class "without an essence" (55). We leave aside here how their version of antiessentialism, like all other versions, collapses and becomes a new essentialism in which a trans-historical notion of surplus labor becomes the foundation of a new pro-capital social theory. **Since class-as-process theory views class as an effect of "producing and appropriating surplus labor" (**52), **and because in all societies surplus labor is produced and appropriated, class-as-process theory makes class the immanent feature of all societies throughout history** (58), Even in such societies as early communism and post-capitalist socialism, in which the social surplus labor produced is appropriated not by private owners but by society as a collective, there is class according to this view. **There is no outside to class**-- **ever, anywhere**. Class-as-process is a rather crude translation of Althusser's post-class theory of ideology into class theory. For Althusser ideology is not a "false consciousness" by which the exchange of labor power for wages is seen as being a fair exchange. Instead, he writes that ideology is "the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" *(Lenin and Philosophy 162).* Ideology for Althusser, who draws on Lacan and Freud for his main concepts, is basically a theory of subjectivity (170-177). This is another way of saying that, **for Althusser, "ideology has no history**" (159) because "human societies secrete ideology as the very element and atmosphere indispensable to their historical respiration and life" *(For Marx* 232). Similarly, **for Gibson-Graham, class is an organic part of all societies and not a specific historical stage in them** *(The End of Capitalism* 58-59). All societies, they contend, secrete class. **Given their affirmation that capitalism is here to stay** (263), **it would be "unrealistic**," to use Gibson-Graham's word, **to struggle to end class rule. The practical thing to do is to learn to live with it**. Consequently, the mark of an activist agency in the class-as-process theory is not a militancy to overthrow class because that requires a revolutionary act, which they claim is "outmoded" *(The End of Capitalism* 263). Instead, **they call for an intervention in the homogeneity of class to make it heterogeneous and plural** (52, 58). Class stays; its modalities and forms multiply (52, 58**). This view of class, which is represented as cutting edge** (Gibson-Graham, *A Postcapitalist Politics* 1-21,66-68,90-92), **is interesting not because of its arguments but mostly for what it says about the way the Left in the global North has accommodated and normalized the class interests of capital**. The goal of class-as-process, for example, as Gibson-Graham state, is not to "eradicate all or even specifically capitalist forms of exploitation" but to contribute to "self-transformative class subjectivity"-and change the emotional components of exploitation (53). As always, there is more**. Class-as-process is a discursive device for dis- Solving what Marx calls "the antithesis between lack of property and property."** He argues that this antithesis "so long as it is not comprehended as the antithesis of labour and capital, still remains an indifferent antithesis, not grasped in its *active connection,* in its *internal relation,* not yet grasped as a *contradiction" (Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of* 1844,293-94). **Grasping this contradiction is grasping the binary theory of class and realizing that class is a relation of owning: the owning of labor by capital.** As such, **it is the other of human freedom because it is grounded in the exploitation of humans by humans-private property is the congealed alienated labor of the other**. **Using the epistemological alibi of anti-essentialism, class-as-process obscures the constitutive role of private property** (ownership of the means of production) In the construction of class divisions. Thus, **in the name of opposing economism, It actually protects the economic interests of capital:** "class in our conception is overdetermined, rather than defined by property ownership and other sorts of social relations" (Gibson-Graham, *The End of Capitalism* 179). **Private property, they contend, is only one of many factors that make class** (55, 179), and it is no more significant in this construction than, for example, "affects and emotions" *(A Postcapitalist Politics* 1-21). **But private property is the sensuous "expression of estranged human life," and class is its concrete effect in the every day. "The** positive **transcendence of *private property* as the appropriation of *human life* is therefore the positive transcendence of all estrangement-that is to say the return of man from religion, family, state, etc. to his *human,* i.e. *social,* existence**" (Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of J* 844, 297). **Ending the contradiction of the binary of property and propertyless is the end of class and the end of alienation: it is the beginning of human freedom from necessity**. **Class-as-process naturalizes private property and the estrangement of humans- from their work,** from others and from themselves-by making class the plural effect of "the intersection of all social dimensions or processes-economic, political cultural, natural" (Gibson-Graham, *The End of Capitalism* 55). **By pluralizing class, the class-as-process theorists undermine the importance of private property in constructing class relations and thus absolve capital- whose history is a history of accumulation of private property and is "dripping from head to toe, from every pore, with blood and dirt"** (Marx, *Capital* I, 926). **Other critics**, who argue class has become irrelevant to contemporary society, **claim that**, owing to changes in technology and structural transformations in . capitalism, **the differences within classes have so proliferated they have exceeded the differences between classes, thereby making the binary labor theory of class obsolete.** These views go even further and state that the very premise of hinary theories of class-namely, private ownership as determining class relations- has lost its significance in shaping class relations. **We live, they argue, in post-property times in which property has been displaced by access** (Rifkin, *The Age of Access).* **The** increasing **differences within classes**, however, **do not demolish the binary** **class structures under capital**. **The "differences that flourish within classes,"** as John O'Neill argues, **"do not challenge but even confirm the differences between classes. Poverty is colorless and genderless however much it marks women and racial minorities**" ("Oh, My Others, There Is No Other!" 81).

#### Intellectuals on the left have been critical in normalizing the economic structure of capitalism while criticizing the textures and contours of the system – they preclude the fundamental reality that all social dynamics rely on the mode of production and not the other way around.

Ebert and Zavarzadeh in 2008(Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p. 36-38)

**The** cultural **activism of capital against labor**, however, **was not limited to conservative thinkers. It also** energetically **recruited Left intellectuals and "socialists of the** heart." The defense of free enterprise from the Left has always been of great cultural value to capitalism. **When Left intellectuals defend the market directly-in the guise, for example, of "market socialism"** *(Market Socialism: The Debate among Socialists,* ed. Oilman; *Why Market Socialism? Voices from Dissent,* ed. Roosevelt and Belkin)--**or denounce the enemies of capital as totalitarian, as violators of human rights, and for repressing the play of cultural meanings and thus singularity and heterogeneity** (e.g., Sidney **Hook**, Emesto **Laclau**, Jean-Francois **Lyotard**, Jacques **Derrida**), **their discourses seem more authoritative and sound more credible coming from the supposed critics of capital than do the discourses of conservative authors.** To put it precisely: **the Left has been valuable to capitalism because it has played a double role in legitimating capitalism. It has criticized capitalism as a culture, but has normalized it as an economic system** (e.g., Deleuze and Guat-tari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia;* Duncombe, ed., *Cultural Resistance Reader;* Kraus and Lotringer, eds., *Hatred of Capitalism).* **It** has **complained about capitalism's** so-called corporate **culture**, **but** has **normalized it as a system of wage-labor that** is **grounded on exchange-relations and produces the corporate culture**. **The normalization of capitalism by the Left takes many forms**, **but** all **involve the justification of exploitation, which the Left represents as redemptive. They are** all **versions**-with various degrees of conceptual complexity- -**of** Nicholas D. **Kristof's argument in** his "In **Praise of the Maligned Sweatshop**." **He writes that** the sweatshops in Africa set up by capitalists of the North are in fact "opportunities" and advises that "**anyone who cares about** fighting **poverty should campaign in favor of sweatshops**." His argument is summed up by two sentences printed in boldface and foregrounded in his essay: **"What's worse than being exploited? Not being exploited**" *(The New York Times,* 6 June 2006, A-21). **What** has **made this** double **role** of postwar Left writers **so effective for capitalism is the way their** innovative **writing**, unorthodox **uses of language, and** captivating **arguments have generated** intellectual **excitement**. Jean-Paul **Sartre**, Theodor **Adorno,** Jean-Francais **Lyotard**, Jacques **Derrida**, Judith **Butler**, Jean **Baudrillard**, Jacques **Lacan**, Michel **Foucault**, Gilles **Deleuze**, Giorgio **Agamben**, Slavoj **Zizek**, **and** Stuart **Hall**, to name the most familiar authors, **have each used** quite **different**, **but** still **intellectually intriguing idioms**, **to de-historicize capitalism**. In highly subtle and nuanced arguments, **they have translated capitalism's Authoritarian economic practices**-which quietly force workers to concede to the exploitation of their labor-**into cultural values of free choice and self-sovereignty** (at the same time that they question traditional subjectivity). **Their most effective contributions to capitalism and its economic institutions have been to represent capitalism as a discursive system of meanings and** thus **divert attention away from its economic violence to its semantic transgressions-its homogenizing of meanings** in, for example, popular culture **or its erasure of difference** in cultural lifestyles. **They** have **criticized capitalism**, in other words, **for its** cultural **destruction of human imagination, but** at the same time, they **have condoned its logic of exploitation by dismantling** almost all **the conceptual apparatuses and analytics that offer a materialist understanding of capitalism as an economic system**. More specifically, **they have discredited any efforts to place class at the center of understanding and to grasp the extent and violence of labor practices**. They have done so, in the name of the "new" and with an ecstatic joy bordering on religious zeal (Ronell, *The Telephone Book;* Strangelove, *The Empire of Mind: Digital Piracy and the Anti-Capitalist Movement;* Gibson-Graham, *A Postcapitatist Politics).* **Left thinkers,** for example**, have argued that "new" changes in capitalism**-**the shift**, they claim, **from production to consumption**-**have triggered "a revolution in human thought around the idea of 'culture" which**, under new conditions, **has** itself **become material, "primary and constitutive"** (Hall, "The Centrality of Culture" 220, 215), **and is no** longer secondary and **dependent on** such outside **matters as relations of production**. Consequently, Hall and **others have argued that the analytics of base/superstructure has become irrelevant to sociocultural interpretations because the "new" conditions have rendered such concepts as objectivity, cause and effect, and materialism questionable.** "**The** old **distinction**" **between "**economic **'base' and** the ideological **'superstructure**" therefore **can no longer be sustained because the new culture is** what Fredric Jameson calls **"mediatic**" *(Postmodernism* 68). According to Hall, "media both form a critical part of the material infrastructure ... and are the principal means by which ideas and images are circulated" (Hall 209) . . . The logic of Hall's argument is obtained by treating the "material" as materialist. Media, however, are "material" only in a very trivial sense, they have a body of matter, and are a material vehicle (as a "medium"), but **media are not "materialist**" because, as we argue in our theory of materialism below, **they do not produce "value" and are not "productive." They distribute values produced at the point of production**. The un-said of Hall's claim is that **production and consumption/distribution are no longer distinguishable and more significantly, labor has itself become immaterial-**which is now a popular tenet in the cultural turn (Hardt and Negri, *Multitude).* But, even Paul Thompson, who is not without sympathy for the tum to culture, argues that **"labour is never immaterial. It is not the content of labour but its commodity form that gives 'weight' to an object or idea in a market economy,"** and, he adds, **While it is true that production has been deterritorialised** to an extent, **network firms are not a replacement for the assembly line and do not substitute horizontal for vertical forms of coordination**. Network firms are a type of extended hierarchy, based, as Harrison observes, on concentration without centralisation: 'production may be decentralised, while power finance, distribution, and control remain concentrated among the big firms' *(Lean and Mean: The Changing Landscape of Corporate Power in the Age of Flexibility,* 1994: 20). **Internal networks do not exist independently of these relations of production.** and forms of cooperation, such as teams, are set in motion and monitored by management rather than spontaneously formed. ("Foundation and Empire: A Critique of Hardt and Negri" 84) **Relations of production have shaped and will continue to shape the cultural superstructure. Changes in its phenomenology-**the textures of everyday lifestyles, whether one listens to music in a concert hall, on the radio, or through an iPod-**should not lead to postmodern** Quixotic **fantasies about the autonomy of culture from its material base** [Ebert, *Cultural Critique (with an attitude)].* As Marx writes, the Middle Ages could not live on Catholicism, nor could the ancient world on politics. On the contrary, **it is the manner in which they gained their livelihood which explains why in one case politics, in the other case Catholicism, played the chief part** .... And then **there is** Don **Quixote who long ago paid the penalty for wrongly imagining that knight errantry was compatible with all economic forms of society**. (Marx, *Capital* l, 176).

#### The cultural turn evoked by “post-strategies” attempts to break part any material analysis through the use of discursive analysis – despite their attempts to incorporate materialism it remains culturalist and stuck within the paradigm of capitalism.

Ebert and Zavarzadeh in 2008(Teresa L., English, State University of New York, Albany, Mas’ud, prolific writer and expert on class ideology, “Class in Culture”, p. 27-29)

On the theoretical level, **the attacks on labor focused on the material logic**: the question that Sumner H. Slichter had raised, namely that the U.S. was "shifting from a capitalistic community to a laboristic one-that is to a community in which employees rather than businessmen are the strongest single influence." **This second** cultural **front developed new arguments for the legitimacy, permanence, and transhistorical moral and social authority of capitalism as an economic regime** that was seen as the condition of possibility for human freedom. This is what, for example, F. A. Hayek's writings did. Not only did they provide the grounds for a Neoliberal economics that marginalized Keynesianism, but they also offered an ethics and a philosophy for capitalism (The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism). In a subsequent move, **post-theory** ("post" as in postcolonialism, postrnarxism, poststructuralism, etc.) **translated Neoliberal economies into a new philosophy of representation that made discourse the primary ground of social reality**. Discourse was not simply a "text" in its narrow sense but the ensemble of the phenomena in and through which social production of meaning takes place, an ensemble that constitutes a society as such. **The discursive is** not. therefore, **being conceived** as a level nor even as a dimension of the social, but rather **as being co-extensive with the social**.. .. There is nothing specifically social which is constituted outside the discursive, it is clear that the non-discursive is not opposed to the discursive as if it were a matter of "'1'0 separate levels. History and society are an infinite text. (Laclau, "Populist Rupture and Discourse" 87) **Class in post-theory was turned into a trope whose meanings are wayward and indeterminate**-**a metaphor for a particular language game** (Jenks, Culture 4). **This move has de-materialized class by hollowing out its economic content and turning its materialism into "a materiality without materialism and even perhaps without matter**" (Derrida, "Typewriter Ribbon" 281). **This** de-materializing **has taken place through a network of "post**" interpretive **strategies: Such as "destruction**" (Heidegger, The Basic Problems of Phenomenology 22- 23); **"deconstruction"** (Derrida, "Letter to a Japanese Friend"); **"schizoanalysis"** (Deleuze and Guattari, Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia 273-382); **"reparative reading"** (Sedgwick, Touching Feeling 123-151), **"cultural logic"** (Jameson, Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism); **"performativity"** (Butler, Gender Trouble); **"immaterial labor"** (Hardt and Negri, MultItude), **and "whatever** (qualunque)" (Agamben, The Coming Community). **The goal of both the populist and** the **theoretical campaigns against the labor movement**-which capital often referred to as "socialistic schemes" (Fones- Wolf 52}---**has been the blurring of class lines by depicting class antagonisms as cultural differences,** and to persuade people that, as Wallace F. Bennett, chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers put it, **"We are all capitalists"** (quoted in Fones-Wolf 70-73). In other words, **as far as capitalism is concerned, there are no class differences in the U.S. and what makes people different are their values, lifestyles, and preferences. We call this obscuring of class relations by cultural values and the play of language the "cultural turn."** The term "cultural turn" is often used to designate a 'particular movement in social and cultural inquiries that acquires analytical authority in the 1970s and is exemplified by such books as Hayden White's Metahistory and Clifford Geertz's The Interpretation of Cultures , both of which were published in 1973. White describes history writing as a poetic act and approaches it as essentially a linguistic (tropological) practice (Metahistory ix). **The view of history and social practices as poiesis**-which is most powerfully articulated in Heidegger's writings and is re-written in various idioms by diverse authors from Cleanth Brooks through Jacques Derrida to Giorgio Agamben-**constitutes the interpretive logic of the cultural turn**. Geertz's argument that culture is a semiotic practice, an ensemble of texts (Interpretation of Cultures 3- 30), canonizes the idea of culture as writing in the analytical imaginary. **The cultural tum is associated by some critics with the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s,** whose cultural activism they assume energized rebellion against "scientific" social and cultural inquiries and ushered in the cultural tum with its linguistic reading of culture and emphasis on the subjective (Bonnell and Hunt, ed., Beyond the Cultural Turn 1-32). **Other critics have also related the cultural tum to the radical activism of the post-1968 era and to postmodemism as well as to a tendency among radical intellectuals,** as Larry Ray and Andrew Sayer put it, **to approach language no longer as reflecting "material being" but to read it** (in Heidegger's words) **as the "house of being"** (Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn I). **These and** similar **explanations of the cultural tum are insightful in their own terms**. However, **"their own terms" are not only historically narrow but are conceived within the very terms that they seem to critique: they are, in other words, accounts of the cultural tum from within the cultural tum**. As a result, **in spite of their professed interest in material analysis, their interpretations, like the writings of the cultural tum, remain culturalist. They** too **analyze culture in cultural terms**-that is, **immanently**. **Culture cannot be grasped in its own terms because its own terms are always the terms of ideology. Therefore to understand culture, one needs to look "outside**."

# IMPACTS

### Environment

**The efficiency caused by capitalism is increasing the demand, this causes more emissions which destroys the environment- empirically evidence**

**Foster et al 10** (John Bellamy, is editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology, University of Oregon, Brett Clark, assistant professor of sociology, North Carolina State University, Richard York, co-editor of Organization & Environment and associate professor of sociology, University of Oregon, Monthly Review, “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency: The Return of the Jevons Paradox”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/capitalism-and-the-curse-of-energy-efficiency>, July 2, 2012) ALK

Technological **optimists** have tried to **argue that the rebound effect is small**, **and therefore** **environmental problems can be solved** largely **by technological innovation alone, with the efficiency gains translating into lower throughput of energy and materials** (dematerialization). **Empirical evidence of a substantial rebound effect is**, however, **strong**. **For example,** technological **advancements in** motor **vehicles**, which **have increased the average** **m**iles **p**er **g**allon **of vehicles by 30 percent in the** **U**nited **S**tates **since 1980**, **have not reduced th**e overall **energy used by** motor **vehicles**. **Fuel consumption per vehicle stayed constant while the efficiency gains led to the augmentation**, not only of the numbers of cars and trucks on the roads (and the miles driven), but also their size and “performance” (acceleration rate, cruising speed, etc.)—so that SUVs and minivans now dot U.S. highways. At the macro level, the Jevons Paradox can be seen in the fact that, **even though the** **U**nited **S**tates **has** managed to **double its energy efficiency since 1975**, **its energy consumption has risen dramatically**. Juliet Schor notes that over the last thirty-five years: **energy expended per dollar** of GDP **has been cut in half. But** rather than falling, **energy demand has increased**, by roughly **40 percent**. Moreover, demand is rising fastest in those sectors that have had the biggest efficiency gains—transport and residential energy use**. Refrigerator efficiency improved by 10 percent, but the number of refrigerators in use rose by 20 percent. In aviation, fuel consumption per mile fell by more than 40 percent, but total fuel use grew by 150 percent** because passenger miles rose**. Vehicles are a similar story**. **And with soaring demand, we’ve had soaring emissions**. Carbon dioxide from these two sectors has risen 40 percent, twice the rate of the larger economy. **Economists and environmentalists who try to measure the direct effects of efficiency on the lowering of price and the immediate rebound effect generally tend to see the rebound effect as relatively small,** in the range of 10 to 30 percent in high-energy consumption areas such as home heating and cooling and cars. **But** once **the indirect effects**, apparent **at the** **macro level**, are incorporated, the Jevons Paradox **remain**s extremely **significant**. It is here at the macro level that scale effects come to bear: improvements in energy efficiency can lower the effective cost of various products, propelling the overall economy and expanding overall energy use.31 **Ecological economists** Mario Giampietro and Kozo Mayumi **argue that the Jevons Paradox can only be understood in a macro-evolutionary model, where improvements in efficiency result in changes in the matrices of the economy, such that the overall effect is to increase scale and tempo of the system as a whole**. Most analyses of the Jevons Paradox remain abstract, based on isolated technological effects, and removed from the historical process. **They fail to examine**, as Jevons himself did, the character of industrialization. Moreover, they are still further removed from **a realistic understanding of the accumulation-driven character of capitalist development. An economic system devoted to profits, accumulation, and economic expansion without end will tend to use any efficiency gains or cost reductions to expand the overall scale of production. Technological innovation will therefore be heavily geared to these same expansive ends**. **It is no mere coincidence that** each of the epoch-making innovations (namely, **the steam engine, the railroad, and the automobile**) that dominated the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries **were characterized by their importance in driving capital accumulation and the positive feedback they generated with respect to economic growth as a whole**— so that the scale effects on the economy arising from their development necessarily overshot improvements in technological efficiency.33 Conservation in the aggregate is impossible for capitalism, however much the output/input ratio may be increased in the engineering of a given product. This is because all savings tend to spur further capital formation (provided that investment outlets are available). This is especially the case where core industrial resources—what Jevons called “central materials” or “staple products”—are concerned. The Fallacy of Dematerialization The Jevons Paradox is the product of a capitalist economic system that is unable to conserve on a macro scale, geared, as it is, to maximizing the throughput of energy and materials from resource tap to final waste sink. Energy savings in such a system tend to be used as a means for further development of the economic order, generating what Alfred Lotka called the “maximum energy flux,” rather than minimum energy production.34 The de-emphasis on absolute (as opposed to relative) energy conservation is built into the nature and logic of capitalism as a system unreservedly devoted to the gods of production and profit. As Marx put it: “Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!”35 **Seen in the context of a capitalist society**, the Jevons Paradox therefore **demonstrates the fallacy of current notions that the environmental problems facing society can be solved by purely technological means.** Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist development.36 Each new steam engine, as Jevons emphasized, was more efficient than the one before. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical.”37 What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39 The result is the production of mountains upon mountains of commodities, cheapening unit costs and leading to greater squandering of material resources. Under monopoly capitalism, moreover, such commodities increasingly take the form of artificial use values, promoted by a vast marketing system and designed to instill ever more demand for commodities and the exchange values they represent— as a substitute for the fulfillment of genuine human needs. **Unnecessary, wasteful goods are produced by useless toil to enhance purely economic values at the expense of the environment**. Any slowdown in this process of ecological destruction, under the present system, spells economic disaster. In Jevons’s eyes, the “momentous choice” raised by a continuation of business as usual was simply “between brief but true [national] greatness and longer continued mediocrity.” He opted for the former —the maximum energy flux. A century and a half later, in our much bigger, more global—but no less expansive—economy, **it is no longer simply national supremacy that is at stake, but the fate of the planet itself**. To be sure, there are those who maintain that we should “live high now and let the future take care of itself.” To choose this course, though, is to court planetary disaster. **The only real answer for humanity** (including future generations) **and the earth** as a whole **is to** alter the social relations of production, to **create a system in which efficiency is no longer a curse**—a higher system in which equality, human development, community, and sustainability are the explicit goals.

**Capitalism only encourages consumption and accumulation as the method to advance society- this ensures that environmental reforms are unsustainable-only slowing growth and abandoning a consumption society solves**

**Magdoff and Foster 10** (Fred, professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont and adjunct professor of crop and soil science at Cornell University, John Bellamy, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology, University of Oregon, March 2010, The Monthly Review, “What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism>, July 4, 2012) ALK

**We strongly agree with many environmentalists who have concluded that continuing “business as usual” is the path to global disaster.** Many people have determined that**, in order to limit the ecological footprint of human beings on the earth, we need to have an economy—particularly in the rich countries—that doesn’t grow, so as to be able to stop and possibly reverse the increase in pollutants released, as well as to conserve non-renewable resources and more rationally use renewable resources.** Some environmentalists are concerned that, **if world output keeps expanding and everyone in developing countries seeks to attain the standard of living of the wealthy capitalist states, not only will pollution continue to increase beyond what the earth system can absorb, but we will also run out of the limited non-renewable resources on the globe**. The Limits to Growth by Donella Meadows, Jorgen Randers, Dennis Meadows, and William Behrens, published in 1972 and updated in 2004 as Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update, is an example of concern with this issue.[19](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism#en48) **It is clear that there are biospheric limits, and that the planet cannot support the close to 7 billion people already alive** (nor, of course, the 9 billion projected for mid-century) **at** what is known as a Western, “**middle class” standard of living**. The Worldwatch Institute has recently estimated that a world which used biocapacity per capita at the level of the contemporary United States could only support 1.4 billion people.[20](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism#en47) The primary problem is an ancient one and lies not with those who do not have enough for a decent standard of living, but rather with those for whom enough does not exist. As **Epicurus said: “Nothing is enough to someone for whom enough is little.”**[21](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism" \l "en46)**A global social system organized on the basis of “enough is little” is bound eventually to destroy all around it and itself as well**. Many people are aware of the need for social justice when solving this problem, especially because so many of the poor are living under dangerously precarious conditions, have been especially hard hit by environmental disaster and degradation, and promise to be the main victims if current trends are allowed to continue. It is clear that approximately half of humanity—over three billion people, living in deep poverty and subsisting on less than $2.50 a day—need to have access to the requirements for a basic human existence such as decent housing, a secure food supply, clean water, and medical care. We wholeheartedly agree with all of these concerns.[22](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism#en45) Some environmentalists feel that it is possible to solve most of our problems by tinkering with our economic system, introducing greater energy efficiency and substituting “green” energy sources for fossil fuels—or coming up with technologies to ameliorate the problems (such as using carbon capture from power plants and injecting it deep into the earth). There is a movement toward “green” practices to use as marketing tools or to keep up with other companies claiming to use such practices. Nevertheless, within the environmental movement, there are some for whom it is clear that mere technical adjustments in the current productive system will not be enough to solve the dramatic and potentially catastrophic problems we face. Curtis White begins his 2009 article in Orion, entitled “The Barbaric Heart: Capitalism and the Crisis of Nature,” with: “**There is a fundamental question that environmentalists are not very good at asking, let alone answering: ‘Why is this, the destruction of the natural world, happening?**’”[23](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism#en44) **It is impossible to find real and lasting solutions until we are able satisfactorily to answer this seemingly simple question.** It is our contention that most of the critical environmental problems we have are either caused, or made much worse, by the workings of our economic system. Even such issues as population growth and technology are best viewed in terms of their relation to the socioeconomic organization of society. Environmental problems are not a result of human ignorance or innate greed. They do not arise because managers of individual large corporations or developers are morally deficient. Instead, we must look to the fundamental workings of the economic (and political/social) system for explanations. It is precisely the fact that ecological destruction is built into the inner nature and logic of our present system of production that makes it so difficult to solve.In addition, we shall argue that “**solutions” proposed for environmental devastation, which would allow the current system of production and distribution to proceed unabated, are not real solutions.** In fact, such “**solutions” will make things worse because they give the false impression that the problems are on their way to being overcome when the reality is quite different**.**The overwhelming environmental problems facing the world and its people will not be effectively dealt with until we institute another way for humans to interact with nature—altering the way we make decisions on what and how much to produce. Our most necessary, most rational goals require that we take into account fulfilling basic human needs, and creating just and sustainable conditions on behalf of present and future generations** (which also means being concerned about the preservation of other species).

#### Capitalism causes every environmental impact- it alienates humanity from nature, commodifying precious resources and ensuring eco-crisis

**Foster 7** (John Bellamy, The Monthly Review, “The Ecology of Destruction”, February 2009, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/02/01/the-ecology-of-destruction>, July 7, 2012) ALK

I shall concentrate on the third of these notions, the metabolic rift, since this is the most complex of these three socio-ecological concepts, and the one that has been the focus of my own research in this area, particularly in my book [Marx’s Ecology](http://monthlyreview.org/press/books/pb0122/). Marx was greatly influenced by the work of the leading agricultural chemist of his time, Justus von Liebig. Liebig had developed an analysis of the ecological contradictions of industrialized capitalist agriculture. He argued that such industrialized agriculture, as present in its most developed form in England in the nineteenth century, was a robbery system, depleting the soil. Food and fiber were transported hundreds—even in some cases thousands—of miles from the country to the city. This meant that essential soil nutrients, such as nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, were transported as well. Rather than being returned to the soil these essential nutrients ended up polluting the cities, for example, in the degradation of the Thames in London. The natural conditions for the reproduction of the soil were thus destroyed. To compensate for the resulting decline in soil fertility the British raided the Napoleonic battlefields and the catacombs of Europe for bones with which to fertilize the soil of the English countryside. They also resorted to the importation of guano on a vast scale from the islands off the coast of Peru, followed by the importation of Chilean nitrates (after the War of the Pacific in which Chile seized parts of Peru and Bolivia rich in guano and nitrates). The United States sent out ships throughout the oceans searching for guano, and ended up seizing ninety-four islands, rocks, and keys between the passage of the 1856 Guano Islands Act and 1903, sixty-six of which were officially recognized as U.S. appurtenances and nine of which remain U.S. possessions today.15 This reflected a great crisis of capitalist agriculture in the nineteenth century that was only solved in part with the development of synthetic fertilizer nitrogen early in the twentieth century—and which led eventually to the overuse of fertilizer nitrogen, itself a major environmental problem. In reflecting on this crisis of capitalist agriculture, Marx adopted the concept of metabolism, which had been introduced by nineteenth-century biologists and chemists, including Liebig, and applied it to socio-ecological relations. All life is based on metabolic processes between organisms and their environment. Organisms carry out an exchange of energy and matter with their environment, which are integrated with their own internal life processes. It is not a stretch to think of the nest of a bird as part of the bird’s metabolic process. Marx explicitly defined the labor process as the “metabolic interaction between man and nature.” In terms of the ecological problem he spoke of “an irreparable rift in the interdependent process of social metabolism,” whereby the conditions for the necessary reproduction of the soil were continually severed, breaking the metabolic cycle. “Capitalist production,” he wrote, “therefore only develops the techniques and the degree of combination of the social process of production by simultaneously undermining the original sources of all wealth—the soil and the worker.” Marx saw this rift not simply in national terms but as related to imperialism as well. “England,” he wrote, “has indirectly exported the soil of Ireland, without even allowing its cultivators the means for replacing the constituents of the exhausted soil.”This principle of metabolic rift obviously has a very wide application and has in fact been applied by environmental sociologists in recent years to problems such as global warming and the ecological degradation of the world’s oceans.16 What is seldom recognized, however, is that Marx went immediately from a conception of the metabolic rift to the necessity of metabolic restoration, arguing that “by destroying the circumstances surrounding that metabolism, which originated in a merely natural and spontaneous fashion, it [capitalist production] compels its systematic restoration as a regulative law of social reproduction.” The reality of the metabolic rift pointed to the necessity of the restoration of nature, through sustainable production. It is this dialectical understanding of the socio-ecological problem that led Marx to what is perhaps the most radical conception of socio-ecological sustainability ever developed. Thus he wrote in Capital:From the standpoint of a higher socio-economic formation, the private property of individuals in the earth will appear just as absurd as the private property of one man in other men. Even an entire society, a nation, or all simultaneously existing societies taken together, are not owners of the earth. They are simply its possessors, its beneficiaries, and have to bequeath it in an improved state to succeeding generations, as boni patres familias [good heads of the household].

**Capitalism will cause the depletion of all natural resources-fish species prove**

**Magdoff and Foster 10** (Fred, professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont and adjunct professor of crop and soil science at Cornell University, John Bellamy, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology, University of Oregon, March 2010, The Monthly Review, “What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism>, July 4, 2012) ALK

**The irreversible exhaustion of finite natural resources will leave future generations without the possibility of having use of these resources.** Natural resources are used in the process of production—oil, gas, and coal (fuel), water (in industry and agriculture), trees (for lumber and paper), a variety of mineral deposits (such as iron ore, copper, and bauxite), and so on. Some resources, such as forests and fisheries, are of a finite size, but can be renewed by natural processes if used in a planned system that is flexible enough to change as conditions warrant. Future use of other resources—oil and gas, minerals, aquifers in some desert or dryland areas (prehistorically deposited water)—are limited forever to the supply that currently exists. The water, air, and soil of the biosphere can continue to function well for the living creatures on the planet only if pollution doesn’t exceed their limited capacity to assimilate and render the pollutants harmless. **Business owners** and managers **generally consider the short term in their operations**—most take into account the coming three to five years, or, in some rare instances, up to ten years. This is the way they must function **because of unpredictable business conditions** (phases of the business cycle, competition from other corporations, prices of needed inputs, etc.) and demands from speculators looking for short-term returns. **They therefore act in ways that are largely oblivious of the natural limits to their activities—as if there is an unlimited supply of natural resources for exploitation.** **Even if the reality of limitation enters their consciousness, it merely speeds up the exploitation of a given resource**, which is extracted as rapidly as possible, with capital then moving on to new areas of resource exploitation. **When each individual capitalist pursues the goal of making a profit and accumulating capital, decisions are made that collectively harm society as a whole.** The length of time before nonrenewable deposits are exhausted depends on the size of the deposit and the rate of extraction of the resource. While depletion of some resources may be hundreds of years away (assuming that the rate of growth of extraction remains the same), **limits for** some important ones—**oil and some minerals**—**are not that far off**. For example, while predictions regarding peak oil vary among energy analysts—going by the conservative estimates of oil companies themselves, **at the rate at which oil is currently being used, known reserves will be exhausted within the next fifty years**. The prospect of peak oil is projected in numerous corporate, government, and scientific reports. The question today is not whether peak oil is likely to arrive soon, but simply how soon.[27](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism#en40)Even if usage doesn’t grow, the known deposits of the critical fertilizer ingredient phosphorus that can be exploited on the basis of current technology will be exhausted in this century.[28](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism#en39) Faced with limited natural resources, **there is no rational way to prioritize under a modern capitalist system**, **in which the well-to-do with their economic leverage decide via the market how commodities are allocated. When extraction begins to decline, as is projected for oil within the near future, price increases will put even more pressure on what had been, until recently, the boast of world capitalism: the supposedly prosperous “middle-class” workers of the countries of the center**.The well-documented **decline of many ocean fish species, almost to the point of extinction, is an example of how renewable resources can be exhausted**. It is in the short-term individual interests of the owners of fishing boats—some of which operate at factory scale, catching, processing, and freezing fish—to maximize the take. Hence, the fish are depleted. No one protects the common interest**. In a system run generally on private self-interest and accumulation, the state is normally incapable of doing so. This is sometimes called the tragedy of the commons. But it should be called the tragedy of the private exploitation of the commons.**

**Capitalists exploit resources-fresh water proves**

Foster and Clark 9 (John Bellamy, editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology, University of Oregon and Brett, assistant professor of sociology, North Carolina State University, November 2009, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction” <http://gesd.free.fr/paradoxw.pdf>, July 5, 2012) ALK

**The underlying assumption** here — **that agriculture is the only part of the economy that is sensitive to climate change — is obviously false**. What is truly extraordinary in such views, however, is that the blinders of these leading neoclassical economists effectively prevent even a ray of common sense from getting through. GDP measurements become everything, despite the fact that such measurements are concerned only with economic value added, and not with the entire realm of material existence. **There is no understanding here of production as a system, involving nature (and humanity), outside of national income accounting. Even then, the views stated are astonishingly naïve — failing to realize that a decrease by half of agricultural production would necessarily have an extraordinary impact on the price of food! Today, with a “tsunami of hunger sweeping the world,” and at least one billion people worldwide lacking secure access to food, these statements of only a decade ago by leading mainstream environmental economists seem criminal in their ignorance**.36 The same distorted accounting, pointing to “modest projected impacts” on the economy from global warming, led Nordhaus in 1993 to classify climate change as a “second-tier issue,” and to suggest that “**the conclusion that arises from most economic studies is to impose modest restraints, pack up our tools, and concentrate on more pressing problems.” Although he acknowledged that scientists were worried about the pending environmental catastrophe associated with current trends, the views of most economists were more “sanguine.”**37 None of this should surprise us. **Capitalism’s general orientation with respect to public welfare, as is well known, is a kind of trickle-down economics, in which resources and human labor are exploited intensively to generate immeasurable affluence at the top of society.** This is justified by the false promise that some of this affluence will eventually trickle down to those below. In a similar way, the ecological promises of the system could be called “trickle-down ecology**.” We are told that, by allowing unrestrained accumulation, the environment will be improved through ever greater efficiency** — a kind of secondary effect. The fact that the system’s celebrated efficiency is of a very restricted, destructive kind is hardly mentioned. A peculiarity of capitalism, brought out by the Lauderdale Paradox, is that it feeds on scarcity. Hence, nothing is more dangerous to capitalism as a system than abundance. **Waste and destruction are** therefore **rational for the system**. **Although it is often supposed that increasing environmental costs will restrict economic growth, the fact is that such costs continue to be externalized under capitalism on nature (and society) as a whole**. This perversely provides new prospects for private profits through the selective commodification of parts of nature (public wealth). **All of this points to the fact that there is no real feedback mechanism, as commonly supposed, from rising ecological costs to economic crisis, that can be counted on to check capitalism’s destruction of the biospheric conditions of civilization and life itself**. By the perverse logic of the system, whole new industries and markets aimed at profiting on planetary destruction, such as the waste management industry and carbon trading, are being opened up. These **new markets are justified as offering partial, ad hoc “solutions” to the problems generated non-stop by capital’s laws of motion**.38 In fact, **the growth of natural scarcity is seen as a golden opportunity in which to further privatize the world’s commons. This tragedy of the privatization of the commons only accelerates the destruction of the natural environment, while enlarging the system that weighs upon it**. **This is best illustrated by the rapid privatization of fresh water, which is now seen as a new mega-market for global accumulation. The drying up and contamination of freshwater diminishes public wealth, creating investment opportunities for capital, while profits made from selling increasingly scarce water are recorded as contributions to income and riches.** It is not surprising, therefore, that the UN Commission on Sustainable Development proposed, at a 1998 conference in Paris, that governments should turn to “large multinational corporations” in addressing issues of water scarcity, establishing “open markets” in water rights. **Gérard Mestrallet, CEO of the global water giant Suez**, has openly **pronounced: “Water is an efficient product. It is a product which normally would be free, and our job is to sell it. But it is a product which is absolutely necessary for life**.” He further remarked: **“Where else** [other than in the monopolization of increasingly scarce water resources for private gain] **can you find a business that’s totally international, where the prices and volumes, unlike steel, rarely go down?”**39 **Not only water offers new opportunities for profiting on scarcity. This is also the case with respect to fuel and food. Growing fuel shortages, as world oil demand has outrun supply — with peak oil approaching — has led to increases in the prices of fossil fuels and energy in general, and to a global shift in agriculture from food crops to fuel crops**. This has generated a boom in the agrofuel market (expedited by governments on the grounds of “national security” concerns). The result has been greater food scarcities, inducing an upward spiral in food prices and the spiking of world hunger. Speculators have seen this as an opportunity for getting richer quicker through the monopolization of land and primary commodity resources.40 Similar issues arise with respect to carbon-trading schemes, ostensibly aimed at promoting profits while reducing carbon emissions. Such schemes continue to be advanced despite the fact that experiments in this respect thus far have been a failure — in reducing emissions. Here, the expansion of capital trumps actual public interest in protecting the vital conditions of life. At all times, ruling-class circles actively work to prevent radical structural change in this as in other areas, since any substantial transformation in social-environmental relations would mean challenging the treadmill of production itself, and launching an ecological-cultural revolution. Indeed, **from the standpoint of capital accumulation, global warming and desertification are blessings in disguise, increasing the prospects of expanding private riches**. We are thus driven back to Lauderdale’s question: “What opinion,” he asked, “would be entertained of the understanding of a man, who, as the means of increasing the wealth of…a country should propose to create a scarcity of water, the abundance of which was deservedly considered one of the greatest blessings incident to the community? It is certain, however, that such a projector would, by this means, succeed in increasing the mass of individual riches.”41 Numerous ecological critics have, of course, tried to address the contradictions associated with the devaluation of nature by designing new green accounting systems that would include losses of “natural capital.”42 Although such attempts are important in bringing out the irrationality of the system, they run into the harsh reality that the current system of national accounts does accurately reflect capitalist realities of the non-valuation/undervaluation of natural agents (including human labor power itself). To alter this, it is necessary to transcend the system. The dominant form of valuation, in our age of global ecological crisis, is a true reflection of capitalism’s mode of social and environmental degradation — causing it to profit on the destruction the planet. In Marx’s critique, value was conceived of as an alienated form of wealth.43 Real wealth came from nature and labor power and was associated with the fulfillment of genuine human needs. Indeed, “it would be wrong,” Marx wrote, “to say that labour which produces use-values is the only source of the wealth produced by it, that is of material wealth….Use-value always comprises a natural element….Labour is a natural condition of human existence, a condition of material interchange [metabolism] between man and nature.” From this standpoint, Lauderdale’s paradox was not a mere enigma of economic analysis, but rather the supreme contradiction of a system that, as Marx stressed, developed only by “simultaneously undermining the original sources of all wealth — the soil and the worker.”

### War

#### Capitalism means war

Socialist labor party 3 (<http://www.slp.org/res_state_htm/whywar_iraq.html>) jjv

“The underlying problem the U.S. confronts is the one which periodically afflicts all successful [sic] economies: the over-accumulation of capital.

Excessive production of any good—be it cars or shoes or bananas—means that unless new markets can be found, the price of that product falls and profits collapse. Just as it was in the early 1930s, the U.S. is suffering from surpluses of commodities, manufactured products, manufacturing capacity and money. Just as it was then, it is also faced with a surplus of labor, yet the two surpluses, as before, cannot be profitably matched. This problem has been developing in the U.S. since 1973. It has now tried every available means of solving it and, by doing so, maintaining its global dominance. The only remaining, politically viable option is war.” Obviously it is ludicrous to describe as “successful” a system that produces such contradictions and has no better way of coping with them than war. Apart from that, however, this evaluation is essentially correct. The Guardian continued by citing some of the advantages the United States hopes to gain by resorting to its “solution” to its problems—another war on Iraq. “Attacking Iraq offers the U.S....means of offloading capital while maintaining its global dominance. The first is the creation of new geographical space for economic expansion. The second...is military spending (a process some people call ‘military Keynesian-ism’). The third is the ability to control the economies of other nations by controlling the supply of oil. This, as global oil reserves diminish, will become an ever more powerful lever....” Under the overriding competitive profit motive inherent in capitalism, and in the reaching out for control over sources of oil and other raw materials so vital to modern industry, clashes are inevitable. Considering the basic cause and real factors that have produced the wars that have plagued a world dominated by capitalism, it is obviously irrational to blame international disputes and wars on this or that individual or group of individuals. Capitalism means war. Saddam Hussein and his government may be utterly crushed by another war, but at a horrendous price in human blood and suffering. None of the basic problems that beset the Middle East and its long-suffering peoples will be solved. It will not resolve the contradictions of capitalism or make the world a safer place. For when the war ends, the identical process will start again, leading to new clashes of interest and in time to the next greater and more destructive war.

#### Neoliberal motives have fueled military aggression

Robinson, UC Santa Barbara Professor of Sociology, 7

(William I., 2007, Societies Without Borders 2, “Beyond the Theory of Imperialism: Global Capitalism and the Transnational State,” <http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/beyond_imperialism.pdf>, p. 21, accessed 7/9/2012, bs)

Neo-liberalism “peacefully” forced open new areas for global capital in the 1980s and the 1990s. This was often accomplished through economic coercion alone, 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 have been drying up as privatizations ran their course, the “socialist” countries became integrated, the consumption of high-income sectors worldwide reached ceilings, spending through private credit expansion could not be sustained, and so on. The space for “peaceful” expansion, both intensive and extensive, has become ever more restricted. Military aggression becomes an instrument for prying open new sectors and regions, for the forcible restructuring of space in order to further accumulation. The train of neo-liberalism 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 neo-liberal austerity in place, and legitimates the creation of a police state to repress political dissent in the name of security.

#### Capitalism and insecurity are mutually reinforcing- the expansion of new markets guarantees generation of new risks and war

Goodman 9 Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology in Sydney

James Goodman, “Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/4/Global-capitalism-and-the-production-of-insecurity, 7-7-12, JL

Irresistibly, insecurity and coercion force new agendas onto the table, agendas that impose human values against the abstract exchange-values of the cash nexus. Deep divides have opened up between the state – capital nexus and the materiality of everyday life. The juridical claims of new constitutionalism, constructed with greater intensity from the early 1990s, hand-in-hand with the heightened military preparedness, were confronted by the lived reality of marginality in manifold counter-globalist upsurges framed as “ global justice movements ” (Rupert 2003; Goodman 2007). Lately, as noted, we have experienced the intensive exercise of command in the so-called War on Terror, itself confronted by an unprecedented global anti-war movement. Claims for a War on Terror have continued to implode, and are actively opposed both in the United States and worldwide. We may then speculate that naked coercion is itself a measure of weakness, not strength. We can argue that the coercive logic of power exposes the imperial project, making it vulnerable to assault. Ahmad argues we are experiencing “for the ﬁrst time in history, a globalized empire of capital itself, in all its nakedness” (Ahmad 2000: 1). Harvey goes so far as to predict “economic suicide” if the US doctrine of “permanent war” is maintained (Harvey 2003: 207). Wallerstein agrees, arguing that “there is little doubt the United States will continue to decline as a decisive force in world aﬀairs over the next decade” (Wallerstein 2003: 27). Counter-intuitively, decline only seems to embolden the advocates of permanent war. In 2003 the United States and its allies invaded Iraq, ﬂouting the UN Charter, against the largest world protest ever assembled. The mystique of command has remained powerful, and has been electorally popular. In 2004, both the US Presidency and the Australian Government aﬃrmed their electoral base. It was only in 2007, after four years of sustained policy failure, that political blocs began to shift. The very process of collective suicide — in Harvey’s terms — and the ratcheting risks and insecurities this entails; seem to be mutually reinforcing. There is, it seems, a deep insecurity dynamic at play, expressing the commodiﬁcation – militarization process.

### Racism/Sexism

#### Capitalism leads to the destruction of humanity, racism, and sexism

Brown 5 (Charles, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, 05/13/2005, http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm)

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

### Genocide

#### Capitalism polarizes scio-classes and leads to prejudice and genocide

Corrigan 11 (Stephen Corrigan, January 2011, scholar from the department of Phycology at the University of Portsmouth. “The Role of Capitalism in Constructing and Maintaining Mass Hate and Genocide”

<http://port.academia.edu/StephenCorrigan/Papers/451469/The_Role_of_Capitalism_in_Constructing_and_Maintaining_Mass_Hate_and_Genocide>) MB

Capitalism Fuelling Prejudice Marxism focuses on the State creating polarised socio-classes; the proletariat (work force) and the bourgeoisie (ruling class), making inequality inevitable (Quinney, 1975, p192). Social Disorganisation highlights inner-city areas consisting highly of ethnic minority populations as they are largely ascribed to the proletariat socio-class (cited by Rock, 2007, p19). This socio-polarisation limits ethnic minorities from achieving transgression up the socio-economic ladder as their working opportunities are restricted, and they are depicted socially inferior to the ruling bourgeoisie (Quinney, 1975, p193). This allows blame for unattainable economic progression to be mobilised against the minority faction making them appear harmful to society (Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke & Roberts, 1978, p387). The role of Capitalism is therefore centred on its differentiation between socio-classes, enabling discrimination to ensue by allowing the powerful to form prejudices against the powerless. Capitalism can extend mass-hate beyond initial borders, with economic progression being an overriding principle. Marxism argues Colonialism extends Capitalism, promoting social inequality elsewhere to profit the metropole (Head State) at the expense of the indigenous people (Stoler & Cooper, 1997, p3). This can result in social inequality being manufactured against the indigenous majority, making Capitalism instrumental in constructing mass-hate and genocide. Capitalist regimes promote ‘individualistic concerns,’ but can individual prejudice flourish under collective powers? Capitalism Collectives Negate Individual Prejudice

#### Neoliberalism is the root cause of poverty and genocide

Pramono NO DATE (Siswo Pramono, writer from the Journal of Economic and Social Research, “The Genocidal Global Politics and Neoliberalism” <http://jesr.journal.fatih.edu.tr/Neoliberalism.pdf> MB)

In global politics, neoliberalism preoccupies itself with the promotion of four basic issues: (1) global democracy, (2) free trade, (3) global governance through international organizations, and (4) collective security. Neoliberalism focuses on regime creation and institutional building. It attempts, and with great success, to expand the global agenda beyond a mere military strategy (i.e the agenda of traditional realist called the high politics); (micro)economics is now the prima donna of the show. As such, neoliberalism, in its crudest form, is crystallised in the Ten Commandments of the 1989 Washington Consensus (policy instruments set for the world by the US and international financial institutions): • FISCAL DISCIPLINE: strict criteria for limiting budget deficits; • PUBLIC EXPENDITURE PRIORITIES: away from subsidies and administration towards 'neglected fields with high economic returns and the potential to improve income distribution, such as primary health and education, and infrastructure'; • TAX REFORM: broadening the tax base and cutting marginal tax rates;The Genocidal Global Politics and Neoliberalism 117 • FINANCIAL LIBERALIZATION: interest rates should ideally be market-determined; • EXCHANGE RATES: should be managed to induce rapid growth in non-traditional exports; • TRADE LIBERALIZATION: tariffs not quotas, and declining tariffs to around 10 percent within 10 years; • FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT: no barriers and 'equality' with domestic firms; • PRIVATIZATION: state enterprises should be privatized; • DEREGULATION: abolition of 'regulations that impede the entry of new firms or restrict competition', and establishing 'such criteria as safety, environmental protection, or prudential supervision of financial institutions' as the means to justify those which remain; • PROPERTY RIGHTS: secure rights without excessive costs and available to the informal sector (Bretton Wood Project, 2003: 1). But a decade after the forced implementation of the Washington Consensus, or neoliberal globalisation, Joseph Stiglitz, the former Chief Economist at the World Bank, issued the following statement: ...trade liberalization accompanied by high interest rate is an almost certain recipe for job destruction and unemployment creation —at the expense of the poor. Financial market liberalization unaccompanied by an appropriate regulatory structure is an almost certain recipe for economic instability —and may well lead to higher, not lower interest rates, making it harder for poor farmers to buy the seeds and fertilizers that can raise them above subsistence. Privatization, unaccompanied by competition policies and oversight to ensure that monopoly powers are not abused, can lead to higher, not lower, prices for consumers. Fiscal austerity, pursued blindly, in the wrong circumstances, can lead to high unemployment and shredding of the social contract (Stiglitz, 2002: 84). High unemployment and the shredding of the social contract will be the focus of a later discussion in this paper. But, at present, the point is that Stiglitz does not question the truism of neoliberalism (for he does not contend any of the ten principles of the Washington Consensus), but the dogmatic implementation of the consensus. Stiglitz rejects the "one size fits all" principle in the implementation of the consensus. Local varieties matter. However, while criticising the malpractice of capitalism, and while acknowledging various versions of the market model, and while encouraging some roles of the states in the case of market failures, for Stiglitz (2002), the market is the only way of post-Cold War global governance. With such a position at hand, this winner of the Nobel Prize for economics 2001 can only enhance the nuances of market fundamentalism. As such, the genocidal nature of neoliberalism is rooted in the closure (or fundamentalist) character of this paradigm. The closure was amplified in Fukuyama's claim that, by the end of the Cold War, human societies have reached "...the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government" (1989: 4, italic added). For him, final means the end of history. But what is it that actually comes to an end?

### Moral Value

#### Capitalism alienates consumers by replacing all authentic relationships with commodity ones-only consumption of material goods can provide happiness-this isolation is at the root of social problems

**McGregor 3** (Sue McGregor, April 2003, Coordinator, Undergraduate Peace and Conflict Studies Program Mount Saint Vincent University, “Consumerism as a Source of Structural Violence” <http://www.kon.org/hswp/archive/consumerism.pdf> MB)

For the sake of the argument presented in this working paper, consumerism is viewed as a facet of the ideology of contemporary capitalism. Escalating technological development (automation) plus exponential investment capital accumulation have, for a global minority, shifted the emphasis from skilful work to credit-worthy consumption. The work is now done by automated processes at home in the domestic market and elsewhere in the global free-market via the intensified exploitation of people and their environment. Capitalists need consumers to buy products. To ensure that this facet of capitalism exists, social structures and processes have evolved which support and stimulate acquisitiveness in a specific social culture called the "consumer society" (Jones, 1997). A consumer society has the following characteristics (drawn from McGregor, 2001). Identities are built largely out of things because things have meaning. People measure their lives by money and ownership of things. People are convinced that to consume is the surest route to personal happiness, social status, and national success. Advertising, packaging, and marketing create illusory needs that are deemed real because the “economic” machine has made people feel inferior and inadequate. To keep the economic machine moving, people have to be dissatisfied with what they have, hence, with whom they are. Consequently, the meaning of one’s life is located in acquisition, ownership, and consumption. In a consumer society, market values permeate every aspect of daily lives. Marketplaces are abstract, stripped of culture (except the culture of consumption), of social relations, and of any social-historical context. Consumers are placed at the center of the “good society” as individuals who freely and autonomously pursue choices through rational means, creating a society through the power they exercise in the market. Consequently, in a consumer society, there is a widespread lack of moral discipline, a glorification of greed and material accumulation, an increased breakdown in family and community, a rise of lawlessness and disorder, an ascendancy of racism and bigotry, a rise in the priority of national interests over the welfare of humanity, and an increase in alienation and isolation. Social space is reorganized around leisure and consumption as central social pursuits and as the basis for social relationships. A consumer society needs leisure to be commercialized and the home to be mechanized in order that time and energy are freed up for shopping and producing more things to buy. Social activities and emotions are turned into economic activities through the process of commodification.

#### Capitalism generates a consumer society that encourages us to de-humanize one another in the name of material gain-this alienation should be rejected

**McGregor 3** (Sue McGregor, April 2003, Coordinator, Undergraduate Peace and Conflict Studies Program Mount Saint Vincent University, “Consumerism as a Source of Structural Violence” <http://www.kon.org/hswp/archive/consumerism.pdf> MB)

In a consumer society, the act of consuming eventually leads to materialism, defined as a culture where material interests are primary and supercede other social goals (Friedman, 1993). Durning (1992) claims that people living in a consumer culture attempt to satisfy social, emotional, and spiritual needs with material things. This materialism eventually co-opts people’s physical lives, community, and spirit because it gives a misleading sense of being in control and secure, in the short term.A consumer society is fast paced, based on round the clock living but people were not biologically designed for this pace. To compensate for the stress, as a quick fix, people believe that all problems have a material or money solution. People use spending and materialism as a way to build a new ego. People try to become new persons by buying products that support their self-image. Displaying all of the goods one has accumulated helps one gain prestige and envy, thereby living out the ideology of conspicuous consumption. Unfortunately, this practice creates a false, temporary sense of inner peace because the religion of the market (a system of beliefs) co-opts aspects of humanity and spirituality. People eventually begin to think that things are out of whack, that their priorities are mixed up, that their moral center is being lost so . . . they spend more to cover up the fear. To exacerbate this fear, technology has left people isolated with no sense of belonging. It has cocooned them to the extent that they are blinded to their destructive ways. Wisalo (1999) suggests that such destructive consumerism occurs because of humans’ insecurity in their hearts and minds. Ironically, people allegedly consume to gain this security. He says that people feel they can become a new person by purchasing those products that support their self-image of whom they are, want to be, and where they want to go. Unfortunately, this approach to becoming a new person, to developing a sense of self, is unsustainable. People "under the influence of consumerism" never feel completely satisfied because owning something cannot help meet the security of heart and mind, the deeper needs of humanity. Constantly spending and accumulating only gives short-term fulfilment and relief from the need to have peace and security in life.

### Oppression/exclusion

#### The exploitation of labor is masked but inevitable in the commodification of people in the system of capitalism

Shimp 9 (Kaleb, Department of Economics, University of Northern Iowa “The Validity of Karl Marx's Theory of Historical Materialism” <http://business.uni.edu/economics/Themes/shimp.pdf> p. 46-47) APB

Capitalism is the current mode of production. It is a mode dominated by private property and markets. Businesses own machines, buildings, and look and use these 10 produce different items that can be sold in markets to make a profit. That is the general premise. It is also a mode characterized by the takeover of commodity-forms and rapid growth in productive forces. In capitalism, individuals are not tied to land, guilds, or owned in any way. On the surface, they are free to make any decision they see fit. In order to make a living, individuals generally choose to be employed by businesses where they earn a wage in return for their labor. They essentially sell their labor to the business. This is an illustration of the takeover of commodity-form as labor is put into its commodity-form where businesses compare it to another commodity, money, and determine what amounts these commodities will trade for based upon the work the individual will perform. In order to increase productivity and the surplus they ex tract, businesses offer incentives to their workers in the form of promotions, bonuses, stock options, etc. The increase in productive forces provided by these incentives help the businesses in the pursuit of profits and the incentives themselves help the workers to provide for themselves. Everything seems balanced. Productive forces increase, workers earn a wage, and no one is coerced. But if one looks closer, underlying the exchange of labor is another form of coercion and class struggle that is more hidden than the previous modes of production. The lower class is forced to work for the upper class because of the necessity of survival. David Laibman wrote; The capitalist relation of exploitation is unique... its key elements, labor-power and capital, both assume the form of commodities. This enables a structure of domination and surplus extraction to assume an outward form of personal (individual) equality and voluntary (rational ) choice, a form that is not merely a disguise or illusion, but is objectively present in the social experience of the actors in this drama. Understood in this way, the capitalist market is a uniquely powerful engine of coercion and exploitation. (2006,198) The capitalist lower class is coerced into working for the capitalist ruling class. Even though members of the lower class have their choice of which employer to sell their labor to, the fact remains that they must sell their labor to survive. Once their labor Is sold, members of the lower class remains stuck in their role and they cannot escape without losing their means of livelihood (Marx and Engels 1983,177). Although it is not obvious, class antagonism still exists within capitalism.

### Security Impact Turn

#### The effects of securitization by capitalists not only sustains poverty but also increases threats

Griffiths 9 Martin Griffiths is Associate Professor in the School of Political and International Studies at Flinders University, Australia.

Martin Griffiths, “Zones of conﬂict and the global War on Terror,” <http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/Grenfell-James-Rethinking-In-Security-War-and-Violence-Beyond-Savage-Globalization-2009>, 7-8-12, JL)

The very foundations of the neoliberal orthodoxy that has informed the thinking of the key Bretton Woods institutions have been dramatically shaken in the context of the 1990s. The process of neoliberal restructuring has been associated with a weak growth performance, persistent poverty, rising inequality, and endemic crises with costly ramiﬁcations. Countries that performed better than average have typically been those (such as China and Malaysia) that have managed to deviate from rigid neoliberal norms. In this chapter, I have argued that there is a fundamental tension between American support for neo-liberal forms of economic globalization and the global war on terror. There is compelling evidence that although inequality and poverty do not in themselves cause terrorism, when combined with the absence of what Michael Mousseau (2003) calls “market civilization” in many developing countries, they feed much of the anti-American resentment that sustains sympathy for, if not participation in, terrorist organizations such as al-Qaida. The con-sequences of neoliberal policies at the global level have been the subject of much academic debate in recent years, but it is clear that the beneﬁts of globalization are distributed in an extremely uneven fashion. Large parts of the periphery are left behind entirely. At the level of global economic governance, there is a growing imbalance in rule-making. Those rules that favor global market expansion have become more robust and enforceable: intellectual property rights, for example, or dispute resolution in the World Trade Organization. However, rules intended to promote social objectives, such as labor standards, human rights, environmental quality, or poverty reduction, lag far behind. In short, processes of globalization promote “military deglobalization” in the core, where military expenditures (with the marked exception of the United States) are in decline, incentives for war are reduced (particularly among democracies) and supra-territoriality is on the rise. However, the same processes that have helped to create and maintain “zones of peace” in the core have contributed to chronic insecurity for people within states in the periphery. Glossing over this co-constitutive relationship between zones of peace and zones of violent conﬂict has practical implications for policy-making. It renders it diﬃcult if not impossible for the “zone of disorder” to join the “zone of peace,” notwithstanding the Bush Administration’s rhetorical commitment to state-building, democratic freedom and economic liberalization on a global scale.

### Root Cause

#### Capitalism is the root cause of the holocaust

Internationalist Perspective 8 (“Marxism and the Holocaust” http://internationalist-perspective.org/IP/ip-archive/ip\_49\_holocaust.html)

In the specific case of Nazi Germany, Götz Aly and Susanne Heim have argued that the extermination of the Jews was the first stage of a far-reaching demographic project in the service of economic modernisation. Germany's attempt to confront Anglo-American domination of the world market entailed the creation of a vast economic space (Grossraumwirtschaft), continental autarky for Europe, under German hegemony. But such a project was not simply based on geographical expansion; it also necessitated vast demographic changes, especially in Eastern Europe. There, the German planners, demographers, and economists, whose projects Aly and Heim have investigated, confronted a problem of economic backwardness linked to overpopulation. (47) A vast agricultural population, with small landholdings and extremely low productivity, was a formidable obstacle both to German hopes for autarky in food production for the European continent, and for industrial development, economic modernisation, in the East, so as to make the German economic space competitive with Anglo-American capital. The Jews in Eastern Europe, both as a largely urban population, and as the owners of small, unproductive, businesses, constituted a particular obstacle to the migration of Slavs from the overpopulated countryside to the cities, such that their elimination was seen as a pre-requisite for economic development. Moreover, for these planners, such processes of economic transformation could not be left to `market forces,' which in England, the US, and in Western Europe, had taken generations, but, given the exigencies of imperialist competition and war, had to be undertaken by the state on the quick. The Generalplan Ost, within which the extermination of the Jews was the first stage, envisaged the elimination, by `resettlement' (beyond the Urals), death by starvation and slave labour, or mass murder, of a surplus population of perhaps fifty million human beings. (48)

#### Capitalism is the root cause of every impact

Internationalist Perspective 2k, (“Capitalism and Genocide” 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!

#### Capitalism is the root cause of all impacts

Webb 4 (Sam, masters in econ at uconn, “War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush.” 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.

# Alternatives

## Alt Solvency

### General

The alt solves: the rejection of surplus value prevents class formation but it requires total fidelity to the revolutionary project

Shimp 9 (Kaleb, Department of Economics, University of Northern Iowa “The Validity of Karl Marx's Theory of Historical Materialism” <http://business.uni.edu/economics/Themes/shimp.pdf> p. 54-55) APB

It cannot be denied that Marx wrote very little about Oriental societies. This may be due cither to a lack of information or a lack of caring. The quote from Grundisse, however, can be used to illustrate why the Oriental societies are an exception. In order for the Asiatic mode of production to dissipate, a contradiction has to be present. In this state of underdeveloped productive forces, no contradiction exists. In the Asiatic mode of production, as with primitive communism, no classes exist; the only way for antagonistic classes to form is if the productive forces improve and a surplus is created. The presence of a surplus provides motivation for individuals to break from the commune in order to gain control of this surplus. These individuals capture the surplus and emerge into new social strata such as warrior castes, priesthoods, nobles and commoners (Laibman2006,186). The emergence of classes signifies an end to primitive communism. In the Asiatic mode of production, no surplus is present. Therefore, there is no motivation for individuals to break from the commune. There is a "self-sustaining circle of production, unity of agriculture and manufactures, etc." within the Oriental societies that prevent class formation (Marx 1993,486). The "self-sustaining circle of production" is why the Oriental societies remain unchanged. Marx describes this phenomenon in Capital when he discusses the ancient Indian communities. Within each of these communities, a division of labor exists where certain people perform certain tasks that provide for everyone within the small communities. When the population increases, a new community forms on vacant land (Marx 1990,478). These communities are isolated. Because of this, the market is unchanged and people develop no new or additional wants. Hence, there is no upward pressure on the productive forces to satisfy the growing needs and wants of the market. Therefore, the Asiatic mode of production subsists. Giddens recognizes this by saying that the stagnation of productive forces due to circumstances within specific societies is consistent with Marx’s work in Grundisse (1995,84). Still, Giddens and many others feel that the productive forces do not "underlie the major episodic transitions" throughout history (1995, 84-5).

#### Endorsing the negative project of historical totalizing is the only way to recognize the continuity of class domination.

San Juan 6 (Epifanio, Jr., Fulbright Lecturer in American Studies at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, “Crisis and Contradiction in Globalization Discourse” http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/crisisandcontradictioninglobalizationdiscourse.htm) APB

In order to probe and analyze the multilayered contradictions of any phenomenon, we need to apply the principle of historical totalizing: connecting spheres of culture, ideology, and politics to the overarching structure of production and reproduction. This is axiomatic for any historical-materialist critique. Consequently, the question of cultural identity cannot be mechanically divorced from the historically determinate mode of production and attendant social relations of any given socioeconomic formation. What is the point of eulogizing hybrid, cyborg-esque, nomadic global citizens—even fluid, ambivalent "subject positions" if you like—when the majority of these postmodernized creatures are dying of hunger, curable epidemics, diseases and psychosomatic illnesses brought about precisely by the predatory encroachment of globalizing transnational corporations, mostly based in the U.S. and Western Europe? But it is not just academic postmodernists suffering from the virus of pragmatist metaphysics who apologize for profit-making globalization. Even a latterly repentant World Bank expert, Joseph Stiglitz, could submit in his well-known Globalization and Its Discontents, the following ideological plea: "Foreign aid, another aspect of the globalized world, for all its faults still has brought benefits to millions, often in ways that have almost gone unnoticed: guerillas in the Philippines were provided jobs by a World Bank financed-project as they laid down their arms" (Stiglitz 420). Any one slightly familiar with the Cold War policies of Washington vis-à-vis a neocolony like the Philippines knows that World Bank funds were then used by the U.S. Pentagon to suppress the Communist Party-led peasant rebellion in the 1950s against the iniquitous semi-feudal system and corrupt comprador regime (Doty; Constantino). It is globalization utilized to maintain direct coercive U.S. domination of the Philippines at a crucial conjuncture when the Korean War was mutating into the Vietnam War, all designed to contain "World Communism" (China, Soviet Union). Up to now, despite nationalist gains in the last decade, the Philippine government plays host every year to thousands of U.S. "Special Forces" purportedly training Filipino troops in the war against "terrorism"—that is, against anti-imperialist forces like the Communist Party-led New People's Army and progressive elements of the Moro Islamic National Liberation Front and the Moro National Liberation Front (International Peace Mission). One needs to repeat again that the present world system, as Hugo Radice argues, remains "both global and national", a contingent and contradictory process (4). Globalization dialectically negates and affirms national entities—pseudo-nations as well as those peoples struggling for various forms of national sovereignty. While a universal "free market" promoted by TNC triumphalism is deemed to be homogenizing and centralizing in effect, abolishing independent states/nationalities, and creating a global public sphere through juxtaposition, syncretic amalgamation, and so on, one perceives a counter-current of fragmentation, increasing asymmetry, unbridgeable inequalities, and particularistic challenges to neoliberal integration—including fundamentalist political Islam, eco-terrorism, drugs, migration, and other movements of "barbarians at the gates" (Schaeffer). Is it a question of mere human rights in representation and life-style, or actual dignity and justice in the everyday lives of whole populations with singular life-forms? Articulating these historical contradictions without theorizing the concept of crisis in capital accumulation will only lead to the short-circuiting transculturalism of Ashcroft and other ideologies waging battle for supremacy/hegemony over "popular common sense" imposing meaning/order/significance on the whole globalization process (Rupert). Indeed, academic inquirers of globalization are protagonists in this unfolding drama of universalization under duress. One may pose the following questions as a heuristic pedagogical maneuver: Can globalized capital truly universalize the world and bring freedom and prosperity to everyone, as its celebrants claim? Globalization as the transnationalized domination of capital exposes its historical limit in the deepening class inequality in a polarized, segregated and policed world. While surplus-value extraction in the international labor market remains basic to the logic of accumulation, the ideology of neoliberal transnationalism has evolved into the discourse of war on terrorism ("extremism") rationalized as "the clash of civilizations". Contradictions and its temporary resolutions constitute the imperialist project of eliding the crisis of unilateral globalism. A historical-materialist critique should seek to highlight the political economy of this recolonizing strategy operating in the fierce competition of the ruling classes of the U.S., Japan, and Europe to impose hegemonic control in an increasingly boundary-destroying space and continue the neocolonial oppression of the rest of the world. What is needed is a radical critique of the ideology of technological determinism and its associated apologetics of the "civilizing mission", the evangelism of "pre-emptive" intervention in the name of Realpolitik "democracy" against resistance by workers, peasants, women, indigenous communities (in Latin America, Africa, the Philippines and elsewhere [see Houghton and Bell; San Juan, "U.S. Imperial Terror"]), and all the excluded and marginalized peoples of the planet.

#### **Only a horizontal movement by the multitude will overcome capitalism**

Tampio 5 (Nicolas Tampio, 2005, Visiting Assistant Professor of Government at Hamilton College. In 2003-2004 he served as the assistant editor of Political Theory. In 2005 he was awarded his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University “Can the Multitude Save the Left?” [http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v008/8.2tampio. html#authbio](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v008/8.2tampio.%20html#authbio))MB

The multitude, the hero of Hardt and Negri's 2000 book Empire, remained cloaked in shadows. The purpose of that book was rather to illuminate the multitude's enemy: Empire. Empire is the new sovereign power that governs the world. Empire comprises the concrete institutions and structures that regulate the global polity and economy: the United Nations, the U.S. military, NATO, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, etc. Empire also creates the languages, ideologies, and opinions that propagate the imperial order: e.g., that free markets generate free societies, that globalization movements have affinities to Al-Quaeda, that communism is entirely discredited. What makes Empire different and more sinister than earlier forms of capitalism and imperialism, according to Hardt and Negri, is the extent of its rule. Empire encompasses the entire world, presents itself as the culmination of history, and produces the very bodies that it governs. Empire, cinemagraphically, is The Matrix: a global parasite that extracts the energy and labor of a subjugated humanity. In Empire, Hardt and Negri elaborate several features of the multitude that may combat this new global order. The multitude is the postmodern proletariat. It includes everyone exploited by capitalism, including the poor who vitalize society but are dismissed by orthodox Marxism. The multitude produces ideas, songs, books, and software, in addition to cars, tanks, and factories. It is nomadic, circulating the globe in ever-accelerating flows, and miscegenated, hybridizing identities and cultures. The multitude, performing cognitive, symbolic, and affective labor, is not the industrial working class, and its internal diversity and intelligence distinguish it from the people, the masses, and the mob. The multitude is a political subjectivity generating, and generated by, our time. Most importantly, for Hardt and Negri, the multitude desires freedom. The multitude seeks to possess citizenship anywhere in the world, to earn a social wage, and to control collectively the means of production. Many readers of Empire, including several in Paul Passavant and Jodi Dean's edited volume, Empire's New Clothes, pressed Hardt and Negri for more details about the multitude.1 Consider Kam Shapiro's thesis in "The Myth of the Multitude."2 Shapiro begins by drawing attention to the Christian images permeating Empire, including pre-modern Christians debilitating the Roman Empire and St. Francis's exiting early modern capitalism. Then, Shapiro identifies parallels between Hardt and Negri's commitment to spontaneous collective action and George Sorel's General Strike and Rosa Luxembourg's model of revolutionary subjectivity. Finally, Shapiro notes Hardt and Negri's wariness to define the multitude too precisely or to identify any ongoing social movement as an embodiment of the multitude. Shapiro, observing the historical consequences of chiliastic Christianity and Communism, asks, reasonably enough, whether we ought to yearn for any global entity, immanent or transcendent, to deliver us from Empire. "Are we not at present caught between perfectionist utopias and catastrophic myths, both of which are linked to terrible violence?"3 In interviews, Hardt and Negri acknowledged that they needed to elucidate the political subject capable of destroying Empire and building a better future.4 The aim of Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire is to accomplish this conceptually and empirically. One side of Multitude, then, updates Marx's historical materialism to show how the new world order spawns the conditions of possibility for the emergence of the multitude. In diverse ways, Hardt and Negri argue, the global state of war and the postmodern economy undermine Empire and prepare the multitude for absolute democracy. Take the global state of war. Contemporary insurgencies, knowing that they cannot triumph over Empire using conventional armies, organize themselves in distributed networks. Faced with network enemies, the military branch of Empire dismantles its traditional sovereign structures to become a network itself. The network struggles of the multitude, Hardt and Negri observe, are more effective and democratic than earlier models of popular or guerilla warfare. The multitude, for example, can organize itself horizontally, siphon support for Empire, and strike proficiently using the Internet. A similar process is at work, Hardt and Negri maintain, in the postmodern economy. Labor today is becoming increasingly collaborative, cooperative, and communicative. Nearly every profession, from agriculture to industry and entertainment, requires workers to travel, become technologically savvy, and work in groups. Empire encourages the production of the multitude's general intellect to maximize its power. The multitude's mobility and commonality, however, constructs a counter-Empire to oppose the hegemony of Empire. The Internet, once again, is a site of conflict between Empire and the multitude, as when young people use work computers to organize raves and demonstrations. The other side of Multitude, and one that will interest many readers of Empire, provides examples of the nascent political subjectivity in action. The multitude, Hardt and Negri claim, has begun to act for homosexual rights (ACT-UP and Queer Nation), social-movement unionism (the piqueteros in Argentina and Justice for Janitors in the United States), and the cause of global peace (the international antiwar protests of February 15, 2003). The greatest manifestation of the multitude up to now, however, occurred in Seattle in 1999. The globalization activists who disrupted the Third Ministerial Conference of the WTO exemplify one definition of the multitude: singularities that act in common. In Seattle, diverse constituencies — environmentalists and unionists, anarchists and church groups — converged to protest the current form of global capitalism and to discuss alternative futures. The protestors in Seattle are not a perfect embodiment of the multitude because they are predominantly North Americans and because their positive vision is not yet fully articulated. The multitude today is more a virtual political force than an actual political entity. The relevant question for Hardt and Negri, therefore, is not, "What is the multitude?" but: "What can the multitude become?" Hardt and Negri create the concept of the multitude to revive the Left. Hardt and Negri witness a world in which Empire pulls the levers of power and permeates our hearts and minds. There are objections and protests, of course, but these are isolated and incoherent — a march here, a riot there, an editorial elsewhere. For Hardt and Negri, the Left needs a political project to confront and replace Empire. The clay of the multitude already exists, but it needs to be shaped into a powerful body. The multitude needs to become conscious of its own strength. At the beginning of Multitude, the authors describe the figure of the Golem in Jewish mysticism.5 According to the Kabbalah, the Golem is unformed matter that is brought to life by a rabbi pronouncing the name of God over it. The Golem then arises as a monster that can destroy the persecutors of its creator or, perhaps, find redemption through love. Hardt and Negri carry this project into postmodernity. "Today we need new giants and new monsters to put together nature and history, labor and politics, art and invention in order to demonstrate the new power that is being born in the multitude."6

### Total Rejection Key

#### Total rejection is key to getting rid of capitalism

Flank 7 (Lenny, writer, Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony: Marxism, Capitalism, and Their Relation to Sexism, Racism, Nationalism, and Authoritarianism)

A critical examination of the relationship between Marxism and other social justice movements, including feminism, anti-racism, gay liberation, environmentalism, anarchism and Native activism. The capitalist social order is like a Hydra, a many-headed dragon. Try to cut off one head, and the others will kill you. The only way to kill the beast is to cut off all its heads at once. The social revolution must grow to encompass not merely the economic means of production, but the entire mode of social life, including its familial, sexual, racial, national, gender and authority roles. The tactics of the traditional Leninists are entirely unsuited for that task. Only a wider-ranging social movement can hope to defeat capitalist hegemony.

#### The only lasting solution is to get rid of capitalism altogether

League for the revolutionary party 12 (http://lrp-cofi.org/statements/mayday2012.html)

As with the Republicans, the heart of the Democratic Party, along with its money and power, belongs to wealthy capitalists. Capitalism by its nature must try to divide and conquer the working class, in order to maximize profits at the workers’ expense. Under the conditions of deep economic crisis of the past few years, the drives of the system to scapegoat immigrants, people of color, youth and “greedy union workers” for the problems of unemployment, inadequate health care and education, and poverty caused by the profit-making system itself, go into high gear. Anti-immigrant chauvinism, racism and immiseration of the working class are features of capitalism at this time, not of any one given capitalist party or politician. Thus revolutionary socialists oppose voting for candidates of any capitalist party and champion instead an alternative strategy, based on the power of the working class to fight for its own interests. The working class can unite to beat back specific capitalist attacks. People of color, especially youth, will be key to developing a rising fight back. And revolutionary socialists will fight in every struggle to build as strong a movement as possible. We also believe that the only lasting solution is to get rid of capitalism altogether. Socialist revolution will put the working class in power and replace the current system based on production for private profit with a new society based on production to satisfy human needs.

#### We must completely reject capitalism in our daily lives

Herod 4 (James, University of Massachusetts Boston, http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm)

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.

### Hist Mat = Best method

Only historical materialism can account for the inseparability of economics and political and social dominance

Shimp 9 (Kaleb, Department of Economics, University of Northern Iowa “The Validity of Karl Marx's Theory of Historical Materialism” <http://business.uni.edu/economics/Themes/shimp.pdf> p. 41-43) APB

Historical materialism asserts that economic forces are the primary forces that propel man through history as social classes interact. Economic interactions are how man relates to the material world. Man changes the material world, not with thought and conceptualization, but with picks, shovels, ploughs, diggers, looms and lathes (Wolff 2003,28). Man has to labor in order to survive. Labor physically changes the world, causing the economic forces to develop as man is able to gain more and more control over his environment. For example, farmers at one point used animal-driven plows to plant crops in order to make a living. Eventually, tractors that performed the same task as animals, but much more efficiently, were developed and gave farmers greater control of their environment. The tractor was simply a development in the economic forces. As economic forces develop, class struggles become more intense. Class struggles provide the contradiction that causes the dialectical process to work in Marx's theory. Two classes, ruling and lower, struggle against each other until one eventually wins and becomes the new ruling class. From this new ruling class, another lower class will develop, continuing the process. Marx and Engels clearly declare the importance of classes in history with the first sentence of the Communist Manifesto, "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (2005, 7). Classes develop from the conflict between the economic/productive forces, relations of production, and superstructure within society. Marx's clearest representation of the interactions between productive forces, productive relations, and superstructure is in the preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society — the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or — what is but a legal expression for the same thing — with the property relations within which they have been at work before. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. (Marx and Engcls 1983, 159-60) As the productive forces continue to improve, the relations of production (as Marx says, these are for the most part property rights) become a burden (in Marx's words a "fetter") on the improving productive forces, not allowing the productive forces to continue on their path of improvement. The superstructure is the legal, philosophical, religious, and political environment in which the productive forces and productive relations interact. The superstructure exists in order to help the productive relations. Classes develop due to the conflict between the productive forces and productive relations. The productive forces and productive relations do not have a dialectical contradiction. The contradiction is only present between the ruling and lower classes. Between the productive forces and relations of production exists only a conflict and the presence of conflict does not mean the presence of contradiction by the dialectical definition (Heilbroner 1981,39-40). The conflict between the productive forces and the relations of production only provide the basis by which classes develop. The productive forces are always changing and improving. As man labors in the world, the division of labor grows and man finds new and better ways to master his environment. This improvement will benefit the lower class because with greater control of the environment comes a greater capability of obtaining beneficial resources. The ruling class, however, is in an advantageous position and would like the status quo to remain. The current relations of production and superstructure of the society exist to serve the will of the ruling class. The ruling class determines the distribution of goods within the society and they have no desire to change the relations of production. The lower class, on the other hand, is not content with the current situation and would like to take advantage of the ever-improving productive forces. The ruling class prevents this from happening. This contradiction of classes culminates in social revolution. The lower class overthrows the ruling class and forms new relations of production that arc better suited to work with the productive forces. The superstructure changes with the relations of production and the new relations of production and superstructure serve the interests of the new ruling class. The new thesis will stay in existence until the productive relations and productive forces are again no longer compatible. The incompatibility will cause another lower class to form in contradiction to the upper class, beginning the antagonism all over again. Within every mode of production lies its own downfall.

#### Historical materialism is the best methodological approach to fighting capitalism-it provides the ideological backdrop necessary to turn theory into praxis and end capitalist exploitation

Lukacs in 67 (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

**Historical materialism has**, therefore, **a much greater value** for the proletariat **than** that of a method of **historical research**. **It is one of the most important of all its weapons**. For **the class struggle** of the proletariat **signifies** at the same time **the awakening of** its **class consciousness**. **And this awakening followed everywhere from an understanding of the true situation**, of the actually existing historical connections. And **it is this that gives the class struggle** of the proletariat **its special place** among other class struggles, **namely that it obtains its sharpest weapon from** the hand of true science, from its **clear insight into reality**. **Whereas in the class struggles of the past the most varied ideologies**, religious, moral and other forms of 'false consciousness' **were decisive, in the case of the class struggle of the proletariat, the war for the liberation of the last oppressed class, the revelation of the unvarnished truth became both a war-cry and the most potent weapon**. **By laying bare** the springs of **the historical process historical materialism became**, in consequence of the class situation of the proletariat, **an instrument of war**. **The most important function of historical materialism is to deliver a precise judgement on the capitalist social system, to unmask capitalist society**. Throughout the class struggle of the proletariat, therefore, **historical materialism** has constantly been used at every point, where, by means of all sorts of ideological frills, the bourgeoisie had concealed the true situation, the state of the class struggle; it **has been used to focus the cold rays of science upon these veils and to show how false and misleading they were and how far they were in conflict with the truth. For this reason the chief function of historical materialism did not lie in the elucidation of pure scientific knowledge, but in the field of action**. **Historical materialism did not exist for its own sake, it existed so that the proletariat could understand a situation and so that, armed with this knowledge, it could act accordingly.** <224-225>

#### Dialectical materialism is the only sustainable way to stop political paralysis. Their belief in pure subjectivity separates us from the backdrop of capitalism that determines that subjectivity, making paralysis inevitable.

Lukacs in 67 (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

The practical danger of every such dualism shows itself in the loss of any directive for action. **As soon as you abandon the ground of reality that has been conquered and reconquered by dialectical materialism, as soon as you decide to remain on the 'natural' ground of existence**, of the empirical in its stark, naked brutality, **you create a gulf between the subject of an action and the milieux of the 'facts' in which the action unfolds** so that they stand opposed to each other as harsh, irreconcilable principles. **It then becomes impossible to impose the subjective will**, wish or decision **upon the facts or to discover in them any directive for action**. A situation in which the 'facts' speak out unmistakably for or against a definite course of action has never existed, and neither can or will exist. The more conscientiously the facts are explored— in their isolation, i.e. in their unmediated relations—the less com-pellingly will they point in any one direction. It is self-evident that a merely subjective decision will be shattered by the pressure of uncomprehended facts acting automatically 'according to laws'. Thus **dialectical materialism is seen to offer the only approach to reality which can give action a direction**. **The self-knowledge,** both subjective and objective, **of the proletariat at a given point in its evolution is at the same time knowledge of the stage of development achieved by the whole society**. **The facts no longer appear strange** when they are comprehended in their coherent reality, in the relation of all partial aspects to their inherent, but hitherto unelucidated roots in the whole: **we then perceive the tendencies which strive towards the centre of reality, to what we are wont to call the ultimate goal**. **This ultimate goal is not an abstract ideal opposed to the process, but an aspect of truth and reality**. **It is the concrete meaning of each stage reached and an integral part of the concrete moment. Because of this, to comprehend it is to recognise the direction taken** (unconsciously) **by events and tendencies towards the totality. It is to know the direction that determines concretely the correct course of action at any given moment**—in terms of the interest of the total process, viz. the emancipation of the proletariat. However, **the evolution of society constantly heightens the tension between the partial aspects and the whole**. Just because the inherent meaning of reality shines forth with an ever more resplendent light, the meaning of the process is embedded ever more deeply in day-to-day events, and totality permeates the spatio-temporal character of phenomena. **The path to consciousness throughout the course of history does not become smoother but** on the contrary **ever more arduous** and exacting. For this reason **the task of orthodox Marxism,** its victory over Revisionism and utopianism **can never mean the defeat**, once and for all, **of false tendencies**. **It is an ever-renewed struggle against the insidious effects of bourgeois ideology on the thought of the proletariat.** **Marxist orthodoxy is no guardian of traditions, it is the eternally vigilant prophet proclaiming the relation between the tasks of the immediate present and the totality of the historical process**. Hence the words of the Communist Manifesto on the tasks of orthodoxy and of its representatives, the Communists, have lost neither their relevance nor their value: "The Communists arc distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independent of nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole" <23-24>

#### Prefer our alternative-historical materialism provides the methodology needed for a deeper social and political understanding of life. This education is vital to creating the change necessary to stop capitalism.

Andrew N. McNight in 2010 University of Alabama at Birmingham, A Pragmatic and pedagogically Minded Revaluation of Historical Materialism, Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, vol.8. no.2, http://www.jceps.com/PDFs/08-2-04.pdf

Toward a reconstruction of historical materialism, Habermas (1979) adopts many tenets of Marxian theory. Notably, he adopts a common belief that **ethical social action can lead to progress,** or what he, and Lukacs before him, term ―social evolution‖ (130). **Habermas**, however, **renders historical materialism less ideologically rigid and more interrelated to the pursuit of concepts like** ―**moral-practical insight**‖ (120), and the ―moralization of motives for action [italics omitted]‖ (136). This can easily be described using the familiar terms of freedom to control one‘s own production, freedom from oppressive economic dictates, freedom to one‘s own cultural identity and from cultural violence being visited upon the former, etc. **He views this reconstruction of historical materialism as making necessary revisions in a theory** ―whose potential for stimulation has still not been exhausted‖ (95). **His revision is still materialist in that it concerns the Marxian categories of production and reproduction, and historical in that it seeks to identify causes of social change and potentially new and more complex forms of social organization** toward ―securing a normatively prescribed societal identity, a culturally interpreted ‗good‘ or ‗tolerable‘ life‖ (142). Habermas (1979) posits historical materialism not simply as a heuristic, but, as aforementioned, a ―theory of social evolution‖ (130) that can be used to solve many of the problems confronting the moral development of social life. **Progress is**, under this historical and materialist rubric, **both social and physical; it represents advances in** ―empirical knowledge and moral-practical insight . . . **the development of productive forces** and the maturity of forms of social intercourse‖ (142). **Habermas** (1979), however, **warns against a retrogression of Marx‘s general theory into ―historical objectivism** . . . [where] philosophical questions [are suppressed] in favor of a scientistic understanding‖ (96). **Although suspicious of absolute narratives, he also takes a different stance from some on the postmodern left that the instability of social norms is necessarily beneficial to the moral development of a society**. In neo-normative tenor he states, ―**a philosophical ethics not restricted to metaethical statements is possible today only if we can reconstruct general presuppositions of communication and procedures for justifying norms and values**‖ (97). **These presuppositions set the boundaries for social change as the ability of the populace at large to analyze social circumstances and learn their intricacies**: ―a developmental logic [that may explain] the range of variations within which cultural values, moral representation - can be changed and can find different historical expression‖ (98). Put crudely, **the social learning a given culture can accommodate, and the emotional capacity of consciousness to conflict with the underlying contradictions within a given society, is related to the quality and quantity of direct systemic social change**.

#### **The method of rejecting Capitalism is a prerequisite because only through understanding the system can we effectively act on it**

TUMINO 1(Stephen, Pittsburg English Professor “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, KR)

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups. The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

#### The dialectic material method is a prior concern because humanity’s relationship with capitalism and the world creates our society and our horizon for possible action

Dickens and Ormrod 7 (Peter, Professor of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Univ. of Cambridge, J.S., Senior Lecturer of Applied Social Science, Univ. of Brighton, "Cosmic society: towards a sociology of the universe," p. 2-4) APB

Dialectics insists on recognizing the relationships between things rather than the things themselves (Harvey 1996). Things, whether they are stars or societies, are constituted by relationships. These things both form part of these relationships and have causal effects on them. The distinction between parts and wholes is therefore meaningless. Parts are integrated into wholes, and vice versa, in a proc- ess of indefinite change. In situating cosmology within a broader system of social relationships, Best and Kellner insist: Cosmologies are constituted within a social context, and as such, often are influenced by, or are extensions of, social values and ideologies. Conversely, how human beings interpret the stars, planets, and natural world around them shapes how they understand their own societies. the domination of external nature was associated with the domination of internal nature, with the perversion of humanity’s needs and capacities. (Best and Kellner 2001: 136) These relationships may even be made explicit. Two of the founders of sociology, Comte (1974) and Spencer (1971), deliberately described the cosmos and society together. Comte stressed that ‘solidarity’ between elements must exist in social systems as it did in the universe revealed by astronomy. Spencer argued that both society and universe were evolving towards greater degrees of concentration and integration. Dialectics is a concept normally associated with Hegel’s philosophical theory of the progress of ideas through thesis, antithesis and finally synthesis. Marx took up the reins of dialectical thinking – emphasizing contradictory relationships and their role in change and progress – but applied it to the material conditions and struggles of society, rather than the realm of ideas. It is Engels’ (1959) concept of dialectics that is best suited to our purpose, however. Dialectics for Engels was about acknowledging the interactions, especially between humans and nature, in which, because of their intimate relationship, a change in one caused a change in the other as the two became intertwined. Linking the universe and society by asserting that both of them operate in a ‘dialectical’ fashion is therefore a useful way of starting analysis. Dialectics stresses the interactions between the observer and the observed or between the subject and the object. This is a major theme we will develop throughout this study. These dialectics operate on two levels. First, our observations and understandings of the universe create changes in the fundamental ways in which we experience, understand and manage our social universe. But, second, through this mechanism, change is affected on a much deeper level. By observ- ing the universe, people in societies have transformed themselves. In Cosmos and Psyche, Tarnas makes the point convincingly, although for ‘world view’ he might better have written ‘cosmology’: Our world view is not simply the way we look at the world. It reaches inward to constitute our innermost being, and outward to constitute the world. It mirrors but also reinforces and even forges the structures, armorings, and possibilities of our interior life. It deeply configures our psychic and somatic experience, the patterns of our sensing, knowing, and interacting with the world. (Tarnas 2006: 16) We explore the dialectic between cosmos and the self more specifically in the next two chapters (see also Dickens and Ormrod 2007). As the following chapters will suggest, by physically interacting with the universe, humans are transforming themselves once more. As societies interact with nature, human beings start changing themselves. Put in more sociological and material terms, as societies observe and modify external nature they start modifying their own, internal, nature. And this is a dialectical process. The kind of internal nature made in the process of environmental study and transformation has important effects on how external nature is in turn considered and therefore treated. In particular, for critical theorists, the domination of external nature was associated with the domination of internal nature, with the perversion of humanity’s needs and capacities.

#### Method is key-dialectical materialism provides the best method for understanding social and political relations-this education is key to achieve class consciousness and stop capitalism

Lukacs in 67(George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

If the question were really to be formulated in terms of such a crude antithesis it would deserve at best a pitying smile. But in fact it is not (and never has been) quite so straightforward. Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research had disproved once and for all every one of Marx's individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious 'orthodox' Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and hence dismiss all of Marx's theses in toto—without having to renounce his orthodoxy for a single moment. **Orthodox Marxism**, therefore, **does not imply the uncritical acceptance of the results of Marx's investigations**. It is not the 'belief in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a 'sacred' book. **On the contrary, orthodoxy refers exclusively to method. It is the scientific conviction that dialectical materialism is the road to truth and that its methods can be developed, expanded and deepened** only along the lines laid down by its founders. It is the conviction, moreover, that all attempts to surpass or 'improve' it have led and must lead to over-simplification, triviality and eclecticism. Materialist dialectic is a revolutionary dialectic. **This definition is so important** and altogether so crucial for an understanding of its nature **that if the problem is to be approached in the right way this must be fully grasped before we venture upon a discussion of the dialectical method itself**. **The issue turns on the question of theory and practice**. And this not merely in the sense given it by Marx when he says in his first critique of Hegel that "theory becomes a material force when it grips the masses".1 Even **more to the point is the need to discover those features and definitions both of the theory and the ways of gripping the masses which convert the theory, the dialectical method, into a vehicle of revolution**. We must extract the practical essence of the theory from the method and its relation to its object. **If this is not done that 'gripping the masses' could well turn out to be a will o' the wisp**. **It might turn out that the masses were in the grip of quite different forces**, that they were in pursuit of quite different ends. **In that event**, there would be no necessary connection between the theory and their activity, **it would be a form that enables the masses to become conscious of their socially necessary or fortuitous actions, without ensuring a genuine and necessary bond between consciousness and action**. In the same essay\* Marx clearly defined the conditions in which a relation between theory and practice becomes possible. "It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought." Or, as he expresses it in an earlier work:3 "It will then be realised that the world has long since possessed something in the form of a dream which it need only take possession of consciously, in order to possess it in reality." **Only when consciousness stands in such a relation to reality can theory and practice be united. But for this to happen the emergence of consciousness must become the decisive step which the historical process must take** towards its proper end (an end constituted by the wills of men, but neither dependent on human whim, nor the product of human invention). The historical function of theory is to make this step a practical possibility. Only when a historical situation has arisen in which a class must understand society if it is to assert itself; only when the fact that a class understands itself means that it understands society as a whole and when, in consequence, the class becomes both the subject and the object of knowledge; in short, **only when these conditions are all satisfied will the unity of theory and practice, the precondition of the revolutionary function of the theory, become possible**. Such a situation has in fact arisen with the entry of the proletariat into history. "When the proletariat proclaims the dissolution of the existing social order,” Marx declares, "it does no more than disclose the secret of its own existence, for it is the effective dissolution of that order." \* **The links between the theory that affirms this and the revolution are not just arbitrary, nor are they particularly tortuous** or open to misunderstanding. **On the contrary, the theory is essentially the intellectual expression of the revolutionary process itself. In it every stage of the process becomes fixed so that it may be generalised**, communicated, utilised **and developed**. **Because the theory does nothing but arrest and make conscious each necessary step, it becomes at the same time the necessary premise of the following one**. <1-3>

#### Historical Materialist analysis is uniquely key in educational forums for young people to creating stable self determined identities free from the totalization of false class consciousness

McNight 10 (Andrew N., Professor at the University of Alabama, Birmingham, “A Pragmatic reevaluation of historical materialism: Notions of progress and vehicles for social justice” Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies 8(2) p. 5-7) APB

Here he discussed the dialectic between the ―relations of production of production . . . the economic structure of society, the real foundation [and] a legal and political superstructure‖ (4). It is this latter bit that becomes the ―social consciousness of people being defined by their ―social being,‖ the stuff of their material and relational experience. Marx then goes on to say that with changes in the ―economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed‖ (5). The distinction is then made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological—forms. (5) It is perhaps the aforementioned distinction that gives terrain for the critique to follow—the nature of the relationship between foundation, or base, and superstructure. Williams (1977), has noted that this definition may be insufficient to define ―the whole of cultural‘ activity‖ (76), since Marx makes a distinction between material conditions and culture, writ large. In a slightly lesser known and earlier passage, Marx (1963) displays a slightly different conception of the materialist relationship, one that renders the former more subjective and interpretative but within a knowable framework. He states, Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of distinct and peculiarly formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought and views of life. The entire class creates and forms them out of its material foundations and out of the corresponding social relations. The single individual, who derives them through tradition and upbringing, may imagine that they form the real motives and the starting point of this activity. . . . And as in private life one differentiates between what a man thinks and says of himself and what he really is and does, so in historical struggles one must distinguish still more the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests, their conception of themselves, from their reality. (47) It is this elucidation of historical materialism that I feel provides theoretically fertile ground for pragmatic application. As will be restated later, there is play between the base and the superstructure, especially regarding the cultural outcroppings of the material. However, the field of analysis provides a means by which we may examine these relationships and perhaps denude contradictions and false consciousness within class relations. It is communicative action toward some kind of economic liberations that is sought through, as Williams (1977) put it, ―three senses [that] would direct our attention . . . (a) institutions; (b) forms of consciousness; (c) political and cultural practices‖ (77). In this sense we find some degree of harmony with Dewey (1927), that the interplay among the historically created material conditions, the individual consciousness, and that of cultural identity within a plurality of groups/classes. He states, From the standpoint of the individual, it consists in having a responsible share according to capacity in forming and directing the activities of the group to which one belongs in participating according to need in the values with the groups sustain. From the standpoint of the groups, it demands liberation of the potentialities of members of a group in harmony with the interests and goods which are in common. Since every individual is a member of many groups, this specification cannot be fulfilled except when different groups interact flexibly and fully in connection with other groups. (147) The flexibility interaction mentioned for Dewey is inevitable, unless there is to be complete obliteration of one or more of the constituent groups via some kind of class totalization, one that denies identity with multiple groups and the potential common interests among groups although differently expressed, perhaps. The plurality of voices and the endeavor of multiple social analyses within a historical materialist framework may very well aid us in distinguishing ―the phrases and fancies of parties from their real organism and their real interests‖ (47), aforementioned by Marx. This is the site of pedagogy in my view—where students of various ages and backgrounds might accurately discover their own cultural location and point it toward ―liberation of the potentialities of members of a group in harmony with the interests and goods which are in common (147), aforementioned by Dewey as the ethical outcome.

### Class 1st key

#### Class must be the starting point of analysis-it’s the only way to maintain the image of totality needed to unify theory and praxis against capitalism

Lukacs in 67 (George, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and literary critic. He is a founder of the tradition of Western Marxism. He contributed the ideas of reification and class consciousness to Marxist philosophy and theory, and his literary criticism was influential in thinking about realism and about the novel as a literary genre. He served briefly as Hungary's Minister of Culture as part of the government of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, History and Class Consciousness)

**It was left to Marx to** make the concrete discovery of 'truth as the subject' and hence to **establish the unity of theory and practice**. This **he achieved by focusing the known totality upon the reality of the historical process** and by confining it to this. By this means **he determined both the knowable totality and the totality to be known**. **The** scientific **superiority of the standpoint of class (as against that of the individual) has become clear from the foregoing**. **Now we see the reason for this superiority: only** tht **class can** actively **penetrate the reality of society and transform it in its entirety**. For this reason, **'criticism' advanced from the standpoint of class is criticism from a total point of view and** hence it **provides the dialectical unity of theory and practice**. In dialectical unity it is at once cause and effect, mirror and motor of the historical and dialectical process. **The proletariat as the subject of thought in society destroys at one blow the dilemma of impotence: the dilemma created by the pure laws with their fatalism and by the ethics of pure intentions**. Thus **for Marxism the knowledge that capitalism is historically conditioned** (the problem of accumulation) **becomes crucial**. The reason for this is that **only this knowledge, only the unity of theory and practice provide a real basis for social revolution and the total transformation of society**. **Only when this knowledge can be seen as the product of this process can we close the circle of the dialectical method-**and this analysis, too, stems from Hegel. <39-40>

#### **We must discover Class Consciousness in order to combat it**

Lukacs 1920 ( Georg Lukacs, March 1920, Merlin Press 1967, “Class Consciousness”, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/lukacs3.htm>, accessed 7.9.12, KR)

This twofold dialectical determination of ‘false consciousness’ constitutes an analysis far removed from the naive description of what men in fact thought, felt and wanted at any moment in history and from any given point in the class structure. I do not wish to deny the great importance of this, but it remains after all merely the material of genuine historical analysis. The relation with concrete totality and the dialectical determinants arising from it transcend pure description and yield the category of objective possibility. By relating consciousness to the whole of society it becomes possible to infer the thoughts and feelings which men would have in a particular situation if they were able to assess both it and the interests arising from it in their impact on immediate action and on the whole structure of society. That is to say, it would be possible to infer the thoughts and feelings appropriate to their objective situation. The number of such situations is not unlimited in any society. However much detailed researches are able to refine social typologies there will always be a number of clearly distinguished basic types whose characteristics are determined by the types of position available in the process of production. Now class consciousness consists in fact of the appropriate and rational reactions ‘imputed’ [zugerechnet] to a particular typical position in the process of production.[[11]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/lukacs3.htm" \l "11) This consciousness is, therefore, neither the sum nor the average of what is thought or felt by the single individuals who make up the class. And yet the historically significant actions of the class as a whole are determined in the last resort by this consciousness and not by the thought of the individual – and these actions can be understood only by reference to this consciousness. This analysis establishes right from the start the distance that separates class consciousness from the empirically given, and from the psychologically describable and explicable ideas which men form about their situation in life. But it is not enough just to state that this distance exists or even to define its implications in a formal and general way. We must discover, firstly, whether it is a phenomenon that differs according to the manner in which the various classes are related to society as a whole and whether the differences are so great as to produce qualitative distinctions. And we must discover, secondly, the practical significance of these different possible relations between the objective economic totality, the imputed class consciousness and the real, psychological thoughts of men about their lives. We must discover, in short, the practical, historical function of class consciousness. Only after such preparatory formulations can we begin to exploit the category of objective possibility systematically. The first question we must ask is how far is it intact possible to discern the whole economy of a society from inside it? It is essential to transcend the limitations of particular individuals caught up in their own narrow prejudices. But it is no less vital not to overstep the frontier fixed for them by the economic structure of society and establishing their position in it. [[12]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/lukacs3.htm" \l "12) Regarded abstractly and formally, then, class consciousness implies a class-conditioned unconsciousness of ones own socio-historical and economic condition. [[13]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/lukacs3.htm" \l "13) This condition is given as a definite structural relation, a definite formal nexus which appears to govern the whole of life. The ‘falseness’, the illusion implicit in this situation is in no sense arbitrary; it is simply the intellectual reflex of the objective economic structure. Thus, for example, “the value or price of labour-power takes on the appearance of the price or value of labour itself ...” and “the illusion is created that the totality is paid labour.... In contrast to that, under slavery even that portion of labour which is paid for appears unpaid for.” [[14]](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/lukacs3.htm" \l "14) Now it requires the most painstaking historical analysis to use the category of objective possibility so as to isolate the conditions in which this illusion can be exposed and a real connection with the totality established. For if from the vantage point of a particular class the totality of existing society is not visible; if a class thinks the thoughts imputable to it and which bear upon its interests right through to their logical conclusion and yet fails to strike at the heart of that totality, then such a class is doomed to play only a subordinate role. It can never influence the course of history in either a conservative or progressive direction. Such classes are normally condemned to passivity, to an unstable oscillation between the ruling and the revolutionary classes, and if perchance they do erupt then such explosions are purely elemental and aimless. They may win a few battles but they are doomed to ultimate defeat.

# MISC

## Ontology first

#### Ontological views drive the ethics of people’s stance

Parker 99, University of Keele, Centre for Social Theory and Technology & Department of Management (Martin, 1/1/99, Capitalism, Subjectivity and Ethics: Debating Labour Process Analysis, Organization Studies (Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.), Volume: 20, issue 1, Accessed 7/4/12, Pg. 38, LP)

Yet, as I remarked earlier, the oddest thing about these papers is their similarity. All these authors claim to be defending a stance that allows the undesirable effects of the capitalist mode of production to be better resisted, yet these claims come from such different places. One way of summarizing this is to suggest that, in the case of Thompson et al., the ontology drives the ethics. It is because the world is like X (capitalism) that ethical position Y (socialism) follows. The task of critical theorists of work organization then becomes to persuade others that the world is also like X. If they see the world properly, they will realize how unjust it is and want to do something about it. Descriptions of the world are the moral ammunition in this battle. On the other hand, for Knights and Willmott, the epistemology drives the ethics. It is because the world can't be known with any certainty that a particular ethical position follows and the task of critical theorists of work organisation becomes to persuade others that they can't know the world either. Since none of us can then ever be certain then we should become rather more careful in dogmatically asserting that the world is like X because we have no way of knowing that this is the case. With this hermeneutics of suspicion turned on all truth claims we can attempt to build a community of sceptics who are more likely to listen to other voices and less likely to hurt each other. In this battle, hunting dualisms, rooting out certainties, become the stepping stones towards emancipation.

### Collapse inevitable

#### **The 2008 recession proves that the contradictions of capitalism will inevitably and permanently cripple the system, regardless of crisis mitigation.**

Kotz 9 (David M., Professor of Economics at Univ. of Massachusetts Amherst, “The Financial and Economic Crisis of 2008: A Systemic Crisis of Neoliberal Capitalism” <http://rrp.sagepub.com/content/41/3/305.full.pdf+html> 1-2) APB

A financial crisis developed with remarkable speed starting in the late summer of 2008, as mortgage-related securities that had spread through the U.S. and global financial system suddenly collapsed in value.2 This crisis has undermined many of the largest financial institutions in the United States and elsewhere, as well as severely damaging a large part of the world’s financial system. Recently the financial crisis has been joined by a gathering recession in the non-financial sector in the U.S. and global economies. This paper argues that the current financial and real sector crisis should be seen as part of larger development. That is, the current crisis should be seen as a systemic crisis of a particular form of capitalism, namely neoliberal capitalism.3 History shows that capitalism periodically undergoes a systemic crisis. The particular institutional form of capitalism has varied in different periods. However effectively a particular institutional form of capitalism, or social structure of accumulation (SSA), may for a time promote high profits and economic expansion, eventually the contradictions of that form of capitalism undermine its continuing operation, leading to a systemic crisis.4 To refer to a situation as a systemic crisis means that the crisis can be resolved only through a major restructuring of the system. If the current situation were not a systemic crisis, then it should be possible to resolve the financial crisis with appropriate state bailouts of financial institutions and the imposition of some new regulations on the financial system, while mitigating the developing recession with a large economic stimulus program. Following such crisis interventions, neoliberal capitalism would resume more-or-less normal operation. However, if the current financial and economic crisis is an indication of a systemic crisis of neoliberal capitalism, that suggests that neoliberal capitalism cannot be sustained by such limited interventions, and we should expect to see the replacement of neoliberal capitalism by something else.

#### **Capitalism cannot survive permanently. The recession’s massive impact on the labor force is pushing the world towards a socialist alternative**

Kotz 9 (David M., Professor of Economics at Univ. of Massachusetts Amherst, “The Financial and Economic Crisis of 2008: A Systemic Crisis of Neoliberal Capitalism” <http://rrp.sagepub.com/content/41/3/305.full.pdf+html> 12-13) APB

The evidence suggests that we are seeing more than just a severe financial crisis and a severe recession. We are witnessing a crisis of the neoliberal form of capitalism. The ability of that form of capitalism to promote expansion of output and profits appears to have reached its end. Another expansion, within the existing neoliberal model, would require a new asset bubble even more massive than the housing bubble, and it is difficult to imagine how this could arise. Further, the deregulated financial system of the neoliberal model, which would have to play a key role in any new asset bubble, has been unable to survive the collapse of the latest one. Most of the major U.S. financial institutions have needed large government bailouts, and the assets of the financial sector are undergoing a massive contraction. It is difficult to imagine the neoliberal model surviving intact at this time. The SSA theory argues that, when a particular form of capitalism enters its crisis phase, this eventually gives rise either to a new form of capitalism or to a transition beyond capitalism. This suggests that we can expect to see more changes ahead than just a bailout of the financial system and a big government stimulus program. If a restructuring of capitalism rather than its replacement lies ahead, history suggests that we will see the emergence of a more state-regulated form of capitalism in the United States.18 However, there are various possible types of state-regulated capitalism, and exactly what form would come next depends on the outcome of struggles among various classes and groups. A social-democratic form of capitalism based on capital-labor compromise is unlikely to emerge if the labor movement and other popular movements remain politically weak. However, if the currently developing recession is a long and severe one, this could create conditions for the revival of popular movements, which could in turn make possible a social-democratic type of restructuring of capitalism. A long and severe recession could also place more radical changes on the agenda. As people confront the loss of their homes, unemployment and the associated loss of health insurance, the disappearance of much of their life savings, and the growing threat of global climate change, the arguments for a socialist alternative to capitalism can potentially ring true for millions of people. The socialist movement may be reborn in the years ahead, opening the possibility of finally ending the capitalist era.

### Impact indict

#### **The commoditative ideology of capitalism ensures that all we can know about the consequences of our actions is that they will be destructive**

Foster 11 (John B., Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon and editor of Monthly Review “Capitalism and the Accumulation of Catastrophe” http://monthlyreview.org/2011/12/01/capitalism-and-the-accumulation-of-catastrophe) APB

Nevertheless, the contradiction enters in when we recognize that “the present mode of production is predominantly concerned only about the immediate, the most tangible result,” and proceeds on that basis only. “Surprise is expressed that the more remote effects of actions directed to this end [of economic development and wealth accumulation] turn out to be quite different, are mostly quite the opposite in character.” We discover too late that in the pursuit of our self-interested and shortsighted ends we are undermining the very conditions of production. “What cared the Spanish planters in Cuba,” Engels asked, when “they burned down forests on the slopes of the mountains and obtained from the ashes sufficient fertilizer for one generation of very highly profitable coffee trees—what cared they that the heavy tropical rainfall afterwards washed away the unprotected upper stratum of the soil, leaving behind only bare rock!” In heedlessly removing forests for the sake of production and profits people unwittingly remove everything forests provide: The people, who in Mesopotamia, Greece, Asia Minor and elsewhere, destroyed the forests to obtain cultivable land, never dreamed that by removing along with the forests the collecting centers and reservoirs of moisture that they were laying the basis for the present forlorn state of those countries. When the Italians of the Alps used up the pine forests on the southern slopes, so carefully cherished on the northern slopes, they had no inkling that by doing so they were cutting at the roots of the dairy industry of their region; they had still less inkling that they were thereby depriving their mountain springs of water for the greater part of the year and making it possible for them to pour still more furious torrents on the plains during the rainy seasons. All our growing science in this area, Engels added, was negated if we could not address the reality of capitalist production and its dire effects on the environment—thereby inviting the “revenge” of nature.5

## AT: perm

#### The inclusion of the state dooms the permutation because the state will be the point of departure for the movement, inevitably leading to cooption.

Holloway 5 (John, Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences at the [Autonomous University of Puebla](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autonomous_University_of_Puebla), “Can we change the world without taking power?” [http://www.zcommunications.org/can-we-change-the-world-without-taking-power-by-john-holloway) APB](http://www.zcommunications.org/can-we-change-the-world-without-taking-power-by-john-holloway)%20APB)

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. 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 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. Where the first concept sees the radical transformation of society as taking place after the seizure of power, the second insists that it must begin now. Revolution not when the time is right but revolution here and now. This prefiguration, this revolution here-and-now is above all the drive to self-determination. Self-determination cannot exist in a capitalist society. What can and does exist is the drive towards social self-determination: the moving against alien determination, determination by others. Such a moving against determination by others is necessarily experimental, but three things are clear: (a) The drive towards self-determination is necessarily a drive against allowing others to decide on our behalf. It is therefore a movement against representative democracy and for the creation of some form of direct democracy. (b) The drive towards self-determination is incompatible with the state, which is a form of organisation which decides on our behalf and thereby excludes us. (c) The drive towards self-determination makes no sense unless it includes as its central point the self-determination of our work, our activity. It is necessarily directed against the capitalist organisation of work. We are talking, therefore, not just of democracy but of communism, not just of rebellion but of revolution.

#### Anything short of total rejection will cause capitalism to regenerate itself stronger than before (HAIL HYDRA)

Kovel 2 (Joel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, “The Enemy of Nature: the End of Capitalism Or the End of the World?,” p. 142) APB

The value-term that subsumes everything into the spell of capital sets going a kind of wheel of accumulation, from production to consumption and back, spinning ever more rapidly as the inertial mass of capital grows, and generating its force field as a spinning magnet generates an electrical field. This phenomenon has important implications for the reformability of the system. Because capital is so spectral, and succeeds so well in ideologically mystifying its real nature, attention is constantly deflected from the actual source of eco-destabilization to the instruments by which that source acts. The real problem, however, is the whole mass of globally accumulated capital, along with the speed of its circulation and the class structures sustaining this. That is what generates the force field, in proportion to its own scale; and it is this force field, acting across the numberless points of insertion that constitute the ecosphere, that creates ever larger agglomerations of capital, sets the ecological crisis going, and keeps it from being resolved. For one fact may be taken as certain - that to resolve the ecological crisis as a whole, as against tidying up one corner or another, is radically incompatible with the existence of gigantic pools of capital, the force field these induce, the criminal underworld with which they connect, and, by extension, the elites who comprise the transnational bourgeoisie. And by not resolving the crisis as a whole, we open ourselves to the spectre of another mythical creature, the many-headed hydra, that regenerated itself the more its individual tentacles were chopped away. To realize this is to recognize that there is no compromising with capital, no schema of reformism ,that will clean up its act by making it act more greenly or efficiently. We shall explore the practical implications of this thesis in Part III, and here need simply to restate the conclusion in blunt terms: green capital, or non-polluting capital, is preferable to the immediately ecodestructive breed on its immediate terms. But this is the lesser point, and diminishes with its very success. For green capital (or 'socially/ecologically responsible investing') exists, by its very capital-nature, essentially to create more value, and this leaches away from the concretely green location to join the great pool, and follows its force field into zones of greater concentration, expanded profitability - and greater ecodestruction.

#### The perm fails and causes extinction. Any inclusion of capitalism with the alt will fail because of the conflict in ideological orientation

Meszaros 7 (Istvan, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, University of Sussex, “The Only Viable Economy” The Monthly Review 58(11) APB

There can be not even partial correctives introduced into capital’s operational framework if they are genuinely quality-oriented. For the only qualities relevant in this respect are not some abstract physical characteristics but the humanly meaningful qualities inseparable from need. It is true, of course, as stressed before, that such qualities are always specific, corresponding to clearly identifiable particular human needs both of the individuals themselves and of their historically given and changing social relations. Accordingly, in their many sided specificity they constitute a coherent and well defined set of inviolable systemic determinations, with their own systemic limits. It is precisely the existence of such—very far from abstract—systemic limits which makes it impossible to transfer any meaningful operating determinations and orienting principles from the envisaged alternative social metabolic order into the capital system. The two systems are radically exclusive of each other. For the specific qualities corresponding to human need, in the alternative order, carry the indelible marks of their overall systemic determinations, as integral parts of a humanly valid social reproductive system of control. In the capital system, on the contrary, the overall determinations must be unalterably abstract, because capital’s value relation must reduce all qualities (corresponding to need and use) to measurable generic quantities, in order to assert its alienating historical dominance over everything, in the interest of capital expansion, irrespective of the consequences. The incompatibilities of the two systems become amply clear when we consider their relationship to the question of limit itself. The only sustainable growth positively promoted under the alternative social metabolic control is based on the conscious acceptance of the limits whose violation would imperil the realization of the chosen—and humanly valid—reproductive objectives. Hence wastefulness and destructiveness (as clearly identified limiting concepts) are absolutely excluded by the consciously accepted systemic determinations themselves, adopted by the social individuals as their vital orienting principles. By contrast, the capital system is characterized, and fatefully driven, by the—conscious or unconscious—rejection of all limits, including its own systemic limits. Even the latter are arbitrarily and dangerously treated as if they were nothing more than always superable contingent obstacles. Hence anything goes in this social reproductive system, including the possibility—and by the time we have reached our own historical epoch also the overwhelming grave probability—of total destruction. Naturally, this mutually exclusive relationship to the question of limits prevails also the other way round. Thus, there can be no “partial correctives” borrowed from the capital system when creating and strengthening the alternative social metabolic order. The partial—not to mention general—incompatibilities of the two systems arise from the radical incompatibility of their value dimension. As mentioned above, this is why the particular value determinations and relations of the alternative order could not be transferred into capital’s social metabolic framework for the purpose of improving it, as postulated by some utterly unreal reformist design, wedded to the vacuous methodology of “little by little.” For even the smallest partial relations of the alternative system are deeply embedded in the general value determinations of an overall framework of human needs whose inviolable elementary axiom is the radical exclusion of waste and destruction, in accord with its innermost nature. At the same time, on the other side, no partial “correctives” can be transferred from the operational framework of capital into a genuinely socialist order, as the disastrous failure of Gorbachev’s “market socialist” venture painfully and conclusively demonstrated. For also in that respect we would always be confronted by the radical incompatibility of value determinations, even if in that case the value involved is destructive counter value, corresponding to the ultimate—necessarily ignored—limits of the capital system itself. The systemic limits of capital are thoroughly compatible with waste and destruction. For such normative considerations can only be secondary to capital. More fundamental determinations must take the precedence over such concerns. This is why capital’s original indifference to waste and destruction (never a more positive posture than indifference) is turned into their most active promotion when conditions require that shift. In fact waste and destruction must be relentlessly pursued in this system in direct subordination to the imperative of capital expansion, the overwhelming systemic determinant. The more so the further we leave behind the historically ascending phase of the capital system’s development. And no one should be fooled by the fact that frequently the preponderant assertion of counter value is misrepresented and rationalized as “value neutrality” by capital’s celebrated ideologists.

# Answers

## AT: Reformism

### **GENERAL**

#### **Reformism is a just a diversion from radical solutions that will inevitably be coopted by the right**

Magdoff and Magdoff 5 (Harry Magdoff, editor, and Fred Magdoff, Professor of Plant and Soil Science, University of Vermont, “Approaching Socialism,” Monthly Review, 57(3) <http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism>) APB

Reforms can be enacted to soften the social and ecological effects of the raw workings of the capitalist system. Certainly many have occurred, including those that resulted in workers’ gains in the core capitalist countries such as a shorter workday and week, the right to form a union, a government run social security retirement system, higher incomes, and worker safety laws. Concern over the environment has led to laws that have improved the sorry state of air and water quality in most of the advanced capitalist countries. However, as we are now seeing in the countries of the core, it is possible for capital to reverse the gains that were won through hard-fought struggles of the working class. During periods in the ebb and flow of the class struggle when conditions are decidedly in favor of capital, there will be an attempt to reverse the gains and to push towards minimal constraints and maximum flexibility for capital. At the end of the Second World War, capital, fearing revolution that could destroy the system and needing the cooperation of labor to get the countries back on their feet, promoted a welfare state in much of Europe—paid vacations, better wages, and Germany even placed workers on corporations’ boards of directors. In the United States the welfare state began with Roosevelt’s New Deal and new programs were added through the 1960s. Following the Second World War as the economies were rapidly rebuilding—spurred on by the stimulus of the automobile and suburbanization with all their ramifications—there was plenty of money to fund welfare programs, provide higher salaries for labor, and still make large profits. When the economy was growing rapidly taxes also increased (without much effort) to fund new programs. The concern for social stability in the 1960s and the desire to have the masses’ support in the Cold War, especially in the United States, are also part of the explanation for increases in social programs. What actually happened also depended on the militancy of unions as well as other forms of class struggle such as the black movement for political and economic rights. But with the growth of larger and larger corporations, competition between countries became more intense and there were no new forces stimulating the economy to grow rapidly, as had occurred from the end of the Second World War through the 1960s. When economic stagnation developed in the 1970s, capital responded in a number of ways. Investment strategies changed in order to sustain profits—there was a diversion from investment to produce physical commodities toward the service sectors and the speculative world of finance (creating and selling a variety of financial products). With stagnation, capitalist societies, as throughout their history in depressions, also shifted the burdens of stagnation, militarism, and wars to the working people (and the colonial possessions). Beginning in the 1980s those at the top of society have promoted a continuous class war aimed at reducing corporate taxes and taxes on the wealthy. Also starting in the 1980s—and accelerating at this time—the vested interests of capital have unleashed a campaign to dismantle as many worker rights as possible (including those in the reserve army): attacking welfare programs, making it harder to unionize workers and easier to fire them, decreased pension coverage, privatizing basic services (including schools), and attempting to privatize social security. Conservatives in the United States never accepted government social programs and have established the goal of rolling back those initiated during Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal and the 1960s Great Society era, returning to the situation before the national government had a major role in protecting the rights of workers. There is also a similar drive by capital in Europe to decrease worker protections and rights under the guise that it is necessary to make their industries more competitive in the world market. The greed, individualism, and competition fostered by capitalism makes it relatively easy to justify elimination of programs that help workers and the poor. Thus, capitalism can have a “human face” for only short periods of time. Reforms that achieve modest gains can never be counted on to achieve a truly humane society. As we now see, counter-reforms will occur as the strength of capital increases relative to that of labor, and class war from above becomes the norm. But more importantly, the evils of inequality, poverty and misery, environmental degradation, using up resources faster than replacements can be found or developed—as well as the imperialist economic, political, and military penetration of the periphery by leading core countries—all flow out of the very nature of the capitalism. A new society is needed because the evils are part of the DNA of the capitalist system. Moving away from capitalism is not really a choice—the environmental constraints and the growth of immiseration will force a change in the society. The future points to limited possibilities—a turn to fascism (barbarism) or the creation of a collective society that can provide the basic needs for all of humanity.

#### Reformism fails to be the totalizing rejection necessary for the totalizing system of capitalism, making exploitation by the bourgeois easier

Tumino 11 (Stephen, City University of New York (Kingsborough) “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before?”) APB

Without totalizing knowledge of exploitation—which is why such dialectical concepts as "capital" form the basis of Orthodox Marxist class theory—exploitation cannot be abolished. The cultural idealism of the de-politicized voiding of Marxist concepts fits right in with the "volunteer-ism" of the neoliberals and "compassionate" conservatives that they use to justify their massive privatization programs. Considering class struggle politics as a matter of cultural struggles over symbolic status is identical to the strategy of considering the dismantling of social welfare as an opportunity for "local" agency freed from coercive state power, i.e., the bedrock of the "non-governmental" activism and "community" building of the bourgeois reformists. When President select Bush seeks to mobilize what he calls the "armies of compassion" against the "Washington insiders" and return "power" to the "people" it is the old cultural studies logic that all politics is "people vs. power bloc," a warmed over popular frontism that makes politics a matter of building de-politicized cross-class coalitions for bourgeois right, utopic models of a post-political social order without class struggle possessing equality of representation that excludes the revolutionary vanguard. As Marx and Engels said of the "bourgeois socialists" of their day, such utopian measures "at. . . best, lessen the cost, and simplify the administrative work, of bourgeois government" (Manifesto of the Communist Party, Selected Works, 59). Zizek's "affirmation" of revolutionary Marxism as a "totalitarian" desire that polarizes the cultural "lifeworld" between "friends" and "enemies" is another relay of "class-as-an-after-effect of 'struggle'" of the networked left. What the parody does is make class struggle a rhetorical "invention" of Marx(ists) analogous to the bourgeois "rights" politics of the transnational coalitional regime of exploitation ruling today, and erases the need for a global theory of social change. Orthodox Marxism cuts through the closed atmosphere of the "friends" of the networked left and their embrace of a voluntarist "compassionate" millenarianism with a critique from outside so to expose the global collective need for a revolutionary social theory and red cultural studies to end exploitation for all.

#### Reformism merely masks the structural exploitation inevitable in any form of capitalism, dooming actual change

Tumino 11 (Stephen, City University of New York (Kingsborough) “Is Occupy Wall Street Communist?”

<http://redcritique.org/WinterSpring2012/isoccupywallstreetcommunist.htm>) APB

Class, for Marx, explains the global division of labor that exists between those who own and control the means of production of social wealth and those who own nothing but their labor power which they must sell to the employers in order to live. Class inequality will only change, therefore, when the workers end their economic exploitation by capital and take control of production and establish a society in which the rule is "from each according to their ability, to each according to their need" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme). Like the mainstream commentary, Zizek's idea of communism as defense of the idea of community only addresses inequality as if it were a problem of the unfair distribution of wealth and power. While Glenn Beck thinks that any re-distribution of wealth from the rich to the poor would create a violent disruption of an otherwise peaceful, fair and just society, Zizek thinks that the re-distribution of wealth from the poor to the rich that has been the norm since Reagan's presidency is brutal, unjust, and needs to be made fairer. Communism for Zizek amounts to a fairer distribution of wealth in which we do not sacrifice the common good in order to make a few people rich. If the OWS protests are communist in the way Zizek argues, however, and what is being protested is only corporate "greed and corruption" as the OWS website says, then it is not the cause of the class inequality that lies in the daily exploitation of labor by capital at the point of production that is being opposed but only the effects of class on culture because of the way it has allowed the special interests of a tiny minority to dominate social and political life. But by only protesting the cultural effects of class ("greed and corruption"), rather than the cause of the stark inequality that we see, the dominant belief that capitalism may be made "fair" and "democratic" is maintained. The effect of this belief is to make it seem as if the daily exploitation of the working class by the capitalist class is normal and therefore acceptable—it's just the way things are and, therefore, ought to be. By making it seem as if the roots of inequality lie in personal greed and unfairness—and not the law of profit that exploits labor—it becomes impossible to understand and abolish class inequality at its roots. What Zizek and other "left" theorists promote as "communism" presumes that if we only make the system a little fairer, with a little more regulation of Wall Street and a little more protection for workers, then everything will go back to the way it was in some mythological past and democracy will be restored.However, without a basic understanding of class that critiques the dominant ideology that normalizes capitalism by representing it as open to being made "fair" and "democratic," it is impossible to change it, and the domination of social and political life by the 1% will continue. People interested in the Occupy movement sometimes worry that it will be co-opted by the Democrats and diverted from being a movement against social inequality into merely a movement to re-elect Obama and hope for piecemeal reforms. But given the focus on the "greed and corruption" of corporate rule and given the lack of a critique of capitalism that exposes its basic class inequality and explains why there cannot be democracy while classes exist, it is clear that at the level of ideas OWS has already been co-opted into an ideological support of the existing class system. It is for this reason that even the Republicans are able to use the language of Occupy for their own electoral strategies, as Gingrich and Perry have done by attacking the "vulture capitalism" of Romney's investment firm. This ideological limitation and accommodation to bourgeois norms means that OWS as it currently exists is a reformist movement that is attempting to save capitalism at a time of crisis rather than a genuine worker's movement to replace capitalism—which is a system for making profit for a few off of the labor of the many—with socialism—a system whose primary purpose is meeting the needs of the many by abolishing the exploitation of labor by capital. And yet, what's driving people into the Occupy protests, whether or not they realize it—in New York City, in Oakland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Austin, Charleston, Fort Lauderdale, all over the US and around the world—is not the corruption of democracy by greedy corporations but the crisis of the capitalist system itself.

#### Society beyond oppression is only possible if we move away from reformist politics

Principles Of Marxism Working Group 99 (Principles of Arbeitsgruppe Marxismus), “Introduction” Translated by Georg Hammeter, Paul Mazurka, Eddie Proprenter, and Eric Wegner, <http://www.agmarxismus.net/english/english4.htm>) APB

This compellingly demands the overcoming of reformism as dominating political force within the working class movement. The influence of reformism will not diminish „on its own'' - even in periods of revolutionary upheavals. On the contrary, reformist organisations can play a key role (because of their traditional roots within the working class) in appeasing and preventing revolutions. This implies that, in the process of building revolutionary parties, reformist mass organisations must not be ignored or simply „unmasked''. Ways and means have to be found to influence the political development in the reformist parties - not with the illusionary goal of reforming those parties, but to separate the basis from the reformist party bureaucrats and reformism altogether.

#### Reforms act within the framework of capital, ensuring they will never make true gain

Luxemburg 86 (Rosa, Polish-born revolutionary, a leader of the left-wing movement in Germany, “Social Reform or Revolution" p. 8) APB

Within the framework of present society, producers’ co-operatives are limited to the role of simple annexes to consumers’ co-operatives. It appears, therefore, that the latter must be the beginning of the proposed social change. But this way the expected reform of society by means of co-operatives ceases to be an offensive against capitalist production. That is, it ceases to be an attack against the principal bases of capitalist economy. It becomes, instead, a struggle against commercial capital, especially small and middle-sized commercial capital. It becomes an attack made on the twigs of the capitalist tree. According to Bernstein, trade unions too, are a means of attack against capitalism in the field of production. We have already shown that trade unions cannot give the workers a determining influence over production. Trade unions can determine neither the dimensions of production nor the technical progress of production. This much may be said about the purely economic side of the "struggle of the rate of wages against the rate of profit," as Bernstein labels the activity of the trade union. It does not take place in the blue of the sky. It takes place within the well-defined framework of the law of wages. The law of wages is not shattered by applied by trade-union activity. According to Bernstein, it is the trade unions that lead–in the general movement for the emancipation of the working class–the real attack against the rate of industrial profit. According to Bernstein, trade unions have the task of transforming the rate of industrial profit into "rates of wages." The fact is that trade unions are least able to execute an economic offensive against profit.

### Environment

#### Environmental reforms do nothing to check the excesses of capital

International Socialist Group 3 (World Congress of the Fourth International “Ecology and Socialism”, <http://www.isg-fi.org.uk/spip.php?article104>) APB

Today, a practical approach to environmental problems is part of every bourgeois government's program. In general, there is an attempt to set limits to air, soil and water pollution. To these are added gradual plans to reduce the dangerous effects of production-process residues. When all is said and done, these are band-aid measures that do not counteract the real destruction taking place. Economic programs and policy orientations concerning the "ecological market economy" have also taken on importance. Up until now, attempts to re-orient the capitalist economy to an environmentally friendly functioning have not got off the drawing table.

### AT: Keynes

#### Keynesian economics can’t sustain capitalism. Its contradictions are inherent and unreformable.

Meszaros 9 (Istvan, Professor Emeritus at the University of Sussex, “Interview: A structural crisis of the system” Interview by Judith Orr and Patrick Ward, <http://www.socialistreview.org.uk/article.php?articlenumber=10672>) APB

I recently heard Edmund Phelps, who got the 2006 Nobel Prize in Economics. Phelps is a kind of neo-Keynesian. He was, of course, glorifying capitalism and presenting the current problems as just a little hiccup, saying, "All we have to do now is bring back Keynesian ideas and regulation." John Maynard Keynes believed that capitalism was ideal, but he wanted regulation. Phelps was churning out the grotesque idea that the system is like a music composer. He may have some off days when he can't produce so well but if you look at his whole life he's wonderful! Just think of Mozart - he must have had the odd bad day. So that's capitalism in trouble, Mozart's bad days. If anyone believes that, he should have his head examined. But instead of having his head examined he is awarded a prize. If our adversaries have this level of thought - which they have demonstrated now over a 50-year period so it's not just an accidental slip by one award-winning economist - we could say, "Rejoice, this is the low level of our adversary." But with this kind of conception you end up with the disaster we experience every day. We have sunk into astronomic debt. The real liabilities in this country must be counted in trillions. But the important point is that they have been practising financial profligacy as a result of the structural crisis of the productive system. It is not an accident that money has been flowing in such an adventurist way into the financial sector. The accumulation of capital couldn't function properly in the field of the productive economy. We are now talking about the structural crisis of the system. It extends everywhere and it even encroaches on our relationship to nature, undermining the fundamental conditions for human survival. For example, from time to time they announce some targets to cut pollution. We even have a ministry of energy and climate change, which is really a ministry of hot air because nothing is done except announcing a target. But the target is never even approached, let alone fulfilled. This is an integral part of the structural crisis of the system and only structural solutions can get us out of this terrible situation.

#### **Keynesian economics exacerbate the contradictions of capitalism**

Meszaros 5 (Istvan, Professor Emeritus at the University of Sussex, “The Power of Ideology: new and revised edition,” <http://www.amazon.com/The-Power-Ideology-Updated-Edition/dp/1842773143>, p. xi-xiii) APB

In another lecture included in that volume, written in the same spirit of boundless self-confidence as "Economic possibilities for our grandchildren" with the title: "Am I a Liberal?" and delivered at an earlier date, in 1926 Keynes openly admitted that "When it comes to the class struggle as such ... the class war will find me on the side of the educated bourgeoisie",1 instead of pretending, as it is customary today in respectable intellectual and political circles, that there is no such thing as the class struggle. The latter is supposed to be a pure invention of a certain Karl Marx, although in fact the forceful diagnosis of the seminal role played by the class struggle in historical development was first elaborated by some major French historians of the "educated bourgeoisie", and their highly original theoretical contribution was duly acknowledged by Marx himself. In his "Economic possibilities for our grandchildren" Keynes decreed with candid confidence and optimism that "humanity's economic problem" (as he called it) will be fully solved within one hundred years. According to this projection, the "economic problem" - in his theorization completely divorced from all of its fundamental social dimensions - will be so fully and irreversibly solved that our dilemma will be how to\* occupy ourselves at all in the total xii THE POWER OF IDEOLOGY absence of - again in his own words: "foul"2 - economic pressures which now motivate us. As a result, in that irresistibly advancing world of unlimited leisure "We shall honour those who can teach us how to pluck the hour and the day virtuously and well, the delightful people who are capable of taking direct enjoyment in things, the lilies of the field who toil not, neither do their spin".3 The point that must be underlined here is that another sixteen years have gone by since I first quoted these words, and we are now only 26 years away from the magic moment of quasi-biblical fulfillment postulated by Keynes. But what happened in these 74 years: nearly three quarters of the way to the promised land? Did we get any nearer to the conditions so confidently anticipated by the author of Essays in Persuasion? The sobering answer is: not in the slightest. Quite the contrary, despite all advances in the productive powers of our society - which must be under our present conditions of existence also ubiquitously diffused and irresponsibly used destructive powers - the crying inequalities we have to confront with sustained determination, in order to get even one inch nearer to the desired objectives, have become immeasurably greater and structurally even more deeply entrenched than before. At the same time the dangers that must be overcome in order to have any future at all, let alone an idealized future, are now that much more aggravated than what Keynes could even dream about. At the rate of progress we have made in the last 74 years for resolving the structurally entrenched inequalities of our society, moving rather more backwards than forwards, we would need not 26 years to reach the goal envisaged by Keynes but an infinity of time. The trouble is, though, that humanity has no infinity of time at its disposal when in reality it has to face the danger of potential self-annihilation, due to the apparent uncontrollability of its mode of social metabolic reproduction under the rule of capital. Keynes had put his faith, in support of his boundless "persuasive" optimism, in a rather naive mechanistic vision which projected the automatic power of "compound interest" for achieving the desired accumulation of capital. In his view it was the irresistible destiny of this unlimited accumulation of capital emanating not from the power of humanly degrading exploitative production but from the somewhat mysterious and totally beneficial financial domain of "compound interest" (a neutral fiction, akin to the "globalizing" fantasies of our time: in both cases tendentiously abstracted from the role of the far from our time: in both cases tendentiously abstracted from the role of the far from neutral guarantor and enforcer: the capitalist state) - which in its turn was supposed to bring with it the projected happy ending. His own, openly confessed, "educated bourgeois" ideological horizon could not allow Keynes to see or admit that the structurally inalterable imperative of restless capital accumulation, fatefully inimical even in its longest term xiii perspective to any idea of restful human gratification and to a correspondingly different conception of time, was totally incompatible with moving from the present order of society - where in his own words "foul is useful and fair is not" - "out of the tunnel of economic necessity into the daylight"4 of a qualitatively different and humanly rewarding social order. Thus, trapped by the dictates of his "educated bourgeois" social interests, Keynes ideologically embellished and propagandized in his Essays in Persuasion precisely the structurally safeguarded cause of humankind's perilous condition as the ideal remedy to all of the existing troubles and contradictions. An evident fallacy of the worst kind. In reality nothing could sustain such a vision in the lifetime of Keynes, nor indeed ever since those heady days. The well deserved collapse of the WTO's meeting in Cancun in September 2003, highlighting the miserable condition of the overwhelming majority of humankind, thanks to the defiant intervention of the "wretched of the earth", puts forcefully into relief how far we are even today from taking the first timid steps in the direction of facing up to the growing dangers and ever-accumulating contradictions of our "foul" predicament, let alone from finding for them the postulated Keynesian ideal solutions. This is where we find ourselves today, when we can no longer afford to confound the fundamental causes of human grievances with their advocated utterly fictionalized and at the same time highly partisan - illusory remedy, whether the latter is offered with open and honest self-assurance, as done by John Maynard Keynes in his Essays in Persuasion, or as the deceptive ideological

## AT: Transition Wars

They will not attack the labor; violence will not be used to stop the transition away from capitalism nor would it work

Meszaros 95 **(**Istvan, Prof @ U of Sussex. Beyond Capital. P 725-727)

Another argument which is often used in favour of permanent accommodation is the threat of extreme authoritarian measures that must be faced by a socialist revolutionary movement. This argument is backed up by emphasizing both the immense destructive power at capital's disposal and the undeniable historical fact that no ruling order ever cedes willingly its position of command over society, using if need be even the most violent form of repression to retain its rule. The weakness of this argument is twofold, despite the factual circumstances which would seem to support it. First, it disregards that the antagonistic confrontation between capital and labour is not a political/military one in which one of the antagonists could be slaughtered on the battlefield or riveted to chains. Inasmuch as there can be chains in this confrontation, labour is wearing them already, in that the only type of chains compatible with the system must be 'flexible' enough to enable the class of labour to produce and be exploited. Nor can one imagine that the authoritarian might of capital is likely to be used only against a revolutionary socialist movement. The repressive anti-labour measures of the last two decades — not to mention many instances of past historical emergency characterized by the use of violence under the capital system —give a foretaste of worse things to come in the event of extreme confrontations. But this is not a matter of either/or, with some sort of apriori guarantee of a 'fair' and benevolent treatment in the event of labour's willing accommodation and submission. The matter hinges on the gravity of the crisis and on the circumstances under which the antagonistic confrontations unfold. Uncomfortable as this truth may sound to socialists, one of the heaviest chains which labour has to wear today is that it is tied to capital for its continued survival, for as long as it does not succeed in making a strategic break in the direction of a transition to a radically different social metabolic order. But that is even more true of capital, with the qualitative difference that capital cannot make any break towards the establishment of a different social order. For capital, truly, 'there is no alternative' — and there can never be — to its exploitative structural dependency on labour. If nothing else, this fact sets well marked limits to capital's ability to permanently subdue labour by violence, compelling it to use, instead, the earlier mentioned 'flexible chains' against the class of labour. It can use violence with success selectively, against limited groups of labour, but not against the socialist movement organized as a revolutionary mass movement. This is why the development of 'communist mass consciousness' (to use Marx's expression), in contrast to the vulnerability of narrow sectarian orientation, is so important. The second point that must be made in this context is equally important. It concerns the innermost determinations of the capital system as a necessarily expansion-oriented and accumulation-driven social metabolic order. The point is that the exercise of power through the repressive machinery of violence is extremely wasteful in the system's own terms of reference; even if undoubtedly it can serve the purpose of redressing the power relations in capital's favour in a situation of emergency. What must weigh heavily in the balance is that it is impossible to secure the required expansion and capital-accumulation on a permanent basis through the perpetuation of economically wasteful emergency, apart from its anything but negligible political dangers. The idea of' Big Brother' successfully ruling over labour as a permanent condition is too fantastic even for a work of Orwellian fiction, let alone for the actuality of capital's mode of social metabolic reproduction. For the latter must perish if it is unable to secure its own reproduction through the appropriation of the fruits of ever more productive labour and the concomitant expanded realization of value, which in its turn is inconceivable without a dynamic process of 'productive consumption'. And neither ever-improving labour productivity, with the necessarily increasing socialization of the labour process as its precondition, nor the required — ever-expanding — scale of 'productive consumption' is compatible with the idea of a permanent state of emergency. Moreover, as Chomsky rightly argued many years ago, the surveillance system that must go with a successful enforcement of permanent authoritatian rule involves the absurdity (and, of course, the corresponding cost) of infinite regress in monitoring not only the population at large but also the monitoring personnel itself, as well as the monitors of the monitors,290 etc. We must add here that the idea of capital's permanent rule through the use of violence must also postulate the total unity of global capital against the national labour forces which happen to be effectively under the control of capital's particular units in the existing (but by no means unified) global order. This vacuous postulate of capital's global unity and uniformity arbitrarily brushes aside not only the law of uneven development. It also ignores the abundant historical evidence which shows that the exercise of force on a mass scale — through war — always needed masses of people to be able to impose violence on their counterparts, motivated as a rule for many centuries by national rivalries. Indeed, the national articulation of the global capital system, far from being a historical accident, had a great deal to do with capital's need to maintain control over the labour force with at least some degree of consensus. Otherwise the inter-capitalist rivalries, all the way to the most comprehensive international conflagrations, would be unmanageably risky from the point of view of total social capital, nullifying the inner logic of the system to fight out to the full the conflict of interests and make the strongest prevail in the Hobbesian helium omnium contra omnes. For in every situation of major inter-capitalist confrontation the capital system itself would be in danger of being overthrown by its labour antagonist, in the absence of a sufficiently high degree of consensus — present as a rule to a very high degree in national conflicts — between capital and labour belonging to the same side. (In fact some radical socialists tried to counter this consensus, unsuccessfully, with the programme inviting the workers at the outbreak of the First World War 'to turn their weapons against their national bourgeoisie'.) Thus, to sum up, all of the arguments in favour of capital's permanent rule through the imposition of violence on a mass scale suffer from having to define their conditions of realization in a self-contradictory way. Accordingly, as mentioned in Section 18.2.5, to project the rule of capital, in its direct antagonistic confrontation with labour, by way of a completely unstable, hence necessarily transient, state of emergency, as the permanent condition of its future normality, is a mind-boggling notion. To be sure, no one should doubt that the use of violence may postpone for a shorter or longer period of time the success of labour's positive emancipatory efforts; but it cannot prevent the exhaustion of capital's productive potentialities. On the contrary, if anything, it can only accelerate their exhaustion if violence is used on a mass scale, thereby radically undermining the objective conditions of capital's rule.

#### No transition wars – from the internal problems of the current conditions the government can’t commit resources to prevent the masses

Bennett and Nordstrom 2k – Department of Political Science, Pennsylvania State University (D. Scott, Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 44, No. 1, Feb., pp. 33-61, JSTOR)

This leads to our first hypothesis, which is as follows: Hypothesis 1: Poor economic conditions lead to diversionary actions against the rival. Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a "guns versus butter" world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States.

#### Violence is not relied apon by the ruling class, the overthrow of capitalism wont resort to violence as well

Nigam ‘2008 [Aditya Nigam, Joint Director of the Programme in Social and Political Theory, & Political Scientist “Reflections on Revolutionary Violence,”]

<http://kafila.org/2008/11/21/reflections-on-revolutionary-violence/>

“The strong Marxist flavor in the rhetoric of the New Left coincides with the steady growth of the entirely non-Marxian conviction, proclaimed by Mao Tsetung, “Power grows out of the barrel of a gun.” To be sure, Marx was aware of the role of violence in history, but this role was to him secondary; not violence but the contradictions inherent in the old society brought about its end. The emergence of a new society was preceded, but not caused, by violent outbreaks, which he likened to the labor pangs that precede, but of course do not cause, the event of organic birth.” “In the same vein, Marx regarded the state as an instrument of violence at the command of the ruling class; but the actual power of the ruling class did not consist of nor rely on violence. It was defined by the role the ruling class played in society, or more exactly, by its role in the process of production. It has often been noticed, and sometimes deplored, that the revolutionary Left, under the influence of Marx’s teachings, ruled out the use of violent means; the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’—openly repressive in Marx’s writings—came after the revolution and was meant, like the Roman dictatorship, as a strictly limited period. Political assassination, with the exception of a few acts of individual terror perpetuated by small groups of anarchists, was mostly the prerogative of the Right, while organized armed uprisings remained the specialty of the military.”

#### As we reject the capitalist society, there will be a peaceful shifting to the alternative

Trainer 02 DEMOCRACY & NATURE: The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY vol.8, no.1, (March 2002) Debating the significance of the Global Eco-village Movement; A reply to Takis Fotopoulos Ted Trainer is a professor in the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales. His main interests have been global problems, sustainability issues, radical critiques of the economy, alternative social forms and the transition to them. He has written numerous books and articles on these topics, including, The Conserver Society: Alternatives for Sustainability, Saving the Environment: What It Will Take, and What Should We Do?. He is also developing Pigface Point, an alternative lifestyle educational site near Sydney. Visit his website: <http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/>

This is precisely what I am arguing for! Any differences between us here are fairly trivial. On p. 303 he claims that I am saying "...building ecovillages...is the most sensible thing to do here and now in order to maximise our long term contribution to the transition...", but then he says, "In contrast, the approach suggested by the IDS project is to start building a massive programmatic political movement, like the old socialist movement, here and now." But this is not "in contrast" to what I am arguing; it is precisely what I am suggesting that we do...although I am adding that the best way to start doing it is to start building alternatives. Takis says the difference is that in his strategy these developments are "...part of a programatic political movement for systemic change." He does not provide any detail on the nature and content of this movement, but I have no problem with the notion of these initiatives being the first steps in a wider movement that could involve some very different elements, such as focus on taking power and indeed violent confrontation. However I am not convinced the transition must inevitably involve overt conflict, let alone violence. It probably will, but it is conceivable that as conditions deteriorate and as the existence of a more sensible way becomes more evident, and as access to it increases as a result of Eco-village building, there will be a more or less peaceful shift to The Simpler Way. Again I do not think this is very likely, but it is possibility to be worked for. Nothing is foregone in heading down that path, on the understanding that in time it might become clear that overt confrontation might have to be accepted. The longer we can grow while avoiding confrontation the less likely that we will be crushed if it does occur. However the issue is of no practical importance at this point in time. Whatever conclusion one comes to on it our best strategy here and now is to plunge into establishing and spreading the new ways. It will be a long time before it will be evident whether or not we must contest those who have power now, or whether they will lose their power in a collapse of the present resource-expensive infrastructures and of legitimacy. It seems to me therefore that Takis and I are both saying to people more or less on the Left, please join us in the task of starting to establish the new ways, lifestyles and structures right now, as part of a strategy that also involves public education and other forms of political action, and that is intended to become a mass political movement. This does not mean we should stop fighting to defend against the damage the system is causing, or contributing to anti-globalisation campaigns. But it being argued that there is something far more important to do than simply oppose (or reform) the system, which is all that most people on the Left (or in the anti-globalisation movement) are doing.

#### By building localized communities, the strategy will not confront the system, but builds an alternative that will attract people to it

Trainer 2000

Where are we, where do we want to be, how do we get there? Ted Trainer DEMOCRACY & NATURE: The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY vol.6, no.2, (July 2000) Ted Trainer is a professor in the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales. His main interests have been global problems, sustainability issues, radical critiques of the economy, alternative social forms and the transition to them. He has written numerous books and articles on these topics, including, The Conserver Society: Alternatives for Sustainability, Saving the Environment: What It Will Take, and What Should We Do?. He is also developing Pigface Point, an alternative lifestyle educational site near Sydney. Visit his website: <http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/>

By contrast, Chapter 6 of What Is To Be Done ― Now? proposes beginning those local economic renewal activities which could enable people, especially disadvantaged people to start meeting some of their own urgent needs. This would provide an incentive for involvement and experience of participation and co-operation, while actually constructing the first elements in the new local economies. In other words this proposal at least offers people meaningful things to do here and now, things which have some chance (but obviously no guarantee) of attracting and retaining participation and accelerating the existing Eco-village movement.

Surprisingly Takis is strongly opposed to the idea of attempting to set examples.[[28]](http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol6/trainer_where.htm" \l "_edn28) In another source he is even more emphatic. “Setting an example of a sound and preferable lifestyles at the individual and social level (is)...utterly ineffective in bringing about a systemic social change. (This)...does not have any chance of success...in building the democratic majority needed or for systematic social change...systematic social change can never be achieved outside the main political and social arena. The elimination of the present power structures and relations can neither be achieved ‘by setting an example’ nor through education and persuasion. A power base is needed to destroy power.”[[29]](http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol6/trainer_where.htm" \l "_edn29) Chomsky is then criticised on these grounds. Similarly Takis ridicules the idea that we could “bypass” the system by building alternatives.[[30]](http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol6/trainer_where.htm" \l "_edn30) He anticipates open confrontation of some kind, regarding it as inevitable in the transition. “...the goal is to develop a public sphere...that grows in tension and ultimately in a decisive conflict with the state.”[[31]](http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol6/trainer_where.htm" \l "_edn31) Clearly the Eco-village strategy does not set out to confront and it does focus on building an alternative to the system and attracting people to The Simpler Way.

## AT: Sustainable

#### Capitalism is unsustainable because it removes energy from the collective

Ikerd 06 Is Capitalism Sustainable?[1] John Ikerd Professor Emeritus of Agricultural & Applied Economics University of Missouri Columbia College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Sustaining People through Agriculture series,” Small Farm Today Magazine, Missouri Farm Publications, Clark, MO. November-December 2006. <http://web.missouri.edu/ikerdj/papers/SFT-Sustainable%20Captialism.htm#_ftn1> WW

I realize most readers of this magazine are operators of small farms. But, some questions are simply too important to leave the economists and politicians. If our capitalistic economy is not sustainable, neither are our farms or ultimately our society or humanity. Some questions are so important that no one can afford to remain uninformed, uncommitted, and uninvolved. Is capitalism sustainable? Not the type of capitalism that dominates American and most global economies today. This is not a matter of personal opinion, but a direct consequence of the most fundamental laws of science. Sustainability ultimately depends upon energy because anything that is useful in sustaining life on earth ultimately relies on energy. All material things that are of any use to humans – food, clothes, houses, automobiles, – require energy to make and energy to use. All useful human activities – working, thinking – require human energy. Physical scientists lump all such useful activities together and call them “work.” All work requires energy. In performing work, energy is always changed in form. In fact, the natural tendency of energy to change from more concentrated to less concentrated forms gives energy its ability to perform work. All material things, such as food, gasoline, plastic, and steel, are just highly concentrated forms of energy. Matter can be converted into energy, as in eating food or burning gasoline, and the form of energy can be changed, as in using heat to make electricity and electricity to produce light. However, even though work invariably changes matter to energy or changes the form of energy, no energy is lost. This is the first law of thermodynamics, the law of energy conservation, as in Einstein’s famous E=MC2. At first, it might seem that energy could simply be recycled and reused forever, as if sustainability would be inevitable. However, once energy is used to perform work, before it can be used again, it must be reconcentrated, reorganized, and restored. Unfortunately, it takes energy to reconcentrate, reorganize, and restore energy. And, the energy used to reconcentrate and restore energy is simply no longer available to do anything else. It has lost its usefulness. This is the law of entropy, the second law of thermodynamics; the tendency of all closed systems to tend toward the ultimate degradation of matter and energy; toward inert uniformity; an absence of structure, pattern, organization, or differentiation. The barren surfaces of the Moon or Mars are examples of systems near entropy. Since loss of useful energy to entropy is inevitable, it might seem that sustainability is impossible. Even if waste and pollution could be completely avoided in the processes of using and reusing energy, the tendency toward entropy would continue. In fact, life on earth would not be sustainable without the daily inflow of new solar energy. Sustainability ultimately depends upon the use of solar energy to offset the unavoidable effects of entropy. Capitalism is a very efficient system of energy extraction, but it provides no incentive to reconcentrate and restore energy to offset entropy. Capitalists have no economic incentive to invest in energy renewal for the benefit of those of future generations. Capitalists reduce waste and pollution or reuse resources only when it is profitable to do so, meaning only when it is in their individual self-interest to do so. Capitalists have incentives to use renewable energy to support current consumption, but not to re-storing energy for future generations. Capitalism inevitably tends toward physical entropy. The law of entropy applies to social energy and well as physical energy. All forms of human energy – labor, management, innovation, creativity – are products of social relationships. Humans cannot be born, reach maturity, and become useful without the help of other people who care about them personally. People must be educated, trained, civilized, and socialized before they can become productive members of complex societies. All organizations – including business organizations, governments, and economies – depend on the ability of people to work together for a common purpose, which in turn depend upon the sociability and civility of human societies. Human productivity is a direct result of healthy personal relationships, within families, friendships, communities, and societies. Capitalism inevitably dissipates, disperses, and disorganizes social energy because it weakens personal relationships. Maximum economic efficiency requires that people relate to each other impartially, which means impersonally. People must compete rather than cooperate, if market economies are to function efficiently. When people spend more time and energy working – being economically productive – they have less time and energy to spend on personal relationships within families and communities. When people buy things based solely on price rather than buy from people they know and trust, personal relationships within communities suffer from neglect. Capitalism devalues personal relationships and disconnects people and thus dissipates, disperses, and disorganizes social energy. Capitalistic economies use people to do work, while doing nothing to restore the “social capital” needed to sustain positive personal relationships. There is no economic incentive for capitalists to invest in families, communities, or society for the benefit of future generations. Capitalists build relationships or contribute to social causes only when such contributions are expected to contribute to their profits or growth. Capitalists do not waste energy by investing in social capital. Capitalism inevitably tends toward social entropy. Economies are simply the means by which people facilitate their relationships with other people and with their natural environment in complex societies. Economies actually produce nothing; they simply transform physical and social energy into raw materials and human labor, which can be exchanged in impersonal marketplaces.

#### Our current form of capitalism gives no incentive to sustain life on earth, turning into a unsustainable system of extraction and exploitation

Ikerd 06 Is Capitalism Sustainable?[1] John Ikerd Professor Emeritus of Agricultural & Applied Economics University of Missouri Columbia College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Sustaining People through Agriculture series,” Small Farm Today Magazine, Missouri Farm Publications, Clark, MO. November-December 2006. <http://web.missouri.edu/ikerdj/papers/SFT-Sustainable%20Captialism.htm#_ftn1> WW

All economic capital is extracted from either natural or social capital. Once all natural and social capital has been extracted, there will be no source of economic capital. Without capital, an economy loses its ability to produce; it tends toward economic entropy. Today’s capitalistic economies quite simply are not sustainable. A sustainable economy must be based on a fundamentally different paradigm, specifically, on the paradigm of living systems. Living things by nature are self-making, self-renewing, reproductive, and regenerative. Living plants have the natural capacity to capture, organize, and store solar energy, both to support other living organisms and to offset the energy that is inevitably lost to entropy. Living things also have a natural propensity to reproduce their species. Humans, for example, devote large amounts of time and energy to raising families, with very little economic incentive to do so. Obviously, an individual life is not sustainable because every living thing eventually dies. But, communities and societies of living individuals clearly have the capacity and natural propensity to be productive, while devoting a significant part of their life’s energy to conceiving and nurturing the next generation. Relationships within healthy living systems must be mutually beneficial, and thus must be selective in nature. All living organisms are made up of cells and each living cell is surrounded by a selective or semi-permeable membrane. These semi-permeable boundaries keep some things in but let other things out and keep some things out but let other things in. Living organisms likewise are defined by boundaries – skin, bark, scales, – that selectively allow different elements – air, water, food, waste, – to enter and to leave the body of the organism. If these boundaries were either completely permeable or impermeable, the organism would be incapable of life, and thus incapable of producing or reproducing. The same principle holds for all living systems: ecosystems, families, communities, economies, cultures. The relationships among elements of healthy natural ecosystems are by nature mutually beneficial. However, relationships among humans and between humans and nature are matters of choice, and thus must be consciously and purposefully selective. People must be willing and able to choose to maintain positive relationships with other people and to choose to take care of the earth, not only to benefit themselves, but also to benefit those of future generations. Capitalism provides no economic incentives to sustain life on earth, but humans have the innate capacity and natural tendency to do so. Throughout human history, people have chosen families, communities, and societies over isolation, even when it was not in their short run, individual self-interests to do so. Throughout human history, people have shown a sense of respect and reverence toward the earth, and have attempted to care for the earth, even when here was no incentive to do so. It’s only within the past few decades that humans in large numbers have abandoned their basic nature as living, caring beings in pursuit of their narrow, individual self-interests. Not until the last few decades, were the social and ethical constraints removed, turning capitalism into an unsustainable system of extraction and exploitation. To restore sustainability, people must make conscious, purposeful decisions to rely on renewable energy, not just for consumption, but also to rebuild stocks of natural capital for the benefit of future generations. To restore sustainability to capitalism, people must make conscious, purposeful choices to rebuild positive, mutually beneficial relationships with other people, not just for economic gains, but also to restore depleted stocks of social capital. No other economic system even approaches the efficiency of capitalism in utilizing economic capital to meet individual material human needs and wants. But, natural and social capital must be continually renewed and replenished to sustain economic capital. The sustainability of capitalism is simply too important to be left to the politicians and economists. Is capitalism sustainable? This question ultimately must be addressed by all people, including those who operate small farms. You don’t have to be “rocket scientist” to understand energy and entropy. All people have the ability and responsibility to understand the importance of this question, to commit, and to become involved.

#### Capitalism is unsustainable – It must continue to grow without limit in a world limited in resources which means it will end along with earth’s resources and the destruction of humanity

Taylor 8 Evolution's Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of Our World By Graeme Taylor. Graeme is currently an Adjunct Reader with the School of Integrative Systems, University of Queensland <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=LiRTmbcIvOQC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=%22capitalism+is+unsustainable%22&ots=XSP95seXjb&sig=auU5aIlGjSTa6wyQemKC9du3uZs#v=onepage&q=%22capitalism%20is%20unsustainable%22&f=false> 08WW

The fundamental problem people, economists and others 10 accept that there are environmental limits to growth? Why are they deaf to tlx warnings of scientists and blind to the approaching crises? The answer is that they, like us. are products of our cultures and our times. In every age most peo- ple have shared the values of their society. Today we live m capitalist industrial societies which confidently proclaim that market forces plus technology will solve every problem. Most policy makers support these values, not only because it is in their personal interests to defend the system, but also because they passionately believe that capitalism is the best system that has ever existed. And in many ways they are right. For two and a hall centuries industrialization has improved the living stan- dards of must people in the world — in general people now live longer and are better fed. better housed and better educated than ever before. Capitalism (the dominant type of industrial system) has helped to overthrow the dictatorial rule of kings and give individuals more rights and freedoms. Although industrialization has brought misery to many (especially where it has been imposed by force), in general it has brought tremendous benefits to our species.This is not to say that the industrial system is wonderful — the environment is being destroyed and the world is full of cruelty and sullcring. But it is as mean- ingless to say that the industrial system is bad as it is to label Stone Age societies or bad. For all its faults and crimes industrial civilization has been a necessary stage in the evolution of our species. From an evolutionary standpoint the funda- mental problem with the dominant world system is not that it is immoral, but that it is unsustainable. And the reason why industrial capitalism is unsustainable is not that it uses in- dustrial processes (which we need to raise living standards) or that it relies on market forces to set prices (an important economic tool) or even that it is based on self-interest and competition (these are part of our biological makeup). The prob- lem is that it is organized by a belief system that does not recognize the need for limits — limits on environmental exploitation, limits on economic competition and limits on social inequality. Industrial capitalism is like a car that has an accelerator but no brakes.

#### Capitalism has reached almost its end – short lived recoveries will go on until the final collapse

Ravier 10 LIBERTARIAN PAPERS VOL. 2, ART. NO. 26 (2010) 1 CAPITALISM, SOCIALISM AND PUBLIC CHOICE Adrián Ravier, Ph.D. in Applied Economics. URJC Research Fellow, Universidad Francisco Marroquín - University Francisco Marroquin Buenos Aires, Argentina Research field: [Economics](http://www.mendeley.com/economics/) - Macroeconomics Economics Macroeconomics History of Economic Thought Austrian School of Economics Money and Banking Business Cycles ADRIÁN O. RAVIER\* CITE THIS ARTICLE AS: Adrián O. Ravier, “Capitalism, Socialism and Public Choice,” Libertarian Papers 2, 26 (2010) <http://libertarianpapers.org/articles/2010/lp-2-26.pdf> WW

II. Why Capitalism Will Not Survive Schumpeter acknowledges that “many if not most of my fellow economists” see the Depression and the public policy response it elicited as a marked discontinuity in “the trend of capitalist evolution”: According to this view, we have been witnessing not merely a depression and a bad recovery, accentuated perhaps by anti-capitalist policies, but the symptoms of a permanent loss of vitality which must be expected to go on and to supply the dominating theme for the remaining movements of the capitalist symphony; hence no inference as to the future can be drawn from the functioning of the capitalist engine and of its performance in the past (1942, p. 111). Although it might appear to be a short step from capitalism’s “permanent loss of vitality” to the terminal crisis which immediately precedes the dawning of the socialist era, it would be a mistake to think that because Schumpeter and Marx agree on the eventual consequences, they also agree on the contributing factors. The essence of Marx’s critique of the capitalist order consists in the claim that before it collapses, capitalism enters a stage of permanent crisis, only temporally interrupted by short-lived, chimerical recoveries. His main focus is the effect of accumulation and capital concentration on the diminishing pool of profitable investments. In the following, let us therefore examine this aspect of the Marxist doctrine of capitalism’s inevitable selfdestruction, an aspect with which Schumpeter disagreed. The Marxist Trend: “The Theory of the Vanishing of Investment Opportunity” In Schumpeter’s own words “the main reasons for holding that opportunities for private enterprise and investment are vanishing are these: saturation, population, new lands [and] technological possibilities” (1942, p. 113). He then addresses each in turn. Concerning the first point, Schumpeter wonders: “is it not conceivable that wants may some day be so completely satisfied as to become frozen forever after?” (1942, p. 113). He then refutes the idea that either demand or supply is necessarily a function of the size of the population due to qualitative changes that inevitably influence both sides of the equation. Although he acknowledges that concern over a declining birth rate is ‘one of the most significant features of our time’ (1942, p. 115), he concludes that saturation of markets is clearly absurd, pointing out parallels with the refuted theory of Malthus:

#### Capitalism requires increasing investment by the state which leads to a point which it can no longer be sustained and will collapse

Carson 12 Weekend Edition May 25-27, 2012 27 When the Teat Runs Dry Why Corporate Capitalism is Unsustainable by KEVIN CARSON Kevin Carson is a research associate at the Center for a Stateless Society. his written work includes Studies in Mutualist Political Economy, Organization Theory: An Individualist Anarchist Perspective, and The Homebrew Industrial Revolution: A Low-Overhead Manifesto, all of which are freely available online. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2012/05/25/why-corporate-capitalism-is-unsustainable/> WW

I’m not a Marxist, but I find a lot of Marx’s ideas useful. Old Karl certainly had a gift for turning a phrase. Nobody who could come up with something as Proudhonian as “the associated producers” could be all bad. One of his best in my opinion was that new productive forces eventually “become incompatible with their capitalist integument,” at which point “the integument is burst asunder.” Another source of vivid imagery is the Preamble to the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World. Consider this: ”… we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.” These two phrases brilliantly describe the predicament of state-fostered corporate capitalism. Capitalism as an historic system is five hundred or more years old, and the state was intimately involved in its formation and its ongoing preservation from the very beginning. But the state has been far more involved, if such a thing is possible, in the model of corporate capitalism that’s prevailed over the past 150 years. The corporate titans that dominate our economic and political life could hardly survive for a year without the continuing intervention of the state in the market to sustain them through subsidies and monopoly protections. This system is reaching its limits of sustainability. Here are some reasons why: 1) The monopolies on which it depends are increasingly unenforceable. Especially “intellectual property.” 1a) Copyright-based industry has already lost the fight to end file-sharing. 1b) Industrial patents are only enforceable when oligopoly industry, oligopoly retail chains reduce transaction cost of enforcement — unenforceable against neighborhood garage factories using pirated CAD/CAM files. 2) Cheap production tools and soil-efficient horticulture are 2a) increasing competition from self-employment 2b) reducing profitable investment opportunities for surplus capital and destroying direct rate of profit (DROP) 3) State-subsidized production inputs leads to geometrically increasing demand for those inputs, outstripping the state’s ability to supply and driving it into chronic fiscal crisis. For centuries the state has provided large-scale capitalist agribusiness with privileged access to land stolen from the laboring classes. For 150 years, it has subsidized inputs like railroads, airports and highways for long-distance shipping, and irrigation water for factory farming. But as any student of Microecon 101 could tell you, subsidizing something means more and more of it gets consumed. So you get agribusiness that’s inefficient in its use of land and water, and industry that achieves false economies of scale by producing for artificially large market areas. Each year it takes a larger government subsidy to keep this business model profitable. 4) Worsening tendencies toward overaccumulation and stagnation increase the amount of chronic deficit spending necessary for Keynesian aggregate demand management, also worsening the fiscal crisis. The state has built a massive military-industrial complex and created entire other industries at state expense to absorb excess investment capital and overcome the system’s tendency toward surplus production and surplus capital, and sustained larger and larger deficits, just to prevent the collapse that otherwise would have already occurred. In short, capitalism depends on ever-growing amounts of state intervention in the market for its survival, and the system is hitting the point where the teat runs dry. The result is a system in which governments and corporations are increasingly hollowed out. And meanwhile, growing up within this corporate capitalist “integument,” things like open source software and culture, open-source industrial design, permaculture and low-overhead garage micromanufacturing eat the corporate-state economy alive. An ever-growing share of labor and production are disappearing into relocalized resilient economies, self-employment, worker cooperatives and the informal and household economy. In the end, they will skeletonize the corporate dinosaurs like a swarm of piranha.

#### Capitalism requiring increasing amounts of resources is unsustainable

Sutton 11 21 March 2011 - 2:50pm - [David K. Sutton](http://leftcall.com/author/d-k-sutton/)- [Economy](http://leftcall.com/category/economy/) Infinite Growth Is UnsustainableAbout The Left Call | An Appeal for ReasonThe Left Call offers a raw and unfiltered focus on the most important social and political issues of our time. Independent and unbeholden, our perspective does not bow to the corrupting power of moneyed interests. There are no hidden agendas, and no ulterior motives. We will challenge the nonsense, the hypocrisy, and the money corrupting our democracy. The Left Call is Founder – Editor – Primary Contributor http://leftcall.com/2011/03/21/infinite-growth-is-unsustainable/WW

Capitalism, at least as we know it, requires infinite growth. For-profit companies have to continue to grow in size and increase their profits year after year or risk losing investment money. Many people have gotten very wealthy with this economic model and the rest of us, at least in industrialized countries, have benefited greatly as well. We have many modern conveniences and most of us are quite disconnected from the natural world in a way that would have been unimaginable to people only a few centuries ago. This is certainly good from the standpoint of making our lives easier but it’s not good when you look at the long term picture. The problem in the long term is that an economic model of infinite growth requires the use of natural resources at increasing rates. The most obvious of these natural resources is petroleum or oil. But many other resources like water and coal are being used at increasing rates to sustain growth in population. This growth in population is fueled by the continued increase in use of natural resources. It’s a cycle of infinite growth that is simply unsustainable on a planet of finite resources.

#### Cap Unsustainable

Carson 12 (Kevin, May 25, 2012, Center For a Stateless Society, “Why Corporate Capitalism is Unsustainable”, accessed 7.5.12, KR)

I’m not a Marxist, but I find a lot of Marx’s ideas useful. Old Karl certainly had a gift for turning a phrase. Nobody who could come up with something as Proudhonian as “the associated producers” could be all bad. One of his best in my opinion was that new productive forces eventually “become incompatible with their capitalist integument,” at which point “the integument is burst asunder.” Another source of vivid imagery is the Preamble to the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World. Consider this: “… we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.” These two phrases brilliantly describe the predicament of state-fostered corporate capitalism. Capitalism as an historic system is five hundred or more years old, and the state was intimately involved in its formation and its ongoing preservation from the very beginning. But the state has been far more involved, if such a thing is possible, in the model of corporate capitalism that’s prevailed over the past 150 years. The corporate titans that dominate our economic and political life could hardly survive for a year without the continuing intervention of the state in the market to sustain them through subsidies and monopoly protections. This system is reaching its limits of sustainability. Here are some reasons why: 1) The monopolies on which it depends are increasingly unenforceable. Especially “intellectual property.” 1a) Copyright-based industry has already lost the fight to end file-sharing. 1b) Industrial patents are only enforceable when oligopoly industry, oligopoly retail chains reduce transaction cost of enforcement — unenforceable against neighborhood garage factories using pirated CAD/CAM files. 2) Cheap production tools and soil-efficient horticulture are 2a) increasing competition from self-employment 2b) reducing profitable investment opportunities for surplus capital and destroying direct rate of profit (DROP) 3) State-subsidized production inputs leads to geometrically increasing demand for those inputs, outstripping the state’s ability to supply and driving it into chronic fiscal crisis. For centuries the state has provided large-scale capitalist agribusiness with privileged access to land stolen from the laboring classes. For 150 years, it has subsidized inputs like railroads, airports and highways for long-distance shipping, and irrigation water for factory farming. But as any student of Microecon 101 could tell you, subsidizing something means more and more of it gets consumed. So you get agribusiness that’s inefficient in its use of land and water, and industry that achieves false economies of scale by producing for artificially large market areas. Each year it takes a larger government subsidy to keep this business model profitable. 4) Worsening tendencies toward overaccumulation and stagnation increase the amount of chronic deficit spending necessary for Keynesian aggregate demand management, also worsening the fiscal crisis. The state has built a massive military-industrial complex and created entire other industries at state expense to absorb excess investment capital and overcome the system’s tendency toward surplus production and surplus capital, and sustained larger and larger deficits, just to prevent the collapse that otherwise would have already occurred. In short, capitalism depends on ever-growing amounts of state intervention in the market for its survival, and the system is hitting the point where the teat runs dry. The result is a system in which governments and corporations are increasingly hollowed out. And meanwhile, growing up within this corporate capitalist “integument,” things like open source software and culture, open-source industrial design, permaculture and low-overhead garage micromanufacturing eat the corporate-state economy alive. An ever-growing share of labor and production are disappearing into relocalized resilient economies, self-employment, worker cooperatives and the informal and household economy. In the end, they will skeletonize the corporate dinosaurs like a swarm of piranha.

#### Capitalism and its values is a threat to democratic society, threatens the free market and is ultimately unsustainable

Preston 07 Noel Preston Understanding Ethnic THE Federation PRESS o7 Noel’s academic qualifications are: Cert.Teach. (KGCAE), BA., BD.,(Uni of Qld) , M.Ed (Hons.) (UNE), Th.D. (Boston University) oel Preston is an [ethicist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethicist), [theologian](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theologian) and social commentator and is currently Adjunct Professor in the [Key Centre for Ethics, Law Justice and Governance](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Key_Centre_for_Ethics,_Law_Justice_and_Governance&action=edit&redlink=1), [Griffith University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Griffith_University).http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=CptBc1vstFsC&oi=fnd&pg=PA164&dq=%22capitalism+is+unsustainable%22&ots=J5feZhF0m9&sig=d1l5FkYVcmm3JIAIPE8PH5Bqhf0#v=onepage&q=%22capitalism%20is%20unsustainable%22&f=false WW

By the 21st century, the consequences of all this for the global commu- nity, human and non-human, became matters of debate - a political economy debate that centred on moral philosophy and ethical values. It is a debate which the comprehensive responsiveness of an ethic of response would demand, widening the values under consideration and expanding the range of facts, consequences and alternatives constituting the context for ethical judgment. So, responsible voices critical of unregulated commerce and the abandon- ment of governmental responsibility in managing the economy for the com- mon good are multiplying. One such is American billionaire George Soros: Although I have made a fortune on the financial markets, I now fear that the untrammelled intensification of laisse^Jaire capitalism and the spread of market values into all areas of life are endangering our open democratic society. The main enemy of the open society, I believe, is no longer the communist but the capitalist threat,'6 The crescendo of ethical concern about the direction of free market capitalism is magnified by alarming reports about the health of the global natural environment, particularly regarding climate change and the gross poverty of some societies, even within affluent nations. In what is effectively an applied ethics tome, Jonathon Porritt published the case for reframing our economic system. His starting point is unmistakable: the current dominant model of capitalism is unsustainable and unjust. So, can capitalism be refra- ined, redefined, redirected and redeemed? How can a focus on the common good and the public interest co-exist with private property and entrepre- neurship? In Porritt's own terms:17

## Framework

### Exclusion

#### The aff framework attempts dominance over the means of communication to ensure that criticisms of capital are never considered reasonable subject for discussion, guaranteeing societal annihilation

McNight 10 (Andrew N., Professor at the University of Alabama, Birmingham, “A Pragmatic reevaluation of historical materialism: Notions of progress and vehicles for social justice” Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies 8(2) p. 2-3) APB

Our present is marked by decreased equity in the distribution of material wealth as a global scramble for incrementally cheaper labor and ever increased production, and the expansion of consumption-based markets, stresses our social, economic, and natural systems. Political voice has also diminished as the means of communication fall to fewer and fewer corporate interests. Each of these issues portends different problems with regard to democratic vitality and social justice. With all of these aforementioned challenges to democracy the potential for social and environmental catastrophe is profound - exploitation of labor pursuant to perceived market needs and outcomes, the disappearance of the public space and of democratic communication and negotiation, and ecological disaster. This seems more pressing than ever as the current financial crisis has denuded the gross disparities between those who own the means of production and those who labor, and the fragility of the economic lives of the latter. Additionally, there has been a trend toward unilateralism and imperialism in U.S foreign policy, assaults on basic freedoms like speech, privacy, and due process, weakening of academic freedom in our institutions of higher education, and the increased co-opting of religion for purposes of political manipulation. With regard to the former and specific to institutions of education, we have seen the advent of rhetoric touting the necessity and benefits of increased educational ―accountability‖ and related centralization of administrative power into even more rigid top-down hierarchies. All of what precedes has extreme consequences regarding the way we teach, what we learn socially and academically, and how schools operate, either in congress with hegemonic forces, or possibly, if not hopefully, as ethical counterpoints.

### Ethics

# AFF answers

## Alt Answers

### A2 Historical materialism

#### Historical materialism fails, we can’t know everything

Sciabarra 2000 (Chris Mathew, PhD in Political Philosophy, Theory and Methodology, “Total Freedom: Toward A Dialectical Libertarianism” <http://www.nyu.edu/projects/sciabarra/totalfrdm/tfhayek-l.htm>) APB

Despite this commonality, Hayek and Marx part company in their assessments of the future. Although Hayek's approach has its inherent problems, his work provides an effective indictment of Marxism, not only as a statist political ideology, but also as a theoretical project. Marx recognized what I have called the "epistemic strictures" -- or limitations on human knowledge -- that utopians face. But he historicized these limitations, suggesting that history itself would resolve the problem of human ignorance. This Marxian vision of communism has two essential flaws: (1) It presumes god-like planning and control, and a mastery of the many sophisticated nuances, tacit practices, and unintended consequences of social action. But no human being and no group of human beings can possibly triumph over these spontaneous factors; they are partially constitutive of what we mean by "sociality." Those who attempt to build a road from earth to heaven are more likely to wind up in hell. (2) It presumes a total grasp of history. Everything that is has a past and contains within it the seeds of many possible futures. While Marxists are correct to acknowledge that studying what is must necessarily entail an understanding of how it came to be, they often attempt to study the present as if from an imagined future. When Marxists suggest that history itself can lead to a triumph over human ignorance, they actually imply privileged access to total knowledge of future social conditions. This is not merely illegitimate; it is inherently utopian and profoundly undialectical insofar as it is unbounded by the context that exists. It is this kind of totalism that a dialectical method repudiates. At root, the desire for such omniscience is a distortion of the genuinely human need for efficacy. It is based on what Hayek calls a "synoptic delusion," a belief that one can live in a world in which every action produces consistent and predictable outcomes. Such a quest for total knowledge is equally a quest for totalitarian control. To the extent that Marxism has been a beacon for those trying to actualize such an impossibility, it has fueled a reactionary, rather than a progressive, social agenda -- the aggrandizement of the state, the oppression of individual rights, and the fragmentation of groups in pursuit of political power.

#### **Alt fails- their description of capitalism is fluid and monolithic guarantees that resistance is coopted**

GIBSON-GRAHAM, 6 – Professor of Geosciences at University of Massachusetts, PhD; Feminist Economic Geographer and Professor at the Australian National University, PhD

(J.K. Gibson-Graham, “The End of Capitalism as We Knew It,” pg. 255-257)

Through its architectural or organismic depiction as an edifice or body, **Capitalism becomes not an uncentered aggregate of practices but a** structural and **systemic unity**, potentially co-extensive with the national or global economy as a whole. 11 **As a large, durable, and self-sustaining formation, it is** relatively **impervious to** ordinary **political** and cultural **u**, except through some herculean and coordinated struggle. Understood as a unified system or structure, **Capitalism is not ultimately vulnerable to** local and partial **efforts at transformation**. Any such efforts **can always be subverted by Capitalism** at another scale or in another dimension. Attempts to transform production may be seen as hopeless without control of the financial system. Socialisms in one city or in one country may be seen as undermined by Capitalism at the international scale**. Capitalism cannot be chipped away at, gradually replaced or removed piecemeal. It must be transformed in its entirety or not at all.** Thus one of the effects of the unity of Capitalism is to present the left with the task of systemic transformation. Singularity **If the unity of Capitalism confronts us with the mammoth task of systemic transformation, it is the singularity and totality of Capitalism that make the task so hopeless. Capitalism presents itself as a singularity in the sense of having no peer or equivalent**, of existing in a category by itself; and also in the sense that when it appears fully realized within a particular social formation, it tends to be dominant or alone. As a sui generis economic form, Capitalism has no true analogues. Slavery, independent commodity production, feudalism, socialism, primitive communism and other forms of economy all lack the systemic properties of Capitalism and the ability to reproduce and expand themselves according to internal laws. 12 **Unlike socialism, for example, which is always struggling to be born, which needs the protection and fostering of the state, which is fragile and easily deformed, Capitalism takes on its full form as a natural outcome of an internally driven growth process. Its organic unity gives capitalism the peculiar power to regenerate itself, and even to subsume its moments of crisis** as requirements of its continued growth and development. Socialism has never been endowed with that mythic capability of feeding on its own crises; its reproduction was never driven from within by a life force but always from without; it could never reproduce itself but always had to be reproduced, often an arduous if not impossible process. 13

#### Their description of capitalism as an all consuming monolithic force stifles resistance by foreclosing the possibility of meaningful reform

GIBSON-GRAHAM, 93 – Professor of Geosciences at University of Massachusetts, PhD; Feminist Economic Geographer and Professor at the Australian National University, PhD

(J.K. Gibson-Graham, “Waiting for the Revolution, or How to Smash Capitalism while Working at Home in Your Spare Time,” published in *Marxism in the Postmodern Age* by Antonio Callari et al in 1994, pg 188-197)

**The birth of** the concept of **Capitalism** as we know it **coincided in time with the birth of “the economy” as an autonomous social sphere**. Not surprisingly, then, **Capitalism shares with its more abstract sibling the qualities of an integrated system and the capability of reproducing itself** (or of being reproduced). Represented as an organism through which flows of social labor circulate in various forms, Capitalism regulates itself according to logics or laws,’ propelled by a life force along a preordained (though not untroubled) trajectory of growth.Often **the unity of Capitalism is represented in more architectural terms. Capitalism** (or capitalist society) **becomes a structure in which parts are related to one another**, linked to functions, and arranged “in accordance with an architecture that is.. . no less invisible than visible” (Foucauk 1973, 231). **The architectural/structural metaphor confers upon Capitalism qualities of durability and persistence as well as unity and coherence**, giving it greater purchase on social reality than more ephemeral phenomena. While Marxist conceptions usually emphasize the contradictory and crisis-ridden nature of capitalist development, **capitalist crisis may itself be seen as a unifying process. Crises are commonly presented as originating at the organic center of a capitalist society—the capital accumulation**—and as radiating outward to destabilize the entire economic and social formation.What is important here is not the different metaphors and images of economy and society but the fact that they all confer integrity upon Capitalism. **Through its architectural or organismic representation as an edifice or body. Capitalism becomes not an uncentered aggregate of practices but a structural and systemic unity.** potentially **coextensive with the (national or global) economy as a whole. Understood as a unified system or structure,** **Capitalism is not ultimately vulnerable to local and partial efforts at transformation**. Any such efforts can always be subverted by Capitalism at another scale or in another dimension**. Attempts**, for example, **to transform** production **may be seen as hopeless without control of the financial system; and socialisms in one city or in one country may be seen as undermined by Capitalism at the international scale. Capitalism cannot be gradually replaced or removed piecemeal; it must be transformed in its entirety or not at all**. Thus one of the effects of the unity of Capitalism is to confront the Left with the task of systemic transformation.

## Keynesianism Good

#### Keynesianism occupies the middle ground from capitalism and the alternative

DeLong 09 James Bradford DeLong commonly known as Brad DeLong, is a professor of Economics and chair of the Political Economy major at the University of California, Berkeley

James Bradofr DeLong, “Economics: Great Depression,” <http://delong.typepad.com/sdj/economics_great_depression/page/2/>, 7-8-12, JL

The Keynesian escape route opened up key ground in the middle between fascist-style regimentation and socialist-style national planning. Keynes argued that the market economy and capitalist order could be salvaged, and salvaged by relatively minor reforms. An activist welfare-state government with a commitment to full employment had the tools to eliminate Great Depressions, and could put economies back onto the road to Utopia. If only governments would reduce interest rates to get private agents or would themselves spend money freely (without raising taxes) in times when total demand was low, and raise interest rates to reduce private spending and themselves raise taxes (without raising spending) in times when total demand was high, then fluctuations in employment and production could be greatly reduced, and Great Depressions avoided. Belief in this escape route was strongly reinforced by facts. Those countries that had tried it by accident during the Depression--had infiated early, printed money, ensured low interest rates, and run large budget deficits--managed to survive the Depression much more easily than others. World War II provided final proof, were any necessary--"vindication by Mars," as John Kenneth Galbraith calls it. That component of unemployment, called "structural" or "permanent" during the 1930s, that was seemingly-immune to both the self-adjusting forces of the market and the armament of the New Deal vanished entirely in the 1940s as the federal budget deficit approached and then exceeded the levels that had long been recommended by John Maynard Keynes. And the United States fought World War II without reducing civilian consumption: all of U.S. war production came from new capacity or from capacity that stood idle at the end of the 1930s. Demand expansion--deliberate attempts by governments to put the unemployed back to work by deficit spending and loose-money low interest rate policies--was successful in the 1930s and 1940s. It put the unemployed back to work. It did not contain within itself the seeds of a renewed Great Depression. It did not explode into hyperinflation. The coming of "stablization policy" enlarged the policy steps that could be undertaken without forcing a definitive break with the market-capitalist order, and without forcing a choice between Hitler's way and Stalin's. In later years--in the second and third post-World War II generation--tasks of macroeconomic management would prove harder, and the truth of the doctrines of Keynes's disciples if not of the doctrines of Keynes himself would become less clear.

#### Keynesianism is key to finding a solution for both capitalism and socialism, World War 2 Proves

Wilson 95 Peter Wilson is a senior lecturer in international relations at the London School of Economics and Political science

Peter Wilson, “Thinkers of The Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-war Idealism Reassessed,” pp. 206-207

Thus Keynes believed that international institutions and economic policies creating conflict could be replaced by institutions and policies conducive to harmony and peace. Keynes had rejected the classical liberal position that international laissez-faire promoted peace; when combined with the gold standard, it 'probably played a predominant part in the nineteenth century' in causing international conflict. But Keynes was also denying the socialist claim that capitalism necessarily caused war; with the right institutions and policies, there need be no economic causes of war, and indeed international trade could be of mutual advantage. In entering the 1930s debate on the economic causes of war, Keynes was laying out a middle ground between laissez-faire and socialist positions. This 'welfare liberal' position was directly analogous to his position on the inherent stability or instability of capitalism; for The General Theory argued that the classical economists were wrong to see economies as self-equilibrating, but socialists were wrong in thinking that capitalism was necessarily destructively unstable. With the right policies a capitalist economy could be stabilized at high levels of employment, and provide great benefits of both freedom and efficiency. Between the position that there was a natural harmony of interests, and the position that there was a natural conflict of interests, Keynes was arguing that there was no necessary conflict of interests, but that harmony of interests could only be ensured by creating the right institutional and policy framework. Keynes's rejection of the socialist and classical liberal positions was an important part of his attack on both schools of thought, and his substitution of a middle way between them on the issue of war and peace an important part of establishing the case for Keynesian policies. It is surprising that studies of the Keynesianism revolution that gave little attention to a matter which Keynes himself clearly thought important. During the Second World War Keynes contributed to creating an international economic order in which he believed that the interests of one country would not be pitted against another, and so it would be possible to revert to a more open, freer trading system. The elements of this international economic order were, first, commitments by the large economies to maintain or aim at high or full employment; secondly, the creation of the International countries with balance of payments problems, thus reducing the pressure of 'competitive struggle for markets'; and thirdly, the avoidance of postwar debt entanglement through the nature of the wartime Land-Lease, the expected controls on private international capital movements, and cooperation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These arrangements meant, as Keynes put it, that 'the wisdom of Adam Smith' could come into its own again. Keynes was happy to see a return to freer trade, and believed that this would be compatible with - perhaps conducive to - international political harmony.

#### Keynesianism is good – empirically proven successful

Holt et al 3 (Richard P., Timothy A. Canova, Robert N. Horn, J. Barkley Rosser Jr., Marina V. Rosser, University of New Mexico, Southern Oregon University, and James Madison University, American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Volume 62, Issue 3, pages 491–508,

According to Turgeon, idle human capacity—otherwise known as joblessness and underemployment—often constituted a waste of our most precious resources, the lives of our fellow citizens. Idle industrial and financial capacity was also a terrible waste of resources: it meant that interest rates would be higher than need be, that wealth would be redistributed upward to the wealthiest, and that idle human capacity would follow. Turgeon was therefore often critical of the Federal Reserve for its periodic statistical revisions that arbitrarily under- measured levels of industrial capital, which overestimated capacity-utilization rates and justified the Federal Reserve's high real interest rate policies (Turgeon 1980:40). Likewise, he was quite critical of the government's refusal to age adjust unemployment rates, since “crude” unemployment rates painted a far rosier picture than reality warranted (Turgeon 1989:86–88; 1996:31–36, 39).14 Though Turgeon preferred non-military government spending along with a neutral monetary policy, he recognized that military Keynesianism had succeeded in pumping up the U.S. economy from FDR to Reagan and the German economy under Hitler.15 He often noted that both Kennedy and Reagan used a combination of military and commercial Keynesianism (defense spending and tax cuts, respectively) as engines of economic growth, and his harshest criticism was reserved for those administrations (such as the Carter and Bush administrations) that pursued pre-Keynesian policies of fiscal austerity and high real interest rates.16 His arguments on this topic, sounding as if he was endorsing the bastardized versions of commercial and military Keynesians, made many of his colleagues feel uncomfortable. However, the lesson Turgeon wanted to point out was that the federal government was quite capable of fueling economic expansion, whether by spending on the military, by cutting tax rates, or—in a more receptive political climate—by increased social spending and infrastructure investment. For Turgeon, classical Keynesianism offered the best answers to capitalism's problem of idle capacity. Classical Keynesianism favored the neutralization of monetary policy, the creative use of fiscal policy to put people to work, and the constructive use of public projects such as adequate health care and education for all citizens.17

#### Keynesianism is good – Keynesian stimulus reduces the rate of unemployment and increases demand

Madrick 12 (Jeff, journalist, economic policy consultant and analyst, http://www.nextnewdeal.net/rediscovering-government/defending-krugman-importance-keynesian-economics)

Keynes was right: increased government spending in the U.S. is necessary to decrease unemployment and raise demand in the near-term. Paul Krugman hardly needs defending, but his views about the need for Keynesian stimulus in the U.S. right now are coming under considerable fire from centrist and left-of-center economists. I find this disturbing because Krugman’s view abides by basic Keynesian principles that seem to have been discarded by many who profess themselves Keynesians. Is there a wide misunderstanding of Keynes? What seems to upset people is that Krugman argues the government must spend more money now, almost regardless of what it spends it on. The Keynesian thesis is that economies can settle at a high level of unemployment rather than re-adjust to the optimum unemployment level—or level of economic activity—on their own. This was a response to the classical, pre-Depression view that the beauty of free markets was a self-adjustment process based on falling prices in downturns. But ultimately the problem is a lack of demand, and Keynes advocated budget deficits to support an increase in demand. The lack of demand in the economy now is palpable. Krugman’s contention is that in the near-term, we can solve this problem if we have the will to do so. The economy can reduce its rate of unemployment fairly rapidly with adequate Keynesian stimulus. It is clear that monetary stimulus at this point is not enough. This view is not incompatible with longer-term concerns about the economy -- inadequate education for too many, infrastructure decay, old energy technologies, and so on. Many seem to criticize Krugman for not acknowledging “structural” changes in the economy, and they implicitly agree with classical conservative observers that the unemployment rate really can’t fall much below 7 percent. I can’t speak for Krugman, but he seems to be saying that we should not mix up longer-term structural issues with near-term demand inadequacy. It’s very likely the unemployment rate can fall much farther without igniting inflation. I can’t see how he is wrong about this; indeed, he is urgently right about it. We are facing a year or two when the federal government will likely contract spending and will certainly not increase stimulus markedly. Of even greater concern is the refusal in Europe to recognize that austerity—the opposite of Keynesian advice right now—will lead to further recession, which in turn could spill over to the U.S., jeopardizing Obama’s candidacy. When so many commentators criticize Krugman’s view, insisting that any new spending must be investment in infrastructure, must not go to the military, or that there should be no new spending at all, they are ignoring the Keynesian process. Krugman will not advocate against military spending cuts (and I certainly wouldn't myself). But priorities are important here. Let’s keep them clear. In sum, let’s understand that more aggregate demand now will reduce the unemployment rate. There is a near-term solution, not to America’s long-term issues, but to an economy that is sputtering and may lead to a political environment in which those who plan to do more damage win office. One of the true advances in contemporary thinking is that both a power and a duty of government is to use fiscal and monetary policy to ameliorate downturns and create economic expansions. This is the legacy of Keynes, well supported by empirical research.

#### Keynesianism is key to the having the benefits of capitalism without the harms that it produces

Reich 12 (Robert, Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley, was Secretary of Labor in the Clinton administration “The Answer Isn’t Socialism; It’s Capitalism that Better Spreads the Benefits of the Productivity Revolution”, May 6, 2012, <http://robertreich.org/post/22542609387>, July 9, 2012) ALK

But more Keynesian stimulus won’t help solve the more fundamental problem. Although added government spending has gone some way toward filling the gap in demand caused by consumers whose jobs and incomes are disappearing, it can’t be a permanent solution. Even if the wealthy paid their fair share of taxes, deficits would soon get out of control. Additional public investments in infrastructure and basic research and development can make the economy more productive – but more productivity doesn’t necessarily help if a growing portion of the population can’t absorb it. What to do? Learn from our own history. The last great surge in productivity occurred between 1870 and 1928, when the technologies of the first industrial revolution were combined with steam power and electricity, mass produced in giant companies enjoying vast economies of scale, and supplied and distributed over a widening system of rails. That ended abruptly in the Great Crash of 1929, when income and wealth had become so concentrated at the top (the owners and financiers of these vast combines) that most people couldn’t pay for all these new products and services without going deeply and hopelessly into debt – resulting in a bubble that loudly and inevitably popped. If that sounds familiar, it should. A similar thing happened between 1980 and 2007, when productivity revolution of computers, software, and, eventually, the Internet spawned a new economy along with great fortunes. (It’s not coincidental that 1928 and 2007 mark the two peaks of income concentration in America over the last hundred years, in which the top 1 percent raked in over 23 percent of total income.) But here’s the big difference. During the Depression decade of the 1930s, the nation reorganized itself so that the gains from growth were far more broadly distributed. The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 recognized unions’ rights to collectively bargain, and imposed a duty on employers to bargain in good faith. By the 1950s, a third of all workers in the United States were unionized, giving them the power to demand some of the gains from growth. Meanwhile, Social Security, unemployment insurance, and worker’s compensation spread a broad safety net. The forty-hour workweek with time-and-a-half for overtime also helped share the work and spread the gains, as did a minimum wage. In 1965, Medicare and Medicaid broadened access to health care. And a progressive income tax, reaching well over 70 percent on the highest incomes, also helped ensure that the gains were spread fairly. This time, though, the nation has taken no similar steps. Quite the contrary: A resurgent right insists on even more tax breaks for corporations and the rich, massive cuts in public spending that will destroy what’s left of our safety nets, including Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, fewer rights for organized labor, more deregulation of labor markets, and a lower (or no) minimum wage. This is, quite simply, nuts.And this is why a second Obama administration, should there be one, must focus its attention on more broadly distributing the gains from growth. This doesn’t mean “redistributing” from rich to poor, as in a zero-sum game. It doesn’t mean socialism. The rich will do far better with a smaller share of a robust, growing economy than they’re doing with a large share of an economy that’s barely moving forward. This will require real tax reform – not just a “Buffet” minimal tax but substantially higher marginal rates and more brackets at the top, with a capital gains rate matching the income-tax rate. It also means a larger Earned Income Tax Credit, whose benefits extend high into the middle class. That will enable many Americans to move to a 35-hour workweek without losing ground – thereby making room for more jobs. It means Medicare for all rather than an absurdly-costly system that relies on private for-profit insurers and providers. It will require limiting executive salaries and empowering workers to get a larger share of corporate profits. The Employee Free Choice Act should be an explicit part of the second-term agenda. It will require strict limits on the voracious, irresponsible behavior of Wall Street, from which we’ve all suffered. The Glass-Steagall Act must be resurrected (the so-called Volcker Rule is more ridden with holes than cheese), and the big banks broken up. And it will necessitate a public educational system – including early child education – second to none, and available to all our young people. We don’t need socialism. We need a capitalism that works for the vast majority. The productivity revolution should be making our lives better — not poorer and more insecure. And it will do that when we have the political will to spread its benefits.

## Cap Sustainable

#### International capitalism facilitates globalization – key internal link to stable and durable capitalism – collapse is not inevitable.

Whitley, University of Manchester Business School Professor, 1998

(Richard, autumn 1998, “Internationalization and Varieties of Capitalism: The Limited Effects of Cross-National”, Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd, Accessed 7/9/12, Jstore, LP)

Together with the growth of international capital markets, this increasing international managerial control of economic activities has been heralded as leading to a 'borderless' world in which national boundaries and the states controlling them have less significance in terms of economic decision making and development than 'transnational' business elites and financial markets. Within Europe, such claims have, of course, been accentuated by the expansion of the European Union, moves to a single European market, and related efforts to standardize the 'rules of the game' governing economic competition. Some authors have viewed these changes as intensifying the establishment of sectorial economic coordination and control systems on an international scale and the concomitant decline of national and regional ones (e.g. Hellgren and Melin, 1992; Rasanen and Whipp, 1992). Others have heralded the development of 'global commodity chains' as new kinds of global economic coordination and control systems (e.g. Gereffi, 1995a, 1995b; cf. Whitley, 1996b). In general, such 'globalization' is seen as diminishing the significance of different kinds of national and regional forms of economic organization in favor of a new cross-national form of capitalism that is in the process of replacing them by virtue of its superior efficiency.

#### Capitalism is inevitable- the economic crisis does not disprove the fundamental principles of market exchange

THE AUSTRALIAN, 09 (Staff Writer, “The Case for Capitalism,” 6-25-2009, http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,25685611-16382,00.html)

THE way Australians are selling out of shares will delight doomsayers, giving them additional evidence for their argument that capitalism has failed and that only the state can save us from privation. The number of shareholders has slumped by 14 per cent from 2004, when more than half of us had portfolios. But the problem with the cassandras' commentary is that while they are obviously accurate in pointing to the damage down by the global financial crisis, they have misunderstood the nature of the disease and are peddling a snake oil solution to an imaginary malady. Whatever critics, including Kevin Rudd, claim, there was no crisis in capitalism last year; the laws of market economics did not suddenly stop operating - to suggest they did is the equivalent of arguing that the principles of physics are optional. The immutable rule of supply and demand did not disappear in October, the way wealth is created did not change. In the real world, entrepreneurs continued to produce products and supply services to sell for a profit, just as they have done since humanity first grasped that free exchange on open markets is the only just way to create wealth. Last year's disaster on stock exchanges and in credit markets around the world had nothing to do with capitalism. Rather, it was caused by the folly of financial alchemists, who thought they could con investors that it was possible to make money from trading what were ultimately promissory notes based on the supposed value of bundles of loans. And it was also caused by the incompetence of regulators charged with stopping such market manipulation. According to Financial Times journalist Gillian Tett, the collapse of the $US12,000 billion market for these so-called securities precipitated the much broader slump. In the US, where regulators once required banks to hold reserves of $US800 million to cover loans with a face value of $US10bn, the amount required was reduced to just $US160m. This sort of exposure meant disaster was inevitable, and beyond the global scope of the problem there was little to distinguish last year's crisis from other get-rich-quick schemes throughout history. But critics, such as the Prime Minister in his now-famous essay in which he argued that the state must regulate the economy to protect ordinary people from the ravages of capitalism, miss the point. While the world requires efficient regulation to protect the gullible from corrupt credit markets, this is very different from constraining capitalism itself.

#### Capitalism is sustainable- bust cycles are a way to purge excessive profits- continued survival is ensured

THE AUSTRALIAN, 07 (Staff Writer, “Don't worry about global panic: capitalism is just reinventing itself,” 8-25-2007, Lexis)

IN THE good old days of the Cold War, when the West had one of its periodic financial panics, we always had the Soviets on hand to remind us of the mortality of capitalism. As the Dow Jones tumbled and bankers threw themselves from window ledges, Moscow could be relied on to produce some cheerful bigwig from the politburo to explain that things like this never happened under communism. With some deft quote from Karl Marx (or, if he was subtle, John Maynard Keynes) the clever Russian would lecture us on the essential crisis of capitalism and its inevitable collapse under the weight of its own contradictions. These days, the Soviets are long gone, in hot pursuit of profits on global energy markets, and the communists in China have got the most overheated stock market in the world. But even in our post-historical age, we are not quite free from the occasional lapse of faith. Today, financial alarms still have the power to induce a sense of existential crisis, at least for our economic system if not for ourselves. The tendency is made worse, of course, by a modern media obsessed with presenting every spot of bother as the end of the world. The poor Russians. If only they'd known. Their endless prating about alienation and surplus labour was no match for a modern business reporter in search of a headline. This month's malaise in financial markets is a powerful case in point. Armed with their quiver of short, handy nouns, the scribblers besiege us daily with panics, crashes, crunches, and my personal favourite, meltdowns. But to be fair, the capacity of the current financial mess to frighten is greatly enhanced by its apparent complexity, the incomprehensibility of it all. In the past you thought you vaguely understood what drove markets down. The economy stalled unexpectedly, profits dropped and stock prices followed. But even the keen reader of the financial pages must find his eyes glazing over when the conversation turns to collateralised debt obligations and asset-backed securities, alpha-seeking hedge funds and sub-prime mortgages. I love the obscurantism of financial terminology. But when you discover that the Fed doesn't actually set the fed funds rate and that the discount rate, which it does set, is at a premium to fed funds, the temptation is to roll over and beg not to be disturbed until the commissars for financial stability are in charge. And yet we must still carefully ponder our current problems, not because they show us the essential weakness of our modern system but because they show us how strong it is, how efficient, how durable; and above all, how brilliant capitalism is at reinventing itself. First, just as Voltaire noted that the French needed to shoot the occasional admiral from time to time to encourage the others, so capitalism needs a few good collapses to keep it on the right path. The roots of the current crisis lie in an earlier period of happy excess. Although in the US the housing boom would go on for ever, people -- borrowers as well as lenders -- got lazier and lazier about inspecting the shaky foundations on which it was based. Far from representing a collapse of confidence in the system, financial crises are capitalism's way of purging itself of the excesses and Now it's true, you don't want every correction to wipe out half the wealth of the country, as used to be the case, a tendency that had the effect of encouraging capitalism's critics. But nowadays that doesn't happen -- which is the second cause for restrained optimism. The financial authorities have truly learnt the lessons of the big disasters of the past and now act quickly to stop the bleeding. There's a bit of fuss in the US this week about whether the Federal Reserve, through its injections of cheap money into the system, is bailing out institutions that have got themselves into difficulties. But this is silly. As though it would be better for everybody if they repeated the example of the 1930s and stood by while the devil took not only the hindmost, but most of the industrialised world. The third reason for cheer in the current gloom is the stabilising interconnectedness of the global economy. This may sound odd. When someone defaults on a mortgage in Ohio and it causes a crisis for a bank in Frankfurt, isn't there something wrong? On the contrary, financial innovation in the past 10 years has enabled financial markets -- and the customers they serve -- to spread risk around the world. The important lesson here, in fact, is that it is not an excess of free markets that has brought us low, but not enough. Widely available and reliable information is essential to the functioning of markets. The problems at too many banks and hedge funds this month is that they have invested in US assets, backed by dodgy mortgages that were wrongly categorised as healthy. But the biggest cause for comfort in the current crisis goes to the very heart of modern capitalism. Most of the coverage in the past few weeks has focused on the iniquity of an economic system so dependent on financial institutions. Trillions of dollars of financial assets slosh around the world every day at the flick of a switch. Doesn't that make us horribly vulnerable to sudden changes of sentiment? No. In fact it is the very growth of global financial markets that has given us so much of the prosperity we enjoy today. We no longer have boom-and-bust economics. Instead we have long cycles of growth punctuated by short downturns; and that is thanks in very large part to the efficiency of our modern financial markets.

## Impact Turns

### Environment

#### Capitalism causes dematerialization-this solves for the environment

Tupy 12 (Marian, policy analyst with the [Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity](http://www.cato.org/research/gel/index.html), specializing in globalization and global wellbeing, and the political economy of Europe and sub-Saharan Africa, CATO Institute, “[The Miracle that Is the iPhone (or How Capitalism Can Be Good for the Environment)](http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/the-miracle-that-is-the-iphone-or-how-capitalism-can-be-good-for-the-environment/)”, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/the-miracle-that-is-the-iphone-or-how-capitalism-can-be-good-for-the-environment/>, July 5, 2012) ALK

Dematerialization, in other words, should be welcome news for those who worry about the ostensible conflict between the growing world population on the one hand and availability of natural resources on the other hand. While opinions regarding scarcity of resources in the future differ, dematerialization will better enable our species to go on enjoying material comforts and be good stewards of our planet at the same time. That is particularly important with regard to the people in developing countries, who ought to have a chance to experience material plenty in an age of rising environmental concerns. Maybe I am too much of an optimist, but dematerialization could also lead to a greater appreciation of capitalism. Namely, the “profit motive” can be good for the environment. No, I am not talking about dumping toxic chemicals into our rivers, which is illegal and should be prosecuted. Rather, I am talking about the natural propensity of firms to minimize inputs and maximize outputs. Take the humble soda can. According to [the Aluminum Association](http://www.aluminum.org/Content/NavigationMenu/TheIndustry/PackagingConsumerProductMarket/Can/default.htm), “In 1972… a pound of aluminum yielded 21.75 cans. Today, as a result of can-makers’ use of less metal per unit, one pound of aluminum can produce 33 cans.”

#### Capitalism is the only way of helping and protecting the environment

Smith Competitive Enterprise Institute Founder, 93

(Fred, September 1993, “The Market and Nature” Volume 43, http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-market-and-nature/, Accessed 7/7/12, LP)

Sustainable development theorists claim these problems result from “market failure”: the inability of capitalism to address environmental concerns adequately. Free market proponents suggest that such problems are not the result of market forces, but rather of their absence. The market already plays a critical role in protecting those resources privately owned and for which political interference is minimal. In these instances there are truly sustainable practices. Therefore, those concerned with protecting the environment and ensuring human prosperity should seek to expand capitalism, through the extension of property rights, to the broadest possible range of environmental resources. Our objective should be to reduce political interference in both the human and the natural environments, not to expand it. Private stewardship of environmental resources is a powerful means of ensuring sustainability. Only people can protect the environment. Politics per se does nothing. If political arrangements fail to encourage individuals to play a positive role, the arrangements can actually do more harm than good. There are tens of millions of species of plants and animals that merit survival. Can we imagine that the 150 or so governments on this planet–many of which do poorly with their human charges–will succeed in so massive a stewardship task? Yet there are in the world today over five billion people. Freed to engage in private stewardship, the challenge before them becomes surmountable.

#### Free markets are the only way to solve environmental deterioration

Smith and Jeffreys 93 (Fred L. Jr., and Kent, “A Free-Market Environmental Vision”, December 31, 1993, Chapter 23, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/chapters/marlib23.html>, July 5, 2012) ALK

We have seen that pollution is not a failure of markets but a failure of government to permit private individuals to protect their property and persons against trespass. Free-market environmentalism offers a solution to the problem. Also, when government imposes a single risk standard on society in general, many individuals in particular may be harmed. Again, free-market environmentalism would enable individuals to assume (or reject) certain risks without imposing additional risks on other individuals. Some argue that free-market environmentalism entails excessive transaction costs, that is, the costs of time and resources dedicated to negotiating specific arrangements between parties. Therefore, it is claimed, government should step in and impose uniform standards. Efficiency is an important consideration, especially when costs are being imposed against the will of the people who will bear them. However, efficiency is not the only consideration. The best example may be the court system, which is anything but efficient. Society recognizes that human liberty is an overriding concern and, therefore, accepts lowered efficiency in order to preserve a greater good. Some environmentalists have tried to raise a similar argument with the claim that the intrinsic value of an ecological asset can override the liberty of the individual. That argument is a dangerous weapon to place in the hands of any state, for it is as likely to be abused as it is to be applied carefully. Fortunately, that line of thinking is inappropriate in light of the fact that modern technologies are constantly reducing the transaction costs involved in negotiating, monitoring, and enforcing environmental arrangements. If free-market environmentalism is to be widely accepted, it must occupy the moral high ground. To a certain degree it has already done so, although often by default on the part of its detractors. However, merely paying 1ip service to the efficiency of markets is not enough. Free-market environmentalists must strive to demonstrate the superiority of voluntary markets in a host of ecological niches. Because most of the threatened resources, from wildlife to wetlands, from airsheds to oceans, are held and managed by political bureaucracies, they remain at risk. It will be necessary to move more of those resources, along with the direct responsibilities of stewardship, into private hands before clear-cut examples become commonplace. Some environmentalists see limits to free markets at every turn. Yet those same individuals see no limits to government. Past environmental policies have been designed as if politically directed resources automatically become unlimited. Those environmentalists' excessive faith in government is as unwarranted as their visceral opposition to private ownership of resources. The free-market environmental vision does not purport to eliminate the state (or state involvement); it merely limits it to an appropriate role.

#### The wealth that capitalism brings solves for the environment

Taylor 3 ( Jerry, director of [natural resource studies](http://www.cato.org/research/natur-st.html) at the Cato Institute, April 22, 2003, New York Sun, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/happy-earth-day-thank-capitalism>, July 5, 2012) ALK

Indeed, we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental amenities, after all, are luxury goods. America -- like much of the Third World today -- had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues. The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality. There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between $3,500 and $15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet. It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer societies are not -- is only partially correct. In the United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls. In fact, for most pollutants, declines were greater before the federal government passed its panoply of environmental regulations than after the EPA came upon the scene. Much of this had to do with individual demands for environmental quality. People who could afford cleaner-burning furnaces, for instance, bought them. People who wanted recreational services spent their money accordingly, creating profit opportunities for the provision of untrammeled nature. Property values rose in cleaner areas and declined in more polluted areas, shifting capital from Brown to Green investments. Market agents will supply whatever it is that people are willing to spend money on. And when people are willing to spend money on environmental quality, the market will provide it. Meanwhile, capitalism rewards efficiency and punishes waste. Profit-hungry companies found ingenious ways to reduce the natural resource inputs necessary to produce all kinds of goods, which in turn reduced environmental demands on the land and the amount of waste that flowed through smokestacks and water pipes. As we learned to do more and more with a given unit of resources, the waste involved (which manifests itself in the form of pollution) shrank. This trend was magnified by the shift away from manufacturing to service industries, which characterizes wealthy, growing economies. The latter are far less pollution-intensive than the former. But the former are necessary prerequisites for the latter. Property rights -- a necessary prerequisite for free market economies -- also provide strong incentives to invest in resource health. Without them, no one cares about future returns because no one can be sure they'll be around to reap the gains. Property rights are also important means by which private desires for resource conservation and preservation can be realized. When the government, on the other hand, holds a monopoly on such decisions, minority preferences in developing societies are overruled (see the old Soviet block for details). Furthermore, only wealthy societies can afford the investments necessary to secure basic environmental improvements, such as sewage treatment and electrification. Unsanitary water and the indoor air pollution (caused primarily by burning organic fuels in the home for heating and cooking needs) are directly responsible for about 10 million deaths a year in the Third World, making poverty the number one environmental killer on the planet today. Capitalism can save more lives threatened by environmental pollution than all the environmental organizations combined. Finally, the technological advances that are part and parcel of growing economies create more natural resources than they consume. That's because what is or is not a "natural resource" is dependent upon our ability to harness the resource in question for human benefit. Resources are therefore a function of human knowledge. Because the stock of human knowledge increases faster in free economies than it does in socialist economies, it should be no surprise that most natural resources in the western world are more abundant today than ever before no matter which measure one uses.

### Economy

#### Capitalism helps the economy grow and prosper

Rockwell Jr 02 (Llewellyn H., Institute CEO Ludwig von Mises Institue, “The Legitimacy of Capitalism” <http://mises.org/daily/1005>, accessed 7/5/12)

Regulating financial markets is only a start. Government spending is exploding. Protectionism is on the march. The police state is making huge inroads against the ability and responsibility of individuals and communities to provide for their own security and privacy. Politicians are clamoring to put businessmen behind bars, on the belief that this will stop the fall in stock prices. If you think about it, the hysteria is astonishing, even terrifying. The market economy has created unfathomable prosperity and, decade by decade, century by century, miraculous feats of innovation, production, distribution, and social coordination. To the free market, we owe all material prosperity, all leisure time, our health and longevity, our huge and growing population, nearly everything we call life itself. Capitalism and capitalism alone has rescued the human race from degrading poverty, rampant sickness, and early death. In the absence of the capitalist economy and all its underlying institutions, the world's population would, over time, shrink to a fraction of its current size, with whatever was left of the human race systematically reduced to subsistence, eating only what can be hunted or gathered. Even the institution that is the source of the word civilization itself--the city--depends on trade and commerce, and cannot exist without them. And this is only to mention the economic benefits of capitalism. It is also an expression of freedom. It is not so much a social system but the natural result of a society wherein individual rights are respected, where businesses, families, and every form of association are permitted to flourish in the absence of coercion, theft, war, and aggression.

#### Capitalism helps innovation and development of products

Baumol et al., **N**ew York University - Stern School of Business, 07

(William J., Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity, p. 84 LP)

But big firms nonetheless can grow and prosper by constantly refining existing products and services and occasionally developing new ones, typ- ically after considerable market research about what consumers will and won’t buy. The innovation process becomes routine and predictable, pick- ing up “three yards at a time” (to use an American football analogy) rather than seeking the breakaway touchdown. Such constant, albeit routine, refinement is necessary in any economy. Indeed, big firms are also essential to mass-produce some of the innova- tions that radical entrepreneurs are unable by themselves to manufacture in a cost-effective way. Examples are legion: Ford with the mass produc- tion of the automobile, which had seen a long line of inventors before;13 Boeing, Lockheed, McDonnell-Douglas, and Airbus with the airplane that was invented by the Wright brothers; IBM with the mainframe computer that was developed at the University of Pennsylvania; Dell with the personal computer that had been developed by Apple; Microsoft with the PC operating system that apparently was developed by Gary Kildall; and large pharmaceutical companies, which have the resources to conduct the expensive and time-consuming clinical trials on breakthrough therapies in- vented in universities and in small companies. In these and many other cases (including the radical innovations we dis- cuss below), the early innovations were usually in a primitive state, limited in capacity, and often subject to frequent breakdown. It eventually took the bigger firms, with their permanent and well-trained research staffs, to refine them and to turn the innovations into products that consumers wanted and could afford. Understandably, in such environments the re- search arms of these firms give priority to product improvements that enhance reliability and user-friendliness rather than to imaginative break- throughs. Nonetheless, these incremental refinements are essential. With- out such “routinized” research and development activities of big corpora- tions, economies in developed (and developing) countries would be far less productive, and the reliability, practicality, and user-friendliness of many innovative products would be far more circumscribed.

### Poverty

#### Capitalism creates jobs which solves poverty

Tanner 10 (Keeping the poor in poverty October 13, 2010. Michael Tanner is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and author of Leviathan on the Right: How Big-Government Conservatism Brought Down the Republican Revolution http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/keeping-poor-poverty) ALG

Across the country, efforts to increase parental choice are met with a wall of Democratic obstructionism. Choice, we are told, is a threat to the "education system." But which is really more important, the "education system" or poor children? And, of course, nothing is more important in fighting poverty than jobs. Yet the Obama administration is overtly hostile to the entrepreneurs and job creators in our economy. The wealthy are demonized rhetorically. Every other day seems to bring a new proposal to raise their taxes. Just look at the barrage of political commercials and presidential speeches that sneeringly denounce the Bush "tax cuts for the rich." But, as former Texas senator Phil Gramm once noted, "No one ever got a job from a poor man." We can't expect to create more jobs if we punish the type of activity that creates jobs. That means that if we wish to fight poverty, we must end those government policies — high taxes and regulatory excess — that inhibit growth and job creation. We must protect capital investment and give people the opportunity to start new businesses. Along similar lines, one of the great advantages to reforming Social Security with personal accounts is that it would enable low-income Americans to save and accumulate wealth. But don't count on Democrats to lessen their opposition to the idea. Believers in the free market often seem defensive when the topic is poverty. They shouldn't be. Nothing has done as much to lift people out of poverty as capitalism and free markets. All one has to do is look around the world to realize that those countries that provide the most economic freedom have less poverty than those that are still mired in socialism and government control. Compassion is more than talking about the plight of the poor or giving them just enough money to make poverty a bit more comfortable. Real compassion is about creating the conditions that will enable the poor to get out of poverty. That's the point that Tony Blair understood. It's a lesson that Barack Obama and the congressional Democrats should learn.

#### Capitalism creates jobs

Powell 12 (Jim Powell Why There Is No Human Progress without Capitalism January 24, 2012 http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/why-there-is-no-human-progress-without-capitalism Jim Powell, senior fellow, is an expert in the history of liberty. He has lectured in England, Germany, Japan, Argentina and Brazil as well as at Harvard, Stanford and other universities across the United States. He has written for the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Esquire, Audacity/American Heritage and other publications.) ALG

Meanwhile, the Industrial Revolution gained momentum with the development of English textile mills. Entrepreneurs produced not luxuries for the rich but cheap cotton clothing for the multitudes. This made possible improved sanitation, since people could wear one set of clothing while they washed the other set. Most important, England’s population was increasing rapidly, and without the Industrial Revolution, millions would have starved, as happened in rural Ireland during the 1840s. “England was delivered, not by her rulers,” historian Thomas S. Ashton wrote after World War II, “but by those who, seeking no doubt their own narrow ends, devised new instruments of production. There are today on the plains of India and China people plague-ridden and hungry, living lives little better, to outward appearance, than those of the cattle that toil with them by day and share their places of sleep by night. Such Asiatic standards, and such unmechanized horrors, are the lot of those who increase their numbers without passing through an Industrial Revolution.” But aristocratic landowners weren’t happy, because textile mills created jobs that attracted large numbers of people away from farm work on their estates. The original smears against capitalist factories were made during the 1800s by English aristocrats and later picked up by socialists, much as we are now beginning to see Obama campaign strategists relish the prospect of exploiting recent Republican swipes at capitalism. Capitalist entrepreneurs created stupendous numbers of jobs that were productive, because they helped provide what consumers wanted. During the early years of the 20th century, when millions of immigrants landed in America, the unemployment rate dropped as low as 1.6 percent. Not only that: economist Thomas Sowell reported: “Immigrants begin economically below the level of existing members of their own ethnic group already in the country, but eventually they surpass them.” Many immigrants launched what became giant business enterprises. Notable immigrant job creators included John Jacob Astor, Adolphus Busch, William Colgate, Alexander Graham Bell, Samuel Goldwyn, Louis B. Mayer and Helena Rubenstein. Of course, there have been countless failures when entrepreneurs and their employees weren’t able to keep up with changing markets. Since consumers always want the most for the least, competition tends to drive down prices. Consequently, costs must be minimized, which can mean reducing head count — payroll is the largest cost for most businesses. Fortunately, if government doesn’t have excessive taxes, regulations or other obstacles to enterprise, capitalism achieves the highest growth rates of any economic system, creating more and more new jobs. Capitalists have done far more than serve consumers. In addition, many supported charitable enterprises that helped relieve human suffering. Such private individuals could take action much more quickly than government officials who had to cultivate political support for appropriations. It was no coincidence that great charitable enterprises developed along with great business enterprises during the nineteenth century, before there was a welfare state

#### **Economic freedom is key to solving poverty and environmental degradation**

Lawson 2 (Economic Freedom Needed To Alleviate Poverty Around The World July 3, 2002. Robert A. Lawson is professor of economics and George H. Moor Chair in the School of Management at Capital University in Ohio. He is co-author of Economic Freedom of the World: 2002 Annual Report, produced jointly by the Fraser Institute and the Cato Institute. <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/economic-freedom-needed-alleviate-poverty-around-world>) ALG

These protesters believe that free markets lead to widespread poverty, greater gaps between the rich and the poor, and environmental degradation. Only strong government planning through trade tariffs, expansive welfare states, and strict labor and environmental rules can protect the poor of this world from the ravaging forces of the market. These people are dead wrong. A new study, co-authored by James Gwartney and myself, was recently released by a consortium of think tanks, which includes the Cato Institute in the United States. This publication, Economic Freedom of the World: 2002 Annual Report, presents an economic freedom index for 123 countries. Based on 37 data components drawn from a multitude of sources, this index measures the degree to which nations are pursing policies consistent with economic freedom or market capitalism. To score highly on this index, a nation should have low government spending and taxes, sound property rights and legal system, sound money, liberal trade policies, and few government regulations. Economic freedom means that each individual plays the primary role in his economic life, not the government or central plan. The most economically free nation in the world remains Hong Kong followed by Singapore and the United States. The rankings of other major economies are the United Kingdom (4th), Canada (8th), Germany (15th), Japan (24th) Taiwan (30th), France (38th), Mexico (66th), and India (73rd). Most of the lowest ranked nations are in Africa and Latin America. Botswana has the best record for an African nation, tied for 38th with six other nations including France and South Korea. Chile, with the best record in Latin America, was tied with three other nations at 15th. Three former communist countries are in the bottom 10: Russia (116th), Ukraine (119th), and Romania (114th) all did worse than communist China (101st). Data for North Korea and Cuba are not available. The study also shows that economic freedom is strongly linked with both higher levels of income and faster rates of economic growth. The people living in the top one-fifth of the most free countries enjoy an average income of $23,450 and a growth rate in the 1990s of 2.56 percent per year; in contrast, the bottom one-fifth in the rankings had an average income of just $2,556 and a -0.85 percent growth rate in the 1990s. That economic freedom leads to more and faster wealth creation is no longer a controversial argument. But what of the argument that market capitalism leaves the poor behind? In fact, the poor gain a lot from economic freedom. The share of income going to the poorest 10% of the population is completely unrelated to economic freedom. But poor people are much better off with economic freedom. The poorest 10% of the population have an average income of just $728 in the least free countries compared with over $7000 in the most free countries. Simply put, it is much better to be poor in a free, rich country than an unfree, poor country. Free people live longer too. The life expectancy of people living in the most free nations is fully 20 years longer than for people in the least free countries. This is quite literally the difference between knowing your grandchildren or not. Other studies confirm that environmental quality is likely to be enhanced as poor countries become wealthy enough, through economic freedom, to invest in environmental amenities like water treatment plants. People who are concerned about poverty and environmental issues around the globe must realize that economic freedom and the resulting economic prosperity, not oppressive government taxation and regulation, represent the best hope for the poor and the environment alike.

### Women’s rights

#### **Capitalism is key for women to escape oppression**

Powell 12 (Jim Powell Why There Is No Human Progress without Capitalism January 24, 2012 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/why-there-is-no-human-progress-without-capitalism> Jim Powell, senior fellow, is an expert in the history of liberty. He has lectured in England, Germany, Japan, Argentina and Brazil as well as at Harvard, Stanford and other universities across the United States. He has written for the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Esquire, Audacity/American Heritage and other publications.) ALG

During the 19th century, successful entrepreneurs funded great colleges and universities before there was a permanent income tax to encourage deductible philanthropic contributions. In 1861, about 20 Boston scientists and entrepreneurs contributed $100,000 to start the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1868, Western Union investor and land speculator Ezra Cornell started the university that bears his name. In 1873, Baltimore grocer and railroad investor Johns Hopkins died, leaving $7 million to help fund a major university that opened three years later. Railroad entrepreneur Leland Stanford started his university in 1885 as a memorial for his son and operated it on his farm. John D. Rockefeller gave $35 million to help establish the University of Chicago. Decades before women had the vote, entrepreneurs supported education for women by launching women’s colleges like Mount Holyoke (1837), Vassar (1861), Smith (1871), Wellesley (1875), Radcliffe (1879), Bryn Mawr (1885) and Barnard (1889). Moreover, the Industrial Revolution, in the United States as well as Europe, made life easier for women in countless ways. Mass-produced soap, clothing, cosmetics, canned food and myriad other things meant that women didn’t have to spend huge amounts of time making everything they needed. During the 19th century, kerosene lamps replaced troublesome whale-oil lamps, and gas lights and later electric lights replaced kerosene. With so much labor saved, women began to have leisure time, and many used it to start clubs. A large number were for self-improvement. They encouraged the study of literature, history, science, current affairs and foreign languages. There were circulating libraries for members. Such clubs helped women with little formal education to gain more knowledge about the world. Professional women formed clubs to discuss their mutual concerns. While government officials suppressed information about and access to birth control methods, large numbers of women obtained both from private businesses like Sears, Robuck. Capitalism created opportunities for women to gain financial independence. Initially, women earned money outside the home mainly by performing domestic service, as maids, cooks and cleaning women. Then during the 19th century, factory jobs provided new opportunities. Factory owners didn’t care what the proper role of women was supposed to be. They hired women because they were willing to work for less than men, and they were often more conscientious workers than men. The invention of the telegraph, typewriter and telephone created nicer office job options for millions of women. Women got ahead more rapidly in business than in licensed professions and much more rapidly than in politics. We need to understand how far we have come and how we got here. As historian Braudel reminds us, “Wherever the market is absent, or insignificant, one is certain to be observing the lowest plane of human existence.” After the “progressive” expansion of political power during the past century, America still has the Constitution and enough of a market economy left that it could be restored. Capitalism is worth defending. Hopefully, the presidential candidates will learn how to do it.

### War/Peace

**New evidence indicates capitalism guarantees peace**

Hewitt and Gartzke in 10 (ERIK GARTZKE, University of California, San Diego J. JOSEPH HEWITT University of Maryland, “International Crises and the Capital Peace”, International Interactions 36:115-145)

**Recent research suggests that free markets and economic development contribute to a reduction in interstate conflic**t**. This "capitalist peace" has been seen alternately to complement or to supplant the more well-known democratic peace effect**. Here, we compare the behavior of democracies and capitalist dyads in the context of the Interstate Crisis Behavior (ICS) dataset. The ICB data offers a number of advantages in assessing the conflict decisions of national leaders, rather than the accidents of subordinates or others. In particular we explore as yet untested implications of each perspective, examining the effect of regime type and economic and interest variables on escalation and crisis intensity. Our **findings provide new evidence that free markets, economic development, and similar interests account for the special peace in liberal dyads**.

**Cap solves the intensity and escalation of war**

Hewitt and Gartzke in 10 (ERIK GARTZKE, University of California, San Diego J. JOSEPH HEWITT University of Maryland, “International Crises and the Capital Peace”, International Interactions 36:115-145)

**Our analysis builds on a vision of peace involving free markets and economic development**. First, development has contrasting consequences for interstate conflict. **Technological innovation and industrialization vastly increase the ability of some countries to project power, while modern production systems eventually make it cheaper to purchase, rather than coerce, land and the resources that exist in and on territory**. In contrast, the extension of economic and other interests beyond national borders increases incentives to "police" relevant regions and exercise influence, sometimes through force. Second, **since advanced industrial nations do not fundamentally disagree on critical aspects of the international system, most fighting now occurs among developing countries or between developed and developing states** (Gartzke 2006; Gartzke and Rohner 2009). Third, **global financial networks serve as a test of the credibility of leaders' claims and discourage bluffing** (Gartzke and Li 2003)- **Mechanisms that facilitate the transmission of credible information across international boundaries limit bargaining failure, enhancing interstate peace** (Fearon 1994; Schultz 1998, 2001). We **find considerable support for this modernized conception of the capitalist peace.** **Nations that are financially open to the global economy, and that face constrained or interdependent monetary policies, experience fewer interstate crises**. **Development appears to discourage contiguous states from fighting over territory, while increasing policy-based crises**. Policy **affinity leads to fewer ICB crises**. Democracy, in contrast, appears to have no significant impact on interstate crisis behavior. **Results are also consistent with our expectations for crisis intensity and escalation.**

**Capitalist states lack the motives for violence. Peace is a result of compatibility of interests rather than constraints**

Hewitt and Gartzke in 10 (ERIK GARTZKE, University of California, San Diego J. JOSEPH HEWITT University of Maryland, “International Crises and the Capital Peace”, International Interactions 36:115-145)

The U.S./Soviet dyad was among the most, if not the most, disputatious during the cold **war. If the vast consequences of nuclear conflagration did not constrain the superpowers from numerous acts of conflict, what cost or constraint are capital or democracy likely to impose to impel peace**? **Whatever its putative cause, the liberal peace is more than a claim about the reluctant submission of aggressive nations to barriers to war**. **It is not as if democracies or capitalist countries are chomping at the bit to redress old grievances or to realize ongoing greed**. **Rather, these nations lack the impetus to war.** **The most prosperous, developed nations appear largely satisfied with the global status quo**. They have few significant differences. **They lack the motives for violence, not the ability to act aggressively against one another, should such motives arise**. **The** **peace we observe is thus much more about a compatibility of interests or preferences than it is about constraints.**

#### Only with market liberalization can democracy solve war

Hewitt and Gartzke in 10 (ERIK GARTZKE, University of California, San Diego J. JOSEPH HEWITT University of Maryland, “International Crises and the Capital Peace”, International Interactions 36:115-145)

The democratic peace is important, not just because it is a rare "lawlike" relationship in international relations, but also because of the hope it provides to many that the world can become a more peaceful place. It should not be surprising that the good news of democratic peace has been widely embraced by academic researchers, the policy community, and by interested observers. Nevertheless, the merit of an idea in an empirical science must rest in its observed impact more than its abstract virtue. This study contributes to a small but growing body of literature casting doubt on the robustness of the democratic peace observation. It has been known for some time that democracies are only peaceful in pairs. Other research has shown that **the democratic peace is even more exclusive than previously imagined, limiting the finding to developed democracies** (Hegre 2000; Mousseau 2000). We **take this insight full circle, demonstrating that it is economic development and market freedoms, rather than political liberty, that precipitate interstate peace**. It should be emphasized that the capitalist peace is an equally optimistic discovery. **The fact that free markets and prosperity reduce the impetus to war means that the liberal peace still obtains**, **though with a considerably different causal logic and set of empirical precursors**. Indeed, a **liberal economic peace may be even more sustainable and transportable to the broader international community than is liberal government. Promoting democracy, even imposing it as some have advocated (or pursued), is not likely to reduce interstate conflict. While democracy is certainly desirable in its own right, democratizing for peace appears to be based on a misconception, and may even lead to a weakening of the actual determinants of liberal peace. If democracy leads to an expression of popular preferences in places where these preferences are incompatible with U.S. or other Western interests, then it should not be surprising to find that democratization can actually increase interstate conflict**. The **United States may be best advised to focus on promoting economic development and free markets**. As **we have shown, these are the more proximate causes of cooperation among states in the modern world, and may themselves help to promote democracy.**

#### Cap prevents conflict from resource acquisition

Hewitt and Gartzke in 10 (ERIK GARTZKE, University of California, San Diego J. JOSEPH HEWITT University of Maryland, “International Crises and the Capital Peace”, International Interactions 36:115-145)

A more plausible set of mechanisms can be had by looking at what markets do, and how they alter the interests of participating countries. Capital **markets have become the crown jewels of the modern age. Vast wealth is in play each business day. As recent events attest, staggering losses can occur quickly when investors become frightened or skeptical.** Any factor that influences the value of securities is salient to investors. Leaders who scare the capital markets pay a high price. Wealth is lost, investors are angered, and the government itself is often affected. The ability of governments in capitalist countries to service their debts depends on investor confidence. If investors and the state have slightly different incentives when it comes to political conflict, then leaders must choose between military aggression and mollifying investors. Rather than deterring conflict, which choice a leader makes informs observers about a leader's resolve and/or capabilities. Ceteris paribus, a leader that is willing to anger the markets to pursue a dispute is more resolved than one who shies away from financial losses. A leader that is unwilling to anger the markets is probably not resolved. **Markets** also **transform economies by allowing for more efficient allocation and accumulation of capital**. As **labor becomes relatively scarce and commodities grow cheap, the logic of employing expensive labor to take (versus make or trade) inexpensive inputs to production evaporates. Rich states are unwilling to deploy occupying armies to extract relatively cheap goods and services from other states, preferring instead to purchase these goods and services.** **If in addition it becomes widely understood that a group of prosperous countries no longer threaten one another directly or indirectly over access to inputs to production, then the security dilemma is no longer a menace. In contrast, the transition from territorial to globalized commercial nations makes control of international agendas increasingly critical**. **Capitalist countries continue to contemplate war over profitss and politics. However, markets also bring a level of consensus among capitalist states. Letting another country have its way in the realm of policymaking may or may not involve conflict (both nations may "want the same thing"**). **Adversaries can be allies when facing a common problem. If instead two governments have different agendas, then relations can become fractious. The importance of differences grows with the size of a nation's exposure to the international arena**.

#### Capitalism has the unique potential to discourage war between nations

Gartzke, UC San Diego Department of Political Science Associate Professor, 5

(Erik, 2005, The Fraser Institute, “Economic Freedom of the World: 2005 Annual Report,” <http://www.efnasia.org/attachments/Chapter%202_2005.pdf>, p. 29, accessed 7/9/2012, bs)

Liberal political economy oﬀers no such contradiction. Scholars like Montesquieu, Adam Smith, Richard Cobden, Norman Angell, and Richard Rosecrance have long speculated that free markets have the potential to free states from the looming prospect of recurrent warfare. Capitalism encourages cooperation among states by creating conditions that make war unappealing or unnecessary. Free markets create another venue to competition among countries, often containing minor conﬂicts below the level of military force. The transformation of commerce made possible by economic freedom also leads to a transformation in international aﬀairs. Conquest becomes expensive and unproﬁtable. Wealth in modern economies is much harder to “steal” through force than was the case among agricultural and early industrial societies. This “capitalist peace” has been slow to reach fruition but the tools and evidence are now in place to establish a ﬁrmer connection between economic freedom and reductions in conﬂict. I use the Index of Economic Freedom developed by Gwartney and Lawson and multivariate statistical analysis to show that free markets appear to encourage peace. I also evaluate several other factors often thought to inﬂuence whether states ﬁght. Economic freedom is one of the rare factors that generally discourages conﬂict among nations.

#### Capitalist markets encourage international peace

Gartzke, UC San Diego Department of Political Science Associate Professor, 5

(Erik, 2005, The Fraser Institute, “Economic Freedom of the World: 2005 Annual Report,” <http://www.efnasia.org/attachments/Chapter%202_2005.pdf>, p. 32-33, accessed 7/9/2012, bs)

Economic freedom is important to peace for at least two reasons. First, free markets act as a sounding board for political activity. Actions that frighten markets discourage investment, drive down economic conditions domestically, and thus are likely to be avoided by local leaders. The use of force abroad is often associated with a decline in domestic investment and with outﬂows of capital (Bueno de Mesquita, 1990). To the degree that leaders are willing to make foreign-policy statements that scare capital markets, and to the extent that free monetary policies are in place that make it diﬃcult for the government to interfere with capital ﬂows, the international community may be able to infer a leader’s true resolve. Knowing what an opponent is willing to do makes it possible to bargain more eﬀectively, so that resorting to violence to obtain what one side needs is less often necessary. Autonomous global markets create a venue through which leaders can establish credibility without needing to escalate to military force (Gartzke et al., 2001; Gartzke & Li, 2003). Second, economies based on intellectual and ﬁnancial capital are less dependent upon, and less interested in, occupying foreign territory. As the United States has shown in Iraq, winning a war with a twenty-ﬁrst century army is the easy part of conquest. Militaries designed to achieve quick and easy victories on the modern battleﬁeld are increasingly poorly suited to the labor-intensive role of policing a populous society, especially when the population is ambivalent about foreign occupation. Historically, wealth was a function of arable acres. Big countries with lots of land were rich countries. Within these societies, wealth was achieved by sidling up to the sovereign; being a friend of the king meant land, which meant power. Indeed, maintaining one’s economic position was equivalent to being involved in politics. Modern societies do not work this way. Wealth is not primarily derived from agriculture. Instead, money is made or maintained through innovative ideas and entrepreneurial spirit. Commodity prices and labor costs in developed economies have consistently trended in opposite directions. Armies of occupation are expensive and the proceeds of resource theft made possible by conquest are increasingly marginal. This argument suggests that economic freedom should discourage conquest, but that it may have little or no beneﬁcial eﬀects on other kinds of conﬂict, including ﬁghts over international policies and the conduct of domestic regimes. I show elsewhere that economic development is associated with a reduction in warfare over territory but that development actually increases non-territorial disputes (Gartzke, 2004, forthcoming).