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Alt Fails – State Key

Rejection of state solutions dooms their alt – only the state is powerful enough to confront capitalist exploitation.

Jacques **Derrida,** Ecole des hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales Director of Studies, Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates In Philosophy, 1999**,** p. 74-5

Now, perhaps using the strategy of deconstruction, you may for yourself understand, not what power is, but what powers may be in such and such a context. Of course, if I wanted to justify at any cost what I am doing, I would say that everything that I do is concerned with the question of power everywhere. The question of power is so pervasive, however, that I could not isolate the place where I deal with just the question of power. What interests me in what Foucault says about power is not the claim that everything is power, or will to power, in society, but his proposition or assumption that there is no such thing as `the Power', and that today power is in fact dispersed and not concentrated in the form of the state. There are rather only micro‑powers. This is a more useful approach, that is, not to rely on a homogeneous and centralized concept of power. Fromthat point of view, I think this is the condition of a new politics, a new approach to politics. I think this is very necessary and useful. Nevertheless, my concern will be this one: of course we have to pay attention to micro‑powers, to invisible or new forms of power, larger or smaller than the state, or foreign to the logic of the state. We should not, however, forget the state: the state is still very strong, the logic of the state is still very strong. It is today undergoing an unprecedented process. What one calls `globalization' or mondialization, the constitution of new powers in the form of capitalistic corporations, which are stronger than states and do not depend on states, relativizes the authority of states. Nevertheless, the international law, everything which rules the market today, is in the hands of so‑called sovereign states; the international law, the United Nations, GATT and so on are today dependent on states. So the question of the state is not behind us. We have to pay attention to the two logics: on the one hand the deconstruction of the state, and on the other hand the survival of the state. I want to say that the state has both good aspects and bad aspects, and I mention among its bad aspects repression and authority. However, if we want to resist some forces in the world, economic forces for example, perhaps the good old state might be useful!

Abandoning state based reform projects allows capitalism to run rampant, increasing suffering

Dr. Richard Barbrook, Hypermedia Research Centre – U. of Westminster, 6-5-1997, “More Provocations,” Amsterdam.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-1-9706/msg00034.html

I thought that this position is clear from my remarks about the ultra-left posturing of the ‘zero-work’ demand. In Europe, we have real social problems of deprivation and poverty which, in part, can only be solved by state action. This does not make me a statist, but rather anti-anti-statist. By opposing such intervention because they are carried out by the state anarchists are tacitly lining up with the neo-liberals. Even worse, refusing even to vote for the left, they acquiese to rule by neo-liberal parties. I deeply admire direct action movements. I was a radio pirate and we provide server space for anti-roads and environmental movements. However, this doesn’t mean that I support political abstentionism or, even worse, the mystical nonsense produced by Hakim Bey. It is great for artists and others to adopt a marginality as a life style choice, but most of the people who are economically and socially marginalised were never given any choice. They are excluded from society as a result of deliberate policies of deregulation, privatisation and welfare cutbacks carried out by neo-liberal governments. During the ‘70s. I was a pro-situ punk rocker until Thatcher got elected. Then we learnt the hard way that voting did change things and lots of people suffered if state power was withdrawn from certain areas of our life, such as welfare and employment. Anarchism can be a fun artistic pose. However, human suffering is not.

Alt Fails – Bottom Up Fails

Bottom up political movements cedes power over to racist and oppressive agents

Andy Storey, The Society for International Development, 2000, Post-Development Theory: Romanticism and Pontius Pilate politics, *Development*, http://www.palgrave-journals.com/development/journal/v43/n4/pdf/1110194a.pdf

Third, the commonly designated agents of change – the social movements – are not, contrary to the claim of Burbach et al., guaranteed to be ‘anti-authoritarian and democratic in their structures and principles’. Incidentally, to assume that they would be is, in one of the more remarkable contradictions of post-development theory, to assume that such movements, after long histories of global capitalist penetration (from colonization to globalization), somehow occupy a space outside the otherwise hegemonic control of development discourse (Sylvester, 1999: 711). Not all sagas are ‘sagas of resistance and liberation’. Some contemporary environmental movements have been criticized for practising a politics of social exclusion through their emphasis on the preservation of allegedly ancient cultural traditions, however reactionary the political content of some such traditions (Hildyard, 1999). This point can be taken further – organizations of the racist right can lay claim to the label of ‘new social movement’ just as much as organizations which claim to be progressive (Cattarinich, 1999). The existence of so-called social movements does not guarantee that they will behave particularly ‘sociably’, any more than the existence of civil society groups guarantees ‘civility’ (Ndegwa, 1996; Kasfir, 1998). Peter Uvin (1998: 178) documents how social movements in Rwanda ‘often sought nonemancipatory, racist, exclusionary goals’. To trust the political project of development or postdevelopment to these groups, and to assume that the outcome will be a particularly happy one, is to engage in romanticism and wish-fulfilment, akin to the trust some ‘radical’ theorists of the 1970s placed in guerrilla movements (Sylvester, 1999: 711). The post-modern philosopher de Sousa Santos (1999: 42) seems to offer a way around this third problem by counterposing what he terms an ‘oppositional’ post-modernism to a depoliticized ‘celebratory’ version which, as he puts it, ‘refuses to distinguish between emancipatory or progressive and regulatory or conservative’ movements and ideas. This theme is taken up by Munck (1999: 67): ‘To a complacent, conservative post-modernism which revels in the Northern view of the network or spectacle society, we can plausibly counterpose a radical, contestatory and emancipatory postmodernism’. But contesting what, and emancipating whom? For de Sousa Santos (1999: 42), oppositional post-modernism ‘claims a normativity which both posits sides and establishes criteria to choose among them’. He states that such criteria should be established on the basis of ‘bottom up’ and ‘participatory’ methodologies. But if there is one overriding lesson to be learned from recent critical writing on the practice of development – and this is where post-development theory displays a startling imperviousness to such studies – it is that concepts such as ‘bottom up’ and ‘participatory’ can often work to conceal and perpetuate relationships of inequality and domination. Sarah White, for example, has formulated a penetrating critique of ‘the uses and abuses of participation’ (1996: 7, 14) in development projects, warning that ‘The status of participation as a “Hurrah” word, bringing a warm glow to its users and hearers, blocks its detailed examination’ – in particular, examination of how participation may become ‘the means through which existing power relations are entrenched and reproduced’. Her warning, aimed at development practitioners, has clear relevance for development (and post-development) theorists also. Claire Mercer (1999: 3, 31), in a detailed case-study from Tanzania, documents how ‘participation’ became, in effect, a mechanism through which middle and upper income groups in village women’s organizations gained access to social and material resources. Giles Mohan (1999: 46), amongst many others, has also dissected the extent to which the rhetoric of ‘participation’ often serves to conceal the operation of powerful interests within communities (see also Mayoux, 1995; Goebel, 1998; and Hintjens, 1999). It is, therefore, not surprising that a comprehensive survey of the issue finds ‘little evidence of the long-term effectiveness of participation [in itself] . . . as a strategy for social change’ (Cleaver, 1999: 597). Furthermore, some of the most conservative social movements may well be at least as ‘bottom up’ and ‘participatory’ as their progressive counterparts. Thus, the difficulty remains of entrusting the political project of post-development to movements that are far from guaranteed to be politically progressive, and of having no satisfactory basis for deciding whether they are or not (‘participation’, in itself, being a wholly unsatisfactory criterion). This is what Ray Kiely (1999: 45) terms Pontius Pilate politics, and it can only be transcended if critical inquiry is willing to go beyond the mere ‘relativizing of narratives’ (Nygren, 2000: 30). Fourth, even if progressive intent is somehow evident, fragmented social movements and groups, often operating around single issues, may be no match for the power of, for example, increasingly globalized capital. Again, de Sousa Santos (1999: 34, 39) seems to offer a way around the problem: to cope with global forces, he claims, what is needed is a ‘theory of translation capable of making the different struggles mutually intelligible and allowing for the collective actors to talk about the oppressions they resist and the aspirations that mobilize them’ in order to facilitate ‘emancipatory practices [that are] . . . sustainable only so long as they become networked’. But, referring back to the third problem discussed earlier, while the need for networking is obvious, what, if anything, is the basis for deciding which ‘struggles’ and ‘collective actors’ we are concerned with? And how do we distinguish an emancipatory from a non-emancipatory practice, given that ‘participation’, for example, is an inadequate criterion for making such distinctions (see above)?

Alt Fails – Fragments Resistance

( ) Total rejection of capitalism fragments resistance – the perm solves best

J.K. Gibson-Graham, feminist economist, 1996, End of Capitalism

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

Alt Fails – No Alternative to Cap

No alternative to capitalism and capitalism will not collapse

Fareed Zakaria, 6-13-2009,“The capitalist manifesto,” http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935?from=rss

A few years from now, strange as it may sound, we might all find that we are hungry for more capitalism, not less. An economic crisis slows growth, and when countries need growth, they turn to markets. After the Mexican and East Asian currency crises—which were far more painful in those countries than the current downturn has been in America—we saw the pace of market-oriented reform speed up. If, in the years ahead, the American consumer remains reluctant to spend, if federal and state governments groan under their debt loads, if government-owned companies remain expensive burdens, then private-sector activity will become the only path to create jobs. The simple truth is that with all its flaws, capitalism remains the most productive economic engine we have yet invented. Like Churchill's line about democracy, it is the worst of all economic systems, except for the others. Its chief vindication today has come halfway across the world, in countries like China and India, which have been able to grow and pull hundreds of millions of people out of poverty by supporting markets and free trade. Last month India held elections during the worst of this crisis. Its powerful left-wing parties campaigned against liberalization and got their worst drubbing at the polls in 40 years. Capitalism means growth, but also instability. The system is dynamic and inherently prone to crashes that cause great damage along the way. For about 90 years, we have been trying to regulate the system to stabilize it while still preserving its energy. We are at the start of another set of these efforts. In undertaking them, it is important to keep in mind what exactly went wrong. What we are experiencing is not a crisis of capitalism. It is a crisis of finance, of democracy, of globalization and ultimately of ethics. "Capitalism messed up," the British tycoon Martin Sorrell wrote recently, "or, to be more precise, capitalists did." Actually, that's not true. Finance screwed up, or to be more precise, financiers did. In June 2007, when the financial crisis began, Coca-Cola, PepsiCo, IBM, Nike, Wal-Mart and Microsoft were all running their companies with strong balance sheets and sensible business models. Major American corporations were highly profitable, and they were spending prudently, holding on to cash to build a cushion for a downturn. For that reason, many of them have been able to weather the storm remarkably well. Finance and anything finance-related—like real estate—is another story.

Perm – AT: Cooptation

And, reformist political actions can be used to undermine systems of power

Chris Dixon, Activist and founding member of Direct Action Network, 2005, “Reflections on Privilege, Reformism, and Activism,” www.geocities.com/kk\_abacus/ioaa/dixon2.html, accessed 3-6-05

Evidently sasha doesn't grasp my argument in "Finding Hope." Or else he disagrees. It's difficult to tell because, while skillfully sidestepping engagement with my discussion of privilege, he also sidesteps the main thrust of my essay: rethinking radicalism, particularly in the context of privilege. As I wrote, "we have to move beyond the myopic view--often endemic among anarchists--that the most 'important' activism only or mainly happens in the streets, enmeshed in police confrontations." In other words, spheres of traditional 'radical action' are limited and limiting. And though I don't believe that sasha fundamentally disagrees with this criticism, he refuses to accept its broader consequences. For instance, where I question the bounds of 'radicalism' with examples of struggles like opposing prison construction and establishing community and cultural centers, he conclusively points to "a set of demands and goals of which none suggest any serious critique of capitalism and the state in their totality." There is much more to the "totality" that we all confront than capitalism and the state. That's unequivocal. Furthermore, a "totality" has an undeniable physical presence, and people do in fact contest and resist it every day through a variety of struggles using a variety of means--not all containing the "serious critique" necessary to satisfy sasha. J. Kellstadt nicely observes this, noting that an 'activist' perspective (not unlike sasha's) overlooks a whole layer of more "everyday" forms of resistance - from slacking off, absenteeism, and sabotage, to shopfloor "counter-planning" and other forms of autonomous and "unofficial" organizing - which conventional activists and leftists (including most anarchists) have a bad track record of acknowledging. And this still leaves out all of those modes of struggle which take place beyond the shopfloor, such as various forms of cultural and sexual revolution. Unfortunately, sasha doesn't deign to discuss these all-too-pedestrian realities, many of which potentially embrace the very anarchist ethics he touts. They certainly have bearing on the lives of many folks and speak to a breadth of social struggle, but they apparently don't constitute a sufficient "critique." Even if sasha were to acknowledge their importance, my sense is that he would erect a rationalized theoretical division between Kellstadt's "everyday forms of resistance" and 'reformism.' No doubt, he would use a rhetorical sleight of hand on par with the "simple fact of language that those who want to reform the present system are called reformists." A seemingly irrefutable, self-apparent statement, this actually glosses over legitimate questions: Are 'reformists' so easily discernable and cleanly categorized? Are all 'reforms' equal? Can they be part of a long-term revolutionary strategy? So let's talk plainly about reformism. No matter how much some might wish otherwise, it simply isn't a cut-and-dry issue. And while it actually deserves a book-length examination, here I'll sketch some general considerations. Principally, I ask, assuming that we share the goal of dismantling systems of power and restructuring our entire society in nonhierarchical ways, what role does reform play? Must we eschew it, unconditionally embrace it, or is there another approach? sasha steadfastly represents one rather limited 'radical' view. To bolster his critique of 'reformism,' for instance, he critically cites one of the examples in my essay: demanding authentic public oversight of police. "[This] might be a small step for social change in some general sense," he argues, "but ultimately it is a step backwards as it strengthens the legitimacy of the police and of imposed decision." I respect the intent of this critique; it makes sense if one is privileged enough to engage with the police on terms of one's own choosing. Yet in real life, it's both simplistic and insulated. Look at it this way: accepting sasha's argument, are we to wait until the coming insurrectionary upheaval before enjoying an end to police brutality? More specifically, are African-American men to patiently endure the continued targeting of "driving while Black"? Should they hold off their demands for police accountability so as to avoid strengthening "the legitimacy of the police and of imposed decision"? And if they don't, are they 'reformists'? Many folks who experience daily police occupation understand that ending the "imposed decision" (often epitomized by police) will require radical change, and they work toward it. At the same time, they demand authentic public oversight of police forces. The two don't have to be mutually exclusive. I'll even suggest that they can be complementary, especially if we acknowledge the legacies of white supremacy and class stratification embedded in policing. Ultimately, we need a lucid conception of social change that articulates this kind of complementarity. That is, we need revolutionary strategy that links diverse, everyday struggles and demands to long-term radical objectives, without sacrificing either. Of course, this isn't to say that every so-called 'progressive' ballot initiative or organizing campaign is necessarily radical or strategic. Reforms are not all created equal. But some can fundamentally shake systems of power, leading to enlarged gains and greater space for further advances. Andre Gorz, in his seminal book Strategy for Labor, refers to these as "non-reformist" or "structural" reforms. He contends, "a struggle for non-reformist reforms--for anti-capitalist reforms--is one which does not base its validity and its right to exist on capitalist needs, criteria, and rationales. A non-reformist reform is determined not in terms of what can be, but what should be." Look to history for <CONTINUED>

Perm – AT: Cooptation

<CONTINUED>

examples: the end of slavery, the eight-hour workday, desegregation. All were born from long, hard

struggles, and none were endpoints. Yet they all struck at the foundations of power (in these cases, the state, white supremacy, and capitalism), and in the process, they created new prospects for revolutionary change. Now consider contemporary struggles: amnesty for undocumented immigrants, socialized health care, expansive environmental protections, indigenous sovereignty. These and many more are arguably non-reformist reforms as well. None will single-handedly dismantle capitalism or other systems of power, but each has the potential to escalate struggles and sharpen social contradictions. And we shouldn't misinterpret these efforts as simply meliorative incrementalism, making 'adjustments' to a fundamentally flawed system. Certainly that tendency exists, but there are plenty of other folks working very consciously within a far more radical strategy, pushing for a qualitative shift in struggle. "To fight for alternative solutions," Gorz writes, "and for structural reforms (that is to say, for intermediate objectives) is not to fight for improvements in the capitalist system; it is rather to break it up, to restrict it, to create counter-powers which, instead of creating a new equilibrium, undermine its very foundations." Thankfully, this is one approach among a diverse array of strategies, all of which encompass a breadth of struggles and movements. Altogether, they give me hope.

Perm – Solves Best

Perm solves – only using capitalism to fight capitalism can be effective

Monthly Review, March 1990, v. 41, no. 10, p 38

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

Perm – Global/Local Good

Perm solves – the best way to resist capitalism is to let local solutions like the alt coexist with global strategies like the plan

J.K. Gibson-Graham, the pen name of Katherine Gibson, Senior Fellow of Human Geography at Australian National University, and Julie Graham, professor of Geography at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2002, online: http://www.communityeconomies.org/papers/rethink/rethinkp3.rtf, accessed January 9, 2005

Finally, what can we say about an economic politics outside the binary frame? In the face of the programs and plans of anti-globalization theorists and political analysts, our micropolitical experiments can easily be dismissed. Most analysts, like Hardt and Negri, offer a vision of an appropriate political response to globalization that is very distant from the one we are pursuing: Imperial corruption is already undermined by the productivity of bodies, by cooperation, and by the multitude’s designs on productivity. The only event that we are still awaiting is the construction, or rather the insurgence, of a powerful organization. The genetic chain is formed and established in ontology, the scaffolding is continuously constructed and renewed by the new cooperative productivity, and thus we await only the maturation of the political development of the posse. We do not have any models to offer this event. Only the multitude through its practical experimentation will offer models and determine when and how the possible becomes real. (2000: 411) We are no longer capable of waiting for the multitude to construct a powerful organization (Gibson-Graham, 1996). Instead, we continue to be inspired by feminism as a global force, one that started small and personal and largely stayed that way, that worked on cultivating new ways of being, that created new languages, discourses and representations, that built organizations, and that quickly (albeit unevenly) encompassed the globe. Globalization appears to call for one form of politics—mobilization and resistance on the global scale. But we believe there are other ways of practicing transformative politics—involving an opening to the local as a place of political creativity and innovation. To advocate local enactments is in no way to suggest that other avenues should close down. We would hope for the acceptance of multiple powers and forms of politics, with an eye to increasing freedoms and not limiting options. Rather than equivocating, with paradoxical certainty, about when and how a challenge to globalization will arise (the Hardt and Negri position), we have engaged in a here and now political experiment—working on ourselves and in our backyards.29 This is not because we think that we have found the only way forward, but because we have become unable to wait for an effective politics to be convened on some future terrain. The form of politics we are pursuing is not transmitted via a mass organization, but through a language and a set of practices. A language can become universal without being universalist. It can share the space of power with other languages, without having to eradicate or “overthrow” them.30 Academic, NGO, and internet networks can become part of a system of transmission, translation, amplification. In our (admittedly hopeful) vision, the language of the diverse economy and accompanying practices of non-capitalist development may have global purchase one day.

No Revolution

Revolution not coming

Emma Vandore 1/8/09, “Sarkozy, Merkel, Blair call for new capitalism” http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jVLZyGlHi47X6XGavz\_u4nacKPiQD95J4KRO1

The leaders of France and Germany appeared to put disagreements over economic policy behind them Thursday, calling on the U.S. to join global efforts to address the financial crisis. French President Nicolas Sarkozy, leading a two-day conference with former British Prime Minister Tony Blair on the future of capitalism, said the crisis has shown that no country can go it alone on economic policy. "In the 21st century, there it is no longer a single nation who can say what we should do or what we should think," he said. German Chancellor Angela Merkel said the system "cannot continue as it is" and called for better-regulated financial markets. European leaders will meet in Berlin before the G-20 summit in London to decide a common approach as global leaders gear up for a second meeting on the global financial crisis, Sarkozy said. Measures will be taken at the G-20 meeting in London on April 2, Sarkozy promised, saying "we cannot accept the status quo." He called for closer cooperation on economic policy, saying: "We should discuss how each of us is managing his currency, his interest rates." The leaders of France and Germany have differed in the past over how much government support Europe's economy needs. Merkel deplored huge debts that governments are accumulating to spend their way out of the present crisis. But she said she recognized, for the moment, that "there is no other possibility." Leaders should look beyond financial markets, she said, singling out the American budget deficit and China's current account surplus — or trade balance — as problems upsetting the global economy. A Congressional Budget Office report estimates that the U.S. federal budget deficit will hit an unparalleled $1.2 trillion for the 2009 budget year — and that is before President-elect Barack Obama's sweeping stimulus package is calculated. European governments have agreed to be flexible about budget rules that limit deficits to 3 percent of gross domestic product as recession bites. Merkel is planning an extra stimulus of up to euro50 billion ($70 billion) and Sarkozy said Thursday that he is considering additional measures. French Finance Minister Christine Lagarde said Thursday that Paris is planning to inject a second tranche of euro10.5 billion into some of the nation's largest banks in an effort to spur lending. Merkel said the International Monetary Fund has not managed to regulate global capitalism, and she called for the creation of an economy body at the United Nations, similar to the Security Council, to judge government policy. Speaking at the conference, European Competition Commissioner Neelie Kroes said "global rules" on government aid to companies would be "helpful." "A closer network of competition systems is slowly emerging after decades of work," she said. Sarkozy blamed financial speculators for encouraging a system fueled on debt. He called financial capitalism based on speculation "an immoral system" that has "perverted the logic of capitalism." "It's a system where wealth goes to the wealthy, where work is devalued, where production is devalued, where entrepreneurial spirit is devalued," he said. But no more: "In capitalism of the 21st century, there is room for the state," he said. Blair called for a new financial order based on "values other than the maximum short-term profit." "The greatest entrepreneur I had the chance to meet was passionate about what he had created, not what he had accumulated," he said.

AT: Root Cause of War

Cap is not the root cause of war – their authors falsely conflate other problems with modernity with capitalism

Doug Bandow, 2005, “A capitalist Peace?” http://www.reason.com/news/show/32985.html

The point is not that democracy is worthless. Free political systems naturally entail free elections. Other forms of liberty—civil and economic—are more likely to survive when politics also is free. But democracy alone doesn't yield peace. To believe is does is dangerous: There's no panacea for creating a conflict- free world. That doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets—that is, spreading capitalism—is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity. Notes Gartzke: "Warfare among developing nations will remain unaffected by the capitalist peace as long as the economies of many developing countries remain fettered by governmental control." Freeing those economies is critical. It's a particularly important lesson for the anti-capitalist left. For the most part, the enemies of economic liberty also most stridently denounce war, often in near pacifist terms. Yet they oppose the very economic policies most likely to encourage peace. If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical benefits of markets—prosperity and freedom—they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war. Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

AT: Root Cause of Poverty

Don’t buy their bumper-sticker economics – global capitalism is solving poverty

Johan Norberg, et. Al. 2003, “In Defense of Global Capitalism”, Cato Institute.

The world is said to have become increasingly unfair. The chorus of the debate on the market economy runs: ‘‘The rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer.’’ This statement is offered as a dictate of natural law, not as a thesis to be argued. But if we look beyond the catchy slogans and study what has actually happened in the world, we find this thesis to be a half-truth. The first half is true: the rich have indeed grown richer—not all of them everywhere, but generally speaking. Those of us who are privileged to live in affluent countries have grown appreciably richer in the past few decades. So too have the Third World rich. But the second half is, quite simply, wrong. The poor have not, generally speaking, come to be worse off in recent decades. On the contrary, absolute poverty has diminished, and where it was quantitatively greatest—in Asia—many hundreds of millions of people who barely twenty years ago were struggling to make ends meet have begun to achieve a secure existence and even a modest degree of affluence. Global misery has diminished and the great injustices have started to unravel. This opening chapter will contain a long succession of figures and trend descriptions that are necessary to correct the very widespread misunderstanding that exists concerning the state of the world.2