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## Collapse Not Coming

### World leaders and businesses agree, capitalism is here to stay

Harvard Business Review, Capitalism for the Long Term, 2011, http://hbr.org/2011/03/capitalism-for-the-long-term/ar/1

In an ongoing effort that started 18 months ago, I’ve met with more than 400 business and government leaders across the globe. Those conversations have reinforced my strong sense that, despite a certain amount of frustration on each side, the two groups share the belief that capitalism has been and can continue to be the greatest engine of prosperity ever devised—and that we will need it to be at the top of its job-creating, wealth-generating game in the years to come. At the same time, there is growing concern that if the fundamental issues revealed in the crisis remain unaddressed and the system fails again, the social contract between the capitalist system and the citizenry may truly rupture, with unpredictable but severely damaging results.

### Despite the popularity of anti-capitalist doomsaying capitalism will continue to thrive

Kenneth Rogoff, Professor of Economics at Harvard University and recipient of the 2011 Deutsche Bank Prize in Financial Economics, was the chief economist at the International Monetary Fund, Is Modern Capitalism Sustainable?, 2011, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/is-modern-capitalism-sustainable-

In principle, none of capitalism’s problems is insurmountable, and economists have offered a variety of market-based solutions. A high global price for carbon would induce firms and individuals to internalize the cost of their polluting activities. Tax systems can be designed to provide a greater measure of redistribution of income without necessarily involving crippling distortions, by minimizing non-transparent tax expenditures and keeping marginal rates low. Effective pricing of health care, including the pricing of waiting times, could encourage a better balance between equality and efficiency. Financial systems could be better regulated, with stricter attention to excessive accumulations of debt. Will capitalism be a victim of its own success in producing massive wealth? For now, as fashionable as the topic of capitalism’s demise might be, the possibility seems remote. Nevertheless, as pollution, financial instability, health problems, and inequality continue to grow, and as political systems remain paralyzed, capitalism’s future might not seem so secure in a few decades as it seems now.

## Alternative Fails

### Alternative fails – communism is doomed to incite mass death and destruction

R.J. Rummel, The killing machine that is Marxism, 2004, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1301721/posts

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide. In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly then all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster. The Marxists saw the construction of this utopia as a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism and inequality – and, as in a real war, noncombatants would unfortunately get caught in the battle. There would be necessary enemy casualties: the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, "wreckers," intellectuals, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, the rich and landlords. As in a war, millions might die, but these deaths would be justified by the end, as in the defeat of Hitler in World War II. To the ruling Marxists, the goal of a communist utopia was enough to justify all the deaths. The irony is that in practice, even after decades of total control, Marxism did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made living conditions worse than before the revolution. It is not by chance that the world's greatest famines have happened within the Soviet Union (about 5 million dead from 1921-23 and 7 million from 1932-3, including 2 million outside Ukraine) and communist China (about 30 million dead from 1959-61). Overall, in the last century almost 55 million people died in various Marxist famines and associated epidemics – a little over 10 million of them were intentionally starved to death, and the rest died as an unintended result of Marxist collectivization and agricultural policies.

### By theorizing power as a construct of capitalism Marxism either recognizes that it can never be evenly distributed or it relies on an essentialist return to proper humanity that is a religious ideal. Either way the alternative can never solve

Wendy Brown, political theory at the University of Berkley, 2001 “Politics Out of History” Princeton University Press P. 69-71

But if subjects and objects of power are always the effects of power according to Marx, why should this cease to be the case when power is no longer maldistributed, when it is shared among rather than held by political economic subjects? For Marx this is the historical moment at which power becomes both legitimate and transparent, no longer requiring dissimulation. In conditions of true equality, social power— its basis in labor and its distribution through society—loses its secretive quality. At this moment, too, subjects recover an essential nature (“species being”) that is prior to power. Paradoxically, while a particular (collective and radically democratic) organization of power is a condition of this recovered nature, that organization of power is not cast as constitutive of the subjects themselves. At the very point at which subjects are seen to have fully reclaimed their social powers as their own, power ceases to produce and organize them as subjects. Subjects are returned to their true nature at the moment they are rejoined with one another in a condition of radical interdependence and cooperation—but this return and this rejoining entail a recovery of authenticity and freedom (unalienated species being and true human emancipation) that excludes or evicts power. Thus, the final form of history recovers the relation to power of its prelapsarian ancestor. Marx puts the matter this way: “All-round dependence, this natural form of the world-historical co-operation of individuals, will be transformed by this communist revolution into the control and conscious mastery of these powers, which, born of the action of men on one another, have till now overawed and governed men as powers completely alien to them.”12 Yet a power fully mastered, fully under collective sway, is a governing power no longer—hence its transparency as well as its impotence in controlling men’s lives. Power rendered transparent and impotent, power that no longer overawes or governs, is power that is not power. Thus does power evaporate just as it is collectively grasped, as its historic maldistribution is rectified. So also at the moment they share in it equally do subjects cease being produced by power, organized by power, positioned by power, and, above all, mystified by power. But if power is power only when it is not shared, and hence when it is not transparent, we face two possibilities. Either Marx, as Foucault implies, offers us a scene of emancipation that is beyond and outside power, a picture that is otherworldly in the extreme, a picture that partakes of the same religious logic that Marx sought to reject in his break with Hegel. Or perhaps, in the exhaustive abolition of ownership and individual agency that is required by Marx’s formulation of power collectivized, there is an implicit confession that power cannot be completely shared, that democracy is impossible, that communism is an unreachable ideal, precisely because power resists equal distribution—resists equality as such In either case, Marx appears to tacitly recognize that power shared is no longer power, that the only way to capture power collectively is to deprive everyone of it 13 (Can what we once called “actually existing communism” be sympathetically under- stood as impaled on this problem, on the conceit that power can be vanquished from human society) Power that exceeds the form of the labor that generates it is, according to Marx, undemocratic by nature (and hence disappears in true democracy); it is also unknowable insofar as it always and necessarily disguises itself, and this disguise is-part of what constitutes the power of power. Here, let us return to the passage, cited earlier, in which Marx promises to discern the true nature of capital by violating the private property line protecting its secret. In seeking to discover, in “the hidden abode of production,” not only “how capital produces, but how capital is produced,” Marx gestures toward a double operation of power it simultaneously produces itself as a subject or agent and produces an effect outside of itself. The exploitation of labor in commodity production, for example, produces not only capital but also the system of capitalism that reproduces all of the system’s elements. For Marx, power produces its own conditions of reproduction and hence its own futurity, although both moments of production are necessarily rife with contradiction. As he explains in Capital, “Like all its predecessors, the capitalist process of production proceeds under definite material conditions, which are, however, simultaneously the bearers of definite social relations entered into by individuals in the process of reproducing their life. Those conditions, like these relations, are on the one hand prerequisites and on the other hand results and creations of the capitalist process of production; they are produced and reproduced by it.”14 But how could power achieve such a feat—producing both its necessary prerequisites and its intended effects—without having divine or naturalistic dimensions, a metaphysical structure and a teleological course? And what would give humanly generated power these characteristics? Why should power know where it is going if those generating it, produced by it, steeped in it, are largely clueless about its course? What ghostly remainder of God’s prescience and of inherent human ignorance shapes this putative secularization of history? Indeed, not only does Marx ground human social and historical existence in a deep metaphysics, but it is a metaphysics that evaporates at the moment that humans acquire control of their own existence, at the moment they win freedom. Insofar as this freedom entails an emancipation from metaphysics, it is our essential humanness—or, more precisely, our angelic essence—that replaces the structuring function occupied in history by metaphysics.15

### The best way to formulate anti-capitalism is to allow local resistance like the alt to coexist with global strategies like the plan – their alt can never solve alone

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.

## Capitalism Good – Space

### **Only capitalism provides the motivation necessary to colonize space**

Fred Koschara FKE Space Program, April 8, 1997, http://www.l5development.com/fkespace/fkespace.shtml)

Space exploration and colonization holds the potential for fulfillment of all of humanity's rational dreams. However, we are still crippled by the lack of a viable plan for developing the possibilities open to us. The commercial use of space, and the opportunities it represents, are the only methods that will be able to attract the development participation necessary to achieve a suitable level of effort. This is a splendid chance for capitalism to show its mettle and prove its worth: to demonstrate that the profit motive is the most powerful incentive available in modern civilized society.

### **Capitalism’s profit motive, not national pride, will get us off the rock**

Robert L. Haltermann, Space News, September 13, 1999

Space can become a mainstream public issue again, but it will take a partnership between the public, private industry, and the Federal government to move it back. Using the profit motive of capitalism that returns tangible benefits to the Nation, in place of the external challenge that provided us with the prestige and national pride of winning the space race, will be required. It behooves all of us to move in this new direction and expand on what we have already accomplished, otherwise it seems our Nation's civil space programs will continue to be diminished in size and scope and with it the help the private sector needs to be successful in new space endeavors.

Only capitalism lowers the price of space and allows colonization

Glenn Harlan Reynolds, Space Law Professor, Tech New Column, Feb. 3, 2003, http://www.techcentralstation.com/1051/techwrapper.jsp?PID=1051-250&CID=1051-020303B

The irony is that NASA was already starting to realize this. I was supposed to be in on a teleconference at which NASA would unveil the new budget on Monday morning, February 3d. That was cancelled over the weekend, of course, but the word was that NASA was going to reveal a number of interesting new initiatives designed to wean us off of the Space Shuttle and reestablish the momentum in interplanetary exploration. Over the next weeks and months, I suppose that these plans will come out anyway. But the public debate should be on how to move ahead with an ambitious space program without committing ourselves to another big, bureaucratic program like the Space Shuttle, which never really took us where we wanted to go. Instead, we need to find ways to unleash the energies of the private sector, and to allow industries like space tourism to play a bigger role. It's capitalism that lowers costs, not government programs.

Capitalism is getting us off the rock now

Frank Houston, Salon.Com, Aug. 30, 1999

Slowly but surely, the seeds of capitalism are spreading into the heavens. Benson, a conservationist who worked in the early days of the federal Energy Department during the Ford and Carter administrations, represents the beginning of a wave that could soon rival the upstart dreams of Silicon Valley in the 1980s. The commercialization of space has yet to impress Wall Street, but the public sector -- from Congress to NASA to the White House -- has embraced the idea that business will lead the next great space age. A bill being hammered out in the House of Representatives would require NASA to stay out of any activities where its involvement would preclude that of the private sector. In other words, NASA would have to either facilitate commerce or get out of its way. Many people, including businessmen and scientists, see a brand-new industry on the horizon. Benson is aiming to be one of its captains.

## Capitalism Good – Solves Energy

### Continuing the competition fostered by capitalism is the only way to solve energy problems

Paul Roberts, energy expert and writer for Harpers,2004, The End of Oil, pg. 261

This is by no means just free-market folderol. When we talk about building a new energy economy, consider the scale of our task: we need to take all our current energy assets — our coal-fired power plants, our oil pipelines and refineries, our tanker ships, our trains, and planes, and, of course, our automobiles — worth well over ten trillion dollars, and replace them all with an equally colossal and interwoven system of technologies, processes, and networks (many yet to be invented), which by 2050 must be efficiently producing enough energy for nine billion people, their compa­nies, and their lifestyles, all while emitting half the carbon per capita than is currently the case. We are talking, in short, about something so vast and complex and dy­namic that it cannot be launched by a single technology but must be built, one transaction at a time, by the same relentless economic engine, the same competition between technologies and ideas, the same ruthless pursuit of profit, that built our old energy economy. This is not to excuse the greed and shortsightedness of energy compa­nies and their political allies, who often view a new energy economy as ei­ther a threat to their profits and power or an opportunity to sell old tech­nology under a green label. It is, however, to recommend that we no longer be shocked, shocked at such self-interested behavior. The competition that is already shaping the next energy economy is occurring not only between rival technologies and ideas, but between the people, companies, and coun­tries that have staked their existence on those innovations — and that will, quite reasonably, fight like hell to see their investments pay off. For at the root of every political conflict over energy, and every political debate over the best energy policy, is a conflict between economic propositions. I am not advocating that we simply turn the task over to the market and cross our fingers. Our wonderfully efficient market has some astonish­ing blind spots and will require innovative political action to ensure that the energy economy we get is the one we truly want. I do, however, want to argue that until we gain a clearer understanding of the economic risks and rewards in the energy economy, we — and our policymakers — have very little hope of preventing the next energy economy from simply repeating the mistakes of the last one.

Capitalism Good – Key to Growth

### **Capitalism is key to growth**

Robert W. Tracinski, The Moral Basis of Capitalism, www.moraldefense.org, 2003)

Capitalism is the only moral social system because it is the only system that respects the freedom of the producers to think and the right of the individual to set his own goals and pursue his own happiness. With the fall of communism and the alleged end of the "era of big government," many commentators and politicians grudgingly acknowledge the practical value of capitalism. The free market, they concede, is the best system for producing wealth and promoting prosperity; the private economy, in Bill Clinton's words, is the "primary engine of growth."

Capitalism leads to growth – competition and profit create incentive

Myron J. Gordon and Jeffrey S. Rosenthal Professor of Finance, Rotman School of Management, and Professor of Statistics, respectively, both at University of Toronto “Capitalism’s Growth Imperitive” Cambridge Journal of Economics, 2003, vol. 27, issue 1

Abstract: A capitalist firm operating in a competitive market is subject to a growth imperative, because uncertainty about the profit rate under a no-growth policy makes the firm's prospects highly unattractive in finite time and bankruptcy practically certain in the long run. A no-growth policy determines consumption and investment so that they and capital would remain constant over time if the latter's expected return were realised with certainty. Simulation is used to arrive at the probability of bankruptcy by the end of t periods and the expected values of capital and money, for relevant combinations of time and uncertainty under successively more realistic models of a no-growth firm in a competitive market. The sensitivity of the results to variation in the parameters in each of the models is evaluated. Finally, we establish that a plausible growth policy may achieve growth, but the problem of bankruptcy is not resolved. The primary purpose of this paper is to establish that a capitalist enterprise operating in a competitive environment, be it a proprietorship or a corporation, is subject to a growth imperative. By a growth imperative, we mean that the enterprise requires the expectation of a positive growth rate, probably one that is well above the physically feasible rate of growth for an actual closed competitive capitalist system. A positive and probably high mean rate of growth is necessitated by the facts that the actual profit rate is uncertain, and its realisation varies over a very wide range. This high variability makes an enterprise with a zero or negative mean expected value for its growth rate face a future in which bankruptcy is practically certain in the long run, and has an intolerably high probability in the short run, while providing little or no compensating benefits by way of growth in income or wealth until bankruptcy takes place. In fact, income and wealth can be expected to fall over time. By a competitive capitalist enterprise, we mean one in which the enterprise buys and sells in markets in which the government or other regulatory authority plays no role in determining the prices and quantities for what it buys and sells. The reliance on competitive markets for specialisation and exchange and for the determination of each capitalist’s profit is the source of the high variability in the profit rate and the necessity of a positive and probably high mean expected rate of growth. It is widely if not universally accepted that growth is desirable. Keynes gave rise to a macroeconomic theory under which investment is not only desirable for growth in output in the long run, but necessary to avoid stagnation and unemployment in the short run. We make the stronger claim here, that growth is necessary for tolerable prospects for future survival for each capitalist and perhaps for the system as a whole. Some business leaders make the same claim, but they argue that innovations in technology, marketing, etc. by their competitors force them to participate in the quest for competitive advantage. To our knowledge, no theory of a capitalist firm or individual has been advanced under which a policy intended to maintain it at a stationary level is certain or even highly likely to lead to its collapse in the long run and offer highly unattractive prospects in the short run.

## Capitalism Key to Solve the Environment

### Environmental problems are global and require global cooperation

Jim Chen, Professor of Law at the University of Minnesota Law School, Fordham International Law Journal, November / December, 2000, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 217

The most serious environmental problems involve "the depletion and destruction of the global commons." Climate change, ozone depletion, and the loss of species, habitats, and biodiversity are today's top environmental priorities. None can be solved without substantial economic development and intense international cooperation. The systematic degradation of the biosphere respects no political boundaries. Worse, it is exacerbated by poverty. Of the myriad environmental problems in this mutually dependent world, "persistent poverty may turn out to be the most aggravating and destructive." We must remember "above all else" that "human degradation and deprivation ... constitute the greatest threat not only to national, regional, and world security, but to essential life-supporting ecological systems."

### Open markets result in more sustainable environments – statistics prove

Ana Eiras, Economic Policy Analyst for Latin America, and Brett Schaefer, Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs in the Center for International Trade and Economics at Heritage, September 27 2001, Trade: The Best Way to Protect the Environment, http://www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/BG1480.cfm, accessed 8/24/03

Moreover, the United States is an example of the elasticity of spending for environmental protection. As incomes have risen over the past three decades, America has increased "real spending by government and business on the environment and natural resource protection has doubled." [6](http://www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/#pgfId=1174952) Economically free countries typically have a more sustainable environmental policy. In January 2001, the World Economic Forum, the Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), and the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy published an Environmental Sustainability Index (ESI). [7](http://www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/#pgfId=1175129) The Index assigns the health of a country's environment a single number ranging from 0 to 100, in which zero means low sustainability and 100 means high sustainability. This number represents a country's success in coping with environmental challenges and cooperating with other countries in the management and improvement of common environmental problems. Chart 1 illustrates the relationship between The Heritage Foundation/Wall Street Journal 2001 Index of Economic Freedom scores and the ESI. The chart shows a strong relationship between economic freedom and environmental sustainability. The freer the economy, the greater the level of environmental sustainability. The United States is a classic example of economic freedom's beneficial impact on the environment. America has been a champion of economic freedom for decades while simultaneously maintaining one of the world's cleanest environments. Countries with more open trade and investment policies generally have higher levels of environmental sustainability. Free trade and the investment that typically follows it are two important sources of economic growth. Therefore, an open trade policy and a business-friendly environment will not only increase growth, but also provide the means to protect the environment. The Heritage Foundation calculated a "Trade Openness Index" based on the 2001 Index of Economic Freedom by averaging the score for the trade policy, property rights, capital flows and foreign investment, and regulation factors. Consider the relationship between the Trade Openness Index and the Environmental Sustainability Index illustrated in Chart 2. In countries with an open economy, the average environmental sustainability score is more than 30 percent higher than the scores of countries with moderately open economies, and almost twice as high as those of countries with closed economies.

### **Free trade is the only way to save the environment. Without it the global economy will collapse**

Martin Lewis professor in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke University. Green Delusions, 1992 p105-6

Contrary to the eco-radical vision, economic integration through extensive trade networks is not only beneficial for economic development but is also essential for future ecological health. Without the specialization made possible by transregional economic connections, and without the ability to transport essential resources over long distances, our entire economic and technological edifice would collapse.

## Perm 1/2

### 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.

## Perm 2/2

### **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.

## Turn – Focus on Cap = Racism 1/1

### Exclusive focus on class kills resistance to other forms of oppression, like racism

Cornel West, PhD Princeton, Teach @ Yale Divinity, 1988, Marxism and the Interp. Of Culture, ed. Nelson and Grossberg, p. 18-19

I shall argue that there are four basic conceptions of Afro-American oppression in the Marxist tradition. The first conception subsumes Afro-American oppression under the general rubric of working-class exploitation. This viewpoint is logocentric in that it elides and eludes the specificity of Afro-American oppression outside the workplace; it is reductionistic in that it explains away rather than explains this specificity. This logocentric and reductionistic approach results from vulgar and sophisticated versions of economism. I understand economism to be those forms of Marxist theory that defend either simple monodeterminist or subtle multideterminist causal relations between an evolving economic base upon a reflecting and refracting ideological superstructure, thereby giving a priori status to class subjects and modes of production as privileged explanatory variables. 1n regard to Afro-American oppression, economism and its concomitant logocentric and reductionistic approach holds that African people in the United States of America are not subjected to forms of oppression distinct from general working-class exploitation. Historically, this position was put forward by the major figures of the U.S. Socialist party (notwithstanding its more adequate yet forgotten 1903 resolution on the Negro question), especially Eugene Debs. In an influential series of articles, Debs argued that Afro-American oppression was solely a class problem and that any attention to its alleged specificity “apart from the general labor problem” would constitute racism in reverse.4 He wrote, “we [the socialists] have nothing to do with it [the race question], for it is their [the capitalists’] fight. We have simply to open the eyes of as many Negroes as we can and do battle for emancipation from wage slavery, and when the working class have triumphed in the class struggle and stand forth economic as well as political free men, the race problem will disappear.” In the meantime, Debs added, “we have nothing special to offer the Negro, and we cannot make separate appeals to all races. The Socialist Party is the party of the whole working class regardless of color.”5 My aim is not simply to castigate the U.S. Socialist party or insinuate accusative charges of racism against Debs. Needless to say, the Socialist party had many distinguished black members and Debs had a long history of fighting racism. Rather, I am concerned with the fact that the Second International economism in the U.S. Socialist party lead to a logocentric and reductionistic approach to Afro-American oppression, thereby ignoring, or at best downplaying strategies (as opposed to personal moral duties) to struggle against racism.

## Environment Turn

### Poor countries must grow before they protect the environment- Trade is Key

Ana L Eiras, Economic Policy Analyst for Latin America, and Brett D Schaefer, Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs, in the Center for International Trade and Economics (CITE) at The Heritage Foundation, September 27, 2001 http:/Iwww.heritage.orglResearch/TradeandForeignAidlBGl480.ctm

Congress will soon consider H.R. 2149, the Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2001 Trade promotion authority (TPA) enhances the Presidents ability to negotiate trade agreements by restricting agreements negotiated by the Administration to a straight up or down vote in Congress. TPA is important because ft reassures Americas trading partners that deals struck with Americas trade negotiators will not be undone through congressional amendment. Without such assurances, many countries are unwilling to negotiate with the United States. One of the greatest challenges facing passage of TPA is concern among some Members of Congress that free trade creates a “race to the bottom’ in environmental protection. Nothing could be further from the truth. Poor nations cannot afford to value environmental protection more highly than such basic goods as food or health care. If poor nations are to increase environmental protection. they must first increase their wealth. Free trade is a necessary component in catalyzing economic growth. Therefore, free trade is critical in providing the economic means that will enable countries to adopt measures that enhance their protection of the environment.

### Until 3rd world poverty is eliminated environmental protection will be impossible- trade is key

Ana Eiras, Economic Policy Analyst for Latin America, and Brett Schaefer, Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs, in the Center for International Trade and Economics (CITE) at The Heritage Foundation, September 27, 2001 httpi/www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/8G1480.cfm

Even if trade agreements were forged with the environmental restrictions sought by opponents of TPA, they would be more likely to undermine environmental protection in developing countries rather than promote it. Countries with higher incomes are better able to afford environmental protection. Imposing such standards on poorer nations places them in a Catch-22 between paying for environmental protection or staples like food or health care. As illustrated by Dr. Alan Moghissi, President of the Institute for Regulatory Sclence, in his testimony before the International Financial Institutions Advisory Commission (the Meltzer Commission), “how do you explain to a father in the Brazilian rain forest, who is poor, has sick children and is hungry that he should not cut trees because it may impact the biodiversity?“ Until the underlying issue of poverty is addressed, Dr. Moghissi added, “poverty [will be] the equivalent to exposure to the most toxic pollutant. The key to increasing environmental protection in developing nations is to increase economic growth. As a countries standard of living rises through economic liberalization and trade expansion, its industry can more readily afford to control emissions and its citizens have more discretionary income to allocate toward improved environmental quality. Free trade is a central component in increasing economic growth. By opening markets and creating more business opportunities, free trade fosters economic growth by rewarding risk taking by increasing sales profit margins, and market share. Companies can choose to build on those profits by expanding their operations, entering new market sectors, and creating better-paying jobs.”

## Capitalism Good – Solves War

### The expansion of capitalism makes war less likely

CATO Institute, Peace on Earth? Try Free Trade among Men, 2005, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/peace-earth-try-free-trade-among-men

First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France, and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable.

## AT: Capitalism Inevitably Declines

### **Capitalism doesn’t decline, it only shifts to a new city – the symptoms they point out are irrelevant**

Martin Lewis professor in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke University. Green Delusions, 1992 p167-168

The thesis that capitalism is destined to fail from its own internal contradictions is a bit threadbare these days. The present era is one of capitalism regnant, visible in the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, in the renouncing of marxism by sundry Mrican regimes, and in the spectacular success of East Asian capitalist economies. If we are to begin addressing our environmental and social problems we must first come to grips with this fundamental reality. True believers, however, persist in maintaining that capitalism’s suc­cess is merely a mirage. Just as Christian fundamentalists still believe that the second coming is nigh, so too marxists stalwarts continue to see the collapse of Japan and the West not only as inevitable but as due very soon indeed. Thus, they proclaim, we are now in the age of “late capital­ism.” To illustrate the system’s impending demise they point to the abundant signs of economic and social decay in the United States—the same signals that many fundamentalist Christians believe prove that Jesus is about to begin his descent. Several fundamental errors, however, tarnish the crisis and decay thesis. Most importantly radicals of all stripes consistently overestimate the signs of doom. To appreciate this we can play two schools of extrem­ism against each other and in so doing arrive at a reasonable middle ground. The anti-environmentalist ideologue Ben Wattenburg (1984), on the one hand, argues that all measures of social well-being actually show signs of vast and continual improvement; we are misled by the apocalyp­tic prophets, he claims, because we see the past through roge-colored glasses. The eco-marxist James O’Connor (1987), on the other hand, sees only decay wherever he looks. Neither view is particularly instructive, and both would prove paralyzing if taken at face value. We should listen to both Pollyanna and Cassandra, but we would be foolish to accept either as offering accurate assessments or clear prophesies. In a backhanded and unintended manner, the thesis of inevitable capitalist decay is actually belied in the writings of many contemporary marxists. Such scholars consistently and rightfully point to the damages caused by the Reagan and Bush administrations’ social policies. James O’Connor, for example, argues that Reaganomics required us to sacrifice our “dreams of an equitable and just society” (1987:39). This sentiment implies, however, that the recently demolished social programs pre­viously enacted by the Democratic Party were bringing justice and eq­uity to capitalistic American society. Yet if marxism tells us anything it is that justice and equity are absolutely impossible under capitalism. Here we encounter a great intellectual game of “cake eating and having.” When social progress is made within a capitalist society it is ignored or dismissed as chimerical; when social regression occurs it is highlighted as very real indeed—even if it entails nothing but the dismantling of programs previously denied as unreal. Such sophistry does indeed allow one to argue that capitalist society will only ratchet ever downward into more brutal forms of injustice and exploitation. The thesis that capitalism is in inevitable decline is also parochial. The unstated assumption is that capitalism is congruent with the West, if not simply with the United States. Signs of decay in America are thus heralded as foretelling the decline of capitalism in general. Here marxists simply don the same blinders that virtually every American enjoys wear­ing. We find great comfort in believing that the United States is still the world’s dominant country simply by virtue of its sizable gross national product (GNP) and formidable military. But America’s present lead over Japan reflects not the two nations’ internal economic dynamics, but rather America’s tremendous head start, its larger population, and, to a lesser extent, its greater wealth in resources and land. On virtually any measure of economic transformation, be it industrial, technological, or financial, Japan is either ahead or closing in quickly. The great French historian Fernand Braudel (1984) has shown that the world capitalist system is almost always centered in a single city. No city however, has been able to retain dominance for long; capitalism is simply too competitive. Thus Venice yielded to Antwerp, Antwerp to Genoa, Genoa to Amsterdam, Amsterdam to London, and London to New York. And now New York is falling to Tokyo As each former center, and its surrounding country, loses primacy relative decay will be inevita­ble. In the rising star, however, such signs of decrepitude should be absent. The Capitalist Imperative 169 The essential question thus is whether Japan shows the signs of social and economic collapse that eco-marxists perceive in the United States. It is difficult indeed to argue that it does. Economic growth and productiv­ity increases may have slowed down a bit, but they are healthy year after year; sundry economic shocks may provoke fear, but they are always contained after short periods. Inflation and unemployment levels are minuscule by Western standards, violent crime is rare, drug addiction is scarcely a problem, child abuse is almost unknown, and homelessness is nearly nonexistent. And whereas the wage gap between high school and college graduates is increasing in the United States, in Japan it is decreas­ing (Reich 1991:206). Not that Japan is a paradise; if one looks closely enough many social evils are readily apparent. Japanese society is, for example, shockingly bigoted and its progress toward women’s rights is woefully retarded. But even here halting improvements are being made. The belief that capitalism is marching ever onward to its inevitable decline is little more than darkly wishful thinking—wishful because marxists believe that true justice can be instituted only when capi­talism expires, but darkly because marxists well know that the poor suffer disproportionally in times of chaos and crisis.

## Criticism of Cap Bad

### Capitalism co-opts criticism to create more insidious means of oppression

Louis Menand, Distinguished Professor of English, CUNY Graduate Center, January 27, 2003 New Yorker

"Animal Farm," George Orwell's satire, which became the Cold War "Candide," was finished in 1944, the high point of the Soviet-Western alliance against fascism. It was a warning against dealing with Stalin and, in the circumstances, a prescient book. Orwell had trouble finding a publisher, though, and by the time the book finally appeared, in August, 1945, the month of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs, the Cold War was already on the horizon. "Animal Farm" was an instant success in England and the United States. It was a Book-of-the-Month Club selection; it was quickly translated into many languages and distributed, in some countries, by the United States government; and it made Orwell, who had spent most of his life scraping by, famous and rich. "1984," published four years later, had even greater success. Orwell was fatally ill with pulmonary tuberculosis when he wrote it, and he died in January, 1950. He was forty-six. The revision began almost immediately. Frances Stonor Saunders, in her fascinating study "The Cultural Cold War," reports that right after Orwell's death the C.I.A. (Howard Hunt was the agent on the case) secretly bought the film rights to "Animal Farm" from his widow, Sonia, and had an animated-film version produced in England, which it distributed throughout the world. The book's final scene, in which the pigs (the Bolsheviks, in Orwell's allegory) can no longer be distinguished from the animals' previous exploiters, the humans (the capitalists), was omitted. A new ending was provided, in which the animals storm the farmhouse where the pigs have moved and liberate themselves all over again. The great enemy of propaganda was subjected, after his death, to the deceptions and evasions of propaganda-and by the very people, American Cold Warriors, who would canonize him as the great enemy of propaganda. Howard Hunt at least kept the story pegged to the history of the Soviet Union, which is what Orwell intended. Virtually every detail in "Animal Farm" allegorizes some incident in that history: the Kronstadt rebellion, the five-year plan, the Moscow trials, the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, the Tehran conference. But although Orwell didn't want Communism, he didn't want capitalism, either. This part of his thought was carefully elided, and "Animal Farm" became a warning against political change per se. It remains so today. The cover of the current Harcourt paperback glosses the contents as follows: As ferociously fresh as it was more than half a century ago, "Animal Farm" is a parable about would-be liberators everywhere. As we witness the rise and bloody fall of the revolutionary animals through the lens of our own history, we see the seeds of totalitarianism in the most idealistic organizations; and in our most charismatic leaders, the souls of our cruelest oppressors. This is the opposite of what Orwell intended. But almost everything in the popular understanding of Orwell is a distortion of what he really thought and the kind of writer he was.

## Criticism of Cap Bad

### Criticism of capitalism denies American Indians the ability to escape poverty and survive, leading to cultural extinction and genocide

Lilian Friedberg, Executive Director, Sojourner Truth Center for Ethnic Diversity, Summer 2000, American Indian Quarterly, vol 24, no 3

Attempts on the part of American Indians to transcend chronic, intergenerational maladies introduced by the settler population (for example, in the highly contested Casino industry, in the ongoing battles over tribal sovereignty, and so on) are challenged tooth and nail by the U.S. government and its “ordinary” people. Flexibility in transcending these conditions has been greatly curtailed by federal policies that have “legally” supplanted our traditional forms of governance, outlawed our languages and spirituality, manipulated our numbers and identity, usurped our cultural integrity, viciously repressed the leaders of our efforts to regain self-determination, and systematically miseducated the bulk of our youth to believe that this is, if not just, at least inevitable.”55 Today’s state of affairs in America, both with regard to public memory and national identity, represents a flawless mirror image of the situation in Germany vis-à-vis Jews and other non-Aryan victims of the Nazi regime.

### Loss of cultural diversity destroys all life

Lilian Friedberg, Executive Director, Sojourner Truth Center for Ethnic Diversity, Summer 2000, American Indian Quarterly, vol 24, no 3

But what is at stake today, at the dawn of a new millennium, is not the culture, tradition, and survival of one population on one continent on either side of the Atlantic. What is at stake is the very future of the human species. LaDuke, in her most recent work, contextualizes the issues from a contemporary perspective: Our experience of survival and resistance is shared with many others. But it is not only about Native people.. . . In the final analysis, the survival of Native America is fundamentally about the collective survival of all human beings. The question of who gets to determine the destiny of the land, and of the people who live on it—those with the money or those who pray on the land—is a question that is alive throughout society.57 “There is,” as LaDuke reminds us, “a direct relationship between the loss of cultural diversity and the loss of biodiversity. Wherever Indigenous peoples still remain, there is also a corresponding enclave of biodiversity.” But, she continues, The last 150 years have seen a great holocaust. There have been more species lost in the past 150 years than since the Ice Age. (During the same time, Indigenous peoples have been disappearing from the face of the earth. Over 2,000 nations of Indigenous peoples have gone extinct in the western hemisphere and one nation disappears from the Amazon rainforest every year.) It is not about “us” as indigenous peoples—it is about “us” as a human species. We are all related. At issue is no longer the “Jewish question” or the “Indian problem.” We must speak today in terms of the “human problem.” And it is this “problem” for which not a “final,” but a sustainable, viable solution must be found—because it is no longer a matter of “serial genocide,” it has be-come one of collective suicide. As Terrence Des Pres put it, in The Survivor. “At the heart of our problems is that nihilism which was all along the destiny of Western culture: a nihilism either unacknowledged even as the bombs fell or else, as with Hitler or Stalin, demonically proclaimed as the new salvation.”

## Sovereignty Checks Exploitation

### State sovereignty is the last check on unmitigated corporate 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!

State sovereignty is the only check on corporate exploitation

Richard Rorty, philosopher, Achieving Our Country, 1998, p. 98-99.

The cultural Left often seems convinced that the nation-state is obsolete, and that there is therefore no point in attempting to revive national politics. The trouble with this claim is that the government of our nation-state will be, for the foreseeable future, the only agent capable of making any real difference in the amount of selfishness and sadism inflicted on Americans. It is no comfort to those in danger of being immiserated by globalization to be told that, since national governments are now irrelevant, we must think up a replacement for such governments. The cosmopolitan super-rich do not think any replacements are needed, and they are likely to prevail. Bill Readings was right to say that “the nation-state [has ceased] to be the elemental unit of capitalism,” but it remains the entity which makes decisions about social benefits, and thus about social justice.The current leftist habit of taking the long view and looking beyond nationhood to a global polity is as useless as was faith in Marx’s philosophy of history, for which it has become a substitute. Both are equally irrelevant to the question of how to prevent the reemergence of hereditary castes, or of how to prevent right-wing populists from taking advantage of resentment at that reemergence. When we think about these latter questions, we begin to realize that one of the essential transformations which the cultural Left will have to undergo is the shedding of its semi­conscious anti-Americanism, which it carried over from the rage of the late Sixties. This Left will have to stop thinking up ever more abstract and abusive names for “the system” and start trying to construct inspiring images of the country.