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## 1NC Shell

### First the link, framing mobility and transportation as central to human freedom and progress is rooted in logic of consumption that reinforces systems of capital

Katherine Goodwin, a doctoral student at American University's School of International Service in Washington DC and serves as managing editor for the Journal of International Relations and Development, 2011, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/GLEP\_a\_00031?journalCode=glep

Contradictions of freedom and mobility aside, there is a second important point to make regarding the link between mobility and human flourishing. While humans have always been mobile creatures, the contemporary assumption that extensive movement is a necessary part of social well-being has fairly recent origins. The convergence in the nineteenth century of modern capitalist industry, the development of the railroad and telegraph, and the institutionalization of time by factories and states significantly changed the sense of space and time in which people lived.[55](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f55) Two significant transformations concern us here. The first is the emergence of the daily commute between home and work or school, whereby routinized intraurban movement became habitual.[56](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f56) The second is tourism. Before the nineteenth century, "the idea occurred to no one to go off to the seaside … Except for a few English aristocrats (considered perfectly eccentric), one did not travel for pleasure. One took to the road for business, for the service of the king, or to join—if one was a lady—one's husband."[57](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f57) In the era of railroads and leisure time, however, touring other cities became feasible and desirable. These two transformations—commuting to work and travelling for pleasure—led to another new phenomenon: "the increasing experience of landscape from a moving rather than stationary vantage-point" and an "increasing sense of the body as an anonymized parcel of flesh which is shunted from place to place."[58](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f58)At the most intimate scale, mobility became a daily embodied experience, eventually to be taken for granted as a natural part of human life. On a larger scale, Nigel Thrift points to the shifting symbolism of the era, where circulation became a prevalent metaphor and was understood to be "causally connected to progress" in the way that the circulation of blood is causally **[End Page 72]** connected to life.[59](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f59)This perceived connection to progress was heightened and intensified by the modern capitalist impetus towards accessing markets. Fundamental to capitalism is the idea that "the ability of workers and machines and financial capital to find their best employment is essential to well-functioning markets, to efficient markets … a productive society is a mobile society."[60](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f60) Beginning in the nineteenth century, urban planners with the light of progress in their eyes "produced elaborate plans to improve roadways, build canals, improve river navigation and so on, in order to improve the 'circulation' of goods and people."[61](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.library.unlv.edu/journals/global_environmental_politics/v010/10.4.goodwin.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f61) The state became invested in mobility on an unprecedented scale.

Second the impact, continuation of capitalism guarantees nuclear extinction.

Istvan Meszaros, Prof. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Sussex, January 2000, Monthly Review, LN

Given the way in which the ongoing tends of global development assert themselves, in a clearly identifiable way, we may have perhaps a few decades to bring to a halt their destuctiveness, but certainly not centuries. The great liberal economist, Schumpeter, used to characterize—and idealize—capitalism as a system of “productive destruction.” This was, on the whole, true of capital’s ascending phase of development. Today, by contrast, we have reached a stage when, instead of “productive destruction,” we are even increasingly confronted by capital’s destructive production, proceeding on a frightening scale. You ask: “do you think that great mass movements have a chance to blossom again” in the age of globalization and under the “third way” of European social democracy? For me the “third way” is nothing more than a wishful fantasy, in defense of the established, untenable, order. Sociologists like Max Scheler have been predicting for almost a century the merging of the classes into a happy “middle-class”—one could only wonder: the middle of what? In reality, social polarization in our time is greater than ever before, making a mockery of the old social democratic expectations of eliminating—or at least greatly reducing—inequality through “progressive taxation.” As things turned out, we saw the diametrical opposite. To give you just two, very recent, examples: 1.) according to the Budget Office of the U.S. Congress (no “left-wing exaggerator,” for sure), the income of the top 1 percent is equivalent to that of the bottom one hundred million people, i.e. nearly 40 percent of the population. Twenty years ago it was “only” 1 percent against forty-nine million, i.e., less than twenty percent of the U.S. population. Some “equalization” and “merging of the classes into one another!” 2.) In England child poverty trebled in the last twenty years, and continued to be aggravated under the “New Labour” government in the last two and a half years. The “new labour” government preaches the vacuous “third way” sermon, and practices with ever greater severity the politics of antilabor measures, imposing even such policies which Mrs. Thatcher did not dare to introduce, cutting the Welfare State in every possible way, including even the precarious livelihood of the handicapped. Only a fool can assume that this can go on forever. So, in answer to your question, I am firmly convinced that there is a future for a radical mass movement, not only in England but also in the rest of the world. Or, to put it another way, if there is no future for such a movement, there can be no future for humanity itself. If I had to modify Rosa Luxemburg’s dictum, in relation to the dangers we face, I would add to “socialism or barbarism:” “barbarism if we are lucky”—in the sense that extermination of humankind is the ultimate concomitant of capital’s destructive course of development. And the world of that third possibility, beyond the alternatives of “socialism or barbarism,” would be fit only for cockroaches, which are said to be able to endure lethally high levels of nuclear radiation. This is the only rational meaning of capital’s third way.

Third the alternative, we must embrace the historic mission of the proletariat to overthrow capitalism and establish a classless society. Our role today is not to perform exemplary actions but to take sides in this ongoing class struggle.

Stephen Tumino, Professor at Pitt, English Professor at Pitt, 2002, “Pierre Bourdieu as New Global Intellectual for Capital,” The Red Critique 6, September/October, http://redcritique.org/SeptOct02/pierrebourdieuasnewglobalintellectualforcapital.htm

It is only such a scientific knowledge of social totality as provided by classical Marxism that can produce an understanding not only of the effects, but of the causes of inequality in capitalism and therefore of what needs to be done to change it. By merely contesting the political dominance of capital and its symbolic mystique through ethical performances of symbolic disinvestments in "cultural capital" while failing to provide a scientific (i.e., materially causal) knowledge of the social, the figure of the new global intellectual in Bourdieu's writings reinscribes the ruling ideas that as a totality make cultural changes at the level of the superstructure more important than meeting the need for what Marx calls "theory as a material force" (*Reader* 60)—"theory […] capable of seizing the masses" because it "grasp[s] things by the root" (60). The "root" of social inequality is not "knowledge" but "labor". The differences in knowledges available in a society reflect differences in labor, especially the amount of time people have after performing the socially necessary labor required for them to live. For the majority this time is mostly spent in performing surplus-labor for the capitalist who realizes a profit from it. This class division of labor between the many who are wage-slaves for the few who own the means of production will not change with changes in lifestyle and knowledge, by the voluntary sacrifice of the privileges that come with performing intellectual labor for example. It will only change when the workers "expropriate the expropriators" (Marx *Capital* Vol. 1 929) and form "an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" ("Manifesto" 506). Because of the high technical level of development of the productive forces such a revolution presupposes workers who have already become class conscious, i.e., "raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement [of class society] as a whole". In other words, the historical materialist theorization of class consciousness in Marxism presupposes that "the time [...] of revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past" (*Reader* 570) as capitalism itself has already produced a proletarian vanguard, that "most advanced and resolute section" ("Manifesto" 497) of "the proletariat [that] is already conscious of its historic task and is continually working to bring this consciousness to full clarity" (*Reader* 135) in the social movements. What is required of the intellectual because of these conditions is not to perform exemplary actions but to take sides in the ongoing class struggle at the level of theory where, "The only choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology [for] in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above class ideology" (Lenin *What Is To Be Done?* 41).

## Links – General

### Transportation infrastructure facilitates the political and institutional foundations for mass consumption capitalism

Steve Fraser, writer and historian at Columbia "More than Greed," Dissent Vol 59 Num 1 2012, Muse,

Why? Maybe that decision stems from Madrick’s aversion to thinking of the crisis as systemic and to a related faith in the Democratic Party as the repository of the New Deal version of capitalism, a version many progressives would like to restore. But the New Deal not only civilized a broken-down economic system, it also sought successfully to extend the reach of the capitalist marketplace and credit networks not abolish them. It created the political and institutional foundations of mass consumption capitalism. Those foundations eventually crumbled as domestic opportunities for profitable enough capital accumulation grew scarce, a process that in turn exerted a relentless downward pressure on labor costs and the social wage. That is to say, in an increasingly fierce struggle to compete with lower cost foreign producers, American business began to undermine the foundations of “effective demand” among ordinary working people that had kept the system upright for so long. It set in motion a perverse dynamic of disaccumulation or what might be called the auto-cannibalism of an economy eating itself alive. The most developed economy in the world began a process of underdevelopment. Its infrastructure—road, bridges, tunnels, railroads, waterworks, dams, airports, electrical grids—were allowed to decay. The industrial core of the economy was hollowed out by precisely those “financial engineers” Madrick writes [End Page 103] about. Deindustrialization signaled that the old system had broken down. This became a long, secular crisis. Gradually and then at an accelerated rate, it elicited one overriding response; namely, to leverage everything in sight. Everything in this case included capital assets that produced debt-based asset bubbles in stocks or housing or other securities and commodities that provided a kind of “privatized Keynesian” stimulus package for elite financial institutions. Meanwhile, below, a working population found itself drowning in a sea of usurious credit.

### Transportation infrastructure is intrinsically linked to the promotion of capitalism

Jason Scott Smith, Assistant professor of history at the University of New Mexico, "The New Deal Order," Enterprise and Society Vol. 9 # 3 2008, Muse

By using the lens of political economy to focus on the New Deal's public works spending, we can begin to see the outlines of a different interpretation. The huge amount of funds devoted to public construction, the far-reaching federal efforts invested in directing this money, and the long-run impact of the infrastructure itself form the components of the story of a public works revolution.9 This revolution helped justify the new role of the federal government in American life, legitimizing—intellectually and physically—what has come to be known as Keynesian management of the economy. By sponsoring this infrastructure, New Dealers remade the built environment that managed the movement of people, goods, electricity, water, and [End Page 524] waste. Among the New Deal's projects were some of the largest and most significant structures ever built in human history.10 These programs not only anticipated the national highways and the military-industrial complex; in the postwar period government-sponsored economic development also looked abroad. For example, Harry Truman's Point IV program was conceived of as an international PWA, building roads and airports in countries like Afghanistan and Vietnam. Similarly, Lyndon Johnson's vision of exporting Keynesian style economic development to Southeast Asia by replicating the Tennessee Valley Authority on the Mekong Delta reflected the powerful example set by the New Deal. After World War II, construction firms like Bechtel and Brown & Root (today a subsidiary of Halliburton) took their expertise overseas as well. The New Deal's public works programs employed millions of unemployed workers, both urban and rural, while building the infrastructure that helped integrate the disparate regions of the country into a national market. From the beginning, then, New Dealers built a state that was both far more powerful and substantially less liberal than historians have realized: more powerful, in the scale and scope of the federal government's commitment to economic development, and less liberal, in the sense that the New Deal state was focused on state-sponsored economic development, and not, in contrast, centrally occupied with tasks like implementing its social security program (which began making payments only in 1942), or with more radical goals, such as the direct redistribution of wealth through tax policy. By reinterpreting the New Deal in this way through a political economic lens, we gain a new history of just how the New Deal's public works programs contributed to American economic development. Public works also had important ramifications for state building and political party building at the federal, state, and local levels. Harry Hopkins, the head of the WPA, once claimed that the New Deal was a political project that could "tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect." We now know this phrase's descendant, the derisive expression "tax and spend liberalism," but at the time Hopkins made his statement it was pure genius—he succinctly identified the qualities that made New Deal liberalism so powerful and controversial: The taxing and spending functions of government could—and [End Page 525] did—remake the physical landscape of the nation. Even more striking, though, was that through using the taxing and spending powers of the state, New Dealers were able to remake a society's politics.11 These accomplishments raise a central question: how do we evaluate New Deal liberalism when we attend to its political economy and place its public works programs at its core? The New Deal's public works programs reflect a number of achievements and shortcomings. These programs built the infrastructure that made a national market more efficient, spurred dramatic advances in economic productivity, created a network of roads and airports, planned for national highways, improved military bases, foreshadowed the rise of the Sunbelt, and gave the New Dealers a policy tool that could be used to shape overseas development, from the ColdWar through the Vietnam War. Faced with the Great Depression, the New Deal and its public works projects helped save capitalism, an achievement subsequently consolidated by enormous public spending during World War II and the ensuing postwar economic boom.12 Bound up with these triumphs, however, were many limitations. Most notable, of course, was the failure of the public works programs to bring an end to mass unemployment during the Great Depression. Those that the New Deal did manage to employ were white men, for the most part. This was hardly surprising, given their disproportionate presence in the building trades and construction industry, generally. Surely, the New Deal had a remarkable chance to address the crisis of unemployment among African-Americans and women. Yet, in basing so much of their public policy on the building of public works projects, New Dealers largely reinforced the gender and racial boundaries already evident in the labor market, bypassing the maternalist legacies of Progressive Era social policy.13

### Transportation infrastructure is directly linked to supporting and exporting capitalism

Iowa State Daily, Belding: Road, rail infrastructure is part of orthodox capitalism, June 16 2012, http://www.iowastatedaily.com/opinion/article\_24724abe-1a13-11e1-b3e3-001cc4c03286.html

California's recent decision to continue with its plans to build a high-speed rail system, despite criticism from Republicans, highlights the importance of investment in infrastructure. The project carries a high cost, $98 billion, and will not be finished until 2033. However, transportation infrastructure and accommodation facilitates the economic growth we need. Building roads and railways, however, provides a space in which people can move and trade. In ancient times, this investment in creating a place for business consisted of building a new forum. Now, we build roads. Ideologically, government support of public works — roads, canals and the like — is not a new idea. Adam Smith advocated government support of infrastructure (as well as the judicial branch, a standing army and public education for the poor) when he laid the groundwork for the capitalism that so defines our way of life. Funding infrastructure is, in classical conservative thought, orthodox.

## Link – Highway

### Investment in highway infrastructure allows for the expansion of new markets throughout the US that exchanges quality of life for propping up capitalism

Shane Hamilton, assistant professor of history at the University of Georgia, "Trucking Country: Food Politics and the Transformation of Rural Life in Postwar America," 2006, Muse, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ens/summary/v007/7.4hamilton.html

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

## Link – Airports

### Airports are symbols of the global economy ultimately working to reify systems of capital through the expansion of markets via transportation

Walter Russell Mead, world policy journal, Trains, Planes, and Automobiles: The End of the Postmodern Moment, 1995, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40209444

The airport is a kind of bubble of discontinuity in the social and geographical landscape of the modern city. Travelers from every corner of the earth stream in and out, travelers with cultural assumptions and purposes that bear no necessary relation to those of their fellow passengers. The Japanese businessman stands next to the Nigerian immigrant at the bar; the German tourist brushes past a bewildered family of what flight attendants call "Clampetts," first-time flyers from the boondocks attracted by low-cost fares. The airport, like the world we live in, is a confusing place. The tens of thousands of passengers and crew passing through its corridors seem to have nothing in common, but for airports to work, workers and passengers alike must understand and adhere to a complicated combination of regulations and etiquette. Cutthroat competition between airlines coexists with common adherence to traffic and safety regulations without which airport operations would not be possible. The international airport is both an agent and a symbol of the new global economy that is eclipsing the nation-state, but from passport and customs control to air traffic control and international aviation agreements, the airport is one of the places in our society where the nation-state's power is most keenly felt. The airport is also a symbol of man's triumph over the forces of nature, but as most travelers can attest, not even farmers are as painfully exposed to the vagaries of weather as those who seek to travel by air. The best one- word description of an air-port is a term used by French philosopher Michel Foucault: heterotopia. Utopia is a place where everything is good; dystopia is a place where everything is bad; heterotopia is where things are different - that is, a collection whose members have few or no intelligible connections with one another. This, increasingly, is what contemporary ob-servers perceive our world to have become; to feel this perception is to enter the post-modern world.

## Link – Crisis Management

### The political strategy of the affirmative disables radical politics at precisely the moment when it could succeed. They relieve the most pressing crisis symptoms, which allows for an ideological reinforcement of the current system

Istavan Meszaros, Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex, 1995 Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, London: Merlin Press, pg 930

THE difficulty is that the ‘moment’ of radical politics is strictly limited by the nature of the crises in question and the temporal determinations of their unfolding. The breach opened up at times of crisis cannot be left open forever and the measures adopted to fill it, from the earliest steps onwards, have their own logic and cumulative impact on subsequent interventions. Furthermore, both the existing socioeconomic structures and their corresponding framework of political institutions tend to act against radical initiatives by their very inertia as soon as the worst moment of the crisis is over and thus it becomes possible to contemplate again ‘the line of least resistance’. And no one can consider ‘radical restructuring’ the line of least resistance, since by its very nature it necessarily involves upheaval and the disconcerting prospect of the unknown. No immediate economic achievement can offer a way out of this dilemma so as to prolong the life-span of revolutionary politics, since such limited economic achievements made within the confines of the old premises — act in the opposite direction by relieving the most pressing crisis symptoms and, as a result, reinforcing the old reproductive mechanism shaken by the crisis. As history amply testifies, at the first sign of ‘recovery’, politics is pushed back into its traditional role of helping to sustain and enforce the given socio-economic determinations. The claimed ‘recovery’ itself reached on the basis of the ‘well tried economic motivations’, acts as the self-evident ideological justification for reverting to the subservient, routine role of politics, in harmony with the dominant institutional framework. Thus, radical politics can only accelerate its own demise (and thereby shorten, instead of extending as it should, the favourable ‘moment’ of major political intervention) if it consents to define its own scope in terms of limited economic targets which are in fact necessarily dictated by the established socioeconomic structure in crisis.

## Link – Reformism

### The plan is a bourgeois gimmick designed to make us believe capitalism cares about us. Now is the key time to reject such propaganda and embrace class struggle

Eduardo Smith, 10-3-2008, “The Sinking Ship of American Capitalism,” No. 148, http://en.internationalism.org/inter/148/us-sinking-ship

Faced with the deepening economic crisis, the bourgeois media's message to society is that "we are all in this together". Yes, it argues, some CEO's are guilty of excess and greed, but we ALL are more or less responsible for the financial mess. "Everyone" took advantage of the good old days of easy and cheap credit of the debt functioning economy and we all have to line up in a common effort behind the State efforts to save the economy. This is nonsense. The working class has no say on how the bourgeoisie runs its decaying system. The fact is that the condition of the working class has known no improvements over the last four decades of bourgeois gimmicks aimed at keeping its economic system afloat. Unless they want to consider all matter of suffocating debts -credit cards, auto loans, student loans, sky-high mortgages, etc. - a change for the better that workers are obliged to incur in order to partake of the increasingly elusive "American dream". Politicians, in particular those belonging to left wing, want workers to believe that they are concerned about the suffering of the working class. Both the bourgeois left and right want us to believe that the answer to rising unemployment, eroding salaries, the sorry state of the health care system and deteriorating pensions lie in the ballot box, that all is needed is the right president or congressman.  However the reality is that the bourgeoisie has no solution to the crisis of its system and no future to offer society other than an increasingly devastating crisis and murderous imperialist wars. The hard reality is that workers have been paying for years for the crisis of capitalism. And today face with a barrage of attacks from all directions they have no choice but to oppose capitalism's assault on their working and living conditions on their own terrain, the terrain of the class struggle - fighting against the logic of capitalist exploitation. Against capitalism's future of crisis and war, the working class must put forward its own perspective of a society based on human needs.

## Link – Hegemony – Forestalls Collapse

### US hegemony is an attempt to forestall the collapse of international capitalism. Because it’s rooted in the crisis of capitalist accumulation it can never solve their impacts

Nick Beams, member of International Editorial Board and National Secretary of Australian Socialist Equality Party, 2003 “The Political Economy of American Militarism, part 2” July 2, www.wsws.org/articles/2003/jul2003/nb2-j11\_prn.shtml

The immediate impetus for the drive to global domination by the US is rooted in the crisis of capitalist accumulation, expressed in the persistent downward pressure on the rate of profit and the failure of the most strenuous efforts over the past 25 years to overcome it. But it is more than this. At the most fundamental level, the eruption of US imperialism represents a desperate attempt to overcome, albeit in a reactionary manner, the central contradiction that has bedeviled the capitalist system for the best part of the last century.The US came to economic and political ascendancy as World War I exploded. The war, as Trotsky analysed, was rooted in the contradiction between the development of the productive forces on a global scale and the division of the world among competing great powers. Each of these powers sought to resolve the contradiction by establishing its own ascendancy, thereby coming into collision with its rivals. The Russian Revolution, conceived of and carried forward as the first step in the international socialist revolution, was the first attempt of a detachment of the working class to resolve the contradiction between world economy and the outmoded nation-state framework on a progressive basis. Ultimately, the forces of capitalism proved too strong and the working class, as a result of a tragic combination of missed opportunities and outright betrayals, was unable to carry this program forward. But the historical problem that had erupted with such volcanic force—the necessity to reorganise the globally developed productive forces of mankind on a new and higher foundation, to free them from the destructive fetters of private property and the nation-state system—did not disappear. It was able to be suppressed for a period. But the very development of capitalist production itself ensured that it would come to the surface once again, even more explosively than in the past. The US conquest of Iraq must be placed within this historical and political context. The drive for global domination represents the attempt by American imperialism to resolve the central contradiction of world capitalism by creating a kind of global American empire, operating according to the rules of the “free market” interpreted in accordance with the economic needs and interests of US capital, and policed by its military and the military forces of its allies. This deranged vision of global order was set out by Bush in his address to West Point graduates on June 1, 2002. The US, he said, now had the best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the seventeenth century to “build a world where great powers compete in peace instead of prepare for war.” Competition between great nations was inevitable, but war was not. That was because “America has, and intends to keep, military strengths beyond challenge thereby making the destabilising arms races of other eras pointless and limiting rivalries to trade and other pursuits of peace.” This proposal to reorganise the world is even more reactionary than when it was first advanced in 1914. The US push for global domination, driven on as it is by the crisis in the very heart of the profit system, cannot bring peace, much less prosperity, but only deepening attacks on the world’s people, enforced by military and dictatorial forms of rule.

## Link – Economy – Ideology

### Their scenario for economic collapse is rooted in capitalist ideology. By misdiagnosing the problem as the result of temporary circumstance rather than structural contradictions they reify the system.

Istavan Meszaros, Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex, 1995 Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, London: Merlin Press, pg 105-6

The reason why capital is structurally incapable of addressing causes as causes—in contrast to treating all newly arising challenges and complications as more or less successfully manipulatable effects—is because it happens to be its own causal foundation: a varitable, unholy ‘causa sui’. Anything that might aspire at socioeconomic legitimacy and viability must be accompanied within its predetermined structural framework. For as a mode of social metabolic control capital cannot tolerate the intrusion of any principle of socioeconomic regulation that might constrain its expansion-oriented dynamics. Indeed, expansion as such is not simply a relative—to a greater or lesser extent commendable, and in that light under certain circumstances freely adopted whereas under other consciously rejected—economic function but an absolutely necessary way of displacing the capital system's emerging problems and contradictions, in accord with the imperative of avoiding like plague their underlying causes. The self propelling causal foundations of the system cannot be questioned under any circumstance. If troubles appear in it, they must be treated as temporary ‘disfunctions’, to be remedied by reasserting with ever greater rigour the imperative of expanded reproduction. It is for this reason that there can be no alternative to the pursuit of expansion—at all cost—in all varieties of the capital system. So long ad the scope for unobstructed expansion is objectively present, the process of displacing the system’s contradictions can go on unhindered. When things do not go well, i.e., when there is a failure in economic growth and corresponding advancement, the difficulties are diagnosed in terms of the circular proposition which runs away from the underlying causes and highlights only their consequences by saying that ‘there is not enough growth.’ Dealing with problems in this perverse circular way, constantly repeating even at times of major recessions that ‘everything is in place’ for healthy expansion, creates the illusion that capital’s mode of social metabolic control is in no need of fundamental change. Legitimate change must be always envisaged as limited alteration and improvement of what is already given. Change must be brought about by innovation undertaken strictly at the instrumental level, which is supposed to make it self evidently beneficial. Since, however, the necessary historical qualifying conditions and implications of continued expansion are systematically disregarded or brushed aside as irrelevant, the assumption of the permanence and unquestionable viability of capital's causa sui is utterly fallacious.

## Impact – War and Extinction

### Their impact calculus misrepresents how capitalism makes decisions. The ruling class is well aware of your impacts, but because capitalism places a premium on short-term greed, it will continue to recklessly promote its interests anyway, leading to apocalypse

Marko, cyber activist, May 14 2003, “Anarchism and Human Survival: Russell’s problem.” https://www2.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/05/68173.html

It was well recognised that the Star Wars programme would have increased the chances of a nuclear exchange between Moscow and Washington, just as today the pursuit of short term interests is known to have potentially serious international consequences, such as increase in conflict and global weapons of mass destruction proliferation. The ruling class is well aware of the adverse impact the pursuit of its own sectional interests will have on international order. It pursues those interests with renewed zeal anyway. As far as the ruling class is concerned the greatest threat we face is not nuclear war, it is popular democracy. As Adam Smith observed of a previous mercantile system, applicable to today's system of state-corporate mercantilism, "it cannot be very difficult to determine who have been the contrivers of this whole mercantile system; not the consumers, we may believe, whose interest has been entirely neglected; but the producers, whose interest has been so carefully attended to; and among this latter class our merchants and manufacturers have been by far the principal architects." Policy Smith observed, "comes from an order of men, [people] whose interest is never exactly the same with that of the public, who have generally an interest to deceive and even to oppress the public, and who accordingly have, upon many occasions, both deceived and oppressed it." This raises an interesting issue, namely that the pursuit of Armageddon is quite rational. The dominant institutions of capitalism place a premium on short-term greed. Rational participatory planning incorporating long-term concerns such as human survival are of no interest to these pathological institutions. What matters is short-term profit maximisation. One can see this most clearly in the case of such “externalities” as ecological change where the desire to pursue short-term profit undermines the long-term viability of the system itself (also us as a species; indeed many have surmised that we are in the era of the sixth great extinction of life on Earth this time human induced). The fact that the institutional structures of society compel the ruling classes to pursue highly dangerous “security” policies that are another “externality” of the system of state capitalism compels the population to constrain and eventually overthrow these institutions because apocalypse is institutionally rational.

### The proliferation of ethnic wars around the world is caused by decaying capitalism. Only the revolution can provide the unity necessary to prevent these conflicts from destroying humanity

International Communist Current 1-1-2009, “Gaza: Solidarity with the victims of war means class struggle against all exploiters!” <http://en.internationalism.org/icconline/2009/01/gaza>

And as with all imperialist wars, the suffering inflicted on the population, the wanton destruction of houses, hospitals and schools, has no result except to prepare the ground for further rounds of destruction. Israel's proclaimed aim is to smash Hamas and open the door to a more ‘moderate' Palestinian leadership in Gaza, but even former Israeli intelligence officers (at least one of the more...intelligent) can see the futility of this approach. Speaking about the economic blockade, ex-Mossad officer Yossi Alpher said "The economic siege of Gaza has not brought any of the desired political results. It has not manipulated Palestinians into hating Hams, but has probably been counter-productive. It is just useless collective punishment". This is even more true of the air raids. As Israeli historian Tom Segev put it, "Israel has always believed that causing suffering to Palestinian civilians would make them rebel against their national leaders. This assumption has proved wrong over and over" (both quotes from The Guardian 30.12.08). Hizbollah in Lebanon was strengthened by the Israeli attack in 2006; the Gaza offensive may well have the same result for Hamas. But whether strengthened or weakened it will no doubt respond with further attacks on Israeli civilians, if not through rocket attacks, then through a revival of suicide bombings. The ‘spiral of violence' expresses the decay of capitalism ‘Concerned' world leaders like the Pope or UN general secretary Ban Ki-moon often talk about how such actions as Israel's only serve to inflame national hatred and ratchet up the ‘spiral of violence' in the Middle East. All this is true: the whole cycle of terrorism and state violence in Israel/Palestine brutalises the populations and the combatants on both sides and creates new generations of fanatics and ‘martyrs'. But what the Vatican and the UN don't tell us is that this descent into the hell of national hatred is the product of a social system which everywhere is in profound decay. The story is not very different in Iraq where Sunni and Shia are set at each other's throats, in the Balkans where Serbs are pitched against Albanians or Croats, in India/Pakistan where it's Hindu against Muslim or in Africa's myriad wars where violent ethnic divisions are too numerous to mention. The explosion of these conflicts across the globe is the expression of a society which has no future for mankind. And what we are also not told very much about is the involvement of the concerned, humanitarian, democratic world powers in stirring up these conflicts, unless we hear it from the other side of an imperialist divide. The press in Britain was not silent about the support France gave to the Hutu murder gangs in Rwanda in 1994. It is less forthcoming about the role British and American secret forces have played in manipulating the Shia/Sunni divide in Iraq. In the Middle East, America's backing for Israel and Iran and Syria's backing for Hizbollah and Hamas is out in the open, but the more ‘even-handed' role played by France, Germany, Russia and other powers is no less self-serving. The conflict in the Middle East has its own specific aspects and causes, but it can only be understood in the context of a global capitalist machine that is dangerously out of control. The proliferation of wars around the planet, the uncontrollable economic crisis, and the accelerating environmental catastrophe are all evidence of this reality. But while capitalism offers us no hope of peace and prosperity, there is a source of hope in the world: the revolt of the exploited class against the brutality of the system, a revolt expressed most graphically in Europe in the last few weeks in the movements of young proletarians in Italy, France, Germany and above all Greece. These are movements which by their very nature have put forward the need for class solidarity and the overcoming of all national and ethnic divisions. Although only in their infancy, they provide an example that can eventually be followed in those areas of the planet which are most ravaged by divisions inside the exploited class. This is no utopia: already in the past few years public sector workers in Gaza have come out on strike against the non-payment of wages almost simultaneously with public sector workers in Israel striking against the effects of austerity, itself a direct product of Israel's top-heavy war economy. These movements were hardly conscious of each other, but they still show the objective community of interests among workers of both sides of an imperialist divide. Solidarity with the suffering populations of capitalism's war zones does not mean choosing the ‘lesser evil' or supporting the ‘weaker' capitalist gangs like Hizbollah or Hamas against the more obviously aggressive powers like the US or Israel. Hamas has already shown itself to be a bourgeois force oppressing the Palestinian workers - especially when it condemned the public sector strikes as being against "national interests" and when, along with Fatah, it subjected the population of Gaza to a murderous faction fight for control of the region. Solidarity with those caught up in imperialist war means rejecting both warring camps and developing the class struggle against all the world's rulers and exploiters.

Only the rev can prevent capitalism’s self-destruction from destroying humanity

World Revolution 10-6-2008, “Bleak prospects for the world economy,” http://en.internationalism.org/wr/318/bleakprospects

The exact pace that these tendencies will work out their logic in the world economy is impossible to foresee. For the moment, despite enormous pressures, the bourgeoisie is aware of the stakes in the current situation and its more lucid segments will do everything in their power to prevent such a disintegration taking place. Nonetheless, it seems possible that we could have reached a point that will have as crucial repercussions in the world economy as the collapse of the Eastern bloc had nearly 20 years ago. They also demonstrate clearly the growing impasse of the entire capitalist system. So far, the world economy has not suffered the spectacular effects of decomposition that have been visible in the social and political spheres. If the economic sphere begins to disintegrate, then all the other self-destructive tendencies of decomposing capitalism will be unleashed on a new and unprecedented scale. The only solution to this growing threat to human civilisation is the conscious dismantling of capitalist society and its replacement with one based on truly human values. The bourgeoisie cannot entertain this as an option while the other classes in society have no alternative vision. Only the working class, the revolutionary proletariat, can destroy this rotting system before it destroys humanity.

### Without a revolution, capitalism will drag humanity to self-destruction

International Communist Current 10-27-2008, “It will take a revolution to end capitalism,” http://en.internationalism.org/book/export/html/2668

There was no end of ‘history', or end to the class struggle, as the ideologues of the 1990s claimed. But also, today, we are not witnessing the ‘end of capitalism'. Ruling classes across the world have looked into the abyss, seen catastrophe, and despite all manner of imperialist antagonisms, co-ordinated a response. There will be further massive attacks on the working class, continuing the offensive on wages, jobs, services, pensions etc. That's the only perspective that capitalism has, and if there is no resistance to it, capitalism will drag humanity not only towards the abyss of poverty but towards outright self-destruction. The only alternative can come from the working class in its struggles. These are limited at present, but have been slowly developing over the last five years. In the period to come workers will feel even more intensely the effects of capitalism's crisis, but, with some of the illusions from both Right and Left discredited, there is more possibility that not only workers' struggles but workers' consciousness of capitalism will grow. This will be at the basis of the mass strikes to come. Growing consciousness of the reality of capitalism also helps the understanding that it has to be overthrown by the revolution of the working class.

### **Cap leads to extinction**

Youth for International Socialism, 11-3-2008, “Marxism Basics,” http://www.newyouth.com/content/view/117/60/#bother

Under capitalism, the material means for creating a socialist society are created, but the capitalist system will never suffer a "final" collapse - it won't go on its own, it needs to be pushed. If it were to continue in existence for any length of time it would lead the whole of humanity back into barbarism. Even today that barbarism is spreading across Africa and parts of Asia. The tragic shootings of students by students is another example of barbarism. During the course of such a decline the working class internationally will be forced into struggle time and time again. If they fail in conquering power, then over their bones the capitalist system will continue, only maintaining any kind of stability through dictatorship, wars and counter revolutions. Eventually if the working class does not succeed in capturing power and creating a democratic, socialist society, the whole of humanity could descend into chaos. Ordinary people like you and me need to get involved to educate others and spread the ideas of genuine Marxism so that when revolutionary opportunities arise, the working class is able to take power as quickly and peacefully as possible.

## Impact – Kills the Environment

### Global capitalism is tantamount to a regime run by organized crime – while capital ruthlessly destroys ecosystems, its global expansion undermines democracy everywhere

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, 2002, p. 74-76

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

### Capitalism is directly responsible for the ecological crisis – the laws by which capitalism operates must be overthrown to solve

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, 2002, p. 51-2

Capital’s responsibility for the ecological crisis can be shown empirically, by tracking down ecosystemic breakdowns to the actions of corporations and/ or governmental agencies under the influence of capital’s force field. Or it can be deduced from the combined tendencies to degrade conditions of production (the Second Contradiction), on the one hand, and, on the other, the cancerous imperative to expand. Although the Second Contradiction may be offset in individual circumstances by recycling, pollution control, the trading of credits and the like, the imperative to expand continually erodes the edges of ecologies along an ever-lengthening perimeter, over­coming or displacing recuperative efforts and accelerating a cascade of destabilization. On occasion, the force of capital expansion can be seen directly — as when President George W Bush abruptly reversed his pledge to trim emissions of CO2 in March 2001, the day after the stock market went into free-fall and in the context of a gathering crisis of accumulation. More broadly, it operates through a host of intermediaries embedded within the gigantic machine for accumulation that is capitalist society. We need to take a closer look at how this society works on the ground. Too much is at stake to close the argument with a demonstration of abstract laws. Capital is no automatic mechanism, and the laws it obeys, being mediated by consciousness, are no more than tendencies. When we say ‘capital does this’ or that, we mean that certain human actions are carried out under the auspices of capital. We need to learn, then, as much as we can about just what these actions are and how they can be changed. Capital originates with the exploitation of labour, and takes shape as this is subjected to the peculiar forces of money Its nucleus is the abstraction of human transformative power into labour-power for sale on the market. The nascent capitalist economy was fostered by the feudal state, then took over that state (often through revolution), centring it about capital accumulation. With this, the capitalist mode of production was installed as such after which capital began to convert society into its image and created the conditions for the ecological crisis. The giant corporations we rightly identify as ecological destroyers are not the whole of capital, but only its prime economic instruments. Capital acts through the corporation, therefore, but also across society and within the human spirit. Broadly speaking, this has taken place in three dimensions — existentially, temporally and institutionally In other words, people increasingly live their lives under the terms of capital; as they do so, the temporal pace of their life accelerates; finally, they live in a world where institutions are in place to secure this across an ever-expanding terrain: the world of globalization. In this way a society, and a whole way of being, are created hostile to the integrity of ecosystems.

## Alternative

### **Our structuralist criticism goes beyond the consequences of plan to the act of fiat itself. Their advocacy of government action frames dialogue as democratic participation when it is in fact a formal strategy for legitimating the established order**

Mas’ud Zavarzadeh, Dept English @ Syracuse, 1994, “The Stupidity that Consumption is Just as Productive as Production,” The Alternative Orange, V 4, Fall/Winter, http://www.etext.org/Politics/AlternativeOrange/4/v4nl\_cpp.html

My concern is with the practices by which the post-al left, through dialogue, naturalizes (and eroticizes) the violence that keeps capitalist democracy in power. What is violent? Subjecting people to the daily terrorism of layoffs in order to maintain high rates of profit for the owners of the means of production or redirecting this violence (which gives annual bonuses, in addition to multi-million dollar salaries, benefits and stock options, to the CEOs of the very corporations that are laying off thousands of workers) against the ruling class in order to end class societies? What is violent? Keeping millions of people in poverty, hunger, starvation, homelessness, and deprived of basic health care, at a time when the forces of production have reached a level that can, in fact, provide for the needs of all people, or trying to over throw this system? What is violent? Placing in office, under the alibi of "free elections," post-fascists (Italy) and allies of the ruling class (Major, Clinton, Kohl, Yeltsin) or struggling to end this farce? What is violent? Reinforcing these practices by "talking" about them in a "reasonable" fashion (i.e. within the rules of the game established by the ruling class for limited reform from "within") or marking the violence of conversation and its complicity with the status quo, thereby breaking the frame that represents "dialogue" as participation-when in fact it is merely a formal strategy for legitimating the established order? Any society in which the labor of many is the source of wealth for the few—all class societies are societies of violence, and no amount of "talking" is going to challenge that objective fact. "Dialogue" and "conversation" are aimed at arriving at a consensus by which this violence is made more tolerable, justifiable and naturalized.

### The alternative is to embrace a Marxist methodology by rejecting the affirmative’s ideological mystification of capitalism’s material base. Only by rejecting this ideology can we lay bare the structural causes of oppression and spark the revolutionary praxis necessary to build a classless society

Stephen Tumino, prof. of English at Pitt, Spring 2001, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before,” The Red Critique 1, Spring, <http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm>

The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face." It is only Orthodox Marxism that explains socialism as an historical inevitability that is tied to the development of social production itself and its requirements. Orthodox Marxism makes socialism scientific because it explains how in the capitalist system, based on the private consumption of labor-power (competition), the objective tendency is to reduce the amount of time labor spends in reproducing itself (necessary labor) while expanding the amount of time labor is engaged in producing surplus-value (surplus-labor) for the capitalist through the introduction of machinery into the production process by the capitalists themselves to lower their own labor costs. Because of the competitive drive for profits under capitalism it is historically inevitable that a point is reached when the technical mastery—the amount of time socially necessary on average to meet the needs of society through the processing of natural resources—is such that the conditions of the workers worsen relative to the owners and becomes an unbearable global social contradiction in the midst of the ever greater of

wealth produced. It is therefore just as inevitable that at such a moment it obviously makes more sense to socialize production and meet the needs of all to avoid the explosive social conflicts perpetually generated by private property than to maintain the system at the risk of total social collapse on a world scale. "Socialism or barbarism" (Luxemburg) is the inevitable choice faced by humanity because of capitalism. Either maintain private property and the exploitation of labor in production, in which case more and more social resources will go into policing the growingly desperate surplus-population generated by the technical efficiency of social production, or socialize production and inaugurate a society whose founding principle is "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, Selected Works, 325) and "in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (Manifesto of the Communist Party, Selected Works, 53). The time has come to state it clearly so that even the flexodox opportunists may grasp it: Orthodox Marxism is not a free-floating "language-game" or "meta-narrative" for arbitrarily constructing local utopian communities or spectral activist inversions of ideology meant to seduce "desire" and "mobilize" (glorify) subjectivity—it is an absolute prerequisite for our emancipation from exploitation and a new society freed from necessity! Orthodox Marxism is the only global theory of social change. Only Orthodox Marxism has explained why under the system of wage-labor and capital communism is not "an ideal to which reality will have to adjust itself" but "the real movement which abolishes the present state of things" (The German Ideology 57) because of its objective explanation of and ceaseless commitment to "the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority" (Manifesto of the Communist Party, Selected Works, 45) to end social inequality forever.

### The Alternative is to embrace a revolutionary epistemology. Once we realize that the only solution to our dehumanization is the total overthrow of the capitalist system, we will finally be able to actualize the inevitable transition to a new phase of history in which there will be no exploitation or oppression. This can only occur, however, through the very process of alienation the affirmative tries to prevent

Brian R., Nelson, Prof @ Florida International University, 1982 “Marxism,” Western Political Thought: From Socrates to the Age of Ideology, Copyright 1982 by Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, N.J., p 303-305

But here we confront two problems. First, even if we accept Marx's materialist and dialectical analysis of history, how does it follow that a proletarian revolution will of necessity produce a classless or communist society? We may, if only for the sake of argument, grant Marx his dialectical premise that the proletariat is the revolutionary negation of the capitalist system, but what is to prevent the proletariat from simply becoming a new exploiting class? This, after all, is what has happened in the case of every earlier revolutionary transformation, as Marx's own analysis bears out. The answer is already contained in Marx's economic analysis of capitalism. Inherent in that analysis is the basic materialist premise that life determines consciousness. What this means, in terms of the revolutionary role of the proletariat, is that the worker's consciousness is an ideological misperception of the true nature of his condition only so long as capitalism remains viable. But at the point where that economic system can no longer function, a point at which the worker's misery has reached such an intolerable level that he has no choice but to revolt, he will, in Marx's words, be " . . . compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind… 28 He will, in short, be compelled to recognize, by his unique social position within the productive apparatus of capitalism, that it is private property and the existence of social class that are the source of his dehumanization, and that only by their forcible overthrow can he realize his true humanity. It is because of this capacity to grasp the true nature of private property, to understand its inherent exploitive character as such, that Marx accords such a unique status to the industrial working class. Unlike the utopian socialists who saw the proletariat as simply the "most suffering class," Marx saw it as a class with worldwide historical significance. Because of its real material life-its propertylessness and subsequent degradation-Marx believed the proletariat alone had the capacity to comprehend intellectually the source of alienation and dehumanization and, therefore, to eliminate it in its entirety. No earlier productive class could possess such a radical insight, nor therefore initiate such a radical revolution against existing conditions. It is consistent with Marx's materialist view of history, then, that communism must inevitably arise out of the ashes of the capitalist order. (Whether it is true or not is another question.) Yet, here we confront a second, related problem. Marx bases his assertion about the inevitability of communism upon the unique revolutionary role of the proletariat. In Marx's analylsis, communism is inevitable in the final analysis only because a proletarian revolution is inevitable. Why, then, given its inevitability, does Marx constantly call for revolution? Why is it necessary to actively work to bring about that which must occur of necessity? Indeed, to work for it would seem to imply doubts about its inevitability and, by extension, about the whole underlying materialist conception of history. The answer to these questions constitutes a final, and crucial, element in the Marxian philosophy. The issue, in its essence, is whether or not that philosophy is strictly deterministic. Are human beings utterly determined by historico-material conditions, or are they in some sense determining? Marx insists that they are both. To assert that the workers will revolt is, at the same time, to assert that they ought to revolt. Marx combines the is and the ought, the objective analysis of historical reality with a subjective call for revolutionary action. This combining is known as the unity of theory and practice, or praxis, and may be said to be the defining characteristic of Marxism. Theory constitutes objective analysis of historical conditions; practice, revolutionary action aimed at transforming those conditions. For Marx, the overthrow of capitalism must involve both. Now the idea of praxis is most clearly developed in a short eleven paragraphs, or theses, that Marx had written to himself in 1845. These paragraphs, known as The Theses on Feuerbach, argue for the unity of theory and practice by way of a critique of another materialist social philosopher named Ludwig Feuerbach. What made Feuerbach important to Marx was that he was the first to transform Hegel's dialectic into a materialist doctrine, the purpose of which was to reground religious thought upon a more "real basis." Marx immediately recognized the importance of Feuerbach's revision of Hegel. But he also recognized that Feuerbach stopped short of carrying his materialism to its logical conclusion, namely, to a justification of praxis. In this, Marx insists, Feuerbach had perpetuated the problem inherent in all earlier forms of materialism. Thesis number one establishes the basic framework of the problem. According to Marx, "the chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism that of Feuerbach included-is that. . . reality. . . is conceived only in the form of. . . contemplation. . . but not as human sensuous activity, practice, not subjectively."29 The defect, in short, is that while earlier materialism recognizes that reality is material, it recognizes it only from a theoretical point of view, as something to be philosophized about, not as something which includes human action and which can be altered by human action. Put another way, earlier materialists failed to recognize that while material reality shapes human behavior and human consciousness, it is precisely that behavior and that consciousness that alters material reality. It is for this reason that Marx notes in thesis number three that "the materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that it is men that change circumstances. . . . ,,30 It forgets, in short, that human beings are both determined and determining. They are determined by material circumstances, but they determine the circumstances they are determined by! It works dialectically, both ways. Here it will be objected that such a dialectical relationship violates the Marxian premise that life determines consciousness. But the objection fails to grasp the radical nature of what Marx meant by that premise. Recall that Marx believed consciousness to be itself a part of material life, not something independent of it. It was Feuerbach and earlier materialists who, in adopting the purely theoretical attitude, had made the mistake of divorcing mind from material reality. (For this reason, Marx argues, they in effect adopted the position of idealism despite their differing metaphysics.) To assert that human understanding or theory can be carried over to changing existing social conditions is not only not contrary to materialist assumptions, says Marx, it is the necessary conclusion to be derived from those assumptions. Any theory, of course, cannot be carried effectively into practice. The theory must accurately reflect actual social conditions or it will be incapable of changing anything. False consciousness will, of course, be ineffective. A correct understanding of actual social conditions, however, coupled with an attempt to change those conditions, must in the long run be successful, Marx argues. And herein lies precisely the crucial historical role of the proletariat. Their actual life conditions compel the workers to grasp the reality of their social order; those same conditions compel them to change it. Marxism is the theoretical comprehension of the capitalist order; the proletariat its practical revolutionary negation. The proletariat, in short, is the actual material embodiment of Marxian praxis. But how do we in fact know that Marxism is a correct comprehension of the capitalist order, and that its prediction of the inevitability of communism is valid? The answer, Marx argues, is contained within the idea of praxis itself, for it is clear that praxis is the only way in which social theory, any social theory, can be verified. If the theory works in practice, then it is correct; if not, it must either be modified or rejected. This means, in the final analysis, that the ultimate truth of Marxist theory resides in the revolutionary ability of the proletariat to overthrow the capitalist order and produce communism. We shall return to this role of the proletariat as the material validation of Marxist theory shortly, for it has obvious implications in any serious critique of that theory. For now, it is sufficient to recognize that revolution is not simply a means to change the social order for Marx; it is a way of knowing. Revolution is an epistemology! This is an entirely new idea in the Western tradition of political thought, and its implications extend well beyond the issue of communism or a working class revolution. For the idea that praxis is the only means of attaining valid social and political knowledge is a radical rejection of the entire Western epistemological tradition, whether in materialist or idealist form. Prior to Marx, to be objective meant to stand back, to separate oneself from that which was being studied. To intervene subjectively would be to alter the object being investigated and, thus, to invalidate one's theoretical analysis. Marx insists the very opposite is the case. Unless one subjectively intervenes, the validity of theory can neither be proven, nor can it evolve into higher understandings of social reality. Indeed, without this, theory is nothing more than ideology, Marx argues, for in never testing existing reality by attempting to change it, it takes that reality as a given and thus helps to perpetuate it.

## Collapse Coming Now

### The collapse of capitalism is coming

New Zealand Herald, Capitalism - top heavy and toppling, 2011,

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/news/article.cfm?c\_id=3&objectid=10744940

The last fortnight's dramas on financial markets is really just the sound of investors waking up to some fundamental problems in the global economy. It is now dawning on the world's biggest fund managers that there is too much debt weighing on households and governments in the developed world. More importantly, they realize there will not be enough economic growth and income to repay those debts over the next 10-20 years. That means governments might default or print money to repay the debt. Bank shareholders and bondholders may have to realize enormous losses or face high inflation. Growth will be much slower and for longer than expected. Slower economic growth might mean lower corporate profits and lower share prices. After nearly four years of urgent fixes, emergency measures, bank bail-outs, debt shuffles and government pump priming without any real improvement, there is a dawning realization that something is broken at the heart of the global economy. It's surprising to hear where some of these doubts about the future of capitalism are coming from. Some of the world's biggest capitalists are now asking some fundamental questions about whether the type of globalized, free market-driven capitalism we have now is sustainable. Bill Gross is the world's most important fund manager. He runs Pimco, which is the world's biggest bond fund with US$1.3 trillion ($1.5 trillion) in assets. He commented this week that the hollowing out of the United States' free-spending middle classes was at the heart of the problem. He pointed out that for several decades the engine room of the US consumer economy had been starved of income as high-paid manufacturing jobs were exported to lower-paid factories in China and technological innovation replaced workers with machines. For 20 years, the middle classes had made up the gap by borrowing more and governments had also borrowed more in recent years to supplement their incomes. Meanwhile, the extra profits made because of these lower labor costs were shuffled up to those on higher incomes and increasingly to an ageing group of capital owners. Increasingly, wealth and income is being concentrated in the hands of those who can't or won't spend it. This is starving the consumer economy of oxygen it needs to keep growing. Hedge-fund manager Jeremy Grantham also picked up on this structural problem this week. He points out that the share of American income that goes to the top 1 per cent of earners has doubled to 20 per cent in the last 30 years. That richest group are now hoarding that cash in the safest things they can get their hands on. Increasingly that means gold and, ironically, US Treasury bonds, despite their credit-rating downgrade this month. Grantham has put his finger on the core problem with unfettered capitalism. It works to shift wealth to the richest but can eventually topple over under the weight of itself when that wealth is hoarded and not reinvested or spent. The trickle-down theory will not be enough to save capitalism. Even the biggest capitalists are realising that now.

### **Harvard study indicates the collapse of capitalism is coming soon**

Yahoo News, Harvard Professors Claim Capitalism at Risk of Collapse, 12.13.2011, http://voices.yahoo.com/harvard-professors-claim-capitalism-risk-collapse-10642093.html?cat=3

In an astounding display of candor, three very prominent professors from Harvard University have broken ranks by publishing a study in the Harvard Business Review, describing a study they say they've undertaken that shows that because of the huge income disparities inherent in the traditional capitalist model, its ultimate demise is likely. Joseph L. Bower, Herman Leonard and Lynn Sharp Paine, all business professors at Harvard, all agree that while recent events such as the Occupy movement have highlighted the widening gap between rich and poor in capitalistic societies, it's the model itself that is need of reshaping. Because of their positions, and place of employment, the study brings great weight to problems already being addressed around the world by less credentialed human rights leaders. Capitalism, by its very nature, they say, favors those who know how to make money, and punishes those who do not. Unfortunately, as it's turning it, there are far fewer who know how to make money than there needs to be to support such a system, resulting in too few rich, and far too many poor. The result, as has been seen in other social systems, will likely lead to revolt as the have-nots seek to gain what they cannot otherwise obtain though the rules put in place by those in power. The trio are not ready as yet to say when the revolution might come about, but, by the words they choose, it becomes clear that they see trouble on the horizon in today's distressed world. In addition to the Occupy movement, there is a growing concern that the middle class that is supposed to hold a capitalist system together is beginning to falter. Unemployment, that bugaboo of any country seeking to afford its citizens a reasonably high standard of living, has ticked higher and higher in virtually every capitalistic society in existence today. The result is a lower and lower standard of living for the majority of the population; certainly a sign of impeding change if ever there was one. The group also notes that capitalism, because of its extreme focus on the almighty dollar, appears to work great when countries are just starting to embrace it. It's only after years of it being in place that its weaknesses come into play. Thus the rise of the East, as many call the great gains made in Asia, are little more than a temporary illusion. With time, they too will find that their great middle class, rising now, will soon fall back as has been seen in Europe and the United States.

### **Evidence indicates revolution is coming and global capitalism is on the verge of collapse**

Nouriel Roubini, chairman of Roubini Global Economics and a professor of economics at the Stern School of Business at New York University, Are we seeing the end of capitalism?, 2011, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2011/08/21/2003511253/2>

The massive volatility and sharp equity-price correction now hitting global financial markets signal that most advanced economies are on the brink of a double-dip recession. A financial and economic crisis caused by too much private-sector debt and leverage led to a massive releveraging of the public sector in order to prevent Great Depression 2.0. However, the subsequent recovery has been anemic and sub-par in most advanced economies given painful deleveraging. Now a combination of high oil and commodity prices, turmoil in the Middle East, Japan’s earthquake and tsunami, eurozone debt crises and the US’ fiscal problems (and now its rating downgrade) have led to a massive increase in risk aversion. Economically, the US, the eurozone, the UK and Japan are all idling. Even fast-growing emerging markets (China, emerging Asia and Latin America), and export-oriented economies that rely on these markets (Germany and resource-rich Australia), are experiencing sharp slowdowns. Until last year, policymakers could always produce a new rabbit from their hat to reflate asset prices and trigger economic recovery. Fiscal stimulus, near-zero interest rates, two rounds of “quantitative easing,” ring-fencing of bad debt and trillions of dollars in bailouts and liquidity provision for banks and financial institutions: Officials tried them all. Now they have run out of rabbits. So Karl Marx, it seems, was partly right in arguing that globalization, financial intermediation run amok and redistribution of income and wealth from labor to capital could lead capitalism to self-destruct (though his view that socialism would be better has proven wrong). Firms are cutting jobs because there is not enough final demand. However, cutting jobs reduces labor income, increases inequality and reduces final demand. Recent popular demonstrations, from the Middle East to Israel to the UK, and rising popular anger in China — and soon enough in other advanced economies and emerging markets — are all driven by the same issues and tensions: growing inequality, poverty, unemployment and hopelessness. Even the world’s middle classes are feeling the squeeze of falling incomes and opportunities.

### **Collapse coming now, social uprising, redistribution of wealth, increased anti capitalist sentiment**

Kirk Brezuela, Is the End of Capitalism upon Us?, 2011, http://brizuela-kirk.blogspot.com/2011/08/is-end-of-capitalism-upon-us.html

The social uprisings in Egypt, which was later expanded in a wider sense to several Arab world countries (with Syria and Libia as I write still fighting for regime change), in Greece, Spain and even recently in the United Kingdom, are all economic in origin primarily unemployment, but also due to the rising cost of living. The issue is that there is excess capacity in industries, and companies not hiring because there is not enough final demand…but the paradox is that if you’re not hiring workers, there is not enough labour income, which in turns leads to not being enough consumer confidence, which in turns means that there is not enough consumption and therefore not enough final demand. In the last 3 years this has worsen because there was a massive ‘redistribution of income’ from labour to capital and from wages to profits…which means inequality of income and wealth has increased. This redistribution of income and wealth makes the problem of excessive lack of aggregate demand even worse! A report released in April this year by GlobeScan, an international opinion research consultancy, suggests that the number of Americans who believe in the strength of the free market economy dropped markedly last year. In fact, according to the survey results, both Brazil and China, on a percentage basis, ranked higher than the U.S. in overall support for free market capitalism. The report, based on 12,884 interviews in 25 countries, asked participants to agree or disagree with the statement that the ‘free market economy is the best system on which to base the future of the world.’ GlobeScan found Americans strongly agreeing or somewhat agreeing dropped to 59 percent from 74 percent, a 15 percent dip from the year prior and the second largest year-over-year drop of any country besides Turkey. An even more dramatic drop (32 percent drop) occurred among those in the U.S. with annual incomes below $20,000, of which only 44 percent agreed that the free market was the ideal system. The reality is quite simple and it’s an old story: Capitalism is unstable. Capitalism means growth, but also instability. The system is dynamic and inherently prone to crashes that cause great damage along the way.

## Root Cause

### Their war scenario is the inevitable result of the capitalist state’s drive to expand. Postponing the conflict will guarantee a greater conflict in the future, because in the long term the contradictions that underlie it are irreconcilable

Istavan Meszaros, Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex, 1995 Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, London: Merlin Press

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

### The revolution will solve all of your war scenarios. It will take out the economic base that gives the state its power, disabling reactionary violence

Charlie Kimber 9-21-2002, “Can we beat the might of the state?” Socialist Worker issue 1818, http://www.socialistworker.co.uk/article.php?article\_id=4671

Actions by a small minority can cause a great deal of turmoil - as 11 September showed. But they do not threaten the state itself. US capitalism is not fearful of being militarily overthrown by Al Qaida. But socialist revolution is a mass affair. It involves many millions of workers taking action together. In such circumstances workers have immense potential power. Their first strength is numbers. Workers are the majority in many countries and make up large sections of society in most others. Usually when we see confrontation between the state and workers it is only one section of the class - one workplace, one industry, one city or region - that is involved. This enables the state to cope by concentrating its forces. But in a mass revolutionary situation workers up and down a country will be mobilised. This will not be at all easy to deal with. Look at how the government is worrying about having a firefighters' strike at the same time as a possible war in Iraq. There are some 350,000 repressive personnel (police, army, navy, air force) in Britain. They have to deal with a workforce of 28 million plus millions more unemployed, students, youth and pensioners. They certainly could not cope if we all moved together. The second source of workers' potential strength is that the base of revolution will be the workplaces where workers form collectives. As in Russia in 1917 or France in 1968, workers will take over factories, offices, hospitals, schools, oil refineries, telecommunications and internet service providers. Transport will come under workers' control. Nothing and nobody will move without workers sanctioning it. The third source of potential strength is the nature of the state machine itself. In normal times the state apparatus is the faithful servant of the ruling class. It is headed by people whose whole interest and loyalties are with the present system. But at the base the state depends on people whose loyalties may waver at key moments. Send these into action against a really serious movement and the outcome is not at all certain. Imagine working class soldiers, who joined up to escape the dole or the drabness of their lives, sent to attack a movement involving their schoolmates, their brothers, mothers and grannies. You can see why the state forces sometimes split. All these factors explain why apparently unbeatable state machines can fall apart, sometimes at breathtaking speed. The Shah of Iran had the backing of the US, all the latest weaponry and a murderous secret police service. His regime collapsed in 1979. What began as a protest by groups of intellectuals, students and religious figures grew within a few months into the actions of millions of poor people. Most importantly, the power of the workers in the oil industry was mobilised. The Shah was forced to flee as sections of his army switched sides. The regimes in Eastern Europe had no lack of military strength, nuclear back-up or secret policemen. They controlled the media and most of cultural life. But one by one they fell apart from 1989 onwards. South Africa's apartheid regime was armed to the teeth and used torture and murder to back up its control of the black population. But it could not withstand the revolt in the townships and, crucially, the organised strength of the black working class. The Indonesian regime of Suharto was surrounded by goons equipped with the most modern anti-riot technology. But when the people rose up in large numbers they swept Suharto out of office in 1998. In all these cases - Iran, Eastern Europe, South Africa and Indonesia - the result of the collapse of the old regime was certainly not socialism. But they all illustrate the fragility of apparently invulnerable regimes. We are many, they are few, as the poet Shelley said. For all the problems we face, that still remains true.

### All forms of oppression have material causes and therefore are necessarily shaped by the compulsions of capitalism

Helen Scott, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @ U Vennont, 2006 "Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women's Literature", Postcolonial Text, 2.1, http://postcolonial.org/index. php/pctlarticle/view Artic1e/49 1 / 174

For Gedalofs study, the material coordinates of oppression are secondary to the "conceptual space where the social and the self meet ... within particular discourses of gender, race, national and class identities" (2). Her focus is on "narratives" and "discourses" and she subscribes to a Foucauldian understanding of power as "not just a privilege possessed by a dominant group; it is rather exercised by and through us all, situated as we are in multiple networks of 'nonegalitarian and mobile relations'" (19). This formulation effectively "jettisons the primacy of social structures and class antagonism and instead generalizes power as something omnipresent, equating the expression of a system of ideas with the exercise of social domination.[6] It thus has much in common with the post-Althusserian "rejection of economism and... reprioritization of ideology" and disposal of "Althusser' s rather nebulous but necessary affirmation of the primacy of the material 'in the last instance' in favor of a conception of ideology as absolutely autonomous" (Brenner 12-13). The problem with discourse theory is that "once ideology is severed from material reality it no longer has any analytical usefulness, for it becomes impossible to posit a theory of determination - of historical change based on contradiction" (Brenner, paraphrasing Michele Barrett, 13). Marxists understand class in contrast not as an "identity" but rather as a material relationship to the governing mode of production.[7] In extension, all forms of oppression—racial, national, gender, and sexual—have specific material causes and effects and are shaped by the compulsions of capitalism.[8] As Deborah Levenson-Estrada maintains in a study of women union activists in 1970s Guatemala: "There is no 'more important' or 'prior' issue - class or gender - these are inside one another, and the struggle against gender conventions and sexist ideologies is integral to any project of liberation. A critical consciousness about class needs a critical consciousness about gender, and vice versa" (227). Their discourse focus abstracts the individual from language-this is the same logic as the extraction of surplus value that is central to the operation of capitalism. Scott, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @ U Vermont, 2006 (Helen, "Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women's Literature", Postcolonial Text, 2.1, http://postcolonial.orgiindex.php/pctlarticIe/viewArticle/4911174) Postmodernist theory, whether it calls itself post-structuralism, deconstruction or post-Marxism, is constituted by a radical attempt to banish the real human body - the sensate, biocultural, laboring body - from the sphere of language and social life. As a result, I argue, these outlooks reproduce a central feature of commodified society: the abstraction of social products and practices from the laboring bodies that generate them (1) This elision can be seen in readings of Caribbean literature that constantly move away from material relationships and experiences towards allegorical interpretations emphasizing language and representation. The focus on language takes away from material focus. Scott, Prof PostColonial Lit & Theory @U Vennont, 2006 (Helen, "Reading the Text in its Worldly Situation: Marxism, Imperialism, and Contemporary Caribbean Women's Literature", Postcolonial Text, 2.1, http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pctlartic1e/viewArticle/4911174) And yet postmodern paradigms can, ironically, given their habitual celebration of multiplicity and specificity, lead to formulaic—one dimensional, mono-focused, reductive—readings of texts as linguistic, discursive allegories, and exclude multiple possibilities for more specific, grounded readings. And despite postmodernism's vaunted radicalism, as many of its critics have argued, the "linguistic turn" and "descent into discourse" in postcolonial studies have obscured the material coordinates of imperialism, arguably depoliticizing a field of study that is from its inception engaged with inherently political questions of empire, race, colonialism and their relationship to cultural production. [14] In her study of Caribbean women writers, Isabel Hoving equates "high theory" with "political criticism" and attributes the crisis in postcolonial studies to "weariness with the issues of gender, class and race" which is being met with a "return to the literary" (7). Yet it could be argued that it is "high theory" that insistently pulls us away from concrete histories, lived experiences of oppression and resistance, and specific artistic movements and works, and leads us towards monotonous questions of discourse, representation, language, and identity.

## Collapse inevitable

### Capitalism will inevitably collapse due to its structural contradictions. The inequality that it promotes undermines its own expansion

Samir Amin, director of the Third World Forum in Dakar, 1998, “Spectres of Capitalism: A Critique of Current Intellectual Fashions,” Monthly Review Press

One Hundred fifty years after the Communist Manifesto was put forth, we are once again in one of those moments when the gluttons hold their orgy. But this momentary triumph of unrestrained capital is not accompanied by a brilliant new expansive surge for capitalism but by the deepening of its crisis! Thus, the boundless appetite of capital, given full scope by the momentary weakening of its adversary class**,** in fact shows explosively the absurd irrationality of this system. The inequality that it promotes undermines its possibilities for expansion. It expands consumption in a distorted manner by favoring wholesale waste by the rich, but this in no way compensates for the poverty to which it condemns the majority of workers and peoples, who become ever less successfully integrated into its system of exploitation. So capitalism by its very logic, reduces them to a marginal status and settles for mere crisis management, which can do just as long as the social power of its adversaries is not reconstituted. This paradoxical victory of capital giving rise to its prolonged crisis is only apparent if we cool off by reading the Communist Manifesto and recall to our memory the plain reason for this: capitalism is incapable of overcoming its fundamental contradiction.

### Capitalism will inevitably collapse due to its structural contradictions. The productive forces are organized around a tension between profit and social needs, and between labor as a source of value and labor’s alienation. This inevitably leads to crisis

Paul Burkett interviewed by João Aguiar 2007, “Capital and Nature: An Interview with Paul Burkett,” http://climateandcapitalism.wordpress.com/?s=cotton&searchbutton=Go%21

Marx’s Capital establishes three essential contradictions of capitalism which grow in intensity as the system develops historically. These contradictions should be seen as interconnected. First, there is the contradiction between use value and exchange value. This should not be treated as merely a formal, abstract contradiction as is sometimes done in modern theoretical interpretations of Marx’s work. Rather, it must be seen as the historical development of the tension between the requirements of money-making and monetary valuation on the one hand, and the needs of human beings, of sustainable human development, on the other. In Marx’s view, capitalism worsens this tension precisely insofar as it develops and socializes productive forces (labor and nature) in line with the requirements of competitive production for profit. The second contradiction established by Marx is the essentially class-exploitative nature of capitalism, its reliance on the extraction of surplus labor time from the direct producers. Marx shows how the wage-labor form both conceals and is shaped by the fact that workers perform surplus labor for the capitalist even insofar as they are paid the value of their labor power. He also shows that this exploitation is based on capitalism’s specific social separation of workers from access to and control over necessary conditions of production. This separation is what forces workers to accept worktimes longer than those necessary to produce their own commodified means of subsistence, even though the extension of the length and intensity of worktime hinders their development as human beings. More specifically — and this aspect has not been adequately appreciated — Marx shows how this forced surplus labor time involves capital’s appropriation of the labor power (potential work) that is produced during workers’ non-worktime, not only through rest and recuperation but also through the domestic reproductive labors of workers and other members of worker-households. From these first two contradictions emerges the third main contradiction established by Capital: capitalism’s tendency to generate crises of economic and social reproduction. Marx outlined two basic kinds of capitalist crisis. The first, more specific type, which has been the subject of much debate among Marxists, involves what might be termed narrowly economic crises of accumulation due to falling profitability, or an inability to reinvest profits in a way that yields more profit. However, periodic accumulation crises should be seen as a specific outgrowth of the more general, secular, and ever worsening crisis of capitalism, namely, the inability of the system to create and maintain natural and social conditions required for the sustainable development of human beings. Marx himself focused on this second form of crisis in his discussion of the general law of capitalist accumulation in [Chapter 25](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch25.htm) of Capital, Volume I, which showed capitalism’s tendency to create a growing reserve army of unemployed and underemployed workers even apart from its periodic accumulation crises. But he also dealt with the contradiction between capital accumulation and the natural conditions of human development, especially in his discussion of [“Modern Industry and Agriculture”](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch15.htm) in Chapter 15 of the same volume. In fact, Marx’s analysis of the natural and social environmental crises generated by capitalism are the main focus of John Bellamy Foster’s quite important work, [Marx’s Ecology](http://www.monthlyreview.org/marxecol.htm) (Monthly Review Press, 2000) and of my own book, [Marx and Nature](http://www.amazon.com/Marx-Nature-Red-Green-Perspective/dp/0312219407) (St. Martin’s Press, 1999). It must be stressed that, for Marx, both of these two forms of crisis are inevitable historical outgrowths of the use value versus exchange value contradiction and of the class-exploitative nature of capitalism.

### Capitalism isn’t inevitable – it forcefully indoctrinates individuals to fear resistance

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, The Enemy of Nature, 2002, p. 115-16

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

## AT Perm

### The perm is the same “third way” ideology used to defend the established order. This short-circuits the revolution and makes nuclear extinction inevitable

Istvan Meszaros, Prof. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Sussex, January 2000, Monthly Review, LN

Given the way in which the ongoing tends of global development assert themselves, in a clearly identifiable way, we may have perhaps a few decades to bring to a halt their destuctiveness, but certainly not centuries. The great liberal economist, Schumpeter, used to characterize—and idealize—capitalism as a system of “productive destruction.” This was, on the whole, true of capital’s ascending phase of development. Today, by contrast, we have reached a stage when, instead of “productive destruction,” we are even increasingly confronted by capital’s destructive production, proceeding on a frightening scale. You ask: “do you think that great mass movements have a chance to blossom again” in the age of globalization and under the “third way” of European social democracy? For me the “third way” is nothing more than a wishful fantasy, in defense of the established, untenable, order. Sociologists like Max Scheler have been predicting for almost a century the merging of the classes into a happy “middle-class”—one could only wonder: the middle of what? In reality, social polarization in our time is greater than ever before, making a mockery of the old social democratic expectations of eliminating—or at least greatly reducing—inequality through “progressive taxation.” As things turned out, we saw the diametrical opposite. To give you just two, very recent, examples: 1.) according to the Budget Office of the U.S. Congress (no “left-wing exaggerator,” for sure), the income of the top 1 percent is equivalent to that of the bottom one hundred million people, i.e. nearly 40 percent of the population. Twenty years ago it was “only” 1 percent against forty-nine million, i.e., less than twenty percent of the U.S. population. Some “equalization” and “merging of the classes into one another!” 2.) In England child poverty trebled in the last twenty years, and continued to be aggravated under the “New Labour” government in the last two and a half years. The “new labour” government preaches the vacuous “third way” sermon, and practices with ever greater severity the politics of antilabor measures, imposing even such policies which Mrs. Thatcher did not dare to introduce, cutting the Welfare State in every possible way, including even the precarious livelihood of the handicapped. Only a fool can assume that this can go on forever. So, in answer to your question, I am firmly convinced that there is a future for a radical mass movement, not only in England but also in the rest of the world. Or, to put it another way, if there is no future for such a movement, there can be no future for humanity itself. If I had to modify Rosa Luxemburg’s dictum, in relation to the dangers we face, I would add to “socialism or barbarism:” “barbarism if we are lucky”—in the sense that extermination of humankind is the ultimate concomitant of capital’s destructive course of development. And the world of that third possibility, beyond the alternatives of “socialism or barbarism,” would be fit only for cockroaches, which are said to be able to endure lethally high levels of nuclear radiation. This is the only rational meaning of capital’s third way.

**Perm is impossible. The alternative necessarily includes rejecting the aff**

Stephen Tumino, prof. of English at Pitt, Spring 2001, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More Than Ever Before,” The Red Critique 1, Spring, <http://www.redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm>

The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice.

The perm precludes the alternative- if we are led to believe that social change can be achieved by changing our values, than revolution appears to be unnecessary

Stephen Tumino, Professor at Pitt, English Professor at Pitt, 2002, “Pierre Bourdieu as New Global Intellectual for Capital,” The Red Critique 6, September/October, http://redcritique.org/SeptOct02/pierrebourdieuasnewglobalintellectualforcapital.htm

As do conservative discourses generally, Bourdieu saves capitalism by positing the social as made from knowledge and not labor, thereby holding out the false hope that social change will come with a change in people's values. Thus, the role of the intellectual in the process of social change is not to uncover the MATERIAL root of social inequality in the exploitation of wage-labor and produce awareness of what is to be done to change it for a new society where the needs of all are met, but the invention of "new forms of symbolic action" (*Acts* 57), a "change of language" (57), that does not really change anything. What Bourdieu's new "global" intellectual in the end proves is not what is needed to lead the emerging struggles to "fight against the injustices of capitalism", but, rather, Lenin's theory of opportunism in the working class movement, especially his explanation of how "when the working class movement has grown a little stronger [the liberals] dare not deny the class struggle but attempt to narrow down, to curtail the concept of class struggle" ("Liberal and Marxist" 122). Bourdieu's version of the collective intellectual is precisely such a figure of opportunism who does not deny but curtails class struggle to what is possible within capitalism for the benefit of a few.

AT: Framework

Our interpretation of debate is a contest between competing political strategies.

And, The goal of a leftist political platform should not be change the formal apparatuses of government because this reduces politics to a game that only the ruling class can win. Instead, we must see politics as the art of building social force in opposition to the system.

Marta Harnecker, Dir of MEPLA, 2000, “Making the Impossible Possible,” http://www.politicsofhealth.org/main/making\_impossible

To think about the construction of forces and the correlation of forces is to change the traditional vision of politics. This vision tends to reduce politics to the struggle over judicial and political institutions and to exaggerate the role of the state. Immediately one thinks of political parties and the fight over the control and orientation of the formal instruments of power.17 The most radical sectors focus all their political action on the conquest of political power and the destruction of the state. The reformists focus on the administration of political power and the exercise of government as the fundamental and sole form of political practice. The popular sectors and their struggles are the ignored colossus. This is what Helio Gallardo calls the “politicism” of the Latin American left.18 2) Overcoming the narrow conception of power To think about constructing forces is also to overcome the narrow vision that reduces the concept of right-wing power to that of the repressive aspects of the state. The power of the enemy is not only repressive but also, as Carlos Ruiz says, constructive, moulding, disciplining. If the power of the dominant classes were only for the purpose of subjecting the left to censorship, exclusion, obstacles or repression, it would be more fragile. Its strength derives from the fact that, in addition to eliminating those things it doesn’t want, it is capable of creating what it does want: building channels, producing knowledge, rationales and consciousness. It is the power to impose its own way of being seen and of looking at the world.1 To think about how to construct forces is also to overcome the old and deeply rooted mistake of trying to build political forces whether through arms or the ballot box without building social force.20 3) Politics as the art of building social force in opposition to the system The rise of a social force opposing the system is what the ruling classes fear most. That is the source of their narrow conception of politics as the struggle to win positions of power within the institutionalised judicial and political apparatus. For the left, on the other hand, politics must be the art of building social force in opposition to the system. The left must not, therefore, see the people or popular social force as something given that can be manipulated and only needs to be stirred up, but as something that has to be built.21 22

Subpoint A) Education- There’s no educational value to learning about a system that most of us will have no influence on. Plus, our entire kritik is an impact turn to your education. Your education is based on a flawed understanding of how society works, and even worse, it’s preventing the formation of class consciousness.

Subpoint B) Fairness- You just have to defend the system that you use to implement plan.

Subpoint C) Predictability- if our framework’s not predictable it only proves the dominance of capitalist ideology. It should be predictable: it’s a kritik of the system that structures every aspect of our lives. The fact that you haven’t thought about this just proves how good capitalism is at making itself invisible.

AT: Framework

And, Debating about whether or not a policy is a good idea assumes global capitalism. We must change the very parameters of what is considered ‘possible.’

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 1999, The Ticklish Subject, page 198-201

The best formula that expresses the paradox of post-politics is perhaps Tony Blair's characterization of New Labour as the 'Radical Centre': in the old days of 'ideological' political division, the qualification 'radical' was reserved either for the extreme Left or for the extreme Right. The Centre was, by definition, moderate: measured by the old standards, the term 'Radical Centre' is the same nonsense as 'radical moderation'. What makes New Labour (or Bill Clinton's politics in the USA) 'radical' is its radical abandonment of the 'old ideological divides', usually formulated in the guise of a paraphrase of Deng Xiaoping's motto from the 1960s: 'It doesn't matter if a cat is red or white; what matters is that it actually catches mice': in the same vein, advocates of New Labour like to emphasize that one should take good ideas without any prejudice and apply them, whatever their (ideological) origins. And what are these 'good ideas'? The answer is, of course, ideas that work. It is here that we encounter the gap that separates a political act proper from the 'administration of social matters' which remains within the framework of existing sociopolitical relations: the political act (intervention) proper is not simply something that works well within the framework of the existing relations, but something that changes the very framework that determines how things work. To say that good ideas are 'ideas that work' means that one accepts in advance the (global capitalist) constellation that determines what works (if, for example, one spends too much money on education or healthcare, that 'doesn't work', since it infringes too much on the conditions of capitalist profitability). One can also put it in terms of the well-known definition of politics as the 'art of the possible': authentic politics is, rather, the exact opposite, that is, the art of the impossible - it changes the very parameters of what is considered 'possible' in the existing, constellation.29

Decomposing capitalism will destroy the environment. Only the revolution can escape the profit drive and save humanity.

Jerry Grevin 8-19-2007, “Inconvenient Truths About Environmentalism,” Internationalism no. 143, <http://en.internationalism.org/inter/143/environmentalism>

The ecological crisis is real and endangers the future of humanity. It is yet another example how decadent capitalism, which is literally in a state of decomposition, threatens the destruction of civilization and a descent in barbarism, even if world war is avoided. The problem cannot be solved by or within capitalism, which is the cause of the problem in the first place and is incapable by definition of cooperation on the global level that is necessary to address the crisis. Capitalism can only take advantage of rising public concern over global warming as a means to derail the working class from the path of class struggle, as a smokescreen to gain popular support for the increasing austerity necessitated by its deepening economic crisis and produce extortionate profits, and to mobilize the population around a unifying, inter-classist ideology. Freed from the disastrous profit motive, the working class can pursue what is directly necessary to fulfill the social needs of humanity. To assure that technology serves the social needs of society and not the blind, insatiable drive for profit that fuels capitalist economic activity, the working class must understand the nature of its revolutionary responsibilities. Every problem that confronts humanity today increasingly demonstrates the necessity for the working class to rise to the historic challenge of destroying capitalist domination and creating a new society in which the workers of the world can decide what should be done to satisfy the needs of humanity and guarantee the future of society. Capitalism has disqualified itself on an historic level.

AT: Transition Wars

This impact is non-unique – Cross-apply the inevitability debate. The transition will happen eventually, it’s better that it happens before we destroy the biosphere.

Transition wars would not go nuclear – do you really think that the state would use nuclear weapons on its own people? Even if they would, they wouldn’t destroy their own country’s infrastructure. None of their evidence assumes a mass revolution.

### The revolutionary war will be a short decisive win for the proletariat. It will take out the economic base that gives the state its power, disabling reactionary violence

Charlie Kimber 9-21-2002, “Can we beat the might of the state?” Socialist Worker issue 1818, http://www.socialistworker.co.uk/article.php?article\_id=4671

Actions by a small minority can cause a great deal of turmoil - as 11 September showed. But they do not threaten the state itself. US capitalism is not fearful of being militarily overthrown by Al Qaida. But socialist revolution is a mass affair. It involves many millions of workers taking action together. In such circumstances workers have immense potential power. Their first strength is numbers. Workers are the majority in many countries and make up large sections of society in most others. Usually when we see confrontation between the state and workers it is only one section of the class - one workplace, one industry, one city or region - that is involved. This enables the state to cope by concentrating its forces. But in a mass revolutionary situation workers up and down a country will be mobilised. This will not be at all easy to deal with. Look at how the government is worrying about having a firefighters' strike at the same time as a possible war in Iraq. There are some 350,000 repressive personnel (police, army, navy, air force) in Britain. They have to deal with a workforce of 28 million plus millions more unemployed, students, youth and pensioners. They certainly could not cope if we all moved together. The second source of workers' potential strength is that the base of revolution will be the workplaces where workers form collectives. As in Russia in 1917 or France in 1968, workers will take over factories, offices, hospitals, schools, oil refineries, telecommunications and internet service providers. Transport will come under workers' control. Nothing and nobody will move without workers sanctioning it. The third source of potential strength is the nature of the state machine itself. In normal times the state apparatus is the faithful servant of the ruling class. It is headed by people whose whole interest and loyalties are with the present system. But at the base the state depends on people whose loyalties may waver at key moments. Send these into action against a really serious movement and the outcome is not at all certain. Imagine working class soldiers, who joined up to escape the dole or the drabness of their lives, sent to attack a movement involving their schoolmates, their brothers, mothers and grannies. You can see why the state forces sometimes split. All these factors explain why apparently unbeatable state machines can fall apart, sometimes at breathtaking speed. The Shah of Iran had the backing of the US, all the latest weaponry and a murderous secret police service. His regime collapsed in 1979. What began as a protest by groups of intellectuals, students and religious figures grew within a few months into the actions of millions of poor people. Most importantly, the power of the workers in the oil industry was mobilised. The Shah was forced to flee as sections of his army switched sides. The regimes in Eastern Europe had no lack of military strength, nuclear back-up or secret policemen. They controlled the media and most of cultural life. But one by one they fell apart from 1989 onwards. South Africa's apartheid regime was armed to the teeth and used torture and murder to back up its control of the black population. But it could not withstand the revolt in the townships and, crucially, the organised strength of the black working class. The Indonesian regime of Suharto was surrounded by goons equipped with the most modern anti-riot technology. But when the people rose up in large numbers they swept Suharto out of office in 1998. In all these cases - Iran, Eastern Europe, South Africa and Indonesia - the result of the collapse of the old regime was certainly not socialism. But they all illustrate the fragility of apparently invulnerable regimes. We are many, they are few, as the poet Shelley said. For all the problems we face, that still remains true.

## AT: Capitalism is Self Correcting

### The capitalist system is a one trick pony. All it knows to do in the face of crisis is increase exploitation of labor and the environment. This only leads to more economic disorder and creates anti-systemic movements

John Bellamy Foster, University of Oregon, September 1992, “The Absolute General Law of Environmental Degradation Under Capitalism,” Capitalism Nature Socialism 3 (3)

Since the early 1970s, the world economy has been suffering from relative stagnation (or a decline in the secular growth trend) accompanied by rising unemployment and excess capacity. Capital has responded to this crisis in its usual fashion through supply-side "restructuring," or the opening up of the system to a more intensive exploitation (and superexploitation) of labor and the environment. Many regulations previously put into place to protect the conditions of production are now being cast aside -- as Polanyi leads us to expect -- under the ideological mantle of the "self-regulating market."[14] At the same time, the system's core has been shifting away from the production of the goods and services that constitute GNP and toward the speculative proliferation of financial assets. One result of both of these processes has been an acceleration of the pace of environmental degradation. Hence, it is no accident that the last two decades have witnessed a speed-up in the destruction of the remaining natural forest ecosystems throughout the world, which by Wall Street criteria are viewed as non-performing assets to be liquidated as quickly as possible. The second contradiction of capitalism therefore is rapidly gaining on the first -- partly due to measures taken to compensate for the first-- without the first ever abating. The result is a "hyper-capitalist" disorder in which the system is obsessed with both enlarging markets and finding ways around rising environmental costs.[15] Since only a tiny proportion of environmental costs have thus far been internalized by capital and the state, it is a foregone conclusion that the economic repercussions of the second contradiction will grow by leaps and bounds -- partly under the pressure of social movements -- marking nature's ultimate "revenge" on the accumulation process. From a movement perspective the implications seem clear. Any struggle that attempts to combat only one of capitalism's "absolute general laws" while perpetuating the other will prove ineffectual. The future of humanity and the earth therefore lies with the formation of a labor-environmentalist alliance capable of confronting both of capitalism's absolute general laws. The forging of such an alliance would mark the rise of socialist ecology as a world-historical force, and the onset of the struggle that is likely more than any other to define the course of the twenty-first century.