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\*\*\*Collapse UQ\*\*\*

Collapse U: Multiwarrant

Collapse inevitable; 5 reasons

John Bellamy Foster, Introduction, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 p. 15

The capital system, The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time insists, is unable to rise above "short-termism" in its outlook. This is linked to the threefold contradictions of:I. its innate "uncontrollability:' which derives from the antagonistic nature of its mode of social metabolic control; 2. its unceasing dialectic of competition and monopoly; and 3. its inability to integrate politically on the global plane despite its globalizing economic tendencies. It therefore displays a deep aversion to planning.The result is a maximum of waste and destruction, marked by the incessant degradation of human labor, a decreasing rate of utilization, ballooning financial parasitism, a rising threat of nuclear annihilation,expanding barbarismu and accelerating planetary ecological catastrophe. On October 19, 1999, Mészáros delivered a public lecture in Athens entitled "Socialism or Barbarism:' which was later expanded into a small book under the same title that was published in Greek and Italian in 2000 and in English in 2001 (and is included as chapter 4 of the present book). There he argued, well before the events of September 11, 2001, that the world had entered "the potentially deadliest phase of imperialism:' The United States is now effectively at war with the entire planet in a futile attempt to become the state of the capitalist system, even at the risk of the annihilation of humanity itself.

Crisis U- Automobiles

The prime example of the crisis is happening now—transportation/automobiles

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.290-291,

To take a crucially important example of what is incurably wrong in this respect under the rule of capital, we should think of the way in which the ever-growing numbers of automobiles are utilized in our society. The resources squandered on the production and fuelling of automobiles are immense under "advanced capitalism," representing the second highest expenditure-after the mortgage commitments-in the particular households. Absurdly, however, the rate of utilization of automobiles is less than 1 percent, spuriously justified by the exclusive possession rights conferred upon their purchasers. At the same time, the thoroughly practicable real alternative is not simply neglected but actively sabotaged by the massive vested interests of quasimonopolistic corporations. For the simple truth is that what the individuals need (and do not obtain, despite the heavy financial burden imposed upon them) are adequate transport services, and not the economically wasteful and environmentally most damaging privately owned commodity that also makes them lose countless hours of their life in unhealthy traffic jams. Evidently, the real alternative would be to develop public transport to the qualitatively highest level, satisfying the necessary economic, environmental, and personal health criteria well within the scope of such a rationally pursued project, confining at the same time the use of-collectively owned and appropriately allocated, but not exclusively and wastefully possessed-automobiles to specific functions. Thus, the individuals' need-in this case their genuine need for proper transport services-would determine the targets of the vehicles and communication facilities (like roads, railway networks, and navigation systems) to be produced and maintained, in accord with the principle of optimal utilization, instead of the individuals being completely dominated by the established system's fetishistic need for profitable but ultimately destructive capital expansion. The unavoidable, but up to the present time tendentiously avoided, question of the real economy, must be faced in the very near future. For in the so-called third world countries it is inconceivable to follow the wasteful "development" pattern of the past, which in fact condemned them to their precarious condition of today, under the rule of capital's mode of social metabolic reproduction. The clamorous failure of the much promoted "modernization theories" and their corresponding institutional embodiments clearly demonstrate the hopelessness of that approach.

Crisis U- China

China proves the overwhelming failure of the capitalist system—energy, pollution, depletion of resources.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P. 291-292,

In one respect, at least, we have seen alarm raised in this regard-characteristically pressing at the same time for the assertion and absolute preservation of the privileges of the dominant capitalist countries-in the recent past. It concerned the internationally growing need for energy resources and the competitive intervention of some potentially immense economic powers~ above all China, in the unfolding process.Today that concern is primarily about China, but in due course also India must be added, of course, to the list of major countries unavoidably pressing for vital energy resources. And when we add to China the population of the Indian subcontinent, we are talking about more than ~ people. Naturally, if they really followed the once grotesquely propagandized prescription of The Stages of Economic Growth,25 with its simple-minded advocacy of "capitalist take-off and drive to maturity~" that would have devastating consequences for all of us. For the fully automobilized society of two-and-a~half-billion people on the U.S. model of "advanced capitalist development:' with more than 700 motor cars to every 1,000 people, would mean that we would be all dead before long through the global "modernizing" benefits of poisonous pollution~ not to mention the total depletion of the planet's oil reserves in no time at all. But by the same token, in an opposite sense, no one can seriously envisage that the countries in question could be left indefinitely where they stand today. To imagine that the two~and~a~ha1fbifibn people of China and the Indian sub~continent could be permanently condemned to their existing predicament~ still in heavy dependency to the capitalistically advanced parts of the world in one way or another, defies all credulity. The only question is: whether humanity can find a rationally viable and truly equitable solution to the legitimate demand for social and economic development of the peoples involved, or antagonistic competition and destructive struggle over resources are the way of the future, as befits the orienting framework and operating principles of capital's mode of social reproductive control.

Collapse U: Ecological Crisis

Growth within capital has reached its limit—ecology proves.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.292,

Another respect in which the absolute imperative to adopt a qualitatively different way of organizing economic and social life appeared on the horizon in our time concerns the ecology. But again, the only viable way of addressing the increasingly grave problems of our glob- al ecology-if we want to face up in a responsible way to the aggravating problems and contradictions of the planetary household, from their direct impact on such vital questions as global warming to the elementary demand for clean water resources and healthy air-is to switch from the existing order's wasteful husbandry of fetishistic quantification to a genuinely quality oriented one. Ecology, in this respect, is an important but subordinate aspect of the necessary qualitative redefinition of utilizing the produced goods and services, with- out which the advocacy of humanity's permanently sustainable ecology-again, an absolute must-can be nothing more than a pious hope.

Collapse U: Structural Crisis

Capitalism is in structural crisis—our evidence is comparative.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P. 61,

**We live in an age of unprecedented historical crisis.** **Its severity can be gauged by the fact that we are not facing a more or less extensive cyclic crisis of capitalism**, as experienced in the past, **but the deepening structural crisis of the capital system itself**. As such, **this crisis affects**-for the first time ever in history**-the whole of humankind, and demands fundamental changes to the way in which the social metabolism is controlled if humanity is to survive.**

Collapse U: Structural Limits—Try or Die

Capital has hit its absolute structural limit and the system is taking a violent turn to sustain itself—the aff/alt is literally try or be killed.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.25-27,

Here we have an obvious combination of historical contingency and structural necessity. **If humankind had an "infinity of time"** at its disposal, then one could not talk about "capital's abuse of time?' The infinity of time could not be abused by any historically given force. Under such circumstances ongoing "**capital-expansion" would be a harmless quantitative concept, with no end in sight. But humanity has no infinity of anything at its disposal,** as it is absurdly presumed by capital's willing personifications, and certainly not of time. Besides, talking about an infinity of human historical time would be a grotesque contradiction in terms. Only the most insensitive force, devoid of all human consideration, could ignore the limitations of time. This is what we witness today in a characteristic way. **It happens to be our given historical contingency that activates the insuperable-absolute--structural limits of capital. These are absolute structural limits of the capital system that become destructive determinations bent on blocking off humanity's future.** At this juncture in history, **capital cannot be different in any way from what it actually is. This is how capital's structural necessity becomes devastatingly fused with its** brutally-but totally in vain- **ignored historical contingency**. This is so precisely **because capital** does not have, and **cannot have, the consciousness of historical time.** Only structurally open-ended social reproductive systems can have it. Consequently, there can be no way out from this destructive entrapment of humanity without eradicating the capital system itself from its long entrenched control of the social metabolic process. In the same poem from which the epigraph of this book is taken Attila Jozsef calls our attention to the burden of historical time and to the tremendous responsibility inseparable from it. He speaks of the human beings who must meet the great social and historical challenge of our age as "faithful listeners to the laws:' underlining that only in that way can we qualify for being worthy inheritors of the mandate bequeathed to us in the course of humanity's historical development. He is fully conscious, as one absolutely should be, both of the historical continuity on which we can build our future, and of the vital differences, which must be instituted and duly consolidated in the ongoing process of qualitative transformation. These are Jozsef's words: Ia rnateria real nos ha creado echhdndonos hirvientes y violentos en los inoldes de esta sociedad terrible, para afincarnos, por ía humanidad, en el eterno suelo. Tras los sacerdotes, los soldatos y los burgueses alfin nos hemos vueltofieles oidores tie las (eyes: par eso el sentido de toda obra humana zumba en nosotros comae) violón profundo.'° Real matter created us, coal, iron and petrol, threw us into the mould of this horrible society, ardently and untrammeled, to make our stand for humanity on the eternal soil. After priests, soldiers and burghers, thus we became at last the faithful listeners to the laws: this is why the sense of a11 human work throngs in us like the deep viola. The vital requirement to be "faithful listeners to the laws" stressed by Jozsef does not refer simply to manmade laws. It stands above all for the absolutely fundamental law of humanity's relationship to nature itself: the objective substratum of our very existence. This must be the ultimate foundation of the whole system of human laws. Yet, this is the relationship that is being violated by capital in our time in every possible way, irresponsibly ignoring the consequences. One requires no prophetic insight to understand that the ruthless violation of the natural basis of human existence cannot continue indefinitely.

Collapse U: Crisis = Key Time for Shift

Given the deepening structural crisis voting aff/neg now is key—the evidence is conclusive and assumes your turns.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.31

The twentieth century made a significant difference with regard to Marx's admonition. For in the light of seven decades of extremely costly practical experience the original Marxian warning about the necessary practical critique of one's own actions-a warning which could not be in the mid-nineteenth century more than a very general exhortation-had acquired an unavoidable urgency in the socialist movement. For, on the one hand, **given the deepening structural crisis of our established social metabolic order, the well grounded institution of the socialist alternative is more urgent today than ever before, despite the self-complacent propaganda assault by the ruling ideology visible everywhere.** But at the same time, on the other hand, **due to the weighty historical evidence of the Soviet type of development, and the immense sacrifices that had to be endured in its long decades, no one can deny today the necessity for confronting "with unmerciful thoroughness" the problems that are bound to arise. For only through the fully conscious and self-critically committed socialist re-examination of the intended emancipatory steps taken-both in the past and in the present-can it become feasible to make the foundations of socialism in the twenty-first century more secure than they turned out to be in the twentieth**

Collapse U: Crisis = Key Time for Shift

Capitalism is in crisis—now is the time to unite labor as a way to ignite a social consciousness shift, it’s the only alternative.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P. 86-87, Thus, although in a more…great and fundamental.

Thus, **although in a superficial sense capital is undoubtedly triumphant, in a much more fundamental sense it is in the gravest possible trouble**. This may sound paradoxical. Yet, **if you recognize the way in which capital can dominate the social reproduction process everywhere, you must also recognize that it is structurally incapable of resolving its problems and contradictions.** Wherever you look you find that what appears to be-and is loudly advertised as-a rock-solid lasting solution, sooner or later crumbles into dust. For instance, just try to survey in your mind the ephemeral history of "economic miracles" we had in the postwar decades. What sort of "miracles" were they? We had the "German miracle" and the "Japanese miracle:' followed by the Italian, Brazilian, and other "miracles?' As we may well remember, the latest of them was the most tendentiously advertised miracle of the Asian tiger economies. And what happened to that "miracle?" Like all the others, it has evaporated, leaving its place to a severe crisis**. Today you cannot find in the world one single country which is not facing some absolutely fundamental problems,** including the recent calamities on the stock exchanges of Russia and several Eastern European countries. Well, **if you now read the bourgeois newspapers, they are all in some sort of panic. Their headlines are frightening and self-frightening as to what is really going on.** I remember that at the time when the "Asian miracle" was at its peak, the notion of this pretended "miracle" was also used as an overwhelming disciplinary argument against the working classes of the Western capitalist countries. "**Behave yourself Accept the standard of living and the work practices of the kind which the workers in the Asian tiger economies do, or you will be in deep trouble!" A system which claims to have resolved all its problems in the "post-industrial" Western "advanced capitalist" countries, and then has to rely for its continued health on such an authoritarian blackmailing message, does not promise much for the future even in its own terms of reference.** Again, in this respect there is, and **there can only be, one viable and sustainable solution. It is socialism**. Socialism in the sense which 1 mentioned earlier; i.e., **the elimination of the now-given adversarial and antagonistic framework in which one section of the population-a tiny minority-has to dominate the overwhelming majority as a matter of insurmountable structural determination. That is to say, a form of domination that totally expropriates for itself the power of decision-making. Labor as the antagonist of capital has absolutely no power of decision-making; not even in the most limited context.** That is the vital and unavoidable question for the future. And in that sense, I am convinced**, the chances for the revival of the socialist movement sooner or later are absolutely great and fundamental.**

Collapse U: A2 Cap Inevitable

Their uniqueness claims are from apologists of capital and merely describe the status quo. Which ignore and displace the historical contradictions of capital—reason to reject them.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.21-22,

**The apologists of capital** did-and continue to **do-everything they could in order to obliterate people's awareness of historical time, in the interest of eternalizing their system. Only those who have a vital interest in the institution of a positively sustainable social order, and thus in securing the survival of humanity, can really appreciate the importance of historical time at this critical juncture of social development.** Gramsci, at the time when he was already gravely ill in prison, kept on repeating: "Time is the most important thing; it is a simple pseudonym of lif&'6 The defenders of the ruling order could never understand the meaning of his words. For them time can have only one dimension: that of the eternal present. **The past for them is nothing more than the backward projection and blind justification of the established present, and the future is only the self-contradictorily timeless extension of the-no matter how destructive, and thereby also self-destructive--"natural order" of the here and now, encapsulated in the constantly repeated mindless reactionary dictum according to which "there is no alternative:'** Perversely, that is supposed to sum up the future

Links

Links: Anti-Military K Aff’s

**The affirmative’s characterization of the international system by inequalities in military power overlooks historical materialist conditions underlying militarism and war.**

**Lapointe, 2007** [Thierry. "Beyond an Historicism Without Subject: Agency and the Elusive Genealogies of State Sovereignty" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Feb 28, 2007 <http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p180176\_index.html]

It becomes clearer, in this context, that hierarchical relations of power in the international system may not solely rest on “objective” inequalities in military might as has been contended. As critical approaches generally argue, these hierarchical relations are themselves shaped through and conditioned by various institutionalised structures of power—material and discursive—that reproduce social relations of domination and subordination between human subjects across time and space. The question of their historical conditions of emergence and transformation appears to be the fundamental one for any critical approach in IR that seeks to avoid what John M. Hobson calls the fallacy of tempo-centrism and chronofetishism (Hobson 2002). Critical scholarship remains deeply divided on the way in which they problematize the relation between power and sovereignty. How to problematise the historical conditions of emergence of discourses and practices of state sovereignty remains a question that still needs to be debated. In this regard, it exists a fundamental line of fracture dividing Poststructuralism and Historical Materialism in their respective ways to theorise the articulation of power relations/dynamics of power with social discourses and social institutions across time and space. This paper seeks to critically explore the way in which Post-Structuralist scholars in IR have approached the question of the historicity of state sovereignty. While acknowledging their contributions in critiquing the a-historical and essentialist foundations of mainstream IR scholarship, it will be argued that the central weakness of Poststructuralism is that by understanding formation and transformation in state sovereignty as expression of shifting discursive paradigms, it tends to evacuate the specific, uneven and differentiated social relations that create the historical conditions for such discourses to emerge. It will be argued that Poststructuralism magnifies the internal coherence of an epistemic paradigm—discursive rules of an historical era—and downplays the variety of ways in which specific discourses can be mobilized to produce, reproduce and transform different sets of social relations of power by human agents across space in a given historical period. Thus, I argue that Poststructuralism eschews an analysis of the historical process of formation and transformation of forms of knowledge/social power in relations with differentiated forms of institutionalized social practices.

Link: Anti-Military K Aff’s

**Poststructuralism’s flawed epistemology denies empirical, historical, or cause-and-effect investigations into IR**

**Lapointe, 2007** [Thierry. "Beyond an Historicism Without Subject: Agency and the Elusive Genealogies of State Sovereignty" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Feb 28, 2007 <http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p180176\_index.html]

Thirdly, since the human subject is understood as a mere relay in an endless cobweb of power relations, and given that as such he/she is continuously in a position of being object and subject of power, Poststructuralists have reached the verdict that the human subject must be decentred from our theorizing (Ibid:26; Campbell: 5; Bartelson)5. Poststructuralists explicitly embrace Foucault’s stance on the imperative of forsaking a theorizing of Power based on an analysis of subject’s intentionality (Ibid: 25; Bartelson 1995: 54-58; Kennedy 1979: 274). The analytical framework that is put forward eschews the assumption that power is something that dominant groups or class of human subjects use to subordinate others to their will or by constraining their range of available strategies of actions (Bartelson 1995: 49-53). It must rather proceed from the opposite assumption, which asserts that Power imposes itself on all subjects with the end result of continuously producing them as objects. This strategic model of power as a cobweb of actions upon actions involves an explicit retreat from theorizing social dynamics based on a problematizing of the historically specific ways in which agents develop strategies of power/action to ensure their social reproduction within an institutional context not of their own choosing. In that sense, Poststructuralism celebrates the quite problematic notion of history without subjects (Bartelson 1995: chap.3; Giddens 1993: 232). Lastly, the imperative of decentring the subject—i.e. of developing an ‘history with no subject’—implies forsaking the pretension of “total history” that “(…) attempts to discover the overriding unity or central principle which gives coherence to a civilization or period” (Kennedy1979: 272). As far as language is not merely a mirror of reality for it is constitutive of our perception/experience of it, evidences of the past do not speak for themselves outside the specific discursive formation in which they are an integral part of. Thus, it has been rightly argued that discursive and non-discursive are not discrete “realms” or “spheres” that can be grasped independently from another (Campbell 1998: 6). Quoting Laclau and Mouffe, Campbell stresses that “[w]hat is denied is not that… objects exist externally to thought, but the rather different assertion that they could constitute themselves as objects outside of any discursive condition of emergence” (Cambell 1998: 6). Even though scholars that have adopted such a stance claim to reject the idea of a priority of the “discursive” over the “non-discursive” since one can not exist in abstraction of the other, the methodology developed to cope with the relation between Power and Knowledge often betray an implicit emphasis on the first term of the equation. Indeed the methods of inquiry that has been adopted to deal with this problem— archaeologically and genealogically—ascribe a pivotal role to discourse in the theorizing of IR6. Archaeology has been used as a method to delineate the conditions of emergence of discourses of truth and the specific forms through which knowledges are constituted across time and space (Foucault 1966: 13; Shiner 1982: 288). The inquiry into the conditions of possibility of the positivity of discourses has involved delineating their unity—their regularity—in time and space. The concept of episteme7 encapsulates the idea of unity of discourses in a given time/space. It is defined as :“(…) the totality of relations which can be discovered, for a given period, between sciences when one analyses them at the level of discursive regularities” (Foucault 1972: 191). This is why archaeology focuses exclusively on texts and proceeds through examplificatory history. Genealogy has been developed as a stepping stone to go beyond the archaeological focus on the discursive—the inner functioning, the “system of constraints”, of systems of representation—approached more or less independently from the “non-discursive” (Smart 1982: 128; Palmer 1990: 26-27). Genealogy seeks to delineate the relations of power that make possible the positivity of systems of representation8. It seeks to problematise the way in which a specific economy of discourse <CONTINUED>

Link: Anti-Military K Aff’s

<CONTINUED>

is made possible by a constellation of power relations which arise randomly from regionally dispersed sets of social institutions to eventually form a power mechanism (dispositif de pouvoir) (Foucault 1975; 1976; See also Brenner 1994). As Shiner points out: “Genealogy is the analysis of how one constellation of power-knowledge relations is displaced by another; it attends to the breaks that punctuate history” (Shiner 1982: 387). If archaeologists and genealogists aim to delineate, in turn, the conditions of existence of the inner functioning of an economy of discourse, and the constellation of power relations and institutions upon which it rests, they nevertheless categorically deny the possibility of achieving causal explanations as to how and why they are formed and transformed over time (Bartelson 1995; Seigel 1990: 279). In other words, while it stresses discontinuity in time and space, it eschews explanations of the causes of change. The historical process whereby human subjects are involved in the process of “making their own history in a context not of their own choosing”, to paraphrase Marx, is taken out of the realm of possible theoretical investigation. It thereby offers a mode of inquiry that rests upon the primacy of historical contingency. In decentring the human subject from their theorizing of Power/Knowledge—in reducing the human subject to the function of a relay or a symptom of power relations—some critiques have argued that Poststructuralism have not totally managed to brake the fetters of functionalism and to a certain form of “back door determinism” that have plagued for so long social sciences in general (Brenner 1994 ; Palmer 1990; Giddens 1985; 1993: 232; Thompson 1978). This conspicuous absence of human agency in Poststructuralist theorizing of “[…] power and knowledge as constructed discursively, flowing out of and penetrating all realms” (Palmer 1990:27) can easily be found in the forms of theoretical interventions it has given rise to in the field of IR. In their two most significant interventions in furthering critical thinking in IR—which we will be outlined in turn in what follows—Poststructuralist scholars have avoided to think about the Khistorically specific political economy—and complexes of social relations in which human subjects are enmeshed—underpinning the formation and transformations of the Power/Knowledge “nexus”. I will address their contributions in turn in order to highlight some of their strengths, but more to the point what I consider to be the fundamental weaknesses of their analysis: the reification of discourse; a problematic (or conspicuous lack of a) role ascribed to human agency in their contextualizing of evolving meanings taken by state sovereignty in different political discourses; an undifferentiated conception of social power and institutions across time and space; and the emphasis on historical contingency in lieu of historical specificity to explain discontinuities in the organization of political life.

Link: Pomo Aff’s

**Rejecting modernity and calculative thought lumps together capitalism’s distinct social relations and dehistoricizes the specific conditions enabling racism, colonialism, and the Holocaust**

**Malik '96** - senior visting fellow at the Department of Political, International and Policy Studies at the University of Surrey (Kenan, "The Mirror of Race: Postmodernism and the Celebration of Difference," in "In Defense of History," Ed. by E. Meiskins Wood & John Foster, p.127-131, RG)

By conflating the social relations of capitalism with the intellectual and technological progress of “modernity,” the product of the former can be laid at the door of the latter. The specific problems created by capitalist social relations become dehistoricized. In postructuralist discourse racial theory, colonialism, or the Holocaust are not investigated in their specificity, as products of distinctive tendencies within capitalist society, but are all lumped together as the general consequence of “modernity.” In this way the positive aspects of “modern” society – its invocation of reason, its technological advancements, its ideological commitment to equality and universalism – are denigrated while its negative aspects – the inability of capitalism to overcome social divisions, the propensity to treat large sections of humanity as “inferior” or “subhuman,” the contrast between technological advance and moral turpitude, the tendencies towards barbarism – are seen as inevitable or natural.

Link: Anti-Sovereignty

**Rejection of states, the IR system, and diplomacy obscure the role of sovereignty as a socially and historically situated force—no epistemologically relevant analysis can exist absent an historically materialist approach**

**Halliday ’94** [Fred, professor of international relations at the London School of Economics, ‘A Necessary Encounter: Historical Materialism and International Relations’ in Rethinking International Relations (Basingstoke: Macmillan), 47-73]

What these broad concepts of the 'mode of production' and the 'social formation' did entail was that analysis of any area of human acitivity had to be seen in this socio-economic context, and not in abstraction from it. There is therefore no state, no belief, no conflict, no power in general, or independent of this context. By extension, there is no 'international system', or any component activity, be this war or diplomacy, abstracted from the mode of production. Indeed, International Relations is the study of the relations not between states but between social formations. When this insight is applied to the issues of international relations, a definite shift of focus becomes visible. **Thus the state is no longer seen as an embodiment of national interest or judicial neutrality, but rather of the interests of a specific society or social formation, defined by its socio-economic structure**. How far classes control the state, or are separated from it, has been one of the main issues of dispute within the field. Sovereignty equally becomes not a -60- generic legal concept but the sovereignty of specific social forces. Its history is that of forms of social power and attendant legitimisation within a formation. **Security is removed from the distinct theoretical sphere in which it has been placed and becomes the security of specific social groups and for specific socioeconomic reasons**. The history of the system is also seen in another light: the modern inter-state system emerged in a context of the spread of capitalism across the globe, and the subjugation of pre-capitalist societies. This socio-economic system has underpinned both the character of individual states and of their relations with each other: **no analysis of international relations is possible** without reference to capitalism, the social formations it generated and the world system they comprise. 27 The second central theme, embodied in the very term for the paradigm itself, is that of history, and historical determination. In the first instance, Marx argued that history influenced present behaviour. In the phrase he used on one occasion: 'the tradition of the dead generations weighs like a nightmare upon the minds of the living'. But it meant something more than this: Marx argued that the events or character of any society could only be seen in their historical context -- one had to ask how the object of study came about, what the influences, of past events were, and what the impact of the past in shaping the current situation might be. 28 Just as he argued that society had to be seen in its socio-economic context, so he believed that the conditions of generation and a recognition of their contingent location, were central to any analysis. To understand contemporary capitalist society, one had to see how it originated and what the problems and tendencies conditioned by the past were, how it limited what people thought of as being their options, and led them to be influenced, or wholly determined, by passions, illusions, identifications derived usually unwittingly from the past.

Link: Hegemony

**Hegemony creates a false universality based on material dominance and falsely conflates this dominance with the natural course of history to create a coherent vision of world order** Cox '95 - emeritus prof. of pol. sci. @ York Univ. (Robert W., "Critical Political Economy," in "International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder," Ed. by Bjorn Hette, p.43-44,

The question of consumption models is closely linked to the question of hegemony. In the terms I have used, an indicator of hegemony would be a preponderant ontology that tends to absorb or subordinate all others. One intersubjective understanding of the world excludes all others and appears to be universal. It is often said that although United States economic power in the world has experienced a relative decline, the American way of life has never been a more powerful model. An American-derived 'business civi­lization', to use Susan Strange's term, characterizes the globalizing elites; and American pop culture has projected an image of the good life that is a universal object of emulation — a universalized model of consumption. This constitutes a serious obstacle to the rethinking of social practices so as to be more compatible with the biosphere.

A counterchallenge to the universalizing of American pop culture is the affirmation of other cultural identities. The most evident, and the most explicitly negating of American culture, is in Islam; but other cultures are also affirming alternative world-views. The hegemonies of the past and present have universalized from one national culture or one tradition of civilization. A post-hegemonic world order would no longer be the global reach of one particular form of civilization. It would contain a plurality of visions of world order.

In order to avoid such an order lapsing into mutual in­comprehension and conflict, it would be necessary to move beyond a position of pure relativism in order to achieve a kind of supra-intersubjectivity that would provide a bridge across the distinct and separate subjectivities of the different coexisting civilizations.

These various traditions of civilization are not monolithic and fixed. They develop dialectically like any historical structure. Change may come both from internal contradictions — for example, gendered power relations and social inequities can be sources of conflict and mutation in all cultures. Change can also come from borrowings and reactions to the practices of other cultures in a world that is becoming ever more closely knit. Selective adaptation rather than homogenization would characterize change in post-hegemonic pluralism.

Link: Anti-Capitalism

You re-create class divisions—without mass consciousness shift aligned with political changed the right wing will fill in.

**McNally '96** - prof. of pol. sci. @ York Univ. (David, "Language, History, and Class Struggle," in "In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda," Ed. by E. Meiskins Wood & John Foster, p.36-38, RG)

The contradictory character of working class consciousness is a highly dynamic phenomenon. To begin with, there is no homogeneous conscious­ness within the working class. Among a single group of workers, some will veer towards near-total acceptance of the ideas of bosses, supervisors, heads of state, and so on, while others will tends towards an almost thorough-go­ing opposition to such figures. Between these two positions one will find the majority of workers. But their consciousness will not be fixed. Great events—mass strikes and demonstrations, union drives, and so on—coupled with the organized propagation of oppositional ideas can contribute to significant radicalizations; while defeats, setbacks, and the decline of oppo­sitional discourse can have a **deeply conservatizing effect**.

But whatever the existing state of affairs at any one point in time, Gramsci is clear that the contradictory nature of working class consciousness cannot be eliminated. It is an intrinsic feature of capitalist society that the ruling class tries to win ideological consent to its rule (and that such efforts are usually successful to a significant extent), *and* that the life experiences of workers, their resistance to exploitation and domination, generate practices which do not fit with the dominant ideas and which, in fact, entail an implicit worldview that challenges these ideas. Indeed, one of the crucial functions of a revolutionary socialist party for Gramsci is that it try to draw out and systematize the worldview which is implicit in such practices of resistance. This view enables Gramsci to approach the question of revolutionary poli­tics in terms of the contradictions which pervade the experience, activity, and language of oppressed members of society.

Revolutionary politics begins, be argues, with the common sense of the working class. This common sense contains all these, largely implicit, oppositional attitudes. And since socialism, as Marx insisted, is the self-emancipation of the working class, revolutionary ideas cannot be some foreign discourse injected into the working class movement. On the con­trary, the connection between revolutionary ideas and the working class must be organic; it is the task of Marxists to show that socialism is the logical and consistent outgrowth of practices of working class resistance. The revolutionary party must thus be a living part of the working class move­ment; it must share their experiences and speak their language. At the same time, it must also be the force that generalizes experiences of opposition into an increasingly systematic program, the force which challenges the traditional and dominant ideas inherited by workers (patriotism, sexism, racism, etc.) by showing how they conflict with the interests and aspirations implicit in resistance to exploitation and oppression. Contrary to certain idealist renderings of Gramsci which have made the rounds in recent years, he is insistent that the building of such a mass counter-hegemonic move­ment does not take place on a strictly cultural plane or as some rarefied intellectual process of ideological dissent. Counter-hegemonies, he argues, are created through political struggle, movements in which economic resis­tance and ideological combat go hand in hand. For the oppressed, in other words, "critical understanding of self takes place therefore through a strug­gle of political hegemonies'" (p. 333). And "political parties," he insists, operate as the "**historical laboratory**" of counter-hegemonic worldviews; they are "the crucibles where the **unification of theory and practice, under­stood as a real historical process, takes place**" (p. 335).

Link: Anti-Capitalism

You ignore the largest lynchpin of capitalism—state institutions are the benchmark for modern late capitalism—one must start there to solve.

Van Apeldoorn 2004 [Bastiann, prof of political science at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, “Theorizing the transnational: a historical materialist approach, Journal of International Relations and Development, 2004, 7, (142–176),

It is from this perspective that we may also understand the development of transnational relations into relations of capitalist production.The world market itself generated transnational commercial and financial networks enabling the formation of transnational social forces.How ever, it was only when, expanding from the English state-society complex outwards, capitalism transformed the world market into a capitalist market based on the imperative of continuous expansion and deepening that capitalist social relations started to develop across the boundaries of the newly established territorial units called states. It was therefore only on the basis of this capitalist world market — and the internationalization drive of capital it induced — that a process of transnational (capitalist) class formation could develop (class relations — and hence class formation — presupposing production relations). The coming into existence of a transnational bourgeoisie went beyond earlier transnational structures of socialization inasmuch as it created a transnational space for the exercise and reproduction of capitalist class rule.Such a transnational space first arose in the 18th century in the form of what Van der Pijl (1998: especially chapter 3) has called the Lockean heartland, formed through the expansion of the British state-society complex to include parts of North America and other regions through settler colonies, and in its commercial and political expansion confronting (sometimes resulting in war) so-called Hobbesian contender states.It is thus that through this expansion we can witness — though via many crisis and fits and starts — a gradual widening of the area of state-society complexes subject to the imposition of capitalist discipline and a concomitant (deepening) commodification of social relations. It was with the industrial revolution that this expansionary dynamic of capitalism set in for good.Thi s development reached a new climax when in the 19th century under the Pax Britannica the internationalization of capital deepened and the liberal internationalist fraction of a Anglo-Saxon bourgeoisie became more and more cosmopolitan in outlook.

**Questioning economics without attention to the relationship between structures and actors in the political economy fails**

**Cox '95** - emeritus prof. of pol. sci. @ York Univ. (Robert W., "Critical Political Economy," in "International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder," Ed. by Bjorn Hette, p.32-36, RG)

The next question is: change in what? What is political economy? I suggest that political economy is different from both political science and economics as they are commonly understood. We sometimes hear international political economy defined as the politics of international economic relations. This suggests an amal­gam or *rapprochement* of the two fields.

Yet there is a methodological difference between political science and economics, on the one hand, and political economy, as I would like to define it, on the other. Political science and economics are actor-oriented studies. They take off from some rather fixed assump­tions about the framework or parameters within which actions take place — the institutional framework of politics, or the concept of the market. Within these parameters, they can often give quite precise answers to specific questions. Political scientists can analyse political processes within existing structures and possibly give useful advice to politicians about how to gain or retain office or what policy options are feasible in terms of public support. Economists use the relationships derived from the rather abstract concept of a market to predict outcomes under different conditions. Both provide examples of the application of problem-solving theory.

Political economy, by contrast, is concerned with the historically constituted frameworks or structures within which political and economic activity takes place. It stands back from the apparent fixity of the present to ask how the existing structures came into being and how they may be changing, or how they may be induced to change. In this sense, political economy is critical theory.

Historical structures

There is, of course, no absolute distinction between actors and structures. It is not a question of sacrificing the one or the other. Structures are formed by collective human activity over time. Struc­tures, in turn, mould the thoughts and actions of individuals. Historical change is to be thought of as the reciprocal relationship of structures and actors. There is a difference, however, between thinking of this actor—structure relationship as a process configuring structural change, and thinking of actions as confined within fixed, given structures in the manner of problem-solving theory.

Link: Anti-Imperialism

You’re K of IR maintains biopolitics and control by ignoring their causes—socioeconomics. Class is the THE TRUTH.

**Halliday ’94** [Fred, professor of international relations at the London School of Economics, ‘A Necessary Encounter: Historical Materialism and International Relations’ in Rethinking International Relations (Basingstoke: Macmillan), 47-73]

If realism can detach itself from its cousins -- social Darwinism, racism and *Machtpolitik* -- so can an interpretive Marxism be distinguished from its instrumental companion. Such a distinction involves above all an examination of what Marx and Engels themselves wrote, and of the work of independent Marxists who, throughout the Leninist and orthodox communist domination of the subject, sought to provide an alternative interpretation to that of the dogmatists. 1 Just as in sociology, history and other social sciences this independent, broadly 'Western', Marxist current has been able to establish a recognised and analytically fruitful body of work, so there exists the potential for it to do so in the realm of IR. It is this claim which the following chapter seeks to explore, with regard to a potential interaction of International Relations and the Marxist tradition. Despite many decades of potential interaction, the establishment of a relationship between historical materialism and the discipline of international relations is still at an initial stage. At various stages in the history of the discipline, there have been surveys of the implications of Marxism for International Relations in which already constituted points of contact have been identified. 2 Since the 1970s a number of writers have advocated further theoretical work, be it the elaboration of a general Marxist approach to International Relations, or the development of domains in which the International Relations discipline, as presently constituted, can strengthen its analytic endeavours by drawing on specific elements within historical materialism. 3 In an innovative and judicious study, Andrew Linklater has examined the implications for IR of 'critical' Marxism, while stressing the constraints which the international system imposes on any emancipatory project. 4 However, in contrast to such other areas of the social sciences as -48- sociology, economics or history, historical materialism has never occupied a secure place within International Relations; there are many who seek to limit its application, be this explicitly, as was the case with those who denied its relevance, such as Martin Wight and Hans Morgenthau, or implicitly, by relegating it to a minor place, or by presenting it in a selective interpretation, such that its pertinence is constricted. 5 This is achieved above all by blocking out the main theoretical questions of Marxism. The fact that IR is almost wholly silent on what for Marxism is the central category of modern social analysis, namely capitalism, is itself indicative. Equally, as discussed in Chapter 8, the degree to which the Cold War embodied not just competing strategic interests, but different socio-economic ones, has been ignored in most IR literature. The sources of this failure lie on both sides of the relationship. International Relations as a discipline has arisen primarily within British and American universities, and as a theoretical derivative of other disciplines in the social sciences. Neither institutional context, nor theoretical influence, have been ones in which Marxism has had a prominent or generally recognised place. On the other hand, historical materialism has not itself developed the theoretical focus needed for a comprehensive and generally intelligible contribution to International Relations. Much of what was produced in the name of Marxism, by communist regimes or those following them, was vulgar polemic, a repetition of certain standard, formulaic, readings of Marxism itself and concentrated around a justification of political interests. The confining of Marxist discussion of the international to the question of 'imperialism', and a one-sided and banal interpretation of the phenomenon at that, was as much the responsibility of those espousing Marxism as of those opposed to it. 6 Those who, within the independent currents of historical materialism, have sought to elaborate a Marxist approach to International Relations have laboured under the theoretical difficulties that confront those who seek to analyse politics, and ideological factors, within the confines of specific states themselves.

# 

Link: Revolution

**Their aff can’t access the revolution – the revolution is not a simple moment in time – their Utopian alternative fails to examine cultural and political history and thus doesn’t achieve true social change**

**Jameson '96** - head of the Lit. program @ Duke (Fredric, "Five theses on actually existing Marxism," April, 1996, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_n11_v47/ai_18205164/?tag=content;col1>, RG)

But such arguments in their turn presuppose the taking of a position on what is surely the central concept in any Marxian "unity-of-theory-and-practice," namely Revolution itself This is the case because it is the untenability of that concept that is the principal exhibit in the post- or anti-Marxian arsenal. The defense of this concept, however, requires a number of preliminary preparations: in particular, we need to abandon to iconology everything that suggests that revolution is a punctual moment rather than an elaborate and complex process. For example, many of our most cherished iconic images of the various historical revolutions, such as the taking of the Winter Palace and the Tennis Court Oath, need to be set aside.Social revolution is not a moment in time, but it can be affirmed in terms of the necessity of change in what is a synchronic system, in which everything holds together and is interrelated with everything else. Such a system then demands a kind of absolute systemic change, rather than piecemeal 'reform," which turns out to be what is in the pejorative sense "Utopian," that is, illusory, not feasible. That is to say that the system demands the ideological vision of a radical social alternative to the existing social order, something which can no longer be taken for granted or inherited, under the state of current discursive struggle, but which demands reinvention. Religious fundamentalism (whether Islamic, Christian, or Hindu), that claims to offer a radical alternative to consumerism and "the American way of life," only comes into significant being when the traditional Left alternatives, and in particular the great revolutionary traditions of Marxism and communism, have suddenly seemed unavailable.

Link: Terrorism

Terrorism is the result of historical and material deprivation—Liberalism ignores this and casts off folks who are disadvantaged and labels them radicals.

Mousseau '3- Associate prof of IR @ Koc Univ in Istanbul, Turkey (Michael, "Market Civilization and Its Clash with Terror," International Security, 27(3), p.5-29, Project MUSE

Those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder are the most vulnerable to the negative consequences associated with globalization. Those with the most to lose, however, are patrons and their lieutenants who hold privileged positions in the old clientalist hierarchies. This is why leaders of terrorist organizations frequently come from privileged backgrounds. To maintain the clientalist structure that carries with it higher social status, these leaders seek to rally their client base by appealing to some antimarket ideology. Because it is in a [End Page 19] client's interest to have a powerful patron, leaders attract and maintain followers by demonstrations of strength. In this way, the mass murder of Westerners serves two purposes: It reflects the leader's power, and it taps into widespread antimarket fury. **Islam itself is not responsible for the social approval of terror**. Patrons fearing the loss of their privileged status—such as Osama bin Laden—find an antimarket ideology useful to attract followers. They manipulate Islam to serve their own ends, just like their counterparts in Europe did a century ago by contorting Christianity to justify terror and mass murder. [51](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v027/27.3mousseau.html#FOOT51) In fact, Islam emerged in Mecca, the center of sixth-century Mediterranean and South Asian trade, and the Koran stress the market values of universalism, equity, contractual exchange, and a degree of tolerance toward outsiders (non-Muslims). [52](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v027/27.3mousseau.html#FOOT52) The market economy in this region declined before market norms—and liberal culture—intensified and expanded throughout the Islamic world, but the liberal origins of Islam demonstrate that religion can be interpreted, and manipulated, to suit anyone's purposes. In societies steeped in market values, it is difficult to comprehend how anyone can engage in the mass murder of out-groups, or how anyone can support it. Individuals with market values believe that each person is responsible only for his or her actions. Just as those who are not parties to contracts cannot be made obligated to them, individuals cannot be assumed to be responsible for any and all behavior of other members of their apparent in-group. It therefore seems absurd to blame individuals for the alleged bad behavior of others, and this is the social origin of the presumption of individual innocence in market societies. From the clientalist perspective, in contrast, no one is innocent: Individuals share responsibility for the actions of others within the in-group; if followers do not support their leaders, then they are betraying the entire in-group. From the clientalist perspective, all in-group members are privileged and all out-group members are enemies or, at best, outsiders unworthy of empathy. [End Page 20] A paucity of empathy is necessary for doing harm to, and tolerating the suffering of, all out-group members. This is why international human rights are a concern promoted mostly by market democracies. It is also why widespread social support for both terrorism and sectarian violence frequently arises in developing countries but not in countries with deeply integrated markets. [53](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v027/27.3mousseau.html" \l "FOOT53) Clientalist values also lie at the core of the social approval of suicidal mass murder. From the market perspective, all behavior should have some immediate utility for the parties to a contract. It is thus difficult to comprehend the efficacy of suicide. But in cultures where the individual is less important than the group and the absence of science increases devotion to insular beliefs, suicide—under conditions of extreme socioeconomic disruption—may emerge as a socially approved way of expressing ultimate loyalty to the in-group. In this way, cultural insularism, characterized by the absence of a market economy, is a necessary condition for the social approval of suicidal mass murder and sectarian violence. Cultural insularism combined with a particular grievance—such as the negative consequences associated with globalization—can create a deadly mix for Americans and other Westerners. Although latent anti-Americanism and anti-Westernism exist throughout much of the developing world, these are most likely to rise to the surface during economic crises—when nascent middle classes lose their status and turn against emerging liberal values. This is what is happening, for example, in Indonesia where the recent collapse of the local currency has eliminated the savings of the middle class, just as hyperinflation devastated the savings of Germany's middle class seventy-five years ago. Recent terrorist acts against Indonesian Christians (as symbols of the West) and Westerners directly (the November 2002 bombing of a disco in Bali) are reminiscent of Germany's middle class turning against those it identified with market values, such as European Jews and the West. The West, in this sense, means market civilization. [End Page 21]

\*\*\*A2: Impact Turns/ Impact Extensions:\*\*\*

Impact: Nuclear War

Capitalism makes nuclear annihilation inevitable

Meszaros 2000 (Istvan, Prof. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Sussex. Monthly Review. January, 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 idalize—capitalissm 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.

.

Impacts: Extinction

Transition from capitalism to socialism is necessary to solve poverty and human misery, avoid our extinction.

Harry **Magdoff**, editor, **and** Fred **Magdoff**, Professor, Plant and Soil Science, University of Vermont, “Approaching Socialism,” MONTHLY REVIEW v. 57 n. 3, July-August 20**05**. Available from the World Wide Web at: [www.monthlyreview.org/0705magdoffs1.htm](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0705magdoffs1.htm), accessed 4/12/06.

The critical social, economic, and environmental problems of the world are inherent to capitalism. Thus, capitalism must be replaced with an economy and society at the service of humanity—necessitating also the creation of an environment that protects the earth’s life support systems. What we have described above are suggested basic principles and issues that will need consideration during the construction of a socialist society. The experiences of the Soviet Union and China indicate that the attainment of a mobilized and educated populace willing and capable of taking power—understanding the basic problems and limitations and capable of checking the growth of a new bureaucratic class or strata—will not come easily. However, we must learn how to do so if there is to be any hope of significantly improving the conditions of the vast number of the world’s people who are living hopelessly under the most severe conditions while also preserving the earth as a livable planet. This is necessary not only for humans but for all the other species that share the planet with us and whose fortunes are intimately tied to ours.

Class-based mobilization is the only way to avert environmental destruction, our extinction.

Democratic Socialist Party, “Chapter V: Political Consequences of the Environmental Crisis,” ENVIRONMENT, CAPITALISM, AND SOCIALISM, online edition, 2004. Available from the World Wide Web at: [www.dsp.org.au/dsp/ECS/Chapter5.htm](http://www.dsp.org.au/dsp/ECS/Chapter1.htm), accessed 4/22/06.

In solidarity with, and as members of environmental movements, we emphasise two points above all. Firstly, that even relatively small attempts at defending and bettering the environment can come into conflict with capitalist property relations. Secondly, that to succeed in achieving its objectives the environment movement needs to orient itself toward the mobilisation of the working class, the only social class that has the social power to liberate society from environmental destruction. While the environment crisis threatens the survival of all humanity, the survival of the capitalists as a class is dependent on the maintenance of a social system that is by its very nature environmentally destructive. By contrast, the working class has no objective stake in the preservation of the capitalist private profit system, which is the root source of its own oppression. Furthermore, wage workers are usually the chief victims of environmental destruction, being forced to live in the most polluted suburbs and work with dangerous substances.

Impacts: Extinction

Collapsing capitalism is driving u.s. efforts to dominate the globe--this process produces levels of violence that threaten our very survival.

John Bellamy Foster, Professor, University of Oregon, “Imperialism and Empire,” 2001. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://werple.net.au/~andy/blackwood/bellamy-foster.htm>, accessed 4/10/05.

At the core of Mészáros’ argument is the proposition that we are now living within what is “the potentially deadliest phase of imperialism” (the title of the second chapter of his book). Imperialism, he says, can be divided into three distinct historical phases: (1) early modern colonialism, (2) the classic phase of imperialism as depicted by Lenin, and (3) global hegemonic imperialism, with the U.S. as its dominant force. The third phase was consolidated following the Second World War, but it became “sharply pronounced” with the onset of capital’s structural crisis in the 1970s (p. 51). Unlike most analysts, Mészáros argues that U.S. hegemony did not end in the 1970s, though by 1970 the U.S. had suffered a decline in its relative economic position vis á vis the other leading capitalist states when compared with the 1950s. Rather, the 1970s, starting with Nixon’s abandonment of the dollar-gold standard, mark the beginning of a much more determined effort on the part of the U.S. state to establish its global preeminence in economic, military and political terms — to constitute itself as a surrogate global government. At the present stage of the global development of capital, Mészáros insists, “it is no longer possible to avoid facing up to a fundamental contradiction and structural limitation of the system. That limitation is its grave failure to constitute the state of the capital system as such, as complementary to its transnational aspirations and articulation.” Thus it is here that “the United States dangerously bent on assuming the role of the state of the capital system as such, subsuming under itself by all means at its disposal all rival powers,” enters in, as the closest thing to a “state of the capital system.” (pp. 28-29). But the United States, while it was able to bring a halt to the decline in its economic position relative to the other leading capitalist states, is unable to achieve sufficient economic dominance by itself to govern the world system — which is, in any case, ungovernable. It therefore seeks to utilize its immense military power to establish its global preeminence.\* “What is at stake today,” Mészáros writes, is not the control of a particular part of the planet — no matter how large — putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means — even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones — at its disposal. This is what the ultimate rationality of globally developed capital requires, in its vain attempt to bring under control its irreconcilable antagonisms. The trouble is, though, that such rationality — which can be written without inverted commas, since it genuinely corresponds to the logic of capital at the present historical stage of global development — is at the same time the most extreme irrationality in history, including the Nazi conception of world domination, as far as the conditions required for the survival of humanity are concerned (pp. 37-38).

History K

Counter-narratives of history are key to breakdown capitals control of historical time—without historical grounding—their impact turns are irrelevant.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.271-272,

Thus, **radically overcoming capital's necessary abuse of time- which degrades human beings to the condition of "time's carcase," denying them the power of self determination as real subjects-is vital for the creation of an alternative social order.** Decapitated and short- circuited time cannot be remedied at the general societal level alone. **The conditions of individual and social emancipation cannot be separated from-let alone opposed to-one another. They prevail or fail together**, on the temporal plane of simultaneity**. For one is as fully required for the realization of the other, as the other way round. One cannot wait for the emancipation of the individuals until even the elementary general objectives of social transformation are successfully accomplished. For who on earth could take even the first steps of a comprehensive social transformation if not the individuals who can- and do-identify themselves with their chosen society's objectives and values? But to do that, the particular social individuals must liberate themselves from the straitjacket of decapitated time narrowly imposed upon them. They can do that only by acquiring the power of autonomous, conscious, and responsible decision makings with its proper non-adversarially enlarged perspective of meaningful life- activity.** This is how it becomes possible to constitute an alternative social metabolic order on a historically sustainable timescale. And that is what confers true meaning on planning as a vital principle of the socialist enterprise.

Solvency: Historicism 1st Priority

Capitalism forecloses historical contradictions, highlighting short-term gains—our aff/alt fosters historical consciousness which must be the ideological starting point for social change.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.35-36,

No individual and no conceivable form of society today or in the future can avoid the objective determinations and the corresponding burden of historical time, together with the responsibility necessarily arising from them. In general terms, perhaps the greatest indictment of our given social order is that it degrades the inescapable burden of meaningful historical time-the life-time of both the individuals and of humanity---into the tyranny of capital's reified time-imperative~ irrespective of the consequences. Capital's historically unique mode of social metabolic reproduction must degrade time because the most fundamental objective determination of its own form of human interchange is the irrepressible drive to continued self-expansions defined by the intrinsic characteristics of this mode of societal interchange as necessary capital- expansion achievable in commodity society only through the exploitation of labor-time. Thus capital must become blind to all dimensions of time other than that of maximally exploitable surplus-labor and the corresponding labor-time. This is why all possible value and meaning potentially arising from historically created relations must be obliterated from capital's equations~ other than those directly linked to the systemic imperative of capital-accumulation. This is so whether the potential meaning and values involved are concerned with the personal relations of the individuals among themselves as separate individuals, or with the social groups of which the particular individuals form a part, or indeed with humanity in general when that relationship can be and must be consciously grasped, under determinate historical circumstances, like our own historical time today. Meaning and values become legitimate concerns in this reproductive system only if they are readily reducible to the capitalistically idealized cash nexus (as regards the isolated individuals), or to the imperative of profitability in general, when the issue at stake is the accumulation-securing class relation of structural domination and exploitation in the established social order. Naturally, our interest in this context is human historical time, and not some "metaphysical" or "cosmological" considerations of time. For us the time relations linked to the question of "cosmological contingency"-regarding, for instance, the possibility of other earth-like planets which might be capable of supporting advanced forms of life in far away solar systems: a well-known part of some ongoing astrophysical enquiry today-are totally irrelevant. But focusing on human historical time does not mean that any form of relativism is acceptable in our assessment of meaningful time relations. On the contrary, the question of historical necessity is a vital issue here, although it must be evaluated in a qualitatively different way from those who, with hostile ideological intent, try to ascribe a crude mechanical deterministic view to the Marxian-profoundly dialectical-conception of historical time. For the core meaning of human historical necessity is precisely that it is only historical, which means that it is an ultimately disappearing necessity (eine verschwindende Notwendigkeit in Marx's words l), and should not be treated on the model of naturalistic determinations.

Solvency: Intellectuals

Disregarding our alternative in favor of the system is a bourgeois attempt to control individual and collective agency and ignores that individuals, specifically intellectuals can create structural change by engaging in a struggle for emancipation.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P 51-55,

Sadly, this is how the emancipatory quest of the Enlightenment tradition ends in modern bourgeois historiography. The great representatives of the bourgeoisie in the ascendant attempted to found historical knowledge by elucidating the power of the human historical subject to "make history:' even if they could not consistently carry through their inquiry to the originally intended conclusion. Now, every single constituent of their approach must be liquidated. The very idea of "making history" is discarded, with undisguised contempt for all those who might still entertain it, since the only history that should be contemplated is the one already made, which is supposed to remain with us to the end of time. Hence, while it is right and proper to chronicle the "Downfall of the Habsburg Empire:' the intellectual legitimacy of investigating the objective trends and antagonisms of historical development which foreshadow the necessary dissolution of the British and French Empires-or, for that matter, also of the politically and militarily much more mediated and diffused post- war structures of overwhelmingly U.S-dominated imperialism-all this must be a priori ruled out of court. In the same way, the reluctant acknowledgement of the individuals' limitations in imposing the adopted state policy decisions "of absorbing interest" on historical development does not lead to a more realistic grasp of the dialectical reciprocities at work between individuals and their classes in the constitution of the historical subject, nor to the recognition of the inescapable collective parameters of historically relevant action. On the contrary, it brings the skeptical dissection and complete elimination of the historical subject, with devastating consequences for the theories which can be constructed within such horizons. For once the historical subject is thrown overboard, not only the possibility of making but also of understanding history must suffer the same fate, as the great figures of the Enlightenment had correctly recognized while trying to find solutions to the problems confronting them. And finally, the ironical outcome of all this for the historians concerned is that their own enterprise, too, completely loses its raison d'être. A predicament which they bring upon themselves in the course of attempting to undermine the ground of those who refuse to give up the closely interconnected concepts of "historical subject:' "making history:' and "understanding history:' thereby also necessarily breaking all links with the positive aspects of the philosophical tradition to which they belong. In the end, what is left to them as a "way out" is the arbitrary generalization and idealization of a dubious intellectual stance which must turn in its search for skeptical self-assurance not only against its social adversary but even against its own ancestry. They try to hide the contradictions of the solutions they end up with behind the ideology of universal "meaninglessness:' coupled with the apparently self-evident viability of presenting, instead, "patterns" with descriptive "completeness": a hopelessly self-defeating aspiration, if ever there was one. And they justify their programmatic evasion of comprehensive issues-from which the question of how to make intelligible the trends and necessities that emerge from the individuals' pursuit of their socially circumscribed ends cannot be eliminated-on the ground that they properly belong to the "inscrutable depths" of cosmic mysteries. If we look for the reasons behind the depressing trajectory of this radical reversal-from the Enlightenment's preoccupation with human meaning and its progressive realization in history, to the apotheosis of cosmic pessimism and universal meaninglessness-one particular factor stands out, more than anything else, with its weighty and irreversible significance, directly affecting the philosophical tradition in question in its qualitatively altered phases of development. It concerns the objectively given conditions and possibilities of emancipation, as well as the varying social constraints involved in their conceptualizations under different historical circumstances. In truth, already the emancipatory quest of the great historical tradition of the Enlightenment suffers from the constraints which induce its major representatives to leave the question of the historical subject nebulously and abstractly defined (or undefined). This is due partly to the individualistic presuppositions of the philosophers who belong to this tradition, and partly to the potentially antagonistic heterogeneity of the social forces to which they are linked at the given phase of historical confrontations. Thus, what we encounter here, even under circumstances most favorable to the articulation of bourgeois historical conceptions, is the-at first latent, but inexorably growing- presence of untranscendable social antagonisms which find their way to the structuring core of the respective philosophical syntheses. Understandably, therefore, the closure of the historical period in question, in the aftermath of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, brings to light a truly ambivalent achievement. On the one hand, it gives rise to the greatest bourgeois conceptualization of the historical dynamics, at the highest level of generalization, magisterially anticipating within the abstract categorical confines of its horizons the objective logic of capital's global unfolding, coupled with truly epoch-making insights into the key role of labor in historical development. On the other hand, however, it also produces the formerly unimaginable expansion of the mystifying arsenal of ideology. Significantly, the two are combined in the internally torn and even in its own terms extremely problematical synthesis of the Hegelian system; with its "identical Subject and Object" and its "cunning of Reason" in place of the real historical subject; with the reduction of the historical process to the "circle of circles" of the self-generating "progress of the Concept only:' in his construction of the categorial edifice of The Science of Logic as well as in the claimed "true Theodicy" of The Philosophy of History; and with the suppression of historical temporality at the critical juncture of the present, self-contradictorily <CONTINUED>

Solvency: Intellectuals

<CONTINUED>

ending up with the biggest lie of all in a theory that purports to be historical-namely that "Europe is absolutely the end of history"~-after defining the task of Universal History as the demonstration of "how Spirit comes to a recognition and adoption of the Truth. In this sense, hand in hand with the consolidation of the social order after the French Revolution go some highly significant conceptual transformations. At first, the sociohistorical substance and the explanatory value of "class struggles" is recognized by bourgeois historians, even if they try to insert this concept into an increasingly more conservative overall framework. Later, however, all such categories must be completely discarded as nineteenth-century concepts, characteristically ascribing them to Marx (although Marx himself never claimed originality in this respect) in order to be able to get rid of their own intellectual heritage without embarrassment. The Enlightenment's quest for emancipation suffers the same fate of being relegated to the remote past in all its major aspects, more and more being referred to-at best-as a "noble illusion?' When, "from the standpoint of political economy" (which represents the vantage point of capital's established order), the question is how to prevent that history be made by the subordinate classes in furtherance of a new social order, the historical pessimism of "growing meaninglessness:' and the radical skepticism that tries to discredit the very idea of "making history?' are perfectly in tune with the dominant material and ideological interests. At the same time, however, the social forces engaged in the struggle for emancipation from the rule of capital cannot give up either the project of "making history" or the idea of instituting a new social order Not on account of some perverse inclination towards messianic "holism:' but simply because the realization of even their most limited immediate objectives-like food, shelter, basic healthcare, and education, as far as the overwhelming majority of humankind is concerned-is quite inconceivable without radically challenging the established order whose very nature consigns them, of necessity, to their powerless position of structural subordination in society.

Method 1st: Ext

Methodology is the foremost point of departure to any political query. you should evaluate epistemology first because the way you think about problems determines how you respond to them and the consequences they engender.

Smith ‘96

[Steve, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, “Positivism and Beyond,” International theory: Positivism and beyond, New York: Cambridge University Press, 12-1 3//

But the stakes are also high because of the links between theory and practice. International theory underpins and informs international practice, even if there is a lengthy lag between the high- point of theories and their gradual absorption into political debate. Once established as common sense, theories become incredibly powerful since they delineate not simply what can be known but also what it is sensible to talk about or suggest. Those who swim outside these safe waters risk more than simply the judgement that their theories are wrong; their entire ethical or moral stance may be ridiculed or seen as dangerous iust because their theoretical assumptions are deemed as unrealistic. Defining common sense is therefore the ultimate act of political power. In this sense what is at stake in debates about epistemology is very significant for political practice. Theories do not simply explain or predict, they tell us what possibilities exist for human action and intervention they define not merely our explanatory possibilities but also our ethical and practical horizons. In this Kantian light epistemology matters, and the stakes are far more considerable than at first sight seem to be the case.

A2: Permutation (1/9)

No alternative args are false—operating beyond capital is key to equality and development.

John Bellamy Foster, Introduction, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P12-13,

Beyond Capital helped extend the range of the Marxian critique by including powerful gender-based and ecological conceptions of human emancipation as integral components in the transcendence of the regime of capital, without which the needed conditions of substantive equality and genuine sustainable development could not be attained. More than any other work, it highlighted the uncontrollability and wastefulness of capital. The entire reign of capital, Mészáros argued, was approaching its absolute limits as a result of its increasing inability to displace its internal contradictions, creating a global structural crisis of capital. Rather than accepting Margaret Thatcher's proclamation "there is no alternative," Beyond Capita! insisted that the only viable alternative required a complete shift in control over society from capital to the associated producers. The social democratic dream of a "hybrid" system (a reconciliation of capitalism with social welfare) had to be discarded as illusory. Failing to touch the capital system's inner metabolism through its reforms, social democracy was everywhere devolving into neoliberalism or crude capitalism. The penetrating nature of the analysis exhibited in Beyond Capita! can be seen in Mészáro's recognition as early as 1995 that Hugo Chavez in Venezuela was charting the necessary alternative path when he stated: "The sovereign people must transform itself into the object and the subject of power. This option is not negotiable for revolution- aries?'6 Subsequently, Chavez as Venezuelan president was to draw directly on Beyond Capital's analysis, incorporating within his own perspective its insistence on the need for communal exchange of activities in opposition to capitalist commodity exchange. Chavez thus followed Mészáros in designating communal exchange as the "Archimedean point" of revolutionary social transformation.~ Through the direct exchange of activities between nations in the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA), the rise of Venezuela's communal councils, new Constituent Assemblies in Venezuela and Bolivia aimed at dissolving the political hegemony of transnational capital, and the spread of workplace cooperatives in the current Latin American revolt-the near-absolute dominance of capitalist commodity exchange is being loosened.

A2: Permutation (2/9)

Our alternative cannot succeed without radically reorienting social reproduction—the system will re-articulate any gains to protect capital, preventing future progression.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P47-48,

Thus, within the framework of the existing socioeconomic system a multiplicity of potentially dialectical interconnections are reproduced in the form of perverse practical dualisms, dichotomies, and antinomies, reducing human beings to a reified condition (whereby they are brought to a common denominator with, and become replaceable by, "locomotives" and other machines) and to the ignominious status of "time's carcase." And since the possibility of practically manifesting and realizing the inherent worth and human specificity of the individuals through their essential productive activity is blocked off as a result of this process of alienating reduction (which makes "one man during an hour worth just as much as another man"), value as such becomes an extremely problematical concept. For, in the interest of capitalist profit- ability, not only can there be no room left for the actualization of the individuals' specific worth but, worse still, counter-value must unceremoniously prevail over value and assert its absolute domination as the one and only admissible practical value-relation. The alternative socialist accountancy cannot prevail unless it succeeds in radically reorienting the process of societal reproduction in its entirety by breaking the tyranny of capital's dehumanizing time imperative. The fundamental categories of the social reproduction process, as inherent in the vital first-order mediations of a sustainable dialectical interaction between humanity and nature on an indefinite historical timescale, have been subverted in the course of development, especially in the last three centuries under the fetishistic imperatives of capital's social metabolic control. Thus the all-important achievement of humanity in the form of potentially emancipatory free time, embodied in society's productively expanding surplus-labor\_ which happens to be both the precondition as well as the promising storehouse of all future advancement, once extricated from its alienating capitalist integument-has been forced into the ultimately suffocating straitjacket of surplus-value under the corollary imperative of reducing necessary labor-time to the minimum, so as to be managed by the system's not only dehumanizing but also in historical terms increasingly more anachronistic time accountancy

A2: Permutation (3/9)

The alternative is the only way to change the social order—not changing the structure of capitalism at its root results in pessimism and distortion of radical change.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P 50-51,

We are told that we can only understand history in terms of the immediacy of appearance-so that the question of taking control of the underlying structural determinations by grasping the socioeconomic laws at work cannot even arise-while resigning ourselves to the paralyzing conclusion that "if sense there be," it cannot be found any more in historically produced and historically changeable social relations, shaped by human purpose, than in cosmic nature, hence it must forever "escape our perception?' Naturally, the pessimistic skepticism of theories of this kind- which, however, do not hesitate to be stern castigators of all "overall conceptions" (exemplified also by the "postmodern" tirades against "grand narratives")\_need not oppose social practice in genera! in the name of the otherwise stipulated necessary "withdrawal from the world." The need for the latter arises only when major structural change-with reference to some radical overall conception-is implicit in the advocated action. So long as everything can be contained within the parameters of the established order, the "unity of theory and practice" need not be condemned as one of Marx's many alleged "confusions." On the contrary, under such circumstances it can be praised as a highly positive aspect of the intellectual enterprise, lust as we find it, in fact, in Sir Lewis Namier's observation according to which "it is remarkable how much perception is sharpened when the work serves a practical purpose of absorbing interest," with reference to his own study, "The Downfall of the I-labsburg Monarchy," the fruit of work "in Intelligence Departments, first under, and next in, the Foreign Offlce."13 Thus, historical skepticism, no matter how extreme, is quite selective in its diagnoses and in the definition of its targets. For if the subject at issue involves the possibility of envisaging major structural transformations, then it preaches the "meaninglessness" of our predicament and the unavoidability of the conclusion that "if sense there be, it escapes our perception." On the other hand, however, when the question is: how to sustain with all the necessary means and measures the established order, despite its antagonisms, and how to divide the spoils of (or how to move into the vacuum created by) the dying Habsburg Empire, such "practical purpose of absorbing interest," in the service of the Intelligence Departments of another doomed Empire, the British, will miraculously "sharpen perception" and lay to rest the troublesome nuisance of skepticism.

A2: Permutation-Extinction (4/9)

A complete negation of the system from outside the structure is key to solve the pitfalls of prior movements. Relying on the system to fix its own problems results the end of humanity.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P 251-252,

Past history testifies to many instances of not only noble efforts dedicated to introducing significant social changes in order to overcome some major contradictions but also to some partial successes in the originally envisaged direction. All too often, however) the successes have been sooner or later rolled back by the subsequent restoration of the dependency relations of the earlier status quo. The primary reason for such developments was the fateful inertia of structural inequality reproduced in one form or another throughout history, despite some change in personnel from time to time at the apex of society. For structural inequality acted as an anchor, with shorter or longer chains attached to it, invariably dragging the ship back to a position from which there seemed to be no possibility of further progress in the journey, no matter how well intentioned might have been some of the personnel of the ship during a major historical tempest. And to make things worse, this historically determinate and humanly alterable predicament of the people dominated by the existing order was on a regular basis conceptualized and ideologically rationalized as a fatality of nature, even when it had to be conceded that the prevailing structural inequality was very far from being an all-round beneficial one. The necessary corollary of this kind of rationalization-and justification of the unjustifiable-was that social iniquity as an allegedly unalterable determination of nature (said to be well in tune with "human nature") is permanent and tenable. But what if the notion of permanence as such is put into question by evidence of a clearly identifiable and menacing historical change? For as soon as it must be admitted that human historical time is not measurable in terms of the permanence of nature) not to mention the fact that the lasting temporality of nature itself on our planet is being catastrophically undermined by the ongoing destructive intervention in nature by perverse socioeconomic forces, the whole reasoning of anti-historical justification collapses. At that point, it becomes imperative to orient our- selves well within the potentialities and limitations of real historical time, with a view to radically overcoming the perilous social antagonisms that point in the direction of putting an end to human history. At that point in time, exactly where we stand today, the elaboration of the required remedies in the form of a sustainable alternative social order, together with appropriate safeguards to make that order irreversible, becomes an unavoidable historical challenge. For without successfully meeting that challenge, given the urgency of a unique historical time when the survival of humanity is at stake-under the shadow of both the apparently uncontrollable accumulation and deployment of the "real" and not cynically and self-servingly fictionalized weapons of mass destruction, and of capital's devastating encroachment on nature, humankind cannot risk relapsing into an ever more destructive social order, as if we had the infinity of time at our disposal before we have to undertake some corrective action.

A2: Permutation (5/9)

Piecemeal reform only humanizes the system and allows its subordination to continue—radical socialist critique is key.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P. 257-258,

What is at stake here is the vitally important relationship of genuine non-hierarchical coordination, as opposed to all known and feasible forms of structurally enforced domination and subordination. It is one of the favorite devices of the adversaries of socialism to decree the impossibility of taking substantive decisions-in contrast to participating in formalized events, like parliamentary elections or referenda-whenever the numbers of people involved are very large and the issues themselves varied. This preconceived disqualifying device works in the same way as the earlier mentioned rejection of the possibility of comprehensive qualitative change, declared to be inadmissible in contrast to the only acceptable approach of "piecemeal reform." On both occasions, the fetishism of quantity is invoked, in order to confer plausibility on the eternization of the existing order. In the first case, the direction of the emancipatory journey leading to a qualitative change is smuggled out of the picture, in order to he able to turn the real issue into a mechanical caricature of contesting quantities, ascribing victory-by definition, and nothing else-to the idealized "small degrees." In the same way, in the second case, our "complexity merchants" use the fetish of quantity to declare that "beyond a certain size of a community:' never really defined how small or large, substantive decision making cannot be carried out by its members, because there are too many of them. And this is supposed to completely invalidate the concept of participation in any meaningful sense of the term. This kind of reasoning is fallacious not only because right from the beginning it assumes the conclusion that it claims to prove but also, even more importantly, because it diverts attention from the real problem of what is the necessary condition for coordinating the microcosms of participatory decision making into a coherent and historically sustain- able social macrocosm. This is not a question of small or large size. Even the smallest community of two irreconcilably quarrelling people is far too large to be really sustainable. Rather, the only feasible solution of this problem requires the supersession of the adversarial and conflictual inner determination of the particular social microcosms in order to combine them into a positively developing social whole. Thus, the establishment of genuine nonhierarchical, and accordingly nonadversarial, coordination is the challenge facing us in our attempts to secure the future. For that is the only way in which effective participation at all levels of decision-making can positively prevail in the course of socialist development: through the all-embracing autonomous activity of the associated producers as the real subject of power.

A2: Permutation (6/9)

Planning for an alternative to capitalism within capitalism is impossible—the system will use economic rationality to subsume and rearticulate any gains.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P. 267-268,

The main reason why the normality of capital is incompatible with comprehensive planning is because the vital requirement of sustain- able socioeconomic orientation arises from the qualitative aspects of managing a humanly viable reproductive order. If it were simply a question of extending the time involved in capital's economic operations, this would be in principle feasible from the ruling system's standpoint. What intervenes in this regard as a prohibiting condition for resolving the apparently intractable problem is the total absence of a proper measure. A measure suitable to adequately assessing the qualitative human impact of the adopted productive practices~ even on a relatively short-term basis and not only in the long run, is absent. The highly irresponsible way in which the dominant capitalist countries, above all the United States, handle even the minimal requirements of the Kyoto Protocol is a good illustration of this point. Capital has no difficulties with impressive quantification~ and even with self-expansive multiplication~ provided that its projected productive expansion can be defined without any appeal to qualitative considerations either on the plane of material and human resources or with regard to time. In this sense, growth as a particularly important concept both in the present and in the future, must be handled by capital within the crippling confines of fetishistic quantification, although in reality it cannot be sustained at all as a form of productively viable strategy without applying to it profoundly qualitative considerations, as we shall see in the next section. In the same way, comprehensive plan- fling-in contrast to safely selective (as regards the particular productive targets which can be pursued) and temporally limited (short-term) interventions-is inadmissible because neither the scope nor the time- scale of humanly valid overall rationality is amenable to fetishistic quantification. The key concept here is not rationality in and of itself but the necessary determination of the required sustainable rationality by the inherent humanness of the adopted overall measure. Readily quatifiable partial rationality can be filly in tune with capital's operational imperatives within its productive microcosms4,ut not humanly valid overall rationality as the orienting framework and appropriate measure of the system as a whole. For the only thing that can define a viable and sustainable productive system with regard to its orienting overall rationality is human need itself: an inherently qualitative determination. Such qualitative overall determination can only arise from the reality of irrepressible, even if now capitalistically frustrated, human need. This is what is necessarily missing from the capital system's incorrigible self-definition and insurmountable overall determination. It is precisely for this reason that capital must subordinate use-value--which is totally meaningless without its qualitative relationship to clearly identifiable human need-to easily quantifiable exchange-value. The latter need not have anything at all to do with human need-only with the need of capital's extended self-reproduction. Indeed, it is thoroughly compatible with the triumph of destructive counter-value, as the gruesome reality of the military-industrial complex and its lucrative "capital-realizing" involvement in the directly anti-human practices of genocidal wars clearly demonstrate in our time.

A2: Permutation (7/9)

Any alternative to capital must address its contradictions, this requires total divorce from the system—the alternative is the only way to make the transition sustainable.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.275-276,

In order to create an economically viable and also, on a long-term basis, historically sustainable social reproductive order it is necessary to radically alter the self-contradictory inner determinations of the established one which impose the ruthless submission of human need and use to the alienating necessity of capital expansion. This means that the absurd precondition of the ruling productive system-where- by use-values, by preordained and totally iniquitous determinations of ownership, must be divorced from, and opposed to, those who create them, so as to bring about and circularly/arbitrarily legitimate capital's enlarged self-realization-has to be permanently relegated to the past. Otherwise, the only viable meaning of economy as rational economizing with the available, necessarily finite, resources cannot be instituted and respected as a vital orienting principle. Instead, irresponsible wastefulness dominates in capital's socioeconomic-and corresponding political-order which invariably reasserts itself as institutionalized irresponsibility, notwithstanding its self-mythology of absolutely insuperable "efficiency?' (To be sure, the kind of "efficiency" glorified in this way is in fact capital's ultimately self-undermining efficiency for blindly driving forward the adversarial and conflictual parts at the expense of the whole.) Understandably, therefore, the government's well-promoted fantasies of "market socialism" had to fizzle out in the form of a humiliating collapse, due to the acceptance of such presuppositions and capitalistically insuperable structural determinations.

A2: Permutation (8/9)

The permutation ignores that all productivity is tied to capitalist over-consumption—the aff alone is key.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.278,

To be sure, we can only speak of the positive potential of productivity and not of its existing reality, as often predicated, with green-colored good intentions but boundless illusions, by old fashioned single-issue reformers, wishfully asserting that we could do it "right now;' with the productive powers at our disposal today, if we really decided to do so. Unfortunately, however, such a conception completely ignores the way in which our productive system is presently articulated, requiring in the future a radical re-articulation. For productivity wedded to capitalist growth, in the form of the now dominant reality of destructive production, is a most forbidding adversary. In order to turn the positive potentiality of productive development into a much-needed reality, so as to be able to rectify many of the crying inequalities and injustices of our existing society, it would be necessary to adopt the regulative principles of a qualitatively different social order. In other words, humanity's now destructively negated potential of productivity would have to be liberated from its capitalist integument in order to become socially viable productive power.

A2: Permutation (9/9)

The limit of capitalist growth proves the need for total critique from outside the structure—a permutation is literally impossible.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.282-283

**There can be not even partial correctives introduced into capital's operational framework if they are genuinely quality-oriented.** For the only qualities relevant in this respect are not some abstract physical characteristics but the humanly meaningful qualities inseparable from need. It is true, of course, as stressed before, that such qualities are always specific, corresponding to clearly identifiable particular human needs both of the individuals themselves and of their historically given and changing social relations. Accordingly, in their many sided specificity they constitute a coherent and well-defined set of inviolable systemic determinations, with their own systemic limits. It is precisely the existence of such-very far from abstract-systemic limits which makes impossible to transfer any meaningful operating determinations and orienting principles from the envisaged alternative social metabolic order into the capital system. The two systems are radically exclusive of each other. For the specific qualities corresponding to human need, in the alternative order, carry the indelible marks of their overall systemic determinations, as integral parts of a humanly valid social reproductive system of control. In the capital system, on the contrary, the overall determinations must be inalterably abstract, because capital's value relation must reduce all qualities (corresponding to need and use) to measurable generic quantities, in order to assert its alienating historical dominance over everything, in the interest of capital expansion, irrespective of the consequences. The incompatibilities of the two systems become amply clear when we consider their relationship to the question of limit itself The only sustainable growth positively promoted under the alternative social metabolic control is based on the conscious acceptance of the limits whose violation would imperil the realization of the chosen-and humanly valid-reproductive objectives. Hence, wastefulness and destructiveness (as clearly identified limiting concepts) are absolutely excluded by the consciously accepted systemic determinations them- selves, adopted by social individuals as their vital orienting principles. By contrast, the capital system is characterized, and fatefully driven, by he-conscious or unconscious-rejection of all limits, including its own systemic limits. Even the latter are arbitrarily and dangerously treated as if they were nothing more than separable contingent obstacles. Hence, anything goes in this social reproductive system, including the possibility-and by the time we have reached our own historical epoch also the overwhelming grave probability-of total destruction. Naturally, this mutually exclusive relationship to the question of limits prevails also the other way round. Thus, there can be no "partial correctives" borrowed from the capital system when creating and strengthening the alternative social metabolic order. The partial-not to mention general-incompatibilities of the two systems arise from the radical incompatibility of their value dimension. As mentioned above, this is why the particular value determinations and relations of the alternative order could not be transferred into capital's social metabolic framework for the purpose of improving it, as postulated by some utterly unreal reformist design, wedded to the vacuous methodology of "little by little." For even the smallest relations of the alternative system are deeply embedded in the general value determinations of an overall framework of human needs whose inviolable elementary axiom is the radical exclusion of waste and destruction, in accord with its innermost nature.

A2: No Alternative

Saying that there is no alternative to capitalism is propagandistic distortion—abusing history and resulting in constant pessimism.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.24-25

Capital cannot tolerate any limitations to its own mode of social metabolic reproduction. Accordingly, considerations of time are totally inadmissible to it if they call for restraining its uncontrollable imperative for capital-expansion. There can be no exemption from that imperative. Not even when the devastating consequences are already glaringly obvious both in the field of production and on the terrain of the ecology. The only modality of time in which capital can be interested is exploitable labor time. This remains the case even when the ruthless exploitation of labor time becomes a historical anachronism through the potential development of science and technology in the service of human need. Since, however, capital cannot contemplate such an alternative, for pursuing it would require transcending the fetishistic structural limitations of its own mode of operation, capital becomes the enemy of history. That is the only way in which capital can presume extricating itself from its objective predicament of historical anachronism. Thus, capital must negate history in its vision of the world, so that the question of any historical alternative to its own rule should not even conceivably arise, no matter how anachronistic and dangerous its-despite all self-mythology very far from economically efficient- labor-exploitative control of social reproduction. But the trouble is that capital's negation of history is not a leisurely mental exercise. It is a potentially lethal practical process of enlarged capital-accumulation and concomitant destruction in every domain, and not only on the military plane. As we know, in the ascending phase of its development the capital system was immensely dynamic and in many ways also positive. Only with the passing of time-objectively bringing with it the intensification of the capital system's structural antagonisms-had it become a dangerous regressive force. If, however, the ruling reproductive order has no sense of historical time, as happens to be the case today, it can- not even perceive the difference, let alone make the necessary adjustments in accord with the changed conditions. Nihilation of history is the only feasible course of action, inseparable from capital's blindness to the painfully tangible future that must be faced. This is why capital has no alternative to abusing historical time. Its callous maxim, according to which "there is no alternative:' is only a propagandistic variant of the general negation of history corresponding to capital's innermost nature at the present stage of our historical development. This determination of capital was not always the case, but it has become inalterably so. Thus, capital's only way to relate to history in our time is to violently abuse it.

A2: Totalitarianism

Your conflation of our argument with the Soviets/Totalitarian movements is based on capitalist ignorance—our self-critical engagement of historical materialism is k2 overcome all forms of structural domination and subordination.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.30-31,

The twentieth century witnessed not only the first major attempt to establish a post-capitalist society, but also the implosion of that type of society both in the Soviet Union and all over Eastern Europe. Not surprisingly, the **uncritical defenders of capital's social order celebrate that implosion as the healthy return to their "natural" order after an erratic deviation. They have the nerve to postulate now the absolute permanence of the established conditions, notwithstanding all disturbing signs of dangerous instability, ignorant of the deepening economic and ecological crises and of the more or less permanent war endemic to their system. It would be extremely naive to imagine that the move from capital's social metabolic order of reproduction to a historically viable alternative could take place without painful contradictions and even relapses.** **For no social transformation in the entire course of human history required an even remotely comparable qualitative change.** This is so not only **because of the almost prohibitive scale and magnitude of the task, involving a great variety of interrelated national groups- with their long history and deeply rooted traditions as well as diverse interests-in a truly global setting**. What is radically different on top of that from all of the historically witnessed changes from one social formation to another-i.e., **the "non-negotiable" constituent of the required socialist transformation-is the absolute necessity to permanently overcome all forms of structural domination and subordination,** and not only that of the capitalist variety. **In our time no "change of personnel," however well intentioned at first, could even begin to match up to the task. In other words, the adversarial and conflicting relationship between human beings-which has been far too obvious in all known history-is what must be positively superseded through the creation and firmly secured consolidation of the new social order. Otherwise, uncontrollable contradictions and antagonisms will begin to mushroom on the newly established foundations sooner or later, as they actually did in Soviet-type societies, undermining and destroying them in the end. Only a genuine critical-and self-critical-engagement in the course of socialist historical transformation can produce the sustain- able result, by providing the necessary correctives as the conditions change and call for meeting their challenge.** Marx made this amply clear from the very beginning, when he insisted that socialist revolutions should not shirk from criticizing themselves "with unmerciful thoroughness" in order to be able to accomplish their vital emancipatory objectives.