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Transportation investment is the central part of capitalist mode of production

**Henderson ‘4** (Jason is Assistant Professor of Geography @ Department of Geography and Human Environment Studies in San Francisco State University. “Politics of Mobility and Business Elites in Atlanta” Urban Geography, 2004. 25.3. pp 193-216

<http://bss.sfsu.edu/jhenders/Writings/Henderson%20Politics%20of%20Mobility.pdf>

In The Limits to Capitol, David Harvey (1982) theorized that the capitalist mode of production actively produces and reproduces ageography that reflects its own needs, and that transportation is a major component of this production of space. Indeed. transportation is centralto any understanding of the political economy of capitalismbecause it provides the conditions for capital accumulation and provides for the social reproduction of labor (Hodge, 1990). Thus, the accumulation of capital is bound with the cost, speed, and capacity of the transport system to accommodate the turnover time of capital. Transportation is essential for production because it provides capitalists with the means to access raw materials, labor, and markets that are spatially separated from the production site.It is central to understanding the circulation of capital because capitalists seek spatial integration that links production localities together for exchange. Transportation minimizes the spatial barriers to the circulation of capital, allowing for smoother spatial integration and facilitating the "annihilation of space by time" (Harvey, 1983, p. 219). It is also constitutive of thephysical framework for consumption provided in the wider built environment because it enables the consumer to access commodities. The transportation system, then, is an example of how"investment in the built environment entails the creation of a whole physical landscape for the purposes of production, circulation, exchange, and consumption" (Harvey, 1983, p. 202). For Atlanta business elites facing the mobility crisis outlined in the previous section.another more immediate but inextricably related concern emerges out of the exchange value of property. Exchange value is the financial value of land when bought, sold, or rented (Logan and Isriolotch, 1987l. The exchange value of a particular land parcel is inherently dependent on how accessible it is, and thus landed capitalist interests have an inherent interest in making that property accessible to the transportation system. Capital-ist interestsmay seek to encourage the construction of roads or transit to enhance exchange values of land parcels in a downtown. They might also seek to have large airports or national highways built in their metropolitan area in order to increase the collective exchange value ofthe region. To make their respective parcels accessible, they must configure urban space in such a way to make the desired form of mobility possible. For almost SO years Atlanta had a growth coalition that was generally unified about the desired. form of mobility. That desired form of mobility was full "automobility," or the combined promotion of the motor vehicle (cars, trucks), the automobile industry, the highway and street networks and corollary services, plus the centering of society and everyday life around the car and its spaces (Gee Freund and Martin [1993] and Sheller and Urry [2000] for elaborations on automobility. and Gee Preston [1979] for the way Atlanta's business elite and political economy began to center on automobility by the 19200. Although corporate elites in big cities., including Atlanta, supported and even led efforts for rapid rail transit (see Whitt, 1932; Stone, 1989; AcHer, 1991) it was generally accepted that automobiles would dominate virmally all urban trave1.5 The ubiquity of the automobile was rooted in the underlying logic of capitalismand its relationship to "hard mobility.”

Extinction

Simonovic ‘7(LjubodragSimonovic, Ph.D., Philosophy; M.A., Law; author of seven books, 2007, A New World is Possible, “Basis of contemporary critical theory of capitalism.”)

Thefinal stageof a mortal combat between mankind and capitalism is in progress. A specificity of capitalism is that, in contrast to "classical" barbarism (which is of destructive, murderous and plundering nature), it annihilates life by creating a "new world" – a "technical civilization" and an adequate, dehumanized and denaturalized man. Capitalism has eradicated man from his (natural) environment and has cut off the roots through which he had drawn life-creating force. Cities are "gardens" of capitalism where degenerated creatures "grow". Dog excrement, gasoline and sewerage stench, glaring advertisements and police car rotating lights that howl through the night - this is the environment of the "free world" man. By destroying the natural environment capitalism creates increasingly extreme climatic conditions in which man is struggling harder and harder to survive – and creates artificial living conditions accessible solely to the richest layer of population, which causedefinitive degeneration of man as a natural being. "Humanization of life" is being limited to creation of micro-climatic conditions, of special capitalistic incubators - completely commercialized artificial living conditions to which degenerated people are appropriate. The most dramatic truth is: capitalism can survive the death of man as a human and biological being. For capitalism a "traditional man" is merely a temporary means of its own reproduction. "Consumer-man" represents a transitional phase in the capitalism-caused process of mutation of man towards the "highest" form of capitalistic man: a robot-man. "Terminators" and other robotized freaks which are products of the Hollywood entertainment industry which creates a "vision of the future" degenerated in a capitalist manner, incarnate creative powers, alienated from man, which become vehicles for destruction of man and life. A new "super race" of robotized humanoids is being created, which should clash with "traditional mankind", meaning with people capable of loving, thinking, daydreaming, fighting for freedom and survival - and impose their rule over the Earth. Instead of the new world, the "new man" is being created - who has been reduced to a level of humanity which cannot jeopardize the ruling order. Science and technique have become the basic lever of capital for the destruction of the world and the creation of "technical civilization". It is not only about destruction achieved by the use of technical means. It is about technicization of social institutions, of interpersonal relations, of the human body. Increasing transformation of nature into a surrogate of "nature", increasing dehumanization of the society and increasing denaturalization of man are direct consequences of capital's effort, within an increasingly merciless global economic war, to achieve complete commercialization of both natural andthe social environment. The optimism of the Enlightenment could hardly be unreservedly supported nowadays, the notion of Marx that man imposes on himself only such tasks as he can solve, particularly the optimism based on the myth of the "omnipotence" of science and technique. The race for profits has already caused irreparable and still unpredictable damage to both man and his environment. By the creation of "consumer society", which means through the transition of capitalism into a phase of pure destruction, such a qualitative rise in destruction of nature and mankind has been performed that life on the planet is literally facing a "countdown". Instead of the "withering away" (Engels) of institutions of the capitalist society, the withering away of life is taking place.

The alternative is to reject the aff to abandon belief in capitalism

**Johnston ‘4** (Adrian JOHNSTON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of New Mexico, 2004, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, Volume 9 // Issue 3

Perhaps the absence of a detailed practical roadmap in Žižek’s political writings isn’t a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby truly to open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Žižek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance 127 (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle 128). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of realrevolutionary practice (rather than remaining just an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the earlier analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing 93 more than a kind of “magic,” that is, the belief in money’s social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance’s powers. The “external” obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, “internally” believe in it—capitalism’s life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others’ belief in the socioperformative force emanating from this same material.

\*\*\*Links

# Transportation Policy

Transportation infrastructure investment smooth’s the system for effective functioning of capitalism

**Bieling and Deckwirth‘8** (Hans-Jürgen is Professor @ Department of Political Science, Philipps-Universität Marburg Christina is Research Assistant and PhD student @ Department of Political Science, Philipps-Universität Marburg. “Privatising public infrastructure within the EU: the interaction between supranational institutions, transnational forces and national governments” European Review of Labour and Research May 2008 vol. 14 no. 2 237-257SAGEPub.

In Europe, the expansion of public infrastructure networks began at the end of the 19th century when the supply of private services became problematic due to an overload of regulatory provisions and difficulties of public control. As a response to these problems, in most countries and sectors – either state-owned or municipal – public service organisations emerged. Different terms such as ‘public services’, ‘service public’ or ‘Daseinsvorsorge’, underline that the provision of many services was related to economic, but also to social and democratic, goals (Ambrosius 2000: 18). The further expansion of the public sector continued after the end of World War II and can be seen as a result of essentially two factors (Bieling and Deckwirth 2008): On the one hand, socialist and social democratic forces pushed for the socialisation of large parts of the economy in order to extend public control; and on the other hand, more conservative interests also backed such endeavours in order to improve conditions for capitalist development – growth and employment – and economically to buttress the ‘protective barrier’ against communism. Consequently, so-called ‘mixed economies’ emerged, which supported Fordist modes of accumulation, but also modified the operation of the market mechanism. In other words, the expansion of the public infrastructure backed private accumulation and also socially domesticated the different models of capitalist development. In principle, this ambiguity has remained a core feature of public infrastructure up to the present day. However, the main purpose of public infrastructurehas become redefined due to strategies of extensive reorganisation in the name of cost efficiency. The European reorganisation process started in the early 1980s (Bortolotti 2007: 7). First this meant the liberalisation of existing regulatory regimes in most cases. While most networks, which were perceived as ‘natural monopolies’, remained in state ownership and control, their use was extended to private competitors. At the same time, many companies changed their legal form from public to private (‘formal privatisation’). In most cases, the more radical ownership transfer of the company (‘material privatisation’) only occurred years later. However, to obtain a comprehensive view of the reorganisation of public infrastructure, focusing on these forms of privatisation is not sufficient. This is because public companies have also been commercialised as a consequence of ‘new public management’ concepts, i.e. of administrative reforms and the implementation of specific economic benchmarks (Pelizzari 2001; Harms and Reichard 2003). This means that, even if formal and material privatisation measures are not part of administrative reform, microeconomic criteria and profit orientation have become more prominent. In general, the reorganisation of public infrastructure services can be seen as both a consequence and a part of the fundamental changes in capitalist development from the mid-1970s onwards: i.e. the crisis of Fordism, increasing globalisation and the transition towards a finance-led regime of capitalist accumulation. More specifically, the following structural factors have been crucial for the promotion of multiple reorganisationtendencies (Huffschmid 2004; Zeller 2004): first, the attempts of (transnational) corporations to access new spheres of investment opportunities; secondly, rising public debts which induced governments to sell parts of the public infrastructure; thirdly, the poor standard of the infrastructure nurturing the widespread opinion that public organisation is generally inefficient; and fourthly, the partially hegemonic neoliberal view that privatisation would both trigger necessary investments and bring about a more cost efficient provision of services.

Federal infrastructure investment expands the logic of capitalist exploitation

**Harman ‘6** (Chris is a former British journalist and political activist, and a member of the Central Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. He was formerly the editor of International Socialism, and Socialist Worker. “The state and capitalism today: Issue: 25 September 06 From International Socialism,. 2(51): 3–57, Summer 1991 <http://www.isj.org.uk/?id=234>

Any productive capital grows up within the confines of a particular territory, alongside other sibling capitals (they are, as Marx describes them, ‘warring brothers’). They are mutually dependent on each other for resources, finance and markets. And they act together to try to shape the social and political conditionsin that territory to suit their own purposes.This involves an effort to ‘free’ labour from the control of other classes, to remove obstacles to the sales of their products, to create an infrastructure (ports, roads, canals, railways) to fit their requirements,to establish sets of rules for regulating their relations with each other (bourgeois property laws) and to create an armed power which will protect their property both from domestic and external threats. Their efforts to achieve all these things will be aided if they can supplant a mass of local dialects and languages with a single form of spoken and written speech. Their aim, in short, has to be to create a national state power—and with it a national consciousness and language. The national state and different nationally based capitals grow up together, like children in a single family. The development of one inevitably shapes the development of the others. This does not mean that the structures of the state are an immediate product of the needs of capital. Many of the elements of the pre-capitalist state are restructured to fit in with the needs of the capitals that arise within them, rather than simply being smashed and replaced. But they are actively remolded, so as to function in a very different way than previously, a way that corresponds to the logic of capitalist exploitation. Industrial and agrarian capitals were usually not nearly powerful enough to shape the whole of the political structure. But their presence could be a significant counterweight to the old baronies, so making it easier for kings to replace the decentralised feudalism of the early medieval period with absolute monarchies. The ‘mercantilist’ policies of these monarchies then provided the impetus towards a wide development of commercial capital and a much more limited development of productive capital within the confines of each state.

Government infrastructure investment sustains capitalism

**Iowa State Daily ’11**(December 7, 2011, “Road, Rail Infrastructure is Part of Orthodox Capitalism,” Michael Belding, http://www.iowastatedaily.com/opinion/article\_24724abe-1a13-11e1-b3e3-001cc4c03286.html

California's recent decision to continue with its plans to build a high-speed rail system, despite criticism from Republicans, highlights the importance ofinvestment in infrastructure. The project carries a high cost, $98 billion, and will not be finished until 2033. However, transportation infrastructure and accommodation facilitatesthe economic growth we need. Far from being the waste Republicans in California assert it will be, the project will run 520 miles from Los Angeles to San Francisco in areas whose population is expected to rise by 25 million people in the next 20 years and create some 100,000 jobs. Lowering taxes alone will not set the economy aright, restoring confidence and raising productivity. There is no cut-and-dry, one-size-fits-all solution to a problem as complex as the economy. There are far too many national policies at work and far too many businesses of all sizes to discern or divine rules for how the economy works. Building roads and railways, however, provides a space in which people can move and trade. In ancient times, this investment in creating a place for business consisted of building a new forum. Now, we build roads. It's not a matter of being Democrat or Republican, conservative or liberal. Investment in infrastructure goes across party lines. Historically speaking, there have been many reasons for building such projects as the Interstate Highway System. Chances are good that you use it every break to get home. I use it every day to drive down here from my home. President Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican, noticed from his military training that projects from the 1930s to create a national system of roads, already under way, should be expanded. National defense was not the only impetus, however. Increased traffic from automobiles wore on existing highways inadequate to new demands, and the interstate highways have proved vital in evacuating people from natural disasters such as hurricanes. In 2009 dollars, federal spending on transportation and water infrastructure during Eisenhower's second term averaged $25.4 billion. Kennedy's average was $40.4 billion. Johnson's was $48.7 billion. Nixon's was $44.5 billion. Ford's was $47.8 billion. Carter's was $60.2 billion. Reagan's was $53.3 billion. George H. W. Bush's was $55.2 billion. Clinton's was $60.6 billion, and George W. Bush's average spending on transportation and water infrastructure was the highest, at $67.8 billion. Ideologically, government support of public works — roads, canals and the like — is not a new idea. Adam Smith advocated government support of infrastructure **(**as well as the judicial branch, a standing army and public education for the poor) when he laid the groundwork for the capitalism that so defines our way of life. Funding infrastructure is, in classical conservative thought, orthodox.

Expansion of infrastructure takes place within the capitalist framework.

**Libcom‘5** (“Chapter 1: The Crisis of The Mixed Economy”<http://libcom.org/library/economics-politics-and-the-age-of-inflation-mattick-one>, 7-28-5

State monopoly over certain products and services may lead to monopolistic profits, but this is only another form of consumer taxation.For historical and other reasons the relationship between state and private production is changeable and, moreover, varies from country to country. State enterprises may he turned over to private concerns, and private enterprises may be nationalized; the state may be a shareholder in private concerns or keep them alive through subsidies. The interpenetration of private and state production occurs in a variety of combinations.and the state share need not be restricted to the infrastructure. In the industrially developing countries state participation in production is often relatively extensive, as for example, in Italy, an archetypal country in this respect, where state-owned production[1] competing with private capital represents 1 5 percent of total production. Yet no matter j how much state production may expand, it can never be more than a minor fraction of total production if it is not to call into question the very existence of a market economy. In all countries, therefore, a "mixed economy," to the extent that it is a mixture, leaves the private enterprise nature of the economy intact.Even an increase in state production through expansion of the infrastructurecan change nothing, since this expansion takes place within the framework of capitalist accumulation, which reproduces the relationship between state and private production in consonance with accumulation needs.Expanding automobile production entails the construction of new highways, and growing air traffic requires more airports, etc., if expansion of the economy as a whole is not to lag behind the infrastructure. Though it is correct to say that state-organized creation of the general conditions of production benefits private capital, albeit quite unevenly, this does not mean that it improves the profitability of capital beyond the costs of the infrastructure. Since the costs of the infrastructure are borne by private capital, the infrastructure depends on the profitability of capital, not vice versa

# Leadership

US hegemony is an attempt to forestall the collapse of international capitalism.

**Bearns ‘3** (Nick Beams, member of International Editorial Board and National Secretary of Australian Socialist Equality Party, 2003 “The Political Economy of American Militarism, part 2” July 2, [www.wsws.org/articles/2003/jul2003/nb2-j11\_prn.shtml](http://www.wsws.org/articles/2003/jul2003/nb2-j11_prn.shtml)

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

****US hegemony is a tool to sustain capitalistgrowth through endless genocidal wars****

Meszaros ‘7(Professor Emeritus, IstvanMeszaros, Hungarian Marxist philosopher and Professor Emeritus at U. Sussex. “The Only Viable Economy,” Monthly Review, http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm)

The quixotic advocacy of freezing production at the level attained in the early 1970s was trying to camouflage, with vacuous pseudo-scientific model-mongering pioneered at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the ruthlessly enforced actual power relations of U.S. dominated postwar imperialism.  That variety of imperialism was, of course, very different from its earlier form known to Lenin.  For in Lenin's lifetime at least half a dozen significant imperialist powers were competing for the rewards of their real and/or hoped for conquests.  And even in the 1930s Hitler was still willing to share the fruits of violently redefined imperialism with Japan and Mussolini's Italy.  In our time, by contrast, we have to face up to the reality -- and the lethal dangers -- arising from global hegemonic imperialism, with the United States as its overwhelmingly dominant power.[7](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm" \l "_edn7" \t "_blank)  In contrast to even Hitler, the United States as the single hegemon is quite unwilling to share global domination with any rival.  And that is not simply on account of political/military contingencies.  The problems are much deeper.  They assert themselves through the ever-aggravating contradictions of the capital system's deepening structural crisis.  U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism is an -- ultimately futile -- attempt to devise a solution to that crisis through the most brutal and violent rule over the rest of the world, enforced with or without the help of slavishly "willing allies," now through a succession of genocidal wars.  Ever since the 1970s the United States has been sinking ever deeper into catastrophic indebtedness.  The fantasy solution publicly proclaimed by several U.S. presidents was "to grow out of it."  And the result: the diametrical opposite, in the form of astronomical and still growing indebtedness.  Accordingly, the United States must grab to itself, by any means at its disposal, including the most violent military aggression, whenever required for this purpose, everything it can, through the transfer of the fruits of capitalist growth -- thanks to the global socioeconomic and political/military domination of the United States -- from everywhere in the world.  Could then any sane person imagine, no matter how well armored by his or her callous contempt for "the shibboleth of equality," that U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism would take seriously even for a moment the panacea of "no growth"?  Only the worst kind of bad faith could suggest such ideas, no matter how pretentiously packaged in the hypocritical concern over "the Predicament of Mankind." For a variety of reasons there can be no question about the importance of growth both in the present and in the future.  But to say so must go with a proper examination of the concept of growth not only as we know it up to the present, but also as we can envisage its sustainability in the future.  Our siding with the need for growth cannot be in favor of unqualified growth.  The tendentiously avoided real question is: what kind of growth is both feasible today, in contrast to dangerously wasteful and even crippling capitalist growth visible all around us?  For growth must be also positively sustainable in the future on a long-term basis

US hegemony is synonymous with global capitalistic domination – the impact is nuclear war and ecological suicide

**Foster ‘5**(John Foster, Professor of Sociology, University of Oregon; Editor, Monthly Review, 2005, http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm

The unprecedented dangers of this new global disorder are revealed in the twin cataclysms to which the world is heading at present: nuclear proliferation and hence increased chances of the outbreak of nuclear war, and planetary ecological destruction. These are symbolized by the Bush administration’s refusal to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to limit nuclear weapons development and by its failure to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a first step in controlling global warming. As former U.S. Secretary of Defense (in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations) Robert McNamara stated in an article entitled “Apocalypse Soon” in the May–June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy: “The United States has never endorsed the policy of ‘no first use,’ not during my seven years as secretary or since. We have been and remain prepared to initiate the use of nuclear weapons—by the decision of one person, the president—against either a nuclear or nonnuclear enemy whenever we believe it is in our interest to do so.” The nation with the greatest conventional military force and the willingness to use it unilaterally to enlarge its global power is also the nation with the greatest nuclear force and the readiness to use it whenever it sees fit—setting the whole world on edge. The nation that contributes more to carbon dioxide emissions leading to global warming than any other (representing approximately a quarter of the world’s total) has become the greatest obstacle to addressing global warming and the world’s growing environmental problems—raising the possibility of the collapse of civilization itself if present trends continue. The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society

# Economy

“Economic crisis” is an endless repetition of the logic of capital

Zizek ’97(SlavojZizek, Senior Researcher, Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana, 1997, “Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism.”

So, back to the recent Labour victory, one can see how it not only involved a hegemonic reappropriation of a series of motifs which were usually inscribed into the Conservative field—family values, law and order, individual responsibility; the Labour ideological offensive also separated these motifs from the obscene phantasmatic subtext which sustained them in the Conservative field—in which ‘toughness on crime’ and ‘individual responsibility’ subtly referred to brutal egotism, to the disdain for victims, and other ‘basic instincts’. The problem, however, is that the New Labour strategy involved its own ‘message between the lines’: we fully accept the logic of Capital, we will not mess about with it. Today, financial crisis is a permanent state of things the reference to which legitimizes the demands to cut social spending, health care, support of culture and scientific research, in short, the dismantling of the welfare state. Is, however, this permanent crisis really an objective feature of our socio-economic life? Is it not rather one of the effects of the shift of balance in the ‘class struggle’ towards Capital, resulting from the growing role of new technologies as well as from the direct internationalization of Capital and the co-dependent diminished role of the Nation-State which was further able to impose certain minimal requirements and limitations to exploitation? In other words, the crisis is an ‘objective fact’ if and only if one accepts in advance as an unquestionable premise the inherent logic of Capital—as more and more left-wing or liberal parties have done. We are thus witnessing the uncanny spectacle of social-democratic parties which came to power with the between-the-lines message to Capital ‘we will do the necessary job for you in an even more efficient and painless way than the conservatives’. The problem, of course, is that, in today’s global socio-political circumstances, it is practically impossible effectively to call into question the logic of Capital: even a modest social-democratic attempt to redistribute wealth beyond the limit acceptable to the Capital ‘effectively’ leads to economic crisis, inflation, a fall in revenues and so on. Nevertheless, one should always bear in mind how the connection between ‘cause’ (rising social expenditure) and ‘effect’ (economic crisis) is not a direct objective causal one: it is always-already embedded in a situation of social antagonism and struggle. The fact that, if one does not obey the limits set by Capital, a crisis ‘really follows’, in no way ‘proves’ that the necessity of these limits is an objective necessity of economic life. It should rather be conceived as a proof of the privileged position Capital holds in the economic and political struggle, as in the situation where a stronger partner threatens that if you do X, you will be punished by Y, and then, upon your doing X, Y effectively ensues.

Capitalism encourages overproduction and cheap labor which collapses economies

Parenti ‘**7**(Michael Parenti, received his Ph.D. in political science from Yale University., he was awarded a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition serves on the advisory boards of Independent Progressive Politics Network, Education Without Borders, and the Jasenovic Foundation as a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. 2/17/07, <http://community.freespeech.org/how_capitalism_creates_poverty_in_the_world>, “Mystery: How Wealth Creates Poverty in the World”)

The corporate capitalists no more encourage prosperity than do they propagate democracy. Most of the world is capitalist, and most of the world is neither prosperous nor particularly democratic.One need only think of capitalist Nigeria, capitalist Indonesia, capitalist Thailand, capitalist Haiti, capitalist Colombia, capitalist Pakistan, capitalist South Africa, capitalist Latvia, and various other members of the Free World--more accurately, the Free Market World. A prosperous, politically literate populace with high expectations about its standard of living and a keen sense of entitlement, pushing for continually better social conditions, is not the plutocracy's notion of an ideal workforce and a properly pliant polity. Corporate investors prefer poor populations. The poorer you are, the harder you will work-for less. The poorer you are, the less equipped you are to defend yourself against the abuses of wealth. In the corporate world of "free-trade," the number of billionaires is increasing faster than ever while the number of people living in poverty is growing at a faster rate than the world's population. Poverty spreads as wealth accumulates. Consider the United States. In the last eight years alone, while vast fortunes accrued at record rates, an additional six million Americans sank below the poverty level; median family income declined by over $2,000; consumer debt more than doubled; over seven million Americans lost their health insurance, and more than four million lost their pensions; meanwhile homelessness increased and housing foreclosures reached pandemic levels. It is only in countries where capitalism has been reined in to some degree by social democracy that the populace has been able to secure a measure of prosperity; northern European nations such as Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark come to mind. But even in these social democracies popular gains are always at risk of being rolled back. It is ironic to credit capitalism with the genius of economic prosperity when most attempts at material betterment have been vehemently and sometimes violently resisted by the capitalist class. The history of labor struggle provides endless illustration of this. To the extent that life is bearable under the present U.S. economic order, it is because millions of people have waged bitter class struggles to advance their living standards and their rights as citizens, bringing some measure of humanity to an otherwise heartless politico-economic order. A Self-devouring Beast The capitalist state has two roles long recognized by political thinkers. First, like any state it must provide services that cannot be reliably developed through private means, such as public safety and orderly traffic. Second, the capitalist state protects the haves from the have-nots, securing the process of capital accumulation to benefit the moneyed interests, while heavily circumscribing the demands of the working populace, as Debs observed from his jail cell. There is a third function of the capitalist state seldom mentioned. It consists of preventing the capitalist system from devouring itself. Consider the core contradiction Karl Marx pointed to: the tendency toward overproduction and market crisis. An economy dedicated to speedups and wage cuts, to making workers produce more and more for less and less, is always in danger of a crash. To maximize profits, wages must be kept down. But someone has to buy the goods and services being produced. For that, wages must be kept up. There is a chronic tendency-as we are seeing today-toward overproduction of private sector goods and services and underconsumption of necessities by the working populace. In addition, there is the frequently overlooked self-destruction created by the moneyed players themselves. If left completely unsupervised, the more active command component of the financial system begins to devour less organized sources of wealth. Instead of trying to make money by the arduous task of producing and marketing goods and services, the marauders tap directly into the money streams of the economy itself. During the 1990s we witnessed the collapse of an entire economy in Argentina when unchecked free marketeers stripped enterprises, pocketed vast sums, and left the country's productive capacity in shambles. The Argentine state, gorged on a heavy diet of free-market ideology, faltered in its function of saving capitalism from the capitalists. Some years later, in the United States, came the multi-billion-dollar plunder perpetrated by corporate conspirators at Enron, WorldCom, Harkin, Adelphia, and a dozen other major companies. Inside players like Ken Lay turned successful corporate enterprises into sheer wreckage, wiping out the jobs and life savings of thousands of employees in order to pocket billions. These thieves were caught and convicted. Does that not show capitalism's self-correcting capacity? Not really. The prosecution of such malfeasance- in any case coming too late-was a product of democracy's accountability and transparency, not capitalism's. Of itself the free market is an amoral system, with no strictures save "caveat emptor." In the meltdown of 2008-09 the mounting financial surplus created a problem for the moneyed class: there were not enough opportunities to invest. With more money than they knew what to do with, big investors poured immense sums into nonexistent housing markets and other dodgy ventures, a legerdemain of hedge funds, derivatives, high leveraging, credit default swaps, predatory lending, and whatever else.

\*\*\*Impact

# Turns Case

Profit-driven mentality means infrastructures inevitably collapse.

**ICL ‘7**(International Communist League, “Bridges, Levees, Runways, Tracks: Capitalists Starve Infrastructure: Working People Die” Workers Vanguard No. 897, 31 August 2007 <http://www.icl-fi.org/print/english/wv/897/infrastructure.html>

Under capitalism, engineering practice, like everything else, is profit-driven. The Minnesota I-35W steel truss bridge, completed in 1967, was designed to save on the amount of steel required. Like many such bridges, it lacked redundancy: if any structural member fails, the bridge collapses. It was designed without adequately accounting for fatigue and cracking in structural steel due to cyclic stress and corrosion. Although of a different design, the Silver Bridge in West Virginia collapsed in 1967 due to similar factors, killing 46 people.The science underlying crack propagation as a principle failure mechanism in structural materials emerged in 1913 and was elucidated by A.A. Griffith in 1920, and further refined by scientists afterward. Metal fatigue and stress cracking were certainly understood well enough by the mid 1960s to evaluate existing bridges. But it took a disaster like the Silver Bridge collapse for the bourgeoisie to even establish a mandatory bridge inspection program. Nevertheless, more than 30 years later less than 4 percent of “in-depth” inspections correctly identify weld crack indications.Even a well-built bridge will not last if it is not properly maintained. As the former chief engineer for the New York City Department of Transportation, Samuel Schwartz, explained in a*New York Times* (13 August) op-ed piece, “Bridges are machines with movable parts” that need to be regularly cleaned, lubricated and painted to prevent corrosion or the seizing up of moving joints. But, as Schwartz noted, routine maintenance is routinely scuttled because states and localities only receive federal funds for major projects rather than the “mop and pail” work that bridges really need.These kinds of cost-driven irrationalities in infrastructure would not be tolerated if the working class ruled society. But faced with aging, deficient bridges, you might expect that common sense would dictate that even this profit-driven system would, at a minimum, limit traffic load, ensure necessary maintenance and plan for early replacement of the I-35 and other outmoded bridges. Instead, by the late 1980s, more lanes and increased truck weight limits—authorized by Congress—greatly increased the load on the Minneapolis bridge. By the time of the collapse, vehicle traffic had more than doubled from the original projections.

# Extinction

Extinction.

**Cook ‘6**(Prof. of Phil. Univ. Windsor, 2006, Deborah, “STAYING ALIVE: ADORNO AND HABERMAS ON SELF-PRESERVATION UNDER LATE CAPITALISM,” Rethinking Marxism, 18(3):433-447

In the passage in Negative Dialectics where he warns against self-preservation gone wild, Adorno states that it is “only as reflection upon … self-preservation that reason would be above nature” (1973, 289). To rise above nature, then, reason must become “cognizant of its own natural essence” (1998b, 138). To be more fully rational, we must reflect on whatHorkheimer and Adorno once called our underground history (1972, 231). In other words, we must recognize that our behavior is motivated and shaped by instincts, including the instinct for self-preservation (Adorno 1998a, 153). In his lectures on Kant, Adorno makes similar remarks when he summarizes his solution to the problem of self-preservation gone wild. To remedy this problem, nature must first become conscious of itself (Adorno 2000, 104). Adopting the Freudian goal of making the unconscious conscious, Adorno also insists that this critical self-understanding be accompanied by radical social, political, and economic changes that would bring to a halt the self-immolating domination of nature. This is why mindfulness of nature is necessary but not sufficient to remedy unbridled self-preservation. In the final analysis, society must be fundamentally transformed in order rationally to accommodate instincts that now run wild owing to our forgetfulness of nature in ourselves. By insisting on mindfulness of nature in the self, Adorno champions a form of rationality that would tame self-preservation, but in contrast to Habermas, he thinks that the taming of self-preservation is a normative task rather than an accomplished fact. Because self-preservation remains irrational, we now encounter serious environmental problems like those connected with global warming and the greenhouse effect, the depletion of natural resources, and the death of more than one hundred regions in our oceans. Owing to self- preservation gone wild, we have colonized and destabilized large parts of the world, adversely affecting the lives of millions, when we have not simply enslaved or murdered their inhabitants outright. Famine and disease are often the result of ravaging the land in the name of survival imperatives. Wars are waged in the name of self-preservation: with his now notoriously invisible weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein was said to represent a serious threat to the lives of citizens in the West. The war against terrorism, waged in the name of self-preservation, has seriously undermined human rights and civil liberties; it has also been used to justify the murder, rape, and torture of thousands As it now stands, the owners of the means of production ensure our survival through profits that, at best, only trickle down to the poorest members of society. Taken in charge by the capitalist economy, self-preservation now dictates that profits increase exponentially to the detriment of social programs like welfare and health care. In addition, self- preservation has gone wild because our instincts and needs are now firmly harnessed to commodified offers of satisfaction that deflect and distort them. Having surrendered the task of self-preservation to the economic and political systems, we remain in thrall to untamed survival instincts that could well end up destroying not just the entire species, but all life on the planet.

# Ethics

**Capitalism precludes ethics because it preferences economic valuation to any other method of judging theworld**

**Morgareidge ‘98**(Prof of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College 1998 Clayton Why Capitalism is Evil 08/22 http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html

To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.[1]If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consumefood, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else,if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. Thereforeethics,the overriding commitment to meeting human need,is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making.Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seatat the table

# Structural Violence

**Resisting this reliance on economic evaluation is the ultimate ethical responsibility – the current social order guarantees social exclusion on a global scale**

**Zizek and Daly ‘4** (Slavoj and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost isticeconomism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place.Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

The focus on subjective violence makes the struggle against inequality a stop-gap in thought which makes it impossible to resist.

**Zizek ‘8** (Slavoj Violence p 1-4

If there is a unifying thesis that runs through the bric-a-brac of reflections on violence that follow, it is that a similar paradox holds true for violence.At the forefront of our minds, the obvious signals of violence are acts of crime and terror, civil unrest, international conflict. But we should learn to **step back,** to disentangle ourselves from the fascinating lure of this directly visible “subjective” violence, violence performed by a clearly identifiable agent.We need to perceive the contours of the background which generates such outbursts. A step back enables us to identify a violence that sustains our very efforts to fight violence and to promote tolerance. This is the starting point, perhaps even the axiom, of the present book:subjective violence is just the most visible portion of a triumviratethat also includes two objective kinds of violence.First,there is a “symbolic” violence embodied in language and its forms,what Heidegger would call “our house of being.” As we shall see later, this violence is not only at work in the obvious—and extensively studied—cases of incitement and of the relations of social domination reproduced in our habitual speech forms: there is a more fundamental form of violence still that pertains to language as such, to its imposition of a certain universe of meaning.Second, there iswhat I call“systemic” violence, or the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems.The catch is thatsubjective and objective violence **cannot be perceived from the same standpoint:** subjective violence is experienced as such against the background of a non-violent zero level. It is seen as a perturbation of the “normal,” peaceful state of things.However,objective violence is precisely the violence inherent to this “normal” state of things. Objective violence is invisible since it sustains the very zero-level standard against which we perceive something as subjectively violent. Systemic violence is thus something like the notorious “dark matter” of physics,the counterpart to an all-too- visible subjective violence.It may be invisible, but it has to be taken into account if one is to make sense of what otherwise seem to be “irrational” explosions of subjective violence.When the media bombard us with those “humanitarian crises” which seem constantly to pop up all over the world, one should always bear in mind thata particular crisis only explodes into media visibility as the result of a complex struggle. Properly humanitarian considerations as a rule play a less important role here than cultural, ideologico-political, and economic considerations. The cover story of Time magazine on 5 June 2006, for example, was “The Deadliest War in the World.” This offered detailed documentation on how around 4 million people died in the Democratic Republic of Congo as the result of political violence over the last decade. None of the usual humanitarian uproar followed, just a couple of readers’ letters—as if some kind of filtering mechanism blocked this news from achieving its full impact in our symbolic space. To put it cynically, Time picked the wrong victim in the struggle for hegemony in suffering. It should have stuck to the list of usual suspects: Muslim women and their plight, or the families of 9/11 victims and how they have coped with their losses. The Congo today has effectively re-emerged as a Conradean “heart of darkness.” No one dares to confront it head on. The death of a West Bank Palestinian child, not to mention an Israeli or an American, is mediatically worth thousands of times more than the death of a nameless Congolese. Do we need further proof that the humanitarian sense of urgency is mediated, indeed overdetermined, by clear political considerations? And what are these considerations? To answer this, we need to step back and take a look from a different position.When the U.S. media reproached the public in foreign countries for not displaying enough sympathy for the victims of the 9/11 attacks, one was tempted to answer them in the words Robespierre addressed to those who complained about the innocent victims of revolutionary terror: “Stop shaking the tyrant’s bloody robe in my face, or I will believe that you wish to put Rome in chains.”1Instead of confronting violence directly, the present book casts six sideways glances.There are reasons for looking at the problem of violence awry. My underlying premise is thatthere is something inherently mystifying in a direct confrontation with it: the overpowering horror of violent acts and empathy with the victims inexorably function as a lure which**prevents us from thinking**. A dispassionate conceptual development of the typology of violence must by definition ignore its traumatic impact. Yet there is a sense in which a cold analysis of violence somehow reproduces and participates in its horror. A distinction needs to be made, as well, between (factual) truth and truthfulness: what renders a report of a raped woman (or any other narrative of a trauma) truthful is its very factual unreliability, its confusion, its inconsistency. If the victim were able to report on her painful and humiliating experience in a clear manner, with all the data arranged in a consistent order, this very quality would make us suspicious of its truth. The problem here is part of the solution: the very factual deficiencies of the traumatised subject’s report on her experience bear witness to the truthfulness of her report, since they signal that the reported content “contaminated” the manner of reporting it. The same holds, of course, for the so-called unreliability of the verbal reports of Holocaust survivors: the witness able to offer a clear narrative of his camp experience would disqualify himself by virtue of that clarity.2 The only appropriate approach to my subject thus seems to be one which permits variations on violence kept at a distance out of respect towards its victims.

Structural violence outweighs

Fischer ‘2 - Director, European University Center for Peace Studies (Dietrich and JurgenBrauer, Twenty Questions for Peace Economics

http://www.aug.edu/~sbajmb/paper-DPE.PDF)

Galtung coined the notion of “structural violence” (as opposed to direct violence) for social conditions that cause avoidable human suffering and death, even if there is no specific actor committing the violence. Köhler and Alcock (1976) have estimated that structural violence causes about one hundred times as many deaths each year as all international and civil wars combined. It is as if over 200 Hiroshima bombs were dropped each year on the children of the world, but the media fail to report it because it is less dramatic than a bomb explosion.

It’s the root cause of war

**Cox ‘94**(Wayne S., lecturer in political studies at Queen's University, “U.S. Hegemony & the Management of Trade”, Beyond Positivsm: Critical Reflections on International Relations, 1994, page 64-65)

The term structural violence is used here to describe a process of existing power struggles between social groups. Whereas mainstream international conflict studies place the focus of their analyses upon the actual physical act of violence (usually the direct result of the use of military force in the name of states), the theoretical framework proposed here seeks to broaden the definition of violence to include structural relations of hegemony between social groups. In effect, the physical act of violence is but the external expression of an ongoing structural relationship between social groups-a relationship built on structural violence. A definition of conflict that focuses upon the physical act of violence can therefore only describe the results of violence rather than understand the overall process itself. Johan Galtung has provided a basis for the model of sociostructural violence, arguing that "hostile aggression is no inseparable part of the innate structure of the 'minds of men,' but added to it from the outside, e.g. through special socialization processes" (Caltung, llJ64:l)5). According to Galtung, although IIwoutward observations of aggression (in this case, organized politicill acts of violence) are worthy of study in themselves, they are merely a reflection, or a result of, existing sociostructural relationships that are arranged by a set of power relations. These relationships result in an "interaction system [which] is a multi-dimensional system of stratification" (Galtung, 1964:96). From here, Galtung set up a seril's of possible relationships between groups, which are simply characterized as Topdog (T) and Underdog (U). Throughout his discussion, Galtung has focused on the notion of power relationships dictated by the Topdog.

# War

Capitalism’s inherent greed for profits makes war inevitable

**Carchedi ‘6** (Guglielimo, The Fallacies of Keynesian Policies, Rethinking Marxism, 18(1):63-81, Electronic

But there are advantages as well. First, if weapons are exported, the producers of weapons appropriate international value fromother, foreign capitalistsdue to the former's higher value composition (unequal exchange).26 Second, science- and technology-based military innovations are the basic driving force in, and directly support, the development of civilian science and technology. Since World War II, practically all the major innovations in the civilian sphere have been first generated by military research and development. This gives the technological leaders a competitive advantage that makes possible the appropriation of international surplus value. Third, the use of public works can becomepart of the goods considered to be necessary for the reproduction of labor powerand thus can lead to an increase in real wages. This danger is avoided if resources are channeled into the military industry.And finally, military might is a necessary condition for imperialist policies,thus for value appropriation from weaker countries. Once imperialism is introduced into the analysis, the positive effects on the ARP attributed to civilian Keynesianism in the imperialist countries can be seen to be in fact, at least partially, the result of the appropriation of surplus value from the world working class, via foreign capitals, thanks also to military Keynesianism. Disregard of this fundamental point gives Keynesian policies much more credit than they deserve. There is thus no contraposition between civilian and military Keynesianism. The former is partly made possible by the appropriation of international value inherent in the latter. If neither civilian nor military Keynesian policies can jump-start the economy, the alternative is war. The use of weapons in time of war is a specific, powerful method of destruction of excess capital in its commodity form, of value that cannot be realized in times of peace. Their main contribution to an upturn is not through employment and the extra production of surplus value (which are modest because of their high value composition) but through the destruction of surplus capital: the more commodity capital is destroyed (both as weapons and as the other commodities that are destroyed by those weapons), the more commodity capital can be subsequently created. At the same time, this expanded reproduction is spurred by the higher rates of exploitation, and thus of profit, induced by wars. Wars make possible the cancellation of the debt contracted with Labor(e.g., inflation destroys the value of money and thus of state bonds) and the extraction of extra surplus value (the laborers, either forced or instigated by patriotism, accept lower wages, higher intensity of labor, longer working days, etc.). Wars thus create the conditions for an economic upturn. Capitalism needs weapons and thus wars. If capitalism needs wars, wars need enemies. The imperialist nations display great ingenuity in finding, or creating, new enemies. Before the fall of the USSR, the pretext for the arms industry was International Communism. After the Fall, International Communism has been replaced by Arab Fundamentalism and International Terrorism. As the wars against Afghanistan and Iraq show, the substitution is now complete. The attacks of September 11, 2001, were a golden opportunity for the arms industry and U.S. imperialism. This shows that political and ideological factors are of paramount importance for the modes and timing of the conflagration, but they themselves are determined by economic factors. The notion that wars are caused by extraeconomic factors is simply wrong. The Western world has exported (created) countless wars in many dominated countries and has engaged in military Keynesian policies for the above-mentioned reasons.

No uniqueness to their war impacts – capitalism makes war in defense of imperialistic globalization inevitable – causing extinction

Meszaros ‘3(IstvanMeszaros, Professor Emeritus, U Sussex; earlier Chair of Philosophy at Sussex; earlier Professor of Philosophy and Social Science, York University)

Today the situation is qualitatively different for two principal reasons. First, the objective of the feasible war at the present phase of historical development, in accordance with the objective requirements of imperialism—world domination by capital’s most powerful state, in tune with its own political design of ruthless authoritarian “globalization”(dressed up as “free exchange” in a U.S. ruled global market)—is ultimately unwinnable, foreshadowing, instead, the destruction of humankind. This objective by no stretch of imagination could be considered a rational objective in accord with the stipulated rational requirement of the “continuation of politics by other means” conducted by one nation, or by one group of nations against another. Aggressively imposing the will of one powerful national state over all of the others, even if for cynical tactical reasons the advocated war is absurdly camouflaged as a “purely limited war” leading to other “open ended limited wars,” can therefore be qualified only as total irrationality. The second reason greatly reinforces the first. For the weapons already available for waging the war or wars of the twenty first century are capable of exterminating not only the adversary butthe whole of humanity, for the first time ever in history. Nor should we have the illusion that the existing weaponry marks the very end of the road. Others, even more instantly lethal ones, might appear tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. Moreover, threatening the use of such weapons is by now considered an acceptable state strategic device. Thus, put reasons one and two together, and the conclusion is inescapable: envisaging war as the mechanism of global government in today’s world underlines that we find ourselves at the precipice of absolute irrationality from which there can be no return if we accept the ongoing course of development. What was missing from von Clausewitz’s classic definition of war as the “continuation of politics by other means” was the investigation of the deeper underlying causes of war and the possibility of their avoidance. The challenge to face up to such causes is more urgent today than ever before. For the war of the twenty first century looming ahead of us is not only “not winnable in principle.” Worse than that, it is in principle unwinnable. Consequently, envisaging the pursuit of war, as the Bush administration’s September 17, 2002 strategic document does, make Hitler’s irrationality look like the model of rationality.

\*\*\*Alt

# Solvency Ext.

Rethinking is the first step

**Johnston ‘4**(Adrian JOHNSTON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of New Mexico, 2004, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, Volume 9 // Issue 3

The height of Zizek's philosophical traditionalism, his fidelity to certain lasting truths too precious to cast away in a postmodern frenzy, is his conviction that no worthwhile praxis can emerge prior to the careful and deliberate formulation of a correct conceptual framework. His references to the Lacanian notion of the Act (qua agent-less occurrence not brought about by a subject) are especially strange in light of the fact that he seemingly endorses the view that theory must precede practice, namely, that deliberative reflection is, in a way, primary. For Zizek, the foremost "practical" task to be accomplished today isn't some kind of rebellious acting out, which would, in the end, amount to nothing more than a series of impotent, incoherent outbursts. Instead,given the contemporary exhaustion of the socio-political imagination under the hegemony of liberal-democratic capitalism, he sees the liberation of thinking itself from its present constraints as the first crucial step that must be taken if anything is to be changed for the better. In a lecture given in Vienna in 2001, Zizek suggests that Marx's call to break out of the sterile closure of abstract intellectual ruminations through direct, concrete action (thesis eleven on Feuerbach--"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it") must be inverted given the new prevailing conditions of late-capitalism. Nowadays, one must resist succumbing to the temptation to short-circuit thinking in favor of acting, since all such rushes to action are doomed; they either fail to disrupt capitalism or are ideologically co-opted by it.

The alt is necessary to wipe the slate clean for ethical politics

**Zizek ’99 (**Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana 1999 Slavoj, The Ticklish Subject, page 153-154

It would therefore be tempting to risk a 'Badiouian-Pauline reading of the end of psychoanalysis, determining it as a New Beginning, a symbolic 'rebirth' - the radical restructuring of the analysand's subjectivity in such a way that the vicious cycle of the superego is suspended, left behind. Does not Lacan himself provide a number of hints that the end of analysis opens up the domain of Love beyond Law, using the very Pauline terms to which Badiou refers? Nevertheless, Lacan's way is not that of St Paul or Badiou: psychoanalysis is not 'psychosynthesis'; it does not already *posit* a 'new harmony', a new Truth-Event; it- as it were -merely wipes the slate clean for one.However, this 'merely' should be put in quotation marks, because it is Lacan's contention that, in this negative gesture of 'wiping the slate clean', something (a void) is confronted which is already 'sutured' with the arrival of a new Truth-Event. For Lacan negativity, a negative gesture of withdrawal precedes any positive gesture of enthusiastic identification with a Cause: negativity functions as the condition of (im)possibility of the enthusiastic identification- that is to say,it lays the ground, opens up space for it but is simultaneously obfuscated by it and undermines it.For this reason,Lacan implicitly changes the balance between Death and Resurrection in favour of Death: what 'Death' stands for at its most radical is not merely the passing of earthly life, but the 'night of the world', the self-withdrawal, the absolute contraction of subjectivity, the severing of its links with 'reality' - *this* is the 'wiping the slate clean' that opens up the domain of the symbolic New Beginning, of the emergence of the 'New Harmony' sustained by a newly emerged Master-Signifier.

The act of rejection creates a the fissures necessary to resist global capitalism

Holloway ‘5(John, 8-16, Ph.D Political Science-University of Edinburgh , “Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?”, <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>)

In the question of fissures. We often feel helpless because capitalism weighs so heavily on us. But when we say No we start off with an appreciation of our own strength. When we rebel we are in fact tearing a little hole in capitalism. It is very contradictory. By rebelling we are already saying no to the command of capital. We are creating temporary spaces. Within that crack, that fissure, it is important that we fight for other social relations that don't point towards the state, but that they point towards the sort of society we want to create. At the core of these fissures is the drive to self-determination. And then it is a question of working out what does this mean, and how to be organised for self-determination. It means being against and beyond the society that exists. Of expanding the fissures, how to push these fissures forward structurally. The people who say we should take control of the state are also talking about cracks. There is no choice but to start with interstices. The question is how we think of them, because the state is not the whole world. There are 200 states. If you seize control of one, it is still only a crack in capitalism. It is a question of how we think about those cracks, those fissures. And if we start off from ourselves, why on earth should we adopt capitalist, bourgeois forms for developing our struggle? Why should we accept the template of the concept of the state?

**Abstaining solves**  
**Zizek ‘8**(Slavoj Violence p 216-217

In psychoanalytic terms, the voters’ abstention is something like the psychotic Verwerfung (foreclosure, rejection/repudiation) whichis a more radical move than repression (Verdrangung). According to Freud, the repressed is intellectually accepted by the subject, since it is named, and at the same time is negated because the subject refuses to recognise it, refuses to recognise him or herself in it. In contrast to this, foreclosure rejects the term from the symbolic tout court. To circumscribe the contours of this radical rejection one is tempted to evoke Badiou’s provocative thesis: “It is better to do nothing than to contribute to the invention of formal ways of rendering visible that which Empire already recognizes as existent.”6 Better to do nothing than to engage in localised acts the ultimate function of which is to make the system run more smoothly (acts such as providing space for the multitude of new subjectivities). The threat today is not passivity, but pseudo- activity, the urge to “be active,” to “participate,” to mask the nothingness of what goes on. People intervene all the time, “do something”; academics participate in meaningless debates, and so on. The truly difficult thing is to step back, to withdraw. Those in power often prefer even a “critical” participation, a dialogue, to silence—just to engage us in “dialogue,” to make sure our ominous passivity is broken. The voters’ abstention is thus a true political act: it forcefully confronts us with the vacuity of today’s democracies. If one means by violence a radical upheaval of the basic social relations,then, crazy and as it may sound, the problem with historical monsters who slaughtered millions was that they were not violent enough. Sometimes doing nothing is the most violent thing to do.

\*\*\*Framing

# Epistemology

Their truth claims are trapped in a capitalist frame, which predetermines how knowledge is produced

**Schiwy and Ennis ‘2**(PhD Candidate in Romance Studies at Duke, &PhD Candidate in Lit at Duke, 2002, Freya and Michael, Nepantla: Views from the South 3.1 project muse

The essaysgathered in this dossier respond to issues raised during the workshop “Knowledges and the Known: Capitalism and the Geopolitics of Knowledge,” held at Duke University in November 2000. Theyaddress concerns about the possibilities for critical knowledge production at a moment when national state structures are reconfiguring into global institutions and when technologies (like gene prospecting)and epistemic regimes (like property rights and human rights) are installing the particular as a new universal,following the legacy of Enlightenment philosophy and Western political theory.They ask howknowledge production is linked to location and subjectivity and what the importance of these critical perspectives can be whenneoliberal capitalism increasingly instrumentalizes and commodifies knowledge, reinforcing the growing dependence of universities around the world on corporate money.It is precisely within this context that Oscar Guardiola-Rivera engages current critical theory from the perspective of coloniality. Although the essays by Catherine Walsh and Javier Sanjinés address contemporary indigenous uprisings in the Andes, these movements are not their object of study. Instead of being about knowledge production *in* the Andes, all three of these articles are efforts to think about epistemology *from* the Andes.[1](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/nepantla/v003/3.1schiwy.html#endnote:1)

Capitalism dominates transportation policy

**Freemark ‘8** (“Bush’s Transportation Legacy: Corporatism”, YonahFreemark, October 22nd, 2008, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2008/10/22/bushs-transportation-legacy-corporatism/

George W. Bush’s time in office has been marked by repeated and often successful attempts to use the power of the presidency for the benefit of large corporations. In fact, the Bush administration’s policy making, in opposition to the Goldwater/Reagan “limited government” views it claims to uphold, has erred on the side of increasing the size of the federal operation – in order to pass the goodies resulting from two wars on to some of the nation’s most wealthy and powerful corporations. As documented in Naomi Klein’s masterful The Shock Doctrine (2007), this policy was most disastrously implemented in the pursuit of the war in Iraq, during which giant corporate friends like Bechtel and Halliburton received giant, multi-billion-dollar contracts to conduct the failed “rebuilding” of that country, rather than allowing the Corps of Engineers or qualified Iraqis to do the job. As a result, the U.S. government spent large amounts of tax revenues to directly subsidize the growth of giant corporations whose productive output amounted to a few malfunctioning schools, a poorly maintained Iraqi electricity grid, and Taco Bell-outfitted U.S. military bases. Less documented have been the results of a similar effort to remove the government from involvement in the production of infrastructure in the United States. Systematically, the Bush administration has attempted to sell off roads, railways, and ports to private investors, and has encouraged local governments, often the owners of such public assets, to do the same. This effort was made most conspicious during the Dubai Ports World controversy, in which the U.S. government tried to sell a series of ports (some of them already private). The heated congressional interchange mostly revolved around the dangers of selling ports to a middle eastern corporation, and the implication of the exchange was clear: the Bush Administration was more interested in selling public property to a private corporation than thinking about national security. Transportation Department (DOT) Secretary Mary Peters has spent much of her lifetime in in the transportation industry, working for the Arizona Department of Transportation in 1998 and becoming its director in 1998. Bush appointed her to the directorship of the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) in 2001, and she replaced Norman Mineta (a Democrat and Commerce Secretary during the Clinton Administration) at the helm of the DOT in 2006. The focus of her efforts at FHA and then at the helm of the DOT were on roads. From the beginning, though, Peters disavowed the method that had been implemented at the beginning of the construction of the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System in the 1950s. Rather than allocating money directly to state DOTs, which would then implement the national highway network, Peters de-emphasized the construction of new roads and even limited spending on refurbishing existing highways. Rather, this secretary envisioned a different infrastructure-building process: one that focused on Public-Private Partnerships, or PPPs.The Secretary took as example the Chicago Skyway, which was originally completed in 1958 and which connects Chicago to northern Indiana. In 1995, the city – starved for resources – began negotiating its lease, and the result was a $1.8 billion, 99-year lease on the road which privatized this public resource for the benefit of yet another foreign company. The city received a huge lump sum, but the lease certainly put into question whether the city was getting a good deal. If a company was willing to put up front almost $2 billion for a toll road, couldn’t the city have made more money if it had kept the roads in its own hands? And wouldn’t a steady supply of several million dollars a year be worth more than one giant transaction?But Peters, instead of recognizing that Chicago’s decision to sell the road was in fact a desperate search for cash, saw the light in the deal. Repeating the time-worn conservative mantra, she insisted that private industry “knows” how to do things better than the government does. As a result, in 2008, she proposed a radical change in the manner highways in the U.S. are funded: instead of taking advantage of the readily-diminishing gas tax, she argued that people pay to use the roads they use. In some ways, her argument made sense: the gas tax could not continue to provide adequate revenues as electric and hydrogen-based cars replace gasoline ones, and a user fee makes sense. (And that’s ultimately what the gas tax is: theoretically, the more gas you use, the more miles you drive. This obviously punishes people who drive gas guzzlers and rewards people in more efficient cars, of course.) But instead of pushing for public agencies, which continue to own and operate the vast majority of the nation’s roads, to work for this solution, she pointed to the Skyway again, and argued that private companies should be hired to build, operate, and profit from the nation’s roads, which would in her vision almost all become tolled. In some cases, the public should pay private industry to build the roads, and then allow those same companies to profit from the roads once they’re constructed. Using dubious evidence that “poor people don’t use toll roads,” Peters argued that any effort to provide an equitable solution – in which the impoverished living in transit-deficient areas might get a discount – was unnecessary. Her approach was to remove the roads from the public sphere and transfer their ownership, and profit-making mechanism, to private industry.Peters’ anti-public philosophy has been demonstrated in full force in the transit sphere, an environment a highway woman is likely to feel uncomfortable in. Since she became full fledged DOT Secretary, Peters has been embroiled in the dispute over the construction of the Dulles Metrorail Extension of the Washington, D.C. subway to the suburban Virginian airport. After years of promises, Peters seemingly without justification, suddenly announced that the project would not meet federal standards, even though the year before, the project had been supported. Her evidence was that the now 40-years-old D.C. Metro was having increasing infrastructure problems; rather than providing a funding mechanism to solve the problem, however, she simply announced that Metro would not be able to handle the desperately sought and needed subway extension. After being pressured by some powerful Republican members of the Virginia Congressional delegation as well as the members of the Bechtel contracting team which had been hired to build the project, Peters suddenly reversed course, as if realizing that this public project would in fact provide some private benefits and was therefore acceptable. The D.C. Metro’s failings suddenly escaped her notice. And in fact, the Bush Administration has done little to invest in the nation’s older transit systems, such as those in New York City, Chicago, and Philadelphia, which are grossly under-maintained mostly because they are provided far fewer resources per user than smaller systems as a result of the federal government’s spending formula, which prioritizes small and medium towns’ transit networks. The New Starts program, which was intended to provide grants for new “fixed guideway” projects all over the country, has not had its resources increased with the rest of the federal budget, and the result is increasing inability for cities to finance new transit programs. The Small Starts program, which was intended for the construction of streetcar and BRT projects, was never allocated much of anything at all. Seeing New York’s subway fall into increasing decline even as traffic on the streets continued to mount, Peters encouraged the creation of Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s Congestion Zone, which would have charged drivers to enter Manhattan below 72nd Street. Favoring the wealthy over the poor, however, the system would not have guaranteed revenues to the transit system nor would it have ensured a lower fee for lower-income business owners and artists, some of whom truly are dependent on vehicles even in Manhattan. The inequitable program was defeated in the back rooms of the New York State Assembly, but the conservative mantra – the rich above the poor, the corporation above the people – stayed alive. Nowhere more evident has this been true, in fact, than in the Bush Administration’s approach to intercity rail policy. The President, beginning early in his term, decreased his proposed allocations to Amtrak to nil. He claimed that the national railways should be self-sustaining, even though highways and airports are paid for by the public. Never mentioning that Japanese and French rail systems only became profitable once they had invested tens of billions of dollars in high-speed rail infrastructure, the President simply assumed that he could pass off Amtrak to private industry, and find a way for the business people to make money off of it. And in fact, one of the President’s only solutions to the problem was considering auctioning off the railroad’s Northeast Corridor, perhaps the nation’s most valuable single infrastructure asset, to the highest bidder. Let business take care of it – why should government invest in the public’s right-of-way? Peters has reciprocated, doing virtually nothing in her post to push for intercity rail. This year, she proposed $30 million to new intercity rail projects nationwide, but the sum is so minimal it would only pay for about five miles of high speed rail track. It’s quite clear that the Bush Administration will do all it can to push transportation off of the docket of the public, and into the hands of someone else. But the problem of this lack of investment is quite clear, as evidenced in 2007′s infamous Minneapolis bridge incident. We need a strong transportation infrastructure in the United States, or our country will literally fall apart. The public sphere exists to provide resources that the private sphere cannot, and to do so in an equitable way. By systematically finding ways to move public resources into private hands, by encouraging the use of tolling mechanisms that favor the wealthy, and by de-investing in transit and rail, the Bush Administration has done just the opposite. The result is a nation whose roads and railways are in significantly worse shape than they were eight years ago. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the country requires a mind-boggling $1.6 trillion dollars in infrastructure investment, just to bring it to a good condition. Clearly, we have a big task ahead of us. It remains to be seen whether the next administration, whether Obama’s or McCain’s, will significantly change our broken system of infrastructure investment. Let it be clear, however, that for the future of this country, we better hope that it does.

# Ontology

Capitalism causes the ontological death worse than extinction

**Rojcewicz ‘6** (Richard Rojcewicz, Professor of Philosophy, Point Park University, Executive Director, Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center, Duquesne University; cotranslator of Heidegger’s work, 2006, The Gods and Technology: A Reading of Heidegger, p. 140-1

It may well be that conservation will succeed and that technology will solve its own problems by producing things that are safe and nonpolluting; nevertheless, the prime danger, which lies deeper down, will remain. For the danger is not primarily to the existence of humans but to their essence: "The threat to man does not come in the first instance from the potentially lethal effects of the machines and devices of technology. The genuine threat has already affected humans—in their essence" (FT, 29/28). In a sense, the threat inherent in modern technology has already been made good. Though we have thus far averted a nuclear disaster, that does not mean the genuine threat has been obviated. Humans still exist; they are not yet on the endangered species list. It would of course be tragic if humans made that list. Yet, for Heidegger, there could be something more tragic, namely for humans to go on living but to lose their human dignity, which stems from their essence. Here lies the prime danger, the one posed not by technological things but by the disclosive looking that constitutes the essence of modern technology. The prime danger is that humans could become (and in fact are already becoming) enslaved to this way of disclosive looking. Thus what is primarily in danger is human freedom; if humans went on living but allowed themselves to be turned into slaves—that would be the genuine tragedy. The danger in modern technology is that humans may fail to see themselves as free followers, fail to see the challenges directed at their freedom by the current guise of Being, and fail to see the genuine possibilities open to them to work out their destiny. Then, not seeing their freedom, humans will not protect it. They will let it slip away and will become mere followers, passively imposed on by modern technology, i.e., slaves to it, mere cogs in the machine. For Heidegger, there is an essential connection between seeing and freedom. The way out of slavery begins with seeing, insight. But it is the right thing that must be seen, namely, one's own condition. The danger is that humans may perfect their powers of scientific seeing and yet be blind to that wherein their dignity and freedom lie, namely the entire domain of disclosedness and their role in it. Humans would then pose as "masters of the earth," and yet their self-blindness would make them slaves.

Ontological damage is a prerequisite to discussion of action

Dillon ’99(Professor of Politics, University of Lancaster, “moral spaces,” JSTOR)

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other regional modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

# A2: Case outweighs

The Aff’s manipulation of emergency is a trap- it exploits fear to prop up ancapitalism

**Lissovov ‘8** (Assistant Professor- Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies- University of Texas at San Antonio, 2008 Noah De LissovoyCapitalism Nature Socialism, 19:1, 2008, 27 — 40.

A number of contemporary thinkers have argued that public discourse has become corrupted by an anxious preoccupation with what is immediate or shortterm. Thus Je´roˆmeBinde´ claims that an orientation to time dominated by emergency thinking neglects our collective responsibility to the future and atrophies the critical imagination.1 The decline of utopian thinking, in this analysis, is associated with a decline in the capacity for relationships with others across past and future generations. Likewise, Henry Giroux argues that the state of paranoia instituted by the ‘‘war on terror’’ should be replaced with a revitalized ‘‘public time’’ that would permit both a critical examination of how history has produced present crises, as well as a democratic deliberation about shared worlds and futures.2 And according to Hasana Sharp, the rule of fear in the present precludes an affirmation of sociality itself, as well as the exercise of democracy.3I contend in this essay that the shadow cast over contemporary culture by the notion of crisis and emergency is materially grounded within the structure of capitalism itself. Therefore, the present condition cannot simply be redrawn by changing the public conversation. It has been produced, rather, over a considerable amount of time by objective processes. As Binde´ points out, the urgency of challenging the irresponsibility of an exclusive orientation to the short term is precisely that we need to respond, over the long term, to a very real social and ecological emergency. It is important to recognize the extent to which the sense of emergency time projected by the Bush and Blair administrations after the events of September 11, 2001 is a cynical manipulation\*a distraction from both the real reasons for this catastrophe and the real ravages wrought by the system these administrations represent, as well as an excuse for a new phase of imperialist adventurism. The extended paroxysm of fear of the unknown, the Other, and the outside for which this attack has served as the excuse has also become the platform for an energetic expansion of the military and security apparatus, as Mike Davis predicted.5 At another level, however, these proliferating interventions and fortifications themselves, along with a dramatic series of disasters both political and natural, produce a temporality of emergency in the present that is very real. Indeed, the effectiveness of the control over communications by elites depends on the reality that we do experience this other, deeper emergency, in an unarticulated way; thus it becomes an instinctual sense that can be exploited precisely to the extent that it is not properly explored and understood. In this way, the scale and frequency of disaster solicits not only a fanatical millenarianism, but also an immanently rational foreboding and anxiety. The task is to follow the lead of that anxiety in order to discover its real connections, including both its dangers and possibilities. However exploited, redirected, or hystericalized, this underlying intuition is at some level truly responsive and indicates an actual crisis, the terms of which are essential to specify. What can we make of this collective ‘‘common sense,’’ in Gramsci’s terms?6How can it be interrogated and developed into an actual and useful knowledge that might respond to the questions that our historical moment proposes? The essential task of analysis, in this regard, is to move from a simple description of breakdown and mere measurement of panic to the illumination of a problem. Chaos refuses an explanation, but a crisis has causes\*it represents a contradiction, a clash of imperatives and principles that can be identified. My approach to the analysis of crisis in this essay is situated in a critical theoretical and Marxist framework, although I also suggest that the contradictions foregrounded by this tradition need to be partly rethought in light of current transformations in the nature of power and resistance to power. At the same time that we confront an objective social emergency, we are also faced with a crisis of familiar explanations. Popular concerns about a decline in democratic engagement, as well as progressive and even radical denunciations of creeping corporatization, often seem unable to comprehend the most salient features of power in the present\* its destructiveness, its irrationality (defying even, it sometimes seems, capitalism’s own distorted reason), and its global reach and scale. Likewise, in the context of these tendencies, the kinds of democratic agency proposed by familiar explanations seem incapable of constituting an opposition adequate to the present moment. In the latter part of this paper, I outline the principles of an emerging form of oppositional praxis, one that inverts the negativity of emergency time while appropriating irruption and unpredictability as figures of a revolutionary process.

\*\*\*A2’s:

# A2: Perm

**You cannot solve within the system**.

**Korten ‘2** (David Korten, President of the People-Centered Development Forum, in 2002 (BEYOND THE GLOBAL SUICIDE ECONOMY, June 22, 2002, p. <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/pcdf/2002/Gobal6Billion.htm>.)

The first step is to get clear that transformational change is not going to come from within the institutions of the suicide economy. The suicide economy is what organizational consultant Margaret Wheatley calls an “emergent system.” No one planned it. Those responsible for corporate interests grew it into being in their day-to-day effort to increase profits and market share. Step-by-step over a period spanning hundreds of years they reshaped the politics, the legal system, and the culture of humanity to create the interlocking system of interests, laws, and mutual obligations that make the suicide economy virtually impossible to transform from within. Those who promote serious reforms with the suicide economy are almost invariably marginalized or expelled. To change an emergent system that no longer serves you must displace it by growing a more powerful emergent system. According to Wheatley: “This means that the work of change is to start over, to organize new local efforts, connect them to each other, and know that their values and practices can emerge as something even stronger.” The key to transformational change is to create cultural, economic, political, and even spiritual spaces in which to explore new ways of being with one another toward the emergence of new cultures and institutions. This is why the existence of millions of living enterprises is so important. Presently most exist at the fringes of and dependent on the institutions of the suicide economy. The possibility remains, however, for them to gradually walk away from the institutions of the suicide economy and begin to growing webs of relationships among themselves to bring into being newly emerging living economies. The greater the number of members and links in the web the greater the life energy that participating enterprises may potentially attract and recycle within the living economy, thus increasing the strength and viability of both the web and its individual members. Community members can be encouraged to give preference to local living enterprises in their shopping choices, and eventually in their employment and investment choices.

The perm can’t solve the alt – only blatant rejection can destroy it

**Herod ‘4** (James, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm>, Getting Free, 4th Edition A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There *is* no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks,but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must *want something else* and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

The state cannot mediate our fight against our capitalism- perm gets coopted

Holloway ‘5 (John, professor at Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences at the Autonomous University of Puebla, Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?, 5 April 05, <http://www.isj.org.uk/index.php4?id=98>)

I don’t know the answer. Perhaps we can change the world without taking power. Perhaps we cannot.The starting point—for all of us, I think—is uncertainty, not knowing, a common search for a way forward. Because it becomes more and more clear that capitalism is a catastrophe for humanity. A radical change in the organisation of society, that is, revolution, is more urgent than ever.And this revolution can only be world revolution if it is to be effective. But it is unlikely that world revolution can be achieved in one single blow. This means that the only way in which we can conceive of revolution is as interstitial revolution, as a revolution that takes place in the interstices of capitalism, a revolution that occupies spaces in the world while capitalism still exists. The question is how we conceive of these interstices, whether we think of them as states or in other ways. In thinking about this, we have to start from where we are, from the many rebellions and insubordinations that have brought us to Porto Alegre.The world is full of such rebellions, of people saying NO to capitalism: NO, we shall not live our lives according to the dictates of capitalism,we shall do what we consider necessary or desirable and not what capital tells us to do. Sometimes we just see capitalism as an all-encompassing system of domination and forget that such rebellions exist everywhere. At times they are so small that even those involved do not perceive them as refusals, but often they are collective projects searching for an alternative way forward and sometimes they are as big as the Lacandon Jungle or the Argentinazo of three years ago or the revolt in Bolivia just over a year ago.All of these insubordinations are characterised by a drive towards self-determination, an impulse that says, ‘No, you will not tell us what to do, we shall decide for ourselves what we must do.’ These refusals can be seen as fissures, as cracks in the system of capitalist domination. Capitalism is not (in the first place) an economic system, but a system of command. Capitalists, through money, command us, telling us what to do. To refuse to obey is to break the command of capital.The question for us, then, is how do we multiply and expand these refusals, these cracks in the texture of domination? There are two ways of thinking about this. The first says that these movements, these many insubordinations, lack maturity and effectiveness unless they are focused, unless they are channelled towards a goal. For them to be effective, they must be channelled towards the conquest of state power—either through elections or through the overthrowing of the existing state and the establishment of a new, revolutionary state. The organisational form for channelling all these insubordinations towards that aim is the party. The question of taking state power is not so much a question of future intentions as of present organisation. How should we organise ourselves in the present? Should we join a party, an organisational form that focuses our discontent on the winning of state power? Or should we organise in some other way? The second way of thinking about the expansion and multiplication of insubordinations is to say, ‘No, they should not be all harnessed together in the form of a party, they should flourish freely, go whatever way the struggle takes them.’ This does not mean that there should be no coordination, but it should be a much looser coordination. Above all, the principal point of reference is not the state but the society that we want to create. The principal argument against the first conception is that it leads us in the wrong direction. The state is not a thing, it is not a neutral object: it is a form of social relations, a form of organisation, a way of doing things which has been developed over several centuries for the purpose of maintaining or developing the rule of capital. If we focus our struggles on the state, or if we take the state as our principal point of reference, we have to understand that the state pulls us in a certain direction. Above all, it seeks to impose upon us a separation of our struggles from society, to convert our struggle into a struggle on behalf of, in the name of. It separates leaders from the masses, the representatives from the represented; it draws us into a different way of talking, a different way of thinking. It pulls us into a process of reconciliation with reality, and that reality is the reality of capitalism, a form of social organisation that is based on exploitation and injustice, on killing and destruction. It also draws us into a spatial definition of how we do things, a spatial definition which makes a clear distinction between the state’s territory and the world outside, and a clear distinction between citizens and foreigners. It draws us into a spatial definition of struggle that has no hope of matching the global movement of capital. There is one key concept in the history of the state-centred left, and that concept is betrayal. Time and time again the leaders have betrayed the movement, and not necessarily because they are bad people, but just because the state as a form of organisation separates the leaders from the movement and draws them into a process of reconciliation with capital. Betrayal is already given in the state as an organisational form.Can we resist this? Yes, of course we can, and it is something that happens all the time. We can refuse to let the state identify leaders or permanent representatives of the movement, we can refuse to let delegates negotiate in secret with the representatives of the state. But this means understanding that our forms of organisation are very different from those of the state, that there is no symmetry between them.The state is an organisation on behalf of, what we want is the organisation of self-determination, a form of organisation that allows us to articulate what we want, what we decide, what we consider necessary or desirable. What we want, in other words, is a form of organisation that does not have the state as its principal point of reference. The argument against taking the state as the principal point of reference is clear, but what of the other concept? The state-oriented argument can be seen as a pivoted conception of the development of struggle. Struggle is conceived as having a central pivot, the taking of state power. First we concentrate all our efforts on winning the state, we organise for that, then, once we have achieved that, we can think of other forms of organisation, we can think of revolutionising society. First we move in one direction, in order to be able to move in another: the problem is that the dynamic acquired during the first phase is difficult or impossible to dismantle in the second phase. The other concept focuses directly on the sort of society we want to create, without passing through the state. There is no pivot: organisation is directly prefigurative, directly linked to the social relations we want to create. Where the first concept sees the radical transformation of society as taking place after the seizure of power, the second insists that it must begin now.Revolution not when the time is right but revolution here and now.

# A2: Inevitable

They have it backwards

**Johnston ‘4** (Adrian JOHNSTON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of New Mexico, 2004, Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, Volume 9 // Issue 3

A brief remark by Žižek hints that, despite his somewhat pessimistic assessment of traditional Marxism, he basically agrees with the Marxist conviction that the demise of capitalism is an inevitable, unavoidable historical necessity—“The ultimate answer to the reproach that the radical Left proposals are utopian should thus be that, today, the true utopia is the belief that the present liberal-democratic capitalist consensus could go on indefinitely, without radical changes.”151 This hurling of the charge of utopianism back at those making it is quite convincing. In fact, any system proclaiming to be the embodiment of “the end of history” invariably appears to be utopian. Given what is known about the merciless march of history, believing that an ultimate, unsurpassable socio-political arrangement finally has arrived is almost impossible. So, one should indeed accept as true the unlikelihood of capitalism continuing on indefinitely; it must eventually give way to something else, even if this “x” cannot be envisioned clearly from within the present context. Nonetheless, Žižek’s own theorizing calls for a great deal of cautious reservation about the consequences of embracing this outlook as true, of falling into the trap of (to invoke this motif once more) lying in the guise of truth. Just as the combination of a purely negative, critical Marxism with the anticipation of the event of the act-miracle threatens to turn into an intellectual fetish (in the Žižekian ideological sense of something that renders the present reality bearable), so too might acknowledging the truth of capitalism’s finitude have the same unfortunate side-effect. One can tolerate today’s capitalism, because one knows that it cannot last forever; one can passively and patiently wait it out (at one point, Žižek identifies this anticipation of indeterminate change-yet-to-come as a disempowering lure, although he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge that his own work on ideology sometimes appears to be enthralled by just such a lure152). In both cases, the danger is that the very analyses developed by Žižek in his assault upon late-capitalist ideology might serve to facilitate the sustenance of the cynical distance whose underlying complicity with the present state of affairs he describes so well.

The argument that we cannot overcome capitalism is another link - it saps the critical energy from the alt

Zizek ‘95(Slavoj, Ideology Between Fiction and Fantasy, Cardozo Law Review, lexis)

The problematic of "multiculturalism" that imposes itself today is therefore the form of appearance of its opposite, of the massive presence of Capitalism as universal world system: it bears witness to the unprecedented homogenization of today's world. It is effectively as if, since the horizon of social imagination no longer allows us to entertain the idea of an eventual demise of Capitalism - since, as we might put it, everybody seems to accept that Capitalism is here to stay - the critical energy found a substitute outlet in fighting for cultural differences which leave the basic homogeneity of the capitalist world-system intact. Sowe are fighting our PC battles for the rightof ethnic minorities, of gays and lesbians, of different "life-styles," etc., while Capitalism pursues its triumphant march - and today's critical theory, in the guise of "cultural studies," is doing the ultimate service to the unrestrained development of Capitalism by actively contributing in the ideological effort to render its massive presence invisible: in a typical postmodern "cultural critique," the very mention of Capitalism as world system tends to give rise to the accusation of "essentialism," "fundamentalism," etc.

Discourse about the inevitability of capitalism makes it inevitable – Capitalism is self-constructed that can be changed.

Gibson-Graham ‘6(Graham is Professor of Geography for Clark University, Gibson Prof. Geosciences University of Mass. Amherest,“A Postcapitalist Politics”, p. 53-54)

Why has Economy become an everyday term that denotes a force to be reckoned with existing outside of politics and society-a force that constitutes the ultimate arbiter of possibility? How is it that waged labor, the commodity market, and capitalist enterprise have come to be seen as the only "normal" forms of work, exchange, and business organization? When was it that capitalism assumed dis-cursive dominance, becoming the only present form of economy and all that. could be imagined as existing in the proximate future? And why do we have little to say these days about an expansive and generative politics of noncapitalistconstruction ?lWe are convinced that the answers to these questions are connected to the almost total naturalization of "the economy" that has taken place in pub¬lic discourse over recent decades, coinciding with the demise of socialism as an actually existing "alternative" and growing alarm that, with globalization, the autonomy of national economies, and therefore their manageability, is being undermined, This shift from an understanding of the economy as something that can be transformed, or at least managed (by people, the state, the IMF), to something that governs society has involved a hegemonic move by which representations of economy have slipped from their locations in discourse and landed "on the ground," in the "real," not just separate from but outside of society. In thesepostmodern times, the economy is denied the discursive mandate given to other social spheres and the consequences for the viability of any political project of economic innovation are dire. If we are to enact new economies, we need to imagine "the economy" differently-as something that is created in specific geographical contexts and in historically path-dependent ways, but this is not an easy or straightforward project. As Timothy Mitchell argues, we are up against an already existing eco¬nomic object materialized in socio-technical networks of calculation that have, since the 1930s, produced the economy as a "singular and self-evident totali¬ty" (forthcoming)." The economic landscape has been molded according to the imaginary functionings of a "self-contained and dynamic mechanism" known as "the economy," and this representation is difficult to dislodge.