

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Specific Link (International Law) Answers

Marxist theory is neutral on international law

Bill **Bowring**, June 2, **2014**, Bill Bowring Lecture: 'A Marxist approach to state responsibility', Amsterdam, 19 June 2014, Bill Bowring is Professor of Law in the School of Law, Birkbeck, University of London. Barrister at Field Court Chambers, Gray's Inn, criticallegalthinking.com/2014/06/02/bill-bowring-lecture-marxist-approach-state-responsibility/

Marx and Engels had practically nothing to say about law, much less international law. They had strong principled positions on self-determination, for example, for Ireland and Poland as oppressed nations; were in favour of the North in the American Civil War; and against British colonialism in India and French colonialism in Algeria. Lenin developed Marx's and Engels's position on self-determination and formulated a right of peoples to self-determination, put into practice in the Baltics, Finland, Poland, but reversed by Stalin. But this was not explicitly or implicitly a critique of international law. Yevgeny Pashukanis, while he was a legal adviser negotiating in Berlin the Treaty of Rapallo, wrote the General Theory of Law and Marxism, introducing the "commodity form" theory of law. But Pashukanis's own writings on international law and those of his rival and successor Korovin and indeed the Soviet approach to international law were thoroughly positivist, although repeatedly and paradoxically undercut by self-determination.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Specific Link (Hegemony) Answers

Link Turn: The alternative to US hegemony is Chinese hegemony which is the worst parts of capitalism and more repressive

Rebecca **Liao**, December 19, **2014**, Beware of Chinese Hegemony, The National Interest, Rebecca Liao is a corporate attorney, writer and China analyst based in Silicon Valley. Her writing has appeared in Financial Times, Foreign Affairs, The Atlantic and Bloomberg View, among various other publications, nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/beware-chinese-hegemony-11896

In its new leadership role, China is promising it will avoid the traps of Western multilateralism. Namely, it will not demand that countries meet conditions for financial aid that disregard local input and circumstances.

In a key foreign policy speech given late last month, Chinese President Xi Jinping rebuked the Western order and pledged that China will “respect the independent choice of development path and social system by people of other countries.” This is obviously pretense. First, China’s overseas development projects to date have often disregarded local

considerations. True, its bilateral investments have filled a gap where developing countries in Latin America and Asia fail to meet the free-market, liberal requirements of organizations like the IMF and WTO. For example, the China Development Bank and China Export-Import Bank provided approximately \$110 billion to developing countries in 2009 and 2010. Latin America received \$79 billion from these two Chinese banks from 2003 through 2011, far outpacing the World Bank’s \$57 billion. Africa, the largest beneficiary, has reportedly received approximately \$170 billion in foreign investment over the last nine years. () While avoiding the political chaos and economic instability of Western-style globalization, many Chinese investment projects have nevertheless led to vast local environmental

destruction. Unemployment remains untreated or worsens since China prefers to use its own workers.

Local laws and regulations may remain untouched, but Sinification persists. Second, even without explicit economic coercion, China is starting to mold its patron countries into its own image of

authoritarian capitalism. This is especially pronounced in Central Asian governments, particularly the regimes of Nazarbayev’s Kazakhstan and Karimov’s Uzbekistan. And despite their democratic ambitions, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Venezuela Argentina and many other recipients of Chinese dollars are all leaning towards statist models of development.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik General Link Answers

We can use the state against capitalism

Christian **Parenti**, April **2014**, "Climate Change: What Role for Reform?" MONTHLY REVIEW v. 65 n. 11, Christian Parenti is a Professor of Sustainable Development at the School for International Training, Graduate Institute <http://monthlyreview.org/2014/04/01/climate-change-role-reform>, accessed 4-24-14.

There was also a larger point to my essay that the MR editors did not address. By describing policies that the U.S. capitalist state could undertake right now to start euthanizing the fossil-fuel industry, I was also attempting to start a conversation about the state. Once upon a time the state was the heart of the socialist project. But neoliberalism's anti-statist rhetoric has almost "disappeared" the state as an intellectual object—even on much of the left. **The capitalist state is not just a tool of capital's rule. It is also an arena of class struggle.** As such it is an institution that can solidify and enforce popular political victories over capital. If the struggle for climate justice is to get anywhere it will have to think more deeply about the contradictions of the capitalist state, and how such contradictions can be exploited in the short term. On that point, I hope you would agree.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Consequentialist Impact Scenario Answers

Impact Turn: Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts

Anatole **Kaletsky, 2011**, *Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis*, p. 19-21, Anatole Kaletsky is editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relations and on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics

Democratic **capitalism is a system built for survival**. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism's equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products. Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society's problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years. But regardless of the difference in timescale, **capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems**. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning" by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, "zombie" banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d'être is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of "passing on our problems to our grand-children"—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Consequentialist Impact Scenario Framing Answers

Framing Turn: Consequentialism is bad – leads to horrendous decision making

Danny **Scoccia, 2007**, Moral theories: Utilitarianism, Kantianism, and Religious Ethics. Reading: pp. 6-17 & 20-26, Danny Scoccia is Professor Emeritus (Ph.D. University of California at San Diego) at New Mexico State University, Dr. Scoccia's interests include ethical theory, philosophy of law and social and political philosophy, web.nmsu.edu/~dscoccia/321web/321ethicstheory.pdf

The other three views—Kantian ethics, natural rights theories, and “religious ethics”—all agree that **there are many circumstances when maximizing utility would be wrong**. Perhaps the strongest objection to Act Utilitarianism comes from the natural rights theory: Act **Utilitarianism is false, because it tells us to violate people's rights when that's necessary to maximize utility**. The example of Joseph illustrates it, but **here's another example**. **A surgeon has 1 healthy and 5 sick and dying patients. Each of the sick and dying patients needs a new organ— one a new kidney, another a new liver, the third a new heart, etc.—and would fully recover if he received it. It so happens that the 1 healthy patient would be a suitable organ donor for all of them. If the surgeon kills the 1 and redistributes his organs, he saves 5. If he does nothing, then 1 is alive and 5 are dead. On the assumption that all six are equally happy, loved by others, and productive of utility for others in society, then the way to maximize utility is to kill the 1. But if he won't consent to being killed and having his organs transplanted (he doesn't believe in utilitarianism), then killing him would violate his right to life. The objection is simply that it would be wrong to violate his right even if it's the way to maximize utility.**

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Deontological Impact Scenario Answers

Impact Turn: Capitalism is a morally sound system – it preserves freedom to act which is the core of the human condition

Peter **Saunders, 2007**, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, Peter Saunders is a Fellow at the Center for Independent Studies, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html

What Clive Hamilton airily dismisses as a ‘growth’ fetish’ has resulted in one hour of work today delivering twenty-five times more value than it did in 1850. This has freed huge chunks of our time for leisure, art, sport, learning, and other ‘soul-enriching’ pursuits. Despite all the exaggerated talk of an ‘imbalance’ between work and family life, the average Australian today spends a much greater proportion of his or her lifetime free of work than they would had they belonged to any previous generation in history. There is another sense, too, in which capitalism has freed individuals so they can pursue worthwhile lives, and that lies in its record of undermining tyrannies and dictatorships. As examples like Pinochet’s Chile and Putin’s Russia vividly demonstrate, a free economy does not guarantee a democratic polity or a society governed by the rule of law. But as Milton Friedman once pointed out, these latter conditions are never found in the absence of a free economy.(12) Historically, it was capitalism that delivered humanity from the ‘soul-destroying’ weight of feudalism. Later, it freed millions from the dead hand of totalitarian socialism. While capitalism may not be a sufficient condition of human freedom, it is almost certainly a necessary one. [continues] Wherever populations have a chance to move, the flow is always towards capitalism, not away from it. The authorities never had a problem keeping West Germans out of East Germany, South Koreans out of North Korea, or Taiwanese out of Communist China. The attraction of living in a capitalist society is not just that the economy works. It is also that if your version of the good life leads you to turn your back on capitalism, you don’t have to pick up sticks and move away. If you don’t like capitalism, there is no need to bribe people-smugglers to get you out of the country. You simply buy a plot of land, build your mud-brick house, and drop out (or, like Clive, you set up your own think tank and sell books urging others to drop out).

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Deontological Impact Scenario Framing Answers

Framing Turn: Deontology is a failed moral system – ticking time bomb proves

Mark J. Buha, 2010, Rule Utilitarian and Deontologist Perspectives on Comparisons of Torture and Killing, Washington University Jurisprudence Review Volume 2, Issue 2, Mark Buha is an Associate at Maune Raichle Hartley French & Mudd law firm, Mark earned his Juris Doctor from Washington University in St. Louis in 2011. He served as a Senior Editor of the Jurisprudence Review, openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=law_jurisprudence

Deontologists, like rule utilitarians, devise rules that must be followed universally. Deontologists and rule utilitarians differ only in what criteria they use to formulate these rules. Rule utilitarians use only pleasure and pain. They hold that any act that maximizes pleasure and minimizes pain when applied universally is good. Deontologists evaluate actions under an entirely different rubric than rule utilitarians,⁷² often focusing on the mental state of the actor or whether the act violates another's rights.⁷³ **If it violates another's rights, it is strictly forbidden, regardless of the consequences**.⁷⁴ Deontologists tend to treat each individual separately as an end in itself.⁷⁵ Applying this analysis, many deontologists forbid torture under all circumstances.⁷⁶ see torture as a particularly repugnant violation of individual rights. It requires specific intent, deprives the victim of dignity, and invades the victim's physical and psychological integrity. Provided grave enough consequences, this uncompromising position represents a fanaticism⁷⁷ and "moral fundamentalism" that is difficult to defend. Hardly anyone finds it acceptable to rigidly adhere to an abstract moral principle—no matter how sound the principle appears in isolation—when doing so results in the death of hundreds or thousands of people.⁷⁹

Deontologists allow catastrophe and mass death to occur to protect a single individual simply because torture violates his or her rights. The infamous "ticking time bomb" hypothetical illuminates these objections. In this scenario, a bomb is located in a crowded city. If detonated, it will destroy the entire city and millions will die. The bomb's location is unknown, and there is not enough time for a general search. Law enforcement apprehends one of the bomb's planters who knows the bomb's location and how to deactivate it. If the terrorist divulges the information, law enforcement has enough time to disable the bomb. Given these facts, few would adhere to principle; most would torture the individual in order to extract information that would save millions. This hypothetical presses deontology to its ideological limits. Once the prohibitionist admits he would allow torture in this situation, he concedes that his opposition to torture is not based on principle alone, but on something else.⁸⁰ Deontologists respond with both logical and empirical objections to the ticking time bomb hypothetical's seductive simplicity. First, as Richard Matthews points out, the argument may be valid, but it is unsound, and therefore it cannot seriously undermine any position on torture.⁸¹ The ticking bomb argument sets forth an "if-then" conditional: if these facts exist, then a reasonable person would torture.⁸² If the antecedent holds, the consequence follows. But the hypothetical assumes the antecedent's truth without providing any proof. Valid but not sound, the hypothetical proves nothing. If we accepted mere validity, anything could be proven.⁸³ Second, deontologists point out how unlikely it is that the antecedent facts would ever simultaneously exist in the real world. Although each premise has an empirical likelihood of being false, the hypothetical assumes that (1) an actual terrorist threat exists, (2) the threat is imminent, (3) the threat is sufficiently dangerous to justify torture, (4) the apprehended suspect possesses any information relevant to the threat, (5) only a single individual possesses all of the information necessary to extinguish the threat, (6) the individual participated in the attack or is a wrongdoer, (7) torture will be effective in forcing the subject to disclose information, (8) the information disclosed is truthful, and (9) the torturer can distinguish truthful and false information simply by observing the subject. The distinct unlikelihood that all nine elements will simultaneously exist in the real world renders the example almost irrelevant, useful only as a thought exercise.⁸⁴ While these criticisms expose the assumptions in the ticking time bomb hypothetical, they ultimately avoid the issue. While it might be extremely unlikely that such factual circumstances will ever exist, it is not conceptually impossible. The fact remains that **rigid deontology allows the bombs to go off in that scenario**, however unlikely. **Deontologists allow the world to explode to avoid violating the rights of a single individual**.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Alternative Answers

No Solvency: The working class will not succeed in overthrowing the capitalist system

Mike **Cole 2009**, "Critical Race Theory and Education A Marxist Response", chapter 7, pg 121, Mike Cole is a Research Professor in Education and Equality, Head of Research and Director of the Centre for Education for Social Justice at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, UK

The Working Class Won't Create the Revolution Because They Are Reactionary. It is a fundamental tenet of Marxism that the working class are the agents of social revolution, and that the working class, as noted above, needs to become a 'class for itself' in addition to being a 'class in itself' (Marx, 1847 [1995]). It is unfortunately the case that major parts of the world are a long way off such a scenario at the present conjuncture. It is also the case that successful interpellation and related false consciousness hampers the development of class consciousness and the move towards the overthrow of capitalism. Britain is one example where the Ruling Class has been particularly successful in interpellating the working class (see Cole, 2008g, 2008h for discussion). Elsewhere, however, there are examples of burgeoning class consciousness, witnessed for example by the growth of Left parties (see below) in Europe and by developments across South America, notably the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (see below) and in Bolivia. It is to be hoped that, as neoliberal global imperial capitalism continues to reveal and expose its essential ruthlessness and contempt for those who make its profits, class consciousness will increase and that the working class will one day be in a position to overthrow (world) capitalism and to replace it with (world) democratic socialism. Perhaps it should be pointed out here that Marxists do not idolize or deify the working class; it is rather that the structural location in capitalist societies of the working class, so that, once it has become 'a class in itself' makes it the agent for change. Moreover the very act of social revolution and the creation of socialism mean the end of the very existence of the working class as a social class. As Marx and Engels (1845) [1975] put it: When socialist writers ascribe this world-historic role to the proletariat, it is not at all ... because they regard the proletarians as gods. Rather the contrary ... [The proletariat] cannot emancipate itself without abolishing the conditions of its own life. It cannot abolish the conditions of its own life without abolishing all the inhuman conditions of society today which are summed up in its own situation.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Alternative Answers

No Solvency: Alternatives to capitalism fail – lack of individual choice results in tyranny or failure

Allan **Meltzer** March 12, **2009**, "Why Capitalism?" 2008-2009 Bradley Lecture Series, Allan Meltzer is Professor of Political Economy at Carnegie Mellon University's School of Business, Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, First Recipient of the AEI Irving Kristol Award, and Chairman of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.29525,filter.all/pub_detail.asp

Alternatives to Capitalism Critics of capitalism emphasize their dislike of greed and self-interest. They talk a great deal about social justice and fairness, but they do not propose an acceptable alternative to achieve their ends. The alternatives that have been tried are types of Socialism or Communism or other types of authoritarian rule. Anti-capitalist proposals suffer from two crippling drawbacks. First, they ignore the Kantian principle about human imperfection. Second, they ignore individual differences. In place of individual choice under capitalism, they substitute rigid direction done to achieve some proclaimed end such as equality, fairness, or justice. These ends are not precise and, most important, individuals differ about what is fair and just. In practice, the rulers' choices are enforced, often using fear, terror, prison, or other punishment. The history of the twentieth century illustrates how enforcement of promised ends became the justification for deplorable means. And the ends were not realized. Transferring resource allocation decisions to government bureaus does not eliminate crime, greed, self-dealing, conflict of interest, and corruption.

Experience tells us these problems remain. The form may change, but as Kant recognized, the problems continue. Ludwig von Mises recognized in the 1920s that fixing prices and planning resource use omitted an essential part of the allocation problem. Capitalism allocates by letting relative prices adjust to equal the tradeoffs expressed by buyers' demands. Fixing prices eliminates the possibility of efficient allocation and replaces consumer choice with official decisions. Some gain, but others lose; the losers want to make choices other than those that are dictated to them. Not all Socialist societies have been brutal. In the nineteenth century, followers of Robert Owen, the Amana people, and many others chose a Socialist system. Israeli pioneers chose a collectivist system, the kibbutz. None of these arrangements produced sustainable growth. None survived. All faced the problem of imposing allocative decisions that satisfied the decision-making group, sometimes a majority, often not. Capitalism recognizes that where individual wants differ, the market responds to the mass; minorities are free to develop their favored outcome. Walk down the aisles of a modern supermarket. There are products that satisfy many different tastes or beliefs. Theodor Adorno was a leading critic of postwar capitalism as it developed in his native Germany, in Europe, and in the United States. He found the popular culture vulgar, and he distrusted the workers' choices. He wanted a Socialism that he hoped would uphold the values he shared with other intellectuals. Capitalism, he said, valued work too highly and true leisure too little. He disliked jazz, so he was not opposed to Hitler's ban in the 1930s. But Adorno offered no way of achieving the culture he desired other than to impose his tastes on others and ban all choices he disliked. This appealed to people who shared his view. Many preferred American pop culture whenever they had the right to choose. Capitalism permits choices and the freedom to make them. Some radio stations play jazz, some offer opera and symphonies, and many play pop music. Under capitalism, advertisers choose what they sponsor, and they sponsor programs that people choose to hear or watch. Under Socialism, the public watches and hears what someone chooses for them. The public had little choice. In Western Europe change did not come until boats outside territorial limits offered choice. The Templeton Foundation recently ran an advertisement reporting the answers several prominent intellectuals gave to the question: "Does the free market corrode moral character?" Several respondents recognized that free markets operate within a political system, a legal framework, and the rule of law. The slave trade and slavery became illegal in the nineteenth century. Before this a majority enslaved a minority. This is a major blot on the morality of democratic choice that public opinion and the law eventually removed. In the United States those who benefitted did not abandon slave owning until forced by a war. Most respondents to the Templeton question took a mixed stand. The philosopher John Gray recognized that greed and envy are driving forces under capitalism, but they often produce growth and raise living standards so that many benefit. But greed leads to outcomes like Enron and WorldCom that critics take as a characteristic of the system rather than as a characteristic of some individuals that remains under Socialism. Michael Walzer recognized that political activity also corrodes moral character, but he claimed it was regulated more effectively. One of the respondents discussed whether capitalism was more or less likely to foster or sustain moral abuses than other social arrangements. Bernard-Henri Levy maintained that alternatives to the market such as fascism and Communism were far worse. None of the respondents mentioned Kant's view that mankind

includes a range of individuals who differ in their moral character. Institutional and social arrangements like democracy and capitalism influence the moral choices individuals make or reject. **No democratic capitalist country produced any crimes comparable to the murders committed by Hitler's Germany, Mao's China, or Lenin and Stalin's Soviet Union.** As Lord Acton warned, concentrated power corrupts officials. Some use concentrated power to impose their will. Some allow their comrades to act as tyrants. Others proclaim that ends such as equality justify force to control opposition. Communism proclaimed a vision of equality that it never approached. It was unattainable because individuals differ about what is good. And what is good to them and for them is not the same as what is socially desirable to critics of capitalism. Kant's principle warns that utopian visions are unattainable. Capitalism does not offer a vision of perfection and harmony. Democratic capitalism combines freedom, opportunity, growth, and progress with restrictions on less desirable behavior. It creates societies that treat men and women as they are, not as in some utopian vision. In *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Karl Popper showed why utopian visions become totalitarian. All deviations from the utopian ideal must be prevented. The Enrons, WorldComs, and others of that kind show that dishonest individuals rise along with honest individuals. Those who use these examples to criticize capitalism do not use the same standard to criticize all governments as failed arrangements when a Watergate or bribery is uncovered. Nor do they criticize government when politicians promise but do not produce or achieve. We live after twenty-five to forty years of talk about energy, education, healthcare, and drugs. Governments promise and propose, but little if any progress is visible on these issues.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Alternative Answers

No Solvency: Capitalism is inevitable—reforms, not revolution, are the only option.

John K **Wilson, 2000**, "How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People" p. 15- 16, John K. Wilson is Editor and Publisher of Illinois Academe,

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Permutation

Permutation: Do both – Reforms from with-in the system solve best

Chris **Dixon 2001**, "Reflections on Privilege, Reformism, and Activism", Activist and founding member of Direct Action Network Summer, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/chris-dixon-reflections-on-privilege-reformism-and-activism-a-response-to-sasha-k-s-activism-an.lt.pdf>

To bolster his critique of 'reformism,' for instance, he critically cites one of the examples in my essay: demanding authentic we need revolutionary strategy that links diverse, everyday struggles and demands to long-term radical objectives, without sacrificing either. Of course, this isn't to say that every so-called 'progressive' ballot initiative or organizing campaign is necessarily radical or strategic. Reforms are not all created equal. But some can fundamentally shake systems of power, leading to enlarged gains and greater space for further advances. Andre Gorz, in his seminal book *Strategy for Labor*, refers to these as "non-reformist" or "structural" reforms. He contends, "a struggle for non-reformist reforms--for anti-capitalist reforms--is one which does not base its validity and its right to exist on capitalist needs, criteria, and rationales. A non-reformist reform is determined not in terms of what can be, but what should be." Look to history for examples: the end of slavery, the eight-hour workday, desegregation. All were born from long, hard struggles, and none were endpoints. Yet they all struck at the foundations of power (in these cases, the state, white supremacy, and capitalism), and in the process, they created new prospects for revolutionary change. Now consider contemporary struggles: amnesty for undocumented immigrants, socialized health care, expansive environmental protections, indigenous sovereignty. These and many more are arguably non-reformist reforms as well. None will single-handedly dismantle capitalism or other systems of power, but each has the potential to escalate struggles and sharpen social contradictions. And we shouldn't misinterpret these efforts as simply meliorative incrementalism, making 'adjustments' to a fundamentally flawed system.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Transition Wars Disadvantage Link

Link: Capitalist elites will resist the alternative, causing global transition wars

Lee **Harris**, December 1, **2002**, The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing, Hoover Institution Policy Review December 2002 & 2003, Lee Harris is an American author and essayist who writes for Policy Review and Tech Central Station who lives in Stone Mountain, Georgia, www.hoover.org/research/intellectual-origins-america-bashing

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe.

Capitalism Kritik Answers - SCS

Capitalism Kritik Transition Wars Disadvantage Impact

Impact: Revolution is necessarily violent – alternative would lead to levels of unprecedented violence

Michael **Cummings & Eric Cummings, 2011** (On Violence, "Revolutions are Violent", Michael Cummings is veteran and a writer, who deployed to Afghanistan in 2008 with the 173rd Airborne Brigade as a platoon leader, and Iraq in 2010 with 5th Special Forces Group as an intelligence officer. Eric Cummings is a writer who lives in Los Angeles. Their outside writing has appeared in the Washington Post, Stars and Stripes, The New York Times' "At War" blog, FP.com/Thomas Ricks' "The Best Defense" blog and Infantry magazine, <http://onviolence.com/?e=531>)

Michael was arguing a point that we haven't argued enough on this website: revolutions are violent. ¶ Which may seem obvious. Except that extremists from both sides of the political spectrum casually endorse revolutions, like my liberal activist friend endorsing a revolution--a revolution, it is safe to say, the vast majority of the population didn't endorse--to solve the environmental crisis. Like Occupy Protesters who just love revolutions, idealized, romanticized and fantasized through Che Guevara T-shirts, Youtube videos of street protests, and Guy Fawkes masks. Like Tea partiers make a point of bringing guns to political rallies, in case they need to overthrow the government. Both sides casually endorse violence, from Tea Party candidates to Occupy speakers. ¶ (We should make it clear that by "revolutions", we mean revolutions that overthrow the existing power structure, not social or technological revolutions like the industrial revolution, the digital boom or the green revolution.) ¶ The Arab Spring, as our most thought provoking event of 2011, should remind would-be-American-revolutionaries what a revolution really is: the break down of society and order, a revolution in power, which (mostly) results in violence. In this pan-Arab/north African revolution we have seen a few civil wars (Yemen, Syria and Libya), a military invasion (Saudi Arabia into Qatar), authoritarian crackdowns with unlawful arrests (Qatar, Egypt, Syria and Yemen) and protesters generally arrested or attacked throughout. It is safe to say, to those who advocated revolution, violence followed. ¶ This completely fits into the larger narratives of the history of revolutions. The American Revolution (Historians debate over whether this qualifies, I believe it does; it threw out the entire power structure.) cost one in every hundred males his life. The American Revolution is the second deadliest conflict in American history, percentage wise, with only the Civil War beating it, itself its own kind of revolution. ¶ Meanwhile, France's revolution is symbolized by the guillotine, an industrial means of execution. The Russian Revolution lead to the deaths of literally millions of people. The revolutions that wracked Europe throughout the nineteenth century always included violence and death. When I studied Latin America history in high school, my notes read, "Colonialism. Revolution. Dictator. Revolution." It applied to every country. ¶ Violence always coincides with the outbreak of revolutions, for a few reasons: ¶ First, instability. Inherently, revolutions are unstable, by definition an overthrow of the existing power structures. When this happens, chaos ensues. Food shortages, lack of security, a breakdown of the social order. The best explanation for this is our blog's namesake, On Violence, by Hannah Arendt, that argued that violence and power are opposites. Thus, when the power structure disappears--as in France or Russia or Libya--violence fills the gaps. ¶ Second, vengeance. Most revolutions have a very legitimate basis: people feel discriminated against, or suffer from severe economic inequality, or chafe under colonial rule. When the masses revolt, they take their vengeance against their previous oppressors. Look at what happened in the French revolution. Or what happened to Moammar Ghaddafi. Or Saddam Hussein. ¶ Third, civil wars. They happen when revolutionaries disagree, or the over-thrown don't want to leave so easily. Take the above groups advocating revolution, the Occupiers and the Tea Partiers. They don't agree on anything. So if one side starts a revolution, they'll basically have to go to war with the other side. Boom, you've got a civil war. This is what is happening in Syria.

Capitalism Kritik

Capitalism Kritik

General Links

USFG will always coopt plans despite the intentions of the planners – only class revolution avoids cooption

Progressive Labor Party , June 6, **2014**, Communist Revolution Will End Imperialist Wars, The Progressive Labor Party is an international movement opposed to capitalism headed by scholars and workers from many countries and backgrounds, www.plp.org/challenge/2014/6/6/communist-revolution-will-end-imperialist-wars.html

The enactment of fascist labor, education, tax, and energy reforms demonstrate the nature of a capitalist system, designed to benefit the bosses and attack the working class. **There are no legal ways to enact changes for workers' benefit.** The bosses' mass media tells us that the majority is in charge and the laws are just, but in reality the electoral process is completely controlled by the business, financial and political oligarchy. Therefore only those in this oligarchy can get access to power through the vote. Similarly, the rule of law is an illusion, when the same minority of millionaire parasites determines what's legal, and can change laws to benefit their businesses, as with structural reforms here in Mexico. When the electoral farce and bourgeois legality are not enough to control working-class rebellions, the bosses resort to the police and military to repress, jail, and murder dissenters. Capitalists use fascist terror against the working class to violently impose their interests on the majority. The bosses believe that the illusion of bourgeois democracy and fascist terror can prevent the unity of the working class, but they are mistaken. Eventually, millions of workers will unite to build an international communist movement to abolish capitalist oppression and exploitation.

Capitalism Kritik

General Links

Economic and Diplomatic engagement are US' tools of Capitalism

JOHN **Stanton**, July 22, **2105**, Neoliberal American Capitalism Rocks On ... But Does Anyone Hear Pope Francis?, John J. Stanton is an independent journalist and author in the Washington, DC Metro region who focuses largely on national security topics, www.counterpunch.org/2015/07/22/neoliberal-american-capitalism-rocks-on-but-does-anyone-hear-pope-francis/

Though not explicitly stated, America's most powerful instrument of national power is Capitalism. The pistons that power Neoliberal American Capitalism are: Diplomacy, Information, Military, Economic, Financial, Law Enforcement, Intelligence and Human Capital/People. The clearest exposition of the instruments of national power on record can be found in the US Army's 2008 Special Operations Forces Unconventional Warfare Manual. No assessment of American political, economic, international, cultural or military strategy/action can be stamped "legitimate" without reference to and understanding of these Olympian tools of power that America's leaders have at their disposal. Combined they are the elements that form the spear and its tip that is Neoliberal American Capitalism.

Capitalism Kritik

Specific Links – SCS aff Hegemony Advantage

Power struggles – like SCS – increase and extend capitalist exploitation

Progressive Labor Party, June 4, **2015**, China Military Growth Sets Stage for War, The Progressive Labor Party is an international movement opposed to capitalism headed by scholars and workers from many countries and backgrounds, www.plp.org/challenge/2015/6/4/china-military-growth-sets-stage-for-war.html

Recent tensions between the U.S. and China reflect a sharpening battle among imperialists for the world's wealth. The U.S., top dog since World War II, is struggling to maintain control over resources, markets and exploitable labor. **With critical shipping routes and huge oil reserves in the South China Sea at stake, a clash between the U.S. and China looms as a potential prelude to all-out war, the inevitable outgrowth of imperialist competition.** As always under capitalism, the international working class will bear the brunt of this conflict. Imperialist war will end only when the working class, led by the revolutionary communist Progressive Labor Party, seizes state power. Only communism can serve workers' needs. Only a communist society led by PLP can truly make us free.

Capitalism Kritik

Specific Links – SCS aff International Law Advantage

International law is deeply entrenched in, and supports, capitalism

Linarelli, Salomon, & Sornarajah, 2015, Laboratory for Advanced Research on the Global Economy, The Laboratory for Advanced Research on the Global Economy, John Linarelli is Chair in Commercial Law at Durham University, co-directs the Institute of Commercial and Corporate Law at Durham and is a member of the Centre for Law and Global Justice at Durham. Margot Salomon is Associate Professor in the Law Department and the Centre for the Study of Human Rights at the London School of Economics where she directs the Laboratory for Advanced Research on the Global Economy. Muthucumaraswamy Sornarajah is CJ Koh Professor of Law at the National University of Singapore., www.lse.ac.uk/humanRights/research/projects/theLab/internationalLaw.aspx

Contemporary international law supports a particular approach to the market and the promotion of economic interests. Since the early 1990s, **it has been constructed around a neoliberal ideology supporting a global capitalism** of markets for goods, services and technology, open foreign investment regimes, and the free flow of capital across state borders. This ideology reflects a general commitment to private title and privatization, to commodification and accumulation, but was built around the promises by the economically powerful of widespread social and economic benefit. In significant ways these promises did not materialize, often because international law promotes the wrong values and benefits the powerful at the expense of the weak, either by design or because of its structural inadequacies. What has become apparent are the ways in which domination, exploitation and coercion, accompanied by gross inequalities, serve as a set of unexamined facts about the global economy and its normative order, international law. The post-1945 international legal order was supposed to be a break from the coercion of international law of the past in the interests of justice, but what seems to have happened is that the coercion has simply taken on a particular form, which, when combined with fragmentation in international law, have resulted in serious normative deficiencies.

Capitalism Kritik

Consequentialist Impact Scenario - Impact

Capitalism is unsustainable - the drive for profit will cause extinction, but the alt solves

Adrian **Parr, 2013**, THE WRATH OF CAPITAL: Neoliberalism and Climate Change Politics, pp. 145-147, Adrian Parr is Associate Professor of Philosophy and Environmental Studies at the University of Cincinnati, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/parr15828>)

A quick snapshot of the twenty-first century so far: an economic meltdown; a frantic sell-off of public land to the energy business as President George W Bush exited the White House; a prolonged, costly, and unjustified war in Iraq; the Greek economy in ruins; an escalation of global food prices; bee colonies in global extinction; 925 million hungry reported in 2010; as of 2005, the world's five hundred richest individuals with a combined income greater than that of the poorest 416 million people, the richest 10 percent accounting for 54 percent of global income; a planet on the verge of boiling point; melting ice caps; increases in extreme weather conditions; and the list goes on and on and on. Sounds like a ticking time bomb, doesn't it? Well it is. It is shameful to think that massive die-outs of future generations will put to pale comparison the 6 million murdered during the Holocaust; the millions killed in two world wars; the genocides in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Darfur; the 1 million left homeless and the 316,000 killed by the 2010 earthquake in Haiti. The time has come to wake up to the warning signs.³ The real issue climate change poses is that we do not enjoy the luxury of incremental change anymore. We are in the last decade where we can do something about the situation. Paul Gilding, the former head of Greenpeace International and a core faculty member of Cambridge University's Programme for Sustainability, explains that "two degrees of warming is an inadequate goal and a plan for failure" adding that "returning to below one degree of warming . . . is the solution to the problem."⁴ Once we move higher than 2°C of warming, which is what is projected to occur by 2050, positive feedback mechanisms will begin to kick in, and then we will be at the point of no return. We therefore need to start thinking very differently right now. We do not see the crisis for what it is; we only see it as an isolated symptom that we need to make a few minor changes to deal with. This was the message that Venezuela's president Hugo Chavez delivered at the COP15 United Nations Climate Summit in Copenhagen on December 16, 2009, when he declared: "Let's talk about the cause. We should not avoid responsibilities, we should not avoid the depth of this problem. And I'll bring it up again, the cause of this disastrous panorama is the metabolic, destructive system of the capital and its model: capitalism."⁵ The structural conditions in which we operate are advanced capitalism. Given this fact, a few adjustments here and there to that system are not enough to solve the problems that climate change and environmental degradation pose.⁶ Adaptability, modifications, and displacement, as I have consistently shown throughout this book, constitute the very essence of capitalism. Capitalism adapts without doing away with the threat. Under capitalism, one deals with threat not by challenging it, but by buying favors from it, as in voluntary carbon-offset schemes. In the process, one gives up on one's autonomy and reverts to being a child. Voluntarily offsetting a bit of carbon here and there, eating vegan, or recycling our waste, although well intended, are not solutions to the problem, but a symptom of the free market's ineffectiveness. By casting a scathing look at the neoliberal options on display, I have tried to show how all these options are ineffective. We are not buying indulgences because we have a choice; choices abound, and yet they all lead us down one path and through the golden gates of capitalist heaven. For these reasons, I have underscored everyone's implication in this structure – myself included. If anything, the book has been an act of outrage – outrage at the deceit and the double bind that the "choices" under capitalism present, for there is no choice when everything is expendable. There is nothing substantial about the future when all you can do is survive by facing the absence of your own future and by sharing strength, stamina, and courage with the people around you. All the rest is false hope. In many respects, writing this book has been an anxious exercise because I am fully aware that reducing the issues of environmental degradation and climate change to the domain of analysis can stave off the institution of useful solutions. But in my defense I would also like to propose that each and every one of us has certain skills that can contribute to making the solutions that we introduce in response to climate change and environmental degradation more effective and more realistic. In light of that view, I close with the

following proposition, which I mean in the most optimistic sense possible: our politics must start from the point that after 2050 it may all be over.

Capitalism Kritik

Consequentialist Impact Scenario - Framing

The uncertainty regarding every possible outcome makes consequentialism the only option for most rational decision-making

Robert E **Goodin, 1995**, Cambridge University Press, "Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy", Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Public Policy, pg 63, Robert E Goodin, Robert 'Bob' E. Goodin (born 30 November 1950),[1] is professor of government at the University of Essex, and professor of philosophy and social and political theory at Australian National University.[2] He is the editor of The Journal of Political Philosophy[3] and the co-editor of the British Journal of Political Science.[4] pg 63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, at relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

Capitalism Kritik

Deontological Impact Scenario - Impact

Capitalism underlies all forms of oppression – the erosion of justice and values creates inequality that results in crime, disposability, incarceration, authoritarianism, excessive surveillance, exclusion, marginalization, and social death

Henry A. **Giroux**, 2014, Tikkun, Volume 29, Number 3, Summer 2014, Duke University Press “Neoliberalism’s War Against the Radical Imagination” project muse; accessed 7/20/15, Henry A Giroux holds the Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department and a Distinguished Visiting Professorship at Ryerson University

Democracy is on life support in the United States. Throughout the social order, the forces of predatory capitalism are on the march. Their ideological and material traces are visible everywhere—in the dismantling of the welfare state, the increasing role of corporate money in politics, the assault on unions, the expansion of the corporate surveillance-military state, widening inequalities in wealth and income, the defunding of higher education, the privatization of public education, and the war on women’s reproductive rights. As Marxist geographer David Harvey, political theorist Wendy Brown, and others have observed, neoliberalism’s permeation is achieved through various guises that collectively function to undercut public faith in the defining institutions of democracy. As market mentalities and moralities tighten their grip on all aspects of society, public institutions and public spheres are first downsized, then eradicated. When these important sites of democratic expression— from public universities to community health care centers—vanish, what follows is a serious erosion of the discourses of justice, equality, public values, and the common good. Moreover, as literary critic Stefan Collini has argued, under the regime of neoliberalism, the “social self” has been transformed into the “disembedded individual,” just as the notion of the university as a public good is now repudiated by the privatizing and atomistic values at the heart of a hyper-market-driven society. We live in a society that appears to embrace the vocabulary of “choice,” which is ultimately rooted in a denial of reality. In fact, most people experience daily an increasing limitation of choices, as they bear the heavy burden of massive inequality, social disparities, the irresponsible concentration of power in relatively few hands, a racist justice and penal system, the conversion of schools into detention centers, and a pervasive culture of violence and cruelty—all of which portends a growing machinery of social death, especially for those disadvantaged by a ruthless capitalist economy. Renowned economist Joseph Stiglitz is one of many public intellectuals who have repeatedly alerted Americans to the impending costs of gross social inequality. Inequality is not simply about disproportionate amounts of wealth and income in fewer hands, it is also about the monopolization of power by the financial and corporate elite. As power becomes global and is removed from local and nation-based politics, what is even more alarming is the sheer number of individuals and groups who are being defined by the free-floating class of ultra-rich and corporate powerbrokers as disposable, redundant, or a threat to the forces of concentrated power. Power, particularly the power of the largest corporations, has become less accountable, and the elusiveness of illegitimate power makes it difficult to recognize. **Disposability has become the new measure of a neoliberal society in which the only value that matters is exchange value.** Compassion, social responsibility, and justice are relegated to the dustbin of an older modernity that now is viewed as either quaint or a grim reminder of a socialist past. The Institutionalization of Injustice A regime of repression, corruption, and dispossession has become the organizing principle of society in which an ironic doubling takes place. Corporate bankers and powerbrokers trade with terrorists, bankrupt the economy, and commit all manner of crimes that affect millions, yet they go free. Meanwhile, across the United States, citizens are being criminalized for all sorts of behaviors ranging from dress code infractions in public schools to peaceful demonstrations in public parks. As Michelle Alexander has thoroughly documented in her book The New Jim Crow, young men and women of color are being jailed in record numbers for nonviolent offenses, underscoring how justice is on the side of the rich, wealthy, and powerful. And when the wealthy are actually convicted of crimes, they are rarely sent to prison, even though millions languish under a correctional system aimed

at punishing immigrants, low-income whites, and poor minorities. An egregious example of how the justice system works in favor of the rich was recently on full display in Texas. Instead of being sent to prison, Ethan Couch, a wealthy teen who killed four people while driving inebriated, was given ten years of probation and ordered by the judge to attend a rehabilitation facility paid for by his parents. (His parents had previously offered to pay for an expensive rehabilitation facility that costs \$450,000 a year.) The defense argued that he had “affluenza,” a “disease” that afflicts children of privilege who are allegedly never given the opportunity to learn how to be responsible. In other words, irresponsibility is now an acceptable hallmark of having wealth, enabling the rich actually to kill people and escape the reach of justice. Under such circumstances, “justice” becomes synonymous with privilege, as wealth and power dictate who benefits and who doesn’t by a system of law that enshrines lawlessness. In addition, moral and political outrage is no longer animated by the fearful consequences of an unjust society. Rather than fearing injustice at the hands of an authoritarian government, nearly all of us define our fears in reference to overcoming personal insecurities and anxieties. In this scenario, survival becomes more important than the quest for the good life. The American dream is no longer built on the possibility of social mobility or getting ahead. Instead, it has become for many a nightmare rooted in the desire to simply stay afloat and survive.

Capitalism Kritik

Deontological Impact Scenario - Framing

We have a moral obligation to treat individuals with full dignity and respect – anything less is the road to tyranny and sacrifice

Henry **Shue, 1989**, Nuclear Deterrence and Moral Restraint: Critical Choices for American Strategy, pp. 141-2, Henry Shue is a Professor of Ethics and Public Life at Princeton University,
https://books.google.com/books?id=YTVgQAXt_J4C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false

Given the philosophical obstacles to resolving moral disputes, there are at least two approaches one can take in dealing with the issue of the morality of nuclear strategy. One approach is to stick doggedly with one of the established moral theories constructed by philosophers to “rationalize” or “make sense of” everyday moral intuitions, and to accept the verdict of the theory, whatever it might be, on the morality of nuclear weapons use. A more pragmatic alternative approach assumes that trade-offs in moral values and principles are inevitable in response to constantly changing threats, and that the emergence of novel, unforeseen challenges may impel citizens of Western societies to adjust the way they rank their values and principles to ensure that the moral order survives. Nuclear weapons are putting just such a strain on our moral beliefs. Before the emergence of a nuclear-armed communist state capable of threatening the existence of Western civilization, the slaughter of millions of innocent human beings to preserve Western values may have appeared wholly unjustifiable under any possible circumstances. Today, however, it may be that Western democracies, if they are to survive as guardians of individual freedom, can no longer afford to provide innocent life the full protection demanded by Just War morality. It might be objected that the freedoms of Western society have value only on the assumption that human beings are treated with the full dignity and respect assumed by Just War theory. Innocent human life is not just another value to be balanced side by side with others in moral calculations. It is the *raison d’être* of Western political, economic, and social institutions. A free society based on individual rights that sanctioned mass slaughter of innocent human beings to save itself from extinction would be “morally corrupt,” no better than soviet society, and not worth defending. The only morally right and respectable policy for such a society would be to accept destruction at the hands of tyranny, if need be. This objection is partly right in that a society based on individual rights that casually sacrifices innocent human lives for the sake of common social goods is a contradiction in terms. On the other hand, even Just War doctrine allows for the unintentional sacrifice of some innocent human life under certain hard-pressing circumstances. It is essentially a consequentialist moral doctrine that ascribes extremely high – but not absolute – value to innocent human life. The problem for any nonabsolute moral theory, of course, is where to draw the line.

Capitalism Kritik

Alternative Solvency

Alternative is to create and advocate class solidarity against capitalism

Class solidarity is key to solve all capitalism's impacts

Progressive Labor Party, Last Updated **2016**, PLP homepage, The Progressive Labor Party is an international movement opposed to capitalism headed by scholars and workers from many countries and backgrounds, www.plp.org/challenge/2013/12/26/china-us-imperialists-heading-for-armed-clash.html

Only the dictatorship of the working class — communism — can provide a lasting solution to the disaster that is today's world for billions of people. This cannot be done through electoral

politics, but requires a revolutionary movement and a mass Red Army led by PLP. Worldwide capitalism, in its relentless drive for profit, inevitably leads to war, fascism, poverty, disease, starvation and environmental destruction. The capitalist class, through its state power — governments, armies, police, schools and culture — maintains a dictatorship over the world's workers. The capitalist dictatorship supports, and is supported by, the anti-working-class ideologies of racism, sexism, nationalism, individualism and religion. While the bosses and their mouthpieces claim "communism is dead," capitalism is the real failure for billions worldwide. Capitalism returned to Russia and China because socialism retained many aspects of the profit system, like wages and privileges. Russia and China did not establish communism.

Communism means working collectively to build a worker-run society. We will abolish work for wages, money and profits. Everyone will share in society's benefits and burdens. Communism means abolishing racism and the concept of "race." Capitalism uses racism to super-exploit black, Latino, Asian and indigenous workers, and to divide the entire working class. Communism means abolishing the special oppression of women — sexism — and divisive gender roles created by the class society. Communism means abolishing nations and nationalism. **One international working class, one world, one Party.** Communism means that the minds

of millions of workers must become free from religion's false promises, unscientific thinking and poisonous ideology. Communism will triumph when the masses of workers can use the science of dialectical materialism to understand, analyze and change the world to meet their needs and aspirations. Communism means the Party leads every aspect of society. **For this to work, millions of workers — eventually everyone — must become communist organizers.** Join Us!

Capitalism Kritik

Alternative Solvency

Class centric resistance is key – leads to an egalitarian democracy

Bertell **Ollman**, Last updated **2016**, What is Marxism? A Bird's-Eye View, Dialectical Marxism: The Writings of Bertell Ollman, Bertell Ollman is a professor of politics at New York University. He teaches both dialectical methodology and socialist theory. He is the author of several academic works relating to Marxist theory. Ollman attended the University of Wisconsin, receiving a BA in political science in 1956 and an MA in political science in 1957. He went on to study at Oxford University, earning a B.A. in Philosophy, Politics and Economics in 1959, an MA in political theory in 1963, and a PhD in political theory in 1967, https://www.nyu.edu/projects/ollman/docs/what_is_marxism.php

In order to supplement the institutions of force, capitalism has given rise to an ideology, or way of thinking, which gets people to accept the status quo or, at least, confuses them as to the possibility of replacing it with something better. For the most part, the ideas and concepts which make up this ideology work by getting people to focus on the observable aspects of any event or institution, neglecting its history and potential for change as well as the broader context in which it resides. The result is a collection of partial, static, distorted, one-sided notions that reveal only what the capitalists would like everyone to think. For example, in capitalist ideology, consumers are considered sovereign, as if consumers actually determine what gets produced through the choices they make in the supermarket; and no effort is made to analyze how they develop their preferences (history) or who determines the range of available choices (larger system). Placing an event in its real historical and social context, which is to say—studying it "dialectically," often leads (as in the case of "consumer sovereignty") to conclusions that are the direct opposite of those based on the narrow observations favored by ideological thinking. As the attempted separation of what cannot be separated without distortion, capitalist ideology reflects in thought the fractured lives of alienated people, while at the same time making it increasingly difficult for them to grasp their alienation. As the contradictions of capitalism become greater, more intense, and less amenable to disguise, neither the state nor ideology can restrain the mass of the workers, white and blue collar, from recognizing their interests (becoming "class conscious") and acting upon them. The overthrow of capitalism, when it comes, Marx believed, would proceed as quickly and democratically as the nature of capitalist opposition allowed. Out of the revolution would emerge a socialist society which would fully utilize and develop much further the productive potential inherited from capitalism. Through democratic planning, production would now be directed to serving social needs instead of maximizing private profit. The final goal, toward which socialist society would constantly build, is the human one of abolishing alienation. Marx called the attainment of this goal "communism".

Capitalism Kritik

Alternative Solvency

Organizing politics around unconditional resistance to capitalism solves – has to come first

Peter McLaren, 2006, "Slavoj Žižek's Naked Politics: Opting for the Impossible, A Secondary Elaboration", Peter McLaren is a professor of cultural studies at the University of California, http://www.jacweb.org/Archived_volumes/Text_articles/V21_I3_McLaren.htm

Žižek challenges the relativism of the gender-race-class grid of reflexive positionality when he claims that class antagonism or struggle is not simply one in a series of social antagonisms—race, class, gender, and so on—but rather constitutes the part of this series that sustains the horizon of the series itself. In other words, class struggle is the specific antagonism that assigns rank to and modifies the particularities of the other

antagonisms in the series. He notes that "the economy is at one and the same time the genus and one of its own species"

(*Totalitarianism* 193). In what I consider to be his most important work to date, *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality* (coauthored with Judith Butler and Ernesto Laclau), Žižek militantly refuses to evacuate reference to historical structures of totality and universality and argues that class struggle itself enables the proliferation of new political subjectivities (albeit subjectivities that ironically relegate class struggle to a secondary role). As Marx argued, class struggle structures "in advance" the very terrain of political antagonisms. Thus, according to Žižek, class struggle is not "the last horizon of meaning, the last signified of all social phenomena, but the formal generative matrix of the different ideological horizons of understanding" ("Repeating" 16-17). In his terms, class struggle sets the ground for the empty place of universality, enabling it to be filled variously with contents of different sorts (ecology, feminism, anti-racism). He further argues that the split between the classes is even more radical today than during the times of industrial class divisions. He takes the position that post-Marxists have

done an excellent job in uncovering the fantasy of capital (vis-à-vis the endless deferral of pleasure) but have done little to uncover its reality. Those post-Marxists who are advocates of new social movements (such as Laclau and Mouffe) want revolution without revolution; in contrast, Žižek calls for movements that relate to the larger totality of capitalist social relations and that challenge the very matter and antimatter of capital's social universe. His strategic focus on

capitalist exploitation (while often confusing and inconsistent) rather than on racial, ethnic, gender, or sexual identity is a salutary one: "The problem is not how our precious particular identity should be kept safe from global capitalism. The problem is how to oppose global capitalism at an even more radical level; the problem is to oppose it universally, not on a particular level. This whole problematic is a false one" (Olson and Worsham 281). What Žižek sets himself against is the particular experience or political argument. An experience or argument that cannot be universalized is "always and by definition a conservative political gesture: ultimately everyone can evoke his unique experience in order to justify his reprehensible acts" ("Repeating" 4-5). Here he echoes Wood, who argues that capitalism is "not just another specific oppression alongside many

others but an all-embracing compulsion that imposes itself on all our social relations" ("Identity" 29). He also echoes critical educators such as Paulo Freire, who argues against the position that experiences of the oppressed speak for themselves. All

experiences need to be interrogated for their ideological assumptions and effects, regardless of who articulates them or from where they are lived or spoken. They are to be read with, against, and upon the scientific concepts produced by the revolutionary Marxist tradition. The critical pedagogical act of interrogating experiences is not to

pander to the autonomous subject or to individualistic practices but to see those experiences in relationship to the structure of social antagonisms and class struggle. History has not discharged the educator from the mission of grasping the "truth of the present" by interrogating all the existing structures of exploitation present within the capitalist

system where, at the point of production, material relations characterize relations between people and social relations characterize relations between things. The critical educator asks: How are individuals historically located in systematic structures of economic relations? How can these structures—these lawless laws of capital—be overcome and

transformed through revolutionary praxis into acts of freely associated labor where the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all?

Capitalism Kritik

Permutation Answers

Perm doesn't solve: Using the state strengthens and legitimizes the capitalist system

Jim **Glassman 2004**, , "Transnation hegemony and US labor foreign policy: towards a Gramscian international labor geography", Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, volume 22, pages 573-593, Jim Glassman is a professor in the Department of Geography at the University of British Columbia

Whilst previously neglected, it is clear that Antonio Gramsci advanced a conception of the state within a broader Marxist approach to political economy that he referred to as 'Critical Economy'.⁸ For Gramsci, a 'Critical Economy' approach was distinguished from the 'Classical Economy' of Adam Smith and David Ricardo in that it did not seek to construct abstract hypotheses based on generalised, historically indeterminate conditions of a generic 'homo oeconomicus' (Gramsci 1995, **166–167**). The whole conception of 'Critical Economy' was historicist in the sense that categories were always situated within historical circumstances and assessed within the particular context from which they derived, rather than assuming a universal 'homo oeconomicus' (ibid., 171–173, 176–179). Moreover, the importance of a theory of value was acknowledged to the extent that: one must take as one's starting point the labour of all working people to arrive at definitions both of their role in economic production and of the abstract, scientific concept of value and surplus value, as well as ... the role of all capitalists considered as an ensemble (ibid., 168). This distancing from liberal ideology was then continued in Gramsci's direct reflections on the state. According to Gramsci, the conception of the state developed by dominant classes within capitalist social relations derived from a separation of politics and economics. 'The state', as represented by the intellectual class supportive of dominant social forces, 'is conceived as a thing in itself, as a rational absolute' (Gramsci 1992, 229). Additionally, in those situations when individuals view a collective entity such as the state to be extraneous to them, then the relation is a reified or fetishistic one. It is fetishistic when individuals consider the state as a thing and expect it to act and, are led to think that in actual fact there exists above them a phantom entity, the abstraction of the collective organism, a species of autonomous divinity that thinks, not with the head of a specific being, yet nevertheless thinks, that moves, not with the real legs of a person, yet still moves (Gramsci 1995, 15).

Capitalism Kritik

Transition Wars Disadvantage Answers

No Link: The crackdown won't happen – capital can't afford to attack its labor

István **Meszaros, 95**, Beyond Capital, István Mészáros is a Hungarian Marxist philosopher, and Professor Emeritus at the University of Sussex. He held the Chair of Philosophy at Sussex for fifteen years and was earlier Professor of Philosophy and Social Science for four years at York University, P 725-727

Another argument which is often used in favour of permanent accommodation is the threat of extreme authoritarian measures that must be faced by a socialist revolutionary movement. This argument is backed up by emphasizing both the immense destructive power at capital's disposal and the undeniable historical fact that no ruling order ever cedes willingly its position of command over society, using if need be even the most violent form of repression to retain its rule. The weakness of this argument is twofold, despite the factual circumstances which would seem to support it. First, it disregards that the antagonistic confrontation between capital and labour is not a political/military one in which one of the antagonists could be slaughtered on the battlefield or riveted to chains. In as much as there can be chains in this confrontation, **labour is wearing them already**, in that the only type of chains compatible with the system must be 'flexible' enough to enable the class of labour to produce and be exploited. Nor can one imagine that the authoritarian might of capital is likely to be used only against a revolutionary socialist movement. The repressive anti-labour measures of the last two decades — not to mention many instances of past historical emergency characterized by the use of violence under the capital system — give a foretaste of worse things to come in the event of extreme confrontations. But this is not a matter of either/or, with some sort of apriori guarantee of a 'fair' and benevolent treatment in the event of labour's willing accommodation and submission. The matter hinges on the gravity of the crisis and on the circumstances under which the antagonistic confrontations unfold. Uncomfortable as this truth may sound to socialists, one of the heaviest chains which labour has to wear today is that it is tied to capital for its continued survival, for as long as it does not succeed in making a strategic break in the direction of a transition to a radically different social metabolic order. But that is even more true of capital, with the qualitative difference that capital cannot make any break towards the establishment of a different social order. For capital, truly, **'there is no alternative'** — and there can never be — to its exploitative structural dependency on labour. If nothing else, **this fact sets well marked limits to capital's ability to permanently subdue labour by violence, compelling it to use, instead, the earlier mentioned 'flexible chains' against the class of labour**. It can use violence with success selectively, against limited groups of labour, but not against the socialist movement organized as a revolutionary mass movement.

Capitalism Kritik

Transition Wars Disadvantage Answers - Framing

Revolution is necessary for long term survival – outweighs transition wars. Short term pain, long term gain

Chris **Lewis, 1998**, "The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Modern Industrial Civilization," in *The Coming Age of Scarcity: Preventing Mass Death and Genocide in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Michael N Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann, p. 59-60, Chris Lewis is an American Studies professor at University of Colorado-Boulder

In conclusion, **the only solution** to the growing political and economic chaos caused by the collapse of global industrial civilization is to encourage the uncoupling of nations and regions from the global economy. Effort to integrate the underdeveloped countries with this global economy through sustainable development programs such as Agenda 21 will only further undermine the global economy and industrial civilization. Unfortunately, millions will die in the wars and economic and political conflicts created by the accelerating collapse of global civilization. But we can be assured, on the basis of the past history of the collapse of regional civilizations such as the Mayan and the Roman empires, that, barring global nuclear war, human societies and civilizations will continue to exist and develop on a smaller, regional scale. Yes, such civilizations will be violent, corrupt, and often cruel, but, in the end, less so than our current global industrial civilization, which is abusing the entire planet and threatening the mass death and suffering of all its peoples and the living, biological fabric of life on earth. The paradox of global economic development is that although it creates massive wealth and power for modern elites, it also creates massive poverty and suffering for underdeveloped peoples and societies. The failure of global development to end this suffering and destruction will bring about its collapse. This collapse will cause millions of people to suffer and die throughout the world, but it should, paradoxically, ensure the survival of future human societies. The collapse of global civilization is necessary for the future, long-term survival of human beings. Although this future seems hopeless and heartless, it is not. We can learn much from our present global crisis. What we learn will shape our future and the future of the complex, interconnected web of life on earth.