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**Capitalism requires constant expansion; space is the next spatial fix to sustain the system**

**Shammas 19** “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space” Dr. Victor Lund Shammas is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Agder, Norway. His research interests include comparative penology, political economy, critical theory, ethnographic methods, and theology. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9>

No longer terra nullius, space is now the new terra firma of capitalistkind: its naturalized terroir, its next necessary terrain. The logic of capitalism dictates that capital should seek to expand outwards into the vastness of space, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, 2016, p. 1050). The operations of capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) crises of capitalism, revolving around the slow, steady decline of spatial fixes (see e.g., Harvey, 1985, p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 49–78). A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital. Jessop (2006, p. 149) notes that spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies, including the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. Capitalism must regularly discover, develop, and appropriate such new spaces because of its inherent tendency to generate surplus capital, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s (2006, p. xviii) terms, a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions and restructuring…as a temporary solution to crises understood…in terms of the overaccumulation of capital'. It is a temporary solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital; while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be devalued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, 2006, p. xviii), this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation. In this way, Harvey writes, society constantly ‘creates fresh productive powers elsewhere to absorb its overaccumulated capital' (Harvey, 1981, p. 8). Historically, spatial fixes have played an important role in conserving the capitalist system. As Jessop (2006, p. 149) points out, ‘The export of surplus money capital, surplus commodities, and/or surplus labour-power outside the space(s) where they originate enabled capital to avoid, at least for a period, the threat of devaluation'. But these new spaces for capital are not necessarily limited to physical terrains, as with colonial expansion in the nineteenth century; as Greene and Joseph (2015) note, various digital spaces, such as the Internet, can also be considered as spatial fixes: the Web absorbs overaccumulated capital, heightens consumption of virtual and physical goods, and makes inexpensive, flexible sources of labor available to employers. Greene and Joseph offer the example of online high-speed frequency trading as a digital spatial fix that furthers the ‘annihilation of space by time' first noted by Marx in his Grundrisse (see Marx, 1973, p. 524). Outer space serves at least two purposes in this regard. In the short-to medium-term, it allows for the export of surplus capital into emerging industries, such as satellite imaging and communication. These are significant sites of capital accumulation: global revenues in the worldwide satellite market in 2016 amounted to $260 billion (SIA, 2017, p. 4). Clearly, much of this activity is taking place ‘on the ground'; it is occurring in the ‘terrestrial economy'. But all that capital would have to find some other meaningful or productive outlet were it not for the expansion of capital into space. Second, outer space serves as an arena of technological innovation, which feeds back into the terrestrial economy, helping to avert crisis by pushing capital out of technological stagnation and innovation shortfalls. In short, outer space serves as a spatial fix. It swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth. This places outer space on the same level as traditional colonization, analyzed in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, which Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc.' (Hegel, 2008, p. 222). In this regard, SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company. But there is something new at stake. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, 2016). Capitalistkind consists in the naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practice, the (false) universalization of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space—capitalist humanity as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.

**Private space exploitation is neoliberal requires the state to support it – props up capitalism on Earth and facilitates its expansion in space**

Sam **Wolfe**, March 26, 20**20**, Asteroid Mining and Capitalism in Space, https://www.samwoolfe.com/2020/03/asteroid-mining-space-capitalism.html

Shammas and Holen argue that space will become a ‘spatial fix’, a concept developed by the Marxist thinker David Harvey which involves “the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital.” But as Harvey contends, **the geographical expansion and restructuring of the spatial fix is only a temporary solution, as new appropriated spaces (in this case, asteroids) will also be exhausted of their profitability**. Thus, in relation to the question of how far space capitalism will extend, Shammas and Holen assert that “this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation.” Shammas and Holen note that **the ambitions of SpaceX and other similar ventures “are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company.”** SpaceX and other ventures are also like the British East India Company in that they are semi-private corporations. Just as the latter received a Royal Charter from Queen Elizabeth I to carry out its trading operations, so too is SpaceX being supported by the state (the United States in, this case): in the words of Shammas and Holen, “it, too, depends on the infrastructure, contracts, and regulatory environment that thus far only a state seems able to provide.” As Peter Lothian Nelson and Walter E. Block highlight in their book Space Capitalism (2018): **If there’s a consistent charge against Elon Musk and his high-flying companies…it’s that they’re not really examples of independent, innovative market capitalism. Rather, they’re government contractors, dependent on taxpayer money to stay afloat**. **Under a system of neoliberalism**, this is to be expected. In the words of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu: “The economic field is, more than any other, inhabited by the state, which contributes at every moment to its existence and persistence, and also to the structure of the relations of force that characterize it.” Neoliberalism, unlike capitalism per se, supports and facilitates market exchanges. The philosopher Gilles Deleuze and psychoanalyst Félix Guattari make the same point in their book A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1980); they say “it is the modern state that gives capitalism its models of realization.” In a system of neoliberalism, the state is integrated with the market, and for capitalism to thrive in space, it will rely on the state’s funding, subsidisation of infrastructure, regulatory frameworks, contracts, and symbolic support. **The state would prop up space capitalism by making outer space legally, technically, and economically accessible.** In their paper, Shammas and Holen also underscore the position of the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) when it comes to the privatisation of space: Even the UNOOSA spoke vociferously in favor of the commercialization of space, appealing variously to the ‘industry and private sector’ and elevating the ‘space economy’ to a central pillar in its Space2030 Agenda (including the ‘use of resources that create and provide value and benefits to the world population in the course of exploring, understanding and utilizing space’), even as the UN agency falls back on a humanistic, almost social-democratic vision of the equitable distribution of benefits (and profits) from space mining, exploration, and colonization (UNOOSA, 2018) From the point of view of Shammas and Holen, as well as other critics of capitalism, **it seems unlikely that NewSpace will have the humanising effects that the UNOOSA and space capitalists are trying to convince us it will have. It is not humanity venturing forth into outer space in the era of NewSpace, but rather “a specific set of capitalist entrepreneurs” (**Shammas & Holen).

**Capitalism has heightened dissemination of systems of social control that have colonized the mind. It has become a protection racket—it’s the root cause of every impact. Left unaddressed, it’ll cause extinction—only a revolution can solve.**

**Robinson**, PhD Sociology, **16**(William I, professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/35596-sadistic-capitalism-six-urgent-matters-for-humanity-in-global-crisis>)//RM

In these mean streets of globalized capitalism in crisis, it has become profitable to turn poverty and inequality into a tourist attraction. The South African Emoya Luxury Hotel and Spa company has made a glamorized spectacle of it. The resort recently advertised an opportunity for tourists to stay "in our unique Shanty Town ... and experience traditional township living within a safe private game reserve environment." A cluster of simulated shanties outside of Bloemfontein that the company has constructed "is ideal for team building, braais, bachelors [parties], theme parties and an experience of a lifetime," read the ad. The luxury accommodations, made to appear from the outside as shacks, featured paraffin lamps, candles, a battery-operated radio, an outside toilet, a drum and fireplace for cooking, as well as under-floor heating, air conditioning and wireless internet access. A well-dressed, young white couple is pictured embracing in a field with the corrugated tin shanties in the background. The only thing missing in this fantasy world of sanitized space and glamorized poverty was the people themselves living in poverty. Escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation. The "luxury shanty town" in South Africa is a fitting metaphor for global capitalism as a whole. **Faced with a stagnant global economy, elites have managed to turn war, structural violence and inequality into opportunities for capital, pleasure and entertainment**. It is hard not to conclude that unchecked capitalism has become what I term "sadistic capitalism," in which the suffering and deprivation generated by capitalism become a source of aesthetic pleasure, leisure and entertainment for others. I recently had the opportunity to travel through several countries in Latin America, the Middle East, North Africa, East Asia and throughout North America. I was on sabbatical to research what the global crisis looks like on the ground around the world. Everywhere I went, social polarization and political tensions have reached **explosive dimensions.** Where is the crisis headed, what are the possible outcomes and what does it tell us about global capitalism and resistance? This crisis is not like earlier structural crises of world capitalism, such as in the 1930s or 1970s. This one is fast becoming systemic. The crisis of humanity shares aspects of earlier structural crises of world capitalism, but there are six novel, interrelated dimensions to the current moment that I highlight here, in broad strokes, as the "big picture" context in which countries and peoples around the world are experiencing a descent into chaos and uncertainty. 1) The level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented in the face of out-of-control, over-accumulated capital. In January 2016, the development agency Oxfam published a follow-up to its report on global inequality that had been released the previous year. According to the new report, now just 62 billionaires -- down from 80 identified by the agency in its January 2015 report -- control as much wealth as one half of the world's population, and the top 1% owns more wealth than the other 99% combined. Beyond the transnational capitalist class and the upper echelons of the global power bloc, the richest 20 percent of humanity owns some 95 percent of the world's wealth, while the bottom 80 percent has to make do with just 5 percent. This 20-80 divide of global society into haves and the have-nots is the new global social apartheid. It is evident not just between rich and poor countries, but within each country, North and South, with the rise of new affluent high-consumption sectors alongside the downward mobility, "precariatization," destabilization and expulsion of majorities. Escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation: The transnational capitalist class cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to stagnation in the world economy. The signs of an impending depression are everywhere. The front page of the February 20 issue of The Economist read, "The World Economy: Out of Ammo?" Extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge to dominant groups. They strive to purchase the loyalty of that 20 percent, while at the same time dividing the 80 percent, co-opting some into a hegemonic bloc and repressing the rest. **Alongside the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression is heightened dissemination through the culture industries and corporate marketing strategies that depoliticize through consumerist fantasies and the manipulation of desire**. As "Trumpism" in the United States so well illustrates, another strategy of co-optation is the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled toward scapegoated communities. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be **increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization.** Scapegoated communities are under siege, such as the Rohingya in Myanmar, the Muslim minority in India, the Kurds in Turkey, southern African immigrants in South Africa, and Syrian and Iraqi refugees and other immigrants in Europe. As with its 20th century predecessor, 21st century fascism hinges on such manipulation of social anxiety at a time of acute capitalist crisis. **Extreme inequality requires extreme violence** and repression that lend to projects of 21st century fascism. 2) The system is fast reaching the ecological limits to its reproduction. We have reached several tipping points in what environmental scientists refer to as nine crucial "planetary boundaries." We have already exceeded these boundaries in three areas -- climate change, the nitrogen cycle and diversity loss. There have been five previous mass extinctions in earth's history. While all these were due to natural causes, for the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system. We have entered what Paul Crutzen, the Dutch environmental scientist and Nobel Prize winner, termed the Anthropocene -- a new age in which humans have transformed up to half of the world's surface. We are altering the composition of the atmosphere and acidifying the oceans at a rate that undermines the conditions for life. The ecological dimensions of global crisis cannot be understated. "We are deciding, without quite meaning to, which evolutionary pathways will remain open and which will forever be closed," observes Elizabeth Kolbert in her best seller, The Sixth Extinction. "No other creature has ever managed this ... The Sixth Extinction will continue to determine the course of life long after everything people have written and painted and built has been ground into dust." Capitalism cannot be held solely responsible. The human-nature contradiction has deep roots in civilization itself. The ancient Sumerian empires, for example, collapsed after the population over-salinated their crop soil. The Mayan city-state network collapsed about AD 900 due to deforestation. And the former Soviet Union wrecked havoc on the environment. However, **given capital's implacable impulse to accumulate profit and its accelerated commodification of nature, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system**. "Green capitalism" appears as an oxymoron, as sadistic capitalism's attempt to turn the ecological crisis **into a profit-making opportunity**, along with the conversion of poverty into a tourist attraction. 3) **The sheer magnitude of the means of violence is unprecedented**, as is the concentrated control over the means of global communications and the production and circulation of knowledge, symbols and images. We have seen the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression that have brought us into the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control. This real-life Orwellian world is in a sense more perturbing than that described by George Orwell in his iconic novel 1984. In that fictional world, people were compelled to give their obedience to the state ("Big Brother") in exchange for a quiet existence with guarantees of employment, housing and other social necessities. Now, however, the corporate and political powers that be force obedience even as the means of survival are denied to the vast majority. Global apartheid involves the creation of "green zones" that are cordoned off in each locale around the world where elites are insulated through new systems of spatial reorganization, social control and policing. "Green zone" refers to the nearly impenetrable area in central Baghdad that US occupation forces established in the wake of the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The command center of the occupation and select Iraqi elite inside that green zone were protected from the violence and chaos that engulfed the country. Urban areas around the world are now green zoned through gentrification, gated communities, surveillance systems, and state and private violence. Inside the world's green zones, privileged strata avail themselves of privatized social services, consumption and entertainment. They can work and communicate through internet and satellite sealed off under the protection of armies of soldiers, police and private security forces. Green zoning takes on distinct forms in each locality. In Palestine, I witnessed such zoning in the form of Israeli military checkpoints, Jewish settler-only roads and the apartheid wall. In Mexico City, the most exclusive residential areas in the upscale Santa Fe District are accessible only by helicopter and private gated roads. In Johannesburg, a surreal drive through the exclusive Sandton City area reveals rows of mansions that appear as military compounds, with private armed towers and electrical and barbed-wire fences. In Cairo, I toured satellite cities ringing the impoverished center and inner suburbs where the country's elite could live out their aspirations and fantasies. They sport gated residential complexes with spotless green lawns, private leisure and shopping centers and English-language international schools under the protection of military checkpoints and private security police. In other cities, green zoning is subtler but no less effective. In Los Angeles, where I live, the freeway system now has an express lane reserved for those that can pay an exorbitant toll. On this lane, the privileged speed by, while the rest remain one lane over, stuck in the city's notorious bumper-to-bumper traffic -- or even worse, in notoriously underfunded and underdeveloped public transportation, where it may take half a day to get to and from work. There is no barrier separating this express lane from the others. However, a near-invisible closed surveillance system monitors every movement. If a vehicle without authorization shifts into the exclusive lane, it is instantly recorded by this surveillance system and a heavy fine is imposed on the driver, under threat of impoundment, while freeway police patrols are ubiquitous. Outside of the global green zones, warfare and police containment have become normalized and sanitized for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. "Militainment" -- portraying and even glamorizing war and violence as entertaining spectacles through Hollywood films and television police shows, computer games and corporate "news" channels -- may be the epitome of sadistic capitalism. It desensitizes, bringing about complacency and indifference. In between the green zones and outright warfare are prison industrial complexes, immigrant and refugee repression and control systems, the criminalization of outcast communities and capitalist schooling. The omnipresent media and cultural apparatuses of the corporate economy, in particular, **aim to colonize the mind -- to undermine the ability to think critically and outside the dominant worldview**. A neofascist culture emerges through militarism, extreme masculinization, racism and racist mobilizations against scapegoats. 4) We are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism. Capitalism is like riding a bicycle: When you stop pedaling the bicycle, you fall over. **If the capitalist system stops expanding outward, it enters crisis and faces collapse.** In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion -- from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. **There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism.** Meanwhile, the privatization of education, health care, utilities, basic services and public land are turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital's control into "spaces of capital." Even poverty has been turned into a commodity. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? **With the limits to expansion comes a turn toward militarized accumulation -- making wars of endless destruction and reconstruction and expanding the militarization of social and political institutions so as to continue to generate new opportunities for accumulation in the face of stagnation.** 5) There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a "planet of slums," alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins and subject to these sophisticated systems of **social control and destruction**. Global capitalism has no direct use for surplus humanity. But indirectly, it holds wages down everywhere and makes new systems of 21st century slavery possible. These systems include prison labor, the forced recruitment of miners at gunpoint by warlords contracted by global corporations to dig up valuable minerals in the Congo, sweatshops and exploited immigrant communities (including the rising tide of immigrant female caregivers for affluent populations). Furthermore, the global working class is experiencing accelerated "precariatization." The "new precariat" refers to the proletariat that faces capital under today's unstable and precarious labor relations -- informalization, casualization, part-time, temp, immigrant and contract labor. As communities are uprooted everywhere, there is a rising reserve army of immigrant labor. The global working class is becoming divided into citizen and immigrant workers. The latter are particularly attractive to transnational capital, as the lack of citizenship rights makes them particularly vulnerable, and therefore, exploitable. The challenge for dominant groups is how to contain the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity, the immigrant workforce and the precariat. How can they contain the explosive contradictions of this system? The 21st century megacities become the battlegrounds between mass resistance movements and the new systems of mass repression. Some populations in these cities (and also in abandoned countryside**) are at risk of genocide**, such as those in Gaza, zones in Somalia and Congo, and swaths of Iraq and Syria. 6) There is a disjuncture between a globalizing economy and a nation-state-based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and do not wield enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on runaway transnational capital. In the wake of the 2008 financial collapse, for instance, the governments of the G-8 and G-20 were unable to impose transnational regulation on the global financial system, despite a series of emergency summits to discuss such regulation. Elites historically have attempted to resolve the problems of over-accumulation by state policies that can regulate the anarchy of the market. However, in recent decades, transnational capital has broken free from the constraints imposed by the nation-state. The more "enlightened" elite representatives of the transnational capitalist class are now clamoring for transnational mechanisms of regulation that would allow the global ruling class to reign in the anarchy of the system in the interests of saving global capitalism from itself and from radical challenges from below. At the same time, the division of the world into some 200 competing nation-states is not the most propitious of circumstances for the global working class. Victories in popular struggles from below in any one country or region can (and often do) become diverted and even undone by the structural power of transnational capital and the direct political and military domination that this structural power affords the dominant groups. In Greece, for instance, the leftist Syriza party came to power in 2015 on the heels of militant worker struggles and a mass uprising. But the party abandoned its radical program as a result of the enormous pressure exerted on it from the European Central Bank and private international creditors. The Systemic Critique of Global Capitalism **A growing number of transnational elites themselves now recognize that any resolution to the global crisis must involve redistribution downward of income.** However, in the viewpoint of those from below, a neo-Keynesian redistribution within the prevailing corporate power structure is not enough. What is required is a redistribution of power downward and transformation toward a system in which social need trumps private profit. **A global rebellion against the transnational capitalist class has spread since the financial collapse of 2008**. Wherever one looks, there is popular, grassroots and leftist struggle, and the rise of new cultures of resistance**: the Arab Spring**; the resurgence of leftist **politics in Greece, Spain and elsewhere in Europe; the tenacious resistance of Mexican social movements following the Ayotzinapa massacre of 2014; the favela uprising in Brazil against the government's World Cup** and Olympic expulsion policies; the student strikes in Chile; the remarkable surge in the Chinese workers' movement; the shack dwellers and other poor people's campaigns in South Africa; **Occupy Wall Street, the immigrant rights movement, Black Lives Matter,** fast food workers' struggle and the mobilization around the Bernie Sanders presidential campaign in the United States. This global revolt is spread unevenly and faces many challenges. A number of these struggles, moreover, have suffered setbacks, such as the Greek working-class movement and, tragically, the Arab Spring. What type of a transformation is viable, and how do we achieve it**? How we interpret the global crisis is itself a matter of vital importance** as politics polarize worldwide between a neofascist and a popular response. The systemic critique of global capitalism must strive to influence, from this vantage point, **the discourse and practice of movements for a more just distribution of wealth and power. Our survival may depend on it.**

**Thus, we affirm the conceptualization of a real utopia– a radical imagination of an anti-capitalist social order. We allow for imagining a perfect world which is a constituent component in being able to build one.**

**Wright ’12** (Erik Olin Wright, Transforming Capitalism through Real Utopias, American Sociological Review, 26 December 2012) - RM

In what follows I propose **a power- centered framework for addressing these issues anchored in the idea of “real utopias.”** At its core, this proposal **revolves around transforming power relations within the economy in ways that deepen and broaden the possibility of meaningful democracy.** I will begin by briefly discussing two foundational propositions shared by all varieties of critical and emancipatory social science. **The idea of real utopias is one response to the intellectual challenge posed by these propositions**. FOUNDATIONS **All varieties of social science** that have critical and emancipatory aspirations, whether they are anchored in values and beliefs of the left or the right, **share two foundational positions:** Foundational Proposition of Critical Social Science: **Many forms of human suffering and many deficits in human flourishing are the result of existing institutions and social structures.** Foundational Proposition of Emancipatory Social Science: **Transforming existing institutions and social structures in the right way has the potential to substantially reduce human suffering and expand the possibili- ties for human flourishing. The first proposition affirms the very general idea that significant aspects of human suffering and deficits in human flourishing are** not simply the result of human nature, acts of God, or vari- ations in people’s attributes, but are **the result of social causes.** Stated in this abstract way, this proposition is accepted by nearly all sociolo- gists, whether or not they explicitly identify with any of the traditions of critical sociology, and is thus not controversial. The proposition becomes very controversial, of course, when concrete claims are made about the specific mechanisms that generate these harms**. Writers have proposed many social sources of harms: the core structures of the capitalist economy**; unintended effects of the welfare state**; enduring social and cultural structures of racism and sex- ism**; educational institutions; changes in family structures; and particular kinds of technology. A great deal of sociological research attempts to identify these sources of harm and adjudicate among rival arguments. The second proposition should not be con- sidered a simple corollary of the first**. It could be the case that various causal processes con- nected to capitalism explain much human suf- fering, and yet any deliberate attempt at transforming the fundamental structures of capitalism could only make things worse.** The cure could be worse than the disease due to unintended and uncontrollable effects of attempts at deliberate social transformation. This is essentially Hayek’s (1988) argument in his attack on radical reformers. Following a long tradition of classical conservative thought, Hayek makes two central claims (although not stated in precisely these terms): first, **the negative unintended consequences of deliberate social change are generally greater than the positive unintended consequences; second, the larger the attempted social trans- formation, the bigger the negative unintended consequences are likely to be**.1 Taken together, these arguments suggest that even if one accepts the first proposition, in general the second proposition should be rejected. The emancipatory proposition constitutes the “fatal conceit” of intellectuals, in Hayek’s (1988:27) words, that “man is able to shape the world around him according to his wishes.” While I disagree with Hayek’s pessimism and embrace the foundational proposition of emancipatory social science, I do not think such arguments can be dismissed out of hand. **The folk aphorism “the road to hell is paved with good intentions,” has too many historical examples to be ignored, many of them ani- mated by emancipatory aspirations. The idea of real utopias is a way of thinking about alternatives and transformations that responds to these concerns. The expression “real utopia” is meant to be a provocation, for “utopia” and “real” do not comfortably go together.** Thomas Moore coined the word utopia in the early-sixteenth century as a kind of pun, combining the Greek for place—topos—with two prefixes that sound the same in English—ou meaning “not” and eu meaning “good.” **Utopia is thus both a nowhere place and a good place. It is the fan- tasy of a perfect world that fully embodies our moral ideals**. When politicians want to sum- marily discredit a policy proposal without having to provide serious arguments, they call it utopian**. Realists reject such fantasies as a distraction from the serious business of making practical improvements in existing institutions. The idea of real utopias embraces this tension between dreams and practice: utopia implies developing visions of alternatives to dominant institutions that embody our deepest aspirations for a world in which all people have access to the conditions to live flourish- ing lives; real means proposing alternatives attentive to problems of unintended conse- quences, self-destructive dynamics, and diffi- cult dilemmas of normative trade-offs.2 A real utopian holds on to emancipatory ideals with- out embarrassment or cynicism but remains fully cognizant of the deep complexities and contradictions of realizing those ideals**. The exploration of real utopias is an inte- gral part of a broad agenda of an emancipatory social science that includes four basic tasks: 1. Specifying the moral principles for judging social institutions. 2. Using these moral principles as the standards for diagnosis and critique of existing institutions. 3. Developing an account of viable alternatives in response to the critique. 4. Proposing a theory of transformation for real- izing those alternatives**.** First**, how one thinks about alternatives depends in part on one’s conceptualization of the idea of “social system.”** One metaphor for thinking about social systems depicts them as analogous to an organism whose parts are tightly integrated into a functioning whole. There is some degree of freedom and varia- bility in how the parts function, but basically they constitute a totality of functional interde- pendency. If you remove critical parts of the whole or try to dramatically transform them, the whole disintegrates. An alternative metaphor is that a social system is more like an ecosystem. Think of society like a pond. A pond contains many species of fish, insects, and plants. Sometimes an alien species is introduced to an ecosystem and it thrives; sometimes it does not. Some ecosystems are quite fragile and easily dis- rupted; others can tolerate quite significant intrusions of invasive species without being seriously affected. **If you think of society as an ecosystem, it still is the case that every- thing is interdependent, but interactions do not constitute a tightly functionalized totality. This opens up a different way of imagining alternatives. One way to transform an ecosys- tem is to introduce an alien species that ini- tially finds a niche and then gradually displaces certain other species. The idea of real utopias as a way of transforming a soci- ety is more in line with the ecosystem view of society than with the organismic view.** **The second general comment about alter- natives concerns two contrasting ways of thinking about how to make the world a better place—ameliorative reforms and real utopian transformations. Ameliorative reforms look at existing institutions, identify their flaws, and propose improvements that can be enacted. These improvements** matter—they reduce harms and enhance flourishing—but they **are limited to proposals that directly act on exist- ing structures and move one step beyond. Real utopias, in contrast, envision the contours of an alternative social world that embodies emancipatory ideals and then look for social innovation**s we can create in the world as it is **that move us toward that destination.** Some- times, this turns out to be the same as an ame- liorative reform, but often **ameliorative reforms do not constitute building blocks of an emancipatory alternative**. Consider, for example, affirmative action policies around race. Affirmative action is one of the critical policies for combating the pernicious effects of ongoing racism, not merely the legacies of racism in the past. But affirmative action is not, I would argue, a building block of a world of racial justice and emancipation. It is a nec- essary means to move toward such a world, but it is not itself a constituent element of the alternative that we seek. **To embrace real utopias in this way is not to reject ameliorative reforms. In the practical world of struggling to create the social conditions for human flourishing it is important to be a pragmatic idealist. Often this means muddling through with patchwork programs that do not prefigure emancipatory alterna- tives.** Sometimes this is the best one can do. But sometimes it is possible to move strug- gles for equality, democracy, and sustainabil- ity beyond such narrow constraints and create institutions that are constitutive of a more profound alternative.

**Pedagogical spaces like debate are the crucial staging ground for a radical interrogation of capitalism. The debate space is a crucial educational plane in resisting capitalism and imagining crucial alternatives—the ROB is to vote for the best methodology to resist capitalism.**

**McLaren**, Distinguished Fellow – Critical Studies @ Chapman U and UCLA urban schooling prof, and Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, associate professor of Communication – U Windsor, **‘4**

(Peter and Valerie, “Class Dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of ‘difference’,” Educational Philosophy and Theory Vol. 36, Issue 2, p. 183-199)//RM

For well over two decades we have witnessed the jubilant liberal and conservative pronouncements of the demise of socialism. Concomitantly, history's presumed failure to defang existing capitalist relations has been read by many self-identified ‘radicals’ as an advertisement for capitalism's inevitability. As a result, the chorus refrain ‘There Is No Alternative’, sung by liberals and conservatives, has been buttressed by the symphony of post-Marxist voices recommending that we give socialism a decent burial and move on. Within this context, to speak of the promise of Marx and socialism may appear anachronistic, even naïve, especially since the post-al intellectual vanguard has presumably demonstrated the folly of doing so. Yet we stubbornly believe that the chants of T.I.N.A. must be combated for they offer as a fait accompli, something which progressive Leftists should **refuse to accept**—namely **the triumph of capitalism** and its political bedfellow neo-liberalism, which have worked together to naturalize suffering, undermine collective struggle, and obliterate hope. We concur with Amin (1998), who claims that such chants must be defied and revealed as absurd and criminal, and who puts the challenge we face in no uncertain terms: humanity may let itself be led by capitalism's logic to a **fate of collective suicide** or it may pave the way for an alternative humanist project of global socialism. The grosteque conditions that inspired Marx to pen his original critique of capitalism are present and flourishing. The inequalities of wealth and the gross imbalances of power that exist today are leading to abuses that exceed those encountered in Marx's day (Greider, 1998, p. 39). Global capitalism has paved the way for the obscene concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands and created a world increasingly divided between those who enjoy opulent affluence and those who languish in dehumanizing conditions and economic misery. In every corner of the globe, we are witnessing social disintegration as revealed by a rise in abject poverty and inequality. At the current historical juncture, the combined assets of the 225 richest people is roughly equal to the annual income of the poorest 47 percent of the world's population, while the combined assets of the three richest people exceed the combined GDP of the 48 poorest nations (CCPA, 2002, p. 3). Approximately 2.8 billion people—almost half of the world's population—struggle in desperation to live on less than two dollars a day (McQuaig, 2001, p. 27). As many as 250 million children are wage slaves and there are over a billion workers who are either un- or under-employed. These are the concrete realities of our time—realities that **require a vigorous class analysis**, an **unrelenting critique** of capitalism and an oppositional politics capable of confronting what Ahmad (1998, p. 2) refers to as ‘capitalist universality.’ They are realities that require something more than that which is offered by the prophets of ‘difference’ and post-Marxists who would have us relegate socialism to the scrapheap of history and mummify Marxism along with Lenin's corpse. Never before has a Marxian analysis of capitalism and class rule been so desperately needed. That is not to say that everything Marx said or anticipated has come true, for that is clearly not the case. Many critiques of Marx focus on his strategy for moving toward socialism, and with ample justification; nonetheless Marx did provide us with **fundamental insights** into class society that have held true to this day. Marx's enduring relevance lies in his indictment of capitalism which continues to wreak havoc in the lives of most. While capitalism's cheerleaders have attempted to hide its sordid underbelly, Marx's description of capitalism as the sorcerer's dark power is even more apt in light of contemporary historical and economic conditions. Rather than jettisoning Marx, decentering the role of capitalism, and discrediting class analysis, radical educators must continue to engage Marx's oeuvre and extrapolate from it that which is useful **pedagogically, theoretically, and**, most importantly, **politically** in light of the challenges that confront us. The urgency which animates Amin's call for a collective socialist vision necessitates, as we have argued, moving beyond the particularism and liberal pluralism that informs the ‘politics of difference.’ It also **requires** challenging the **questionable assumptions** that have come to constitute the core of contemporary ‘radical’ theory, **pedagogy** and politics. In terms of effecting change, what is needed is a cogent **understanding** of the systemic nature of exploitation and oppression based on the precepts of a radical political economy approach (outlined above) and one that incorporates Marx's notion of ‘unity in difference’ in which people share widely common material interests. Such an understanding extends far beyond the realm of theory, for the manner in which we choose to interpret and explore the social world, the **concepts and frameworks** we use to express our sociopolitical understandings, are more than just abstract categories. They imply intentions, organizational practices, and political agendas. Identifying class analysis as the basis for our understandings and class struggle as the basis for political transformation implies something **quite different** than constructing a sense of political agency around issues of race, ethnicity, gender, etc. Contrary to ‘Shakespeare's assertion that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet,’ it should be clear that this is not the case in political matters. Rather, in politics ‘the essence of the flower lies in the name by which it is called’ (Bannerji, 2000, p. 41). The task for progressives today is to seize the moment and plant the seeds for a political agenda that is grounded in historical possibilities and informed by a vision committed to overcoming exploitative conditions. These seeds, we would argue, must be derived from the tree of radical political economy. For the vast majority of people today—people of all ‘racial classifications or identities, all genders and sexual orientations’—the common frame of reference arcing across ‘difference’, the ‘concerns and aspirations that are most widely shared are those that are rooted in the common experience of everyday life shaped and constrained by political economy’ (Reed, 2000, p. xxvii). While post-Marxist advocates of the politics of ‘difference’ suggest that such a stance is outdated, we would argue that the categories which they have employed to analyze ‘the social’ are now losing their usefulness, particularly in light of actual contemporary ‘social movements.’ All over the globe, there are large anti-capitalist movements afoot. In February 2002, chants of ‘Another World Is Possible’ became the theme of protests in Porto Allegre. It seems that those people struggling in the streets haven’t read about T.I.N.A., the end of grand narratives of emancipation, or the decentering of capitalism. It seems as though the struggle for basic survival and some semblance of human dignity in the mean streets of the dystopian metropoles doesn’t permit much time or opportunity to read the heady proclamations emanating from seminar rooms. As E. P. Thompson (1978, p. 11) once remarked, sometimes ‘experience walks in without knocking at the door, and announces deaths, crises of subsistence, trench warfare, unemployment, inflation, genocide.’ This, of course, does not mean that socialism will inevitably come about, yet a sense of its nascent promise animates current social movements. Indeed, noted historian Howard Zinn (2000, p. 20) recently pointed out that after years of single-issue organizing (i.e. the politics of difference), the WTO and other anti-corporate capitalist protests signaled a turning point in the ‘history of movements of recent decades,’ for it was the issue of ‘class’ that more than anything ‘bound everyone together.’ History, to paraphrase Thompson (1978, p. 25) doesn’t seem to be following Theory's script. Our vision is informed by Marx's historical materialism and his revolutionary socialist humanism, which must not be conflated with liberal humanism. For left politics and pedagogy, a socialist humanist vision remains crucial, whose fundamental features include the creative potential of people to challenge collectively the circumstances that they inherit. This variant of humanism seeks to give expression to the pain, sorrow and degradation of the oppressed, those who labor under the ominous and ghastly cloak of ‘globalized’ capital. It calls for the transformation of those conditions that have prevented the bulk of humankind from fulfilling its potential. It vests its hope for change in the development of critical consciousness and social agents who make history, although not always in conditions of their choosing. The political goal of socialist humanism is, however, ‘not a resting in difference’ but rather ‘the emancipation of difference at the level of human mutuality and reciprocity.’ This would be a step forward for the ‘discovery or creation of our real differences which can only in the end be explored in reciprocal ways’ (Eagleton, 1996, p. 120). Above all else, the enduring relevance of a radical socialist pedagogy and politics is the **centrality** it accords to the interrogation of capitalism. We can no longer afford to remain indifferent to the horror and savagery committed by capitalist's barbaric machinations. We need to recognize that capitalist democracy is unrescuably contradictory in its own self-constitution. Capitalism and democracy cannot be translated into one another without profound efforts at manufacturing empty idealism. Committed Leftists must unrelentingly cultivate a democratic socialist vision that refuses to forget the ‘wretched of the earth,’ the children of the damned and the victims of the culture of silence—a task which requires more than abstruse convolutions and striking ironic poses in the agnostic arena of signifying practices. Leftists must illuminate the little shops of horror that lurk beneath ‘globalization’s’ shiny façade; they must challenge the true ‘evils’ that are manifest in the tentacles of global capitalism's reach. And, more than this, Leftists must search for the cracks in the edifice of globalized capitalism and shine light on those fissures that **give birth to alternatives.** Socialism today, undoubtedly, runs against the grain of received wisdom, but its vision of a vastly improved and freer arrangement of social relations beckons on the horizon. Its unwritten text is nascent in the present even as it exists among the fragments of history and the shards of distant memories. Its potential remains untapped and its promise needs to be redeemed.

**Thus, we start by affirming that the appropriation of outer space is unjust. This is the starting point of our utopia – even if it is imperfect, all we need to prove if it is a possible starting point to be able to begin anticapitalism. Also, cross ex checks for any need for specification on the plan.**

**The next step is an affirmative ballot – a material act of resistance that negates our current flow of doing and the means of production by direct refusal. The “no” is the critical starting point for revolution against capitalist society.**

**Holloway, 02** [John Holloway, Marxist-oriented sociologist and philosopher, 2002, Pluto Press, “Change the World without Taking Power The Meaning of Revolution Today”, pg. 125-129 // RM]

If crisis expresses the extreme dis-articulation of social relations, **then revolution must be understood as the intensification of crisis.** This implies a rejection of two distinct understandings of crisis. Firstly, it rejects the traditional concept of the crisis as an opportunity for revolution. This is a concept shared by Marxists of many different perspectives. The argument is that when the big crisis of capitalism comes, this will be the moment in which revolution becomes possible: economic crisis will lead to an intensification of class struggle, and this, if guided by effective revolutionary organisation, can lead to revolution. This approach understands crisis as economic crisis, as something distinct from class struggle, rather than as being itself class struggle, a turning point in class struggle, the point at which the mutual repulsion of capital and anti-labour (humanity) obliges capital to restructure its command or lose control. Secondly, this approach rejects the view that the crisis of capital can be equated with its restructuring. This view sees crisis as being functional for capital, a ‘creative destruction’ (to use Schumpeter’s phrase) which destroys inefficient capitals and imposes discipline on the workers. The crisis of one economic model or paradigm of rule leads automatically, in this view, to the establishment of a new one. The argument here is that a crisis is essentially open. Crisis may indeed lead to a restructuring of capital and to the establishment of a new pattern of rule, but it may not. To identify crisis with restructuring is to close the possibility of the world, to rule out the definitive rupture of capital. To identify crisis with restructuring is also to be blind to the whole world of struggle that capital’s transition from its crisis to its restructuring has always involved. Crisis is, rather, the falling apart of the social relations of capitalism. It can never be assumed in advance that capital will succeed in recomposing them. Crisis involves a salto mortale for capital, with no guarantee of a safe landing. Our struggle is against capital’s restructuring, our struggle is to intensify the disintegration of capitalism. II The moving force of crisis is the drive for freedom, the reciprocal flight of capital of capital and anti-labour, the mutual repulsion of capital and humanity. The first moment of revolution is **purely negative.** On the side of capital, the drive for freedom involves the spewing out of nauseating workers, the insatiable pursuit of the alchemist’s dream of making money from money, the endlessly restless violence of credit and debt. On the side of anti-capital, flight is in the first place negative, the refusal of domination, the destruction and sabotage of the instruments of domination (machinery, for instance), a running away from domination, nomadism, exodus, desertion. People have a million ways of saying No. The driving force is not so much insubordination, the overt and militant refusal of capital, as **nonsubordination**, the less perceptible and more confused **reluctance to conform.** Often the No is expressed so personally (dying one’s hair green, committing suicide, going mad) that it appears to be incapable of having any political resonance. Often the No is violent or barbaric (vandalism, hooliganism, terrorism): the depradations of capitalism are so intense that they provoke a **scream** against, a No which is almost completely devoid of emancipatory potential, a No so bare that it merely reproduces that which is screamed against. The current development of capitalism is so terroristic that it provokes a terroristic response, so anti-human that it provokes an equally antihuman response, which, although quite comprehensible, merely **reproduces the relations of power which it seeks to destroy**. And yet **that is the starting point**: not the considered rejection of capitalism as a mode of organisation, not the militant construction of alternatives to capitalism. They come later (or may do). **The starting point is the scream, the dangerous, often barbaric No.** III Capitalism’s survival depends on recapturing those in flight. Workers must work and produce value. Capital must exploit them. Without that, there would be no capitalism. Without that, capital as a whole would be left in the same position as the unhappy Mr. Peel: ‘Mr Peel… took with him from England to Swan River, West Australia, means of subsistence and of production to the amount of £50,000. Mr Peel had the foresight to bring with him, besides, 3000 persons of the working-class, men, women and children. Once arrived at his destination, "Mr. Peel was left without a servant to make his bed or fetch his water from the river." Unhappy Mr. Peel who provided for everything except the export of English modes of production to Swan River!" (Marx 1965, p. 766) Mr Peel ceased to be a capitalist (and his money ceased to be capital) simply because the workers fled. In the West Australia of that period, there did not exist the conditions to force them to sell their labour power to capital. Because there was land available, the workers were not separated from the means of doing. Mr Peel’s export of capital turned out to be a flight into emptiness. His incapacity to reunite himself with labour meant that he ceased to rule. The recapture of the workers in flight depends on the double nature of the workers’ freedom. They are free not only to sell their labour power, but also free of access to the means of doing. The answer to Mr. Peel’s problem, in West Australia as elsewhere, is to separate the workers from the means of doing by enclosure. People must be deprived of their freedom to do what they like: freedom is gradually enclosed, hemmed in. This is achieved by the establishment of **property,** the appropriation of the land and other means of living and doing, so that in the end the people have no option but to choose freely to be exploited by Mr. Peel and his like. Property is the means by which freedom is reconciled with domination. Enclosure is the form of compulsion compatible with freedom. You can live wherever you like, provided of course that it is not the property of others; you can do whatever you like, provided of course that it does not involve using the property of others. If you have no access to the means of doing, because all of it is the property of others, then of course you are free to go and offer to sell your labour power to them in order to survive. That does not mean that the owners of the means of doing are obliged to buy your labour power, because of course they have the freedom to use their property as they wish. Property restricts the flight of those without property, but it does nothing at all to restrict the flight of those who own property. Quite possibly, when the workers (or their descendants) eventually returned cap in hand to Mr. Peel (or his descendants) to ask him for a job, they found that he had already invested his money in another part of the world where he would have less problem in converting it into capital. The basic formula for the **recapture** of those in flight from labour is **property**. Those who do not want to labour are entirely free to do as they like, but since the means of doing are enclosed by property, those who do not wish to labour are likely to starve unless they change their attitude and sell their labour power (their and only property) to the owners of the means of doing, thus returning to the labour from which they have fled. Hemmed in, they can try to escape by stealing, but risk being hemmed in even more by the operation of the judicial system. In some countries, they can try to escape by turning to the system of social security or public assistance, which, by and large, keeps people from starving to death on the streets, but, more and more, these systems are designed to return those in flight to the labour market. They can try to escape by borrowing, but few lenders will lend their money to those who are not using their labour power as property to be sold on the market, and even if they do succeed in borrowing, the debt collectors will soon come knocking. In some cases, those in flight set up their own businesses or even form co-operatives, but, in the relatively few cases where these survive, they do so by subordinating themselves to the discipline of the market, by integrating themselves into forms of behaviour from which they have fled. The system of property is like a maze with no exit: all paths of flight lead to recapture. In time, the walls of the maze penetrate the person trapped within. The external limitations become internal definitions, self-definitions, identification, the assumption of roles, the adoption of categories which take the existence of the walls so much for granted that they become invisible. But never entirely. Capital is not hemmed in in the same way. On the contrary, property is its passport to movement. Property can be converted into money, and money can be moved with ease. The curtailing of the flight of capital comes through periodic crisis as mediated through the movement of the market, through the relative attraction of different investment opportunities. It is above all crisis, and the changing in market patterns through which the threat manifests itself, that forces capital, in flight from non-subordinate labour, to confront that labour and face up to **its task of exploiting**. The confrontation with labour is a confrontation with anti-labour, with labour in flight from labour. The confrontation involves the ever more intensive exploitation of those workers who have chosen freely to be exploited and the ever more profound enclosure of all the means of living and doing that, if left unenclosed, might stimulate the flight and non-subordination of the workers. Hence the twin drives of contemporary capitalism: the intensification of labour through the introduction of new technologies and new working practices, and the simultaneous extension of property to enclose more and more areas (genes, software, land). The more capital is repelled by people, the more it is forced to refashion people in its own image. The more frenetically capital flees from nonsubordination (globalisation, in other words), the more violently it has to subordinate.Capital becomes more and more repulsive. More and more, it drives us to flee. But flight seems hopeless, unless it is more than flight. **The scream of refusal must also be a reaffirmation of doing, an emancipation of power-to.** IV To break from capital, it is not enough to flee. It not enough to scream. Negativity, our refusal of capital, is the crucial starting point, theoretically and politically. But mere refusal is easily recaptured by capital, simply because it comes up against capital’s control of the means of production, means of doing, means of living. For the scream to grow in strength, there must be a recuperation of doing, a development of power-to. That implies **a re-taking of the means of doing.** Power-to is already implicit in the scream. Flight is rarely mere flight, the No is rarely mere No. At very least, the scream is ecstatic: in its refusal of that which exists, it projects some idea of what might exist in its place. Struggles are rarely mere struggles-against. The experience of shared struggle already involves the development of relations between people that are different in quality from the social relations of capitalism. There is much evidence that for people involved in strikes or similar struggles, the most important outcome of the struggles is often not the realisation of the immediate demands, but the development of a community of struggle, a collective doing characterised by its opposition to capitalist forms of social relations. Barbarism is not as merely negative as the classic dichotomy between socialism and barbarism suggests. Struggle implies the reaffirmation of social doing, the recuperation of power-to. But the recuperation of power-to or the reaffirmation of doing is still limited by capital’s monopoly of the means of doing. The means of doing must be re-appropriated. But what does that mean? **The appropriation** by the working class **of the means of production** has always been a **central** element of programmes **for a transition** to communism. In the mainstream communist tradition, this has been understood as the appropriation by the state of the largest factories, as state ownership of at least the ‘commanding heights’ of the economy. In the practice of the Soviet Union and other ‘communist’ countries, this did little to transform doing itself or to make doing the responsibility of the doers themselves. The term ‘means of production’ has generally been avoided here precisely because it conjures up images that are difficult to dissociate from this tradition. The problem remains, however: if the means of doing are controlled by capital, then any flight from capital comes up against the need to survive, the need to do in a world in which we do not control the means of doing. As long as the means of doing are in the hands of capital, then doing will be ruptured and turned against itself. The expropriators must indeed be expropriated. To think in terms of property is, however, still to pose the problem in fetishised terms. Property is a noun which is used to describe and conceal an active process of separating. The substance of capitalist rule is not an established relationship between a person and a thing (property), but rather **an active process of separating us from the means of doing**. The fact that this separating is continuously repeated does not, for us, convert a verb into a noun. The fact that it becomes a habitual separating does not in any sense make it normal, any more than the habitual beating by a man of his wife makes that normal or converts the verb of beating into a noun, or an established fact. To think of property as a noun, as a thing, is to **accept the terms of domination**. Nor can we start from the means of production, for the distinction between production and doing is itself a result of the separation; nor even from the means of doing, for the very separation of means of doing from doing is a result of the rupture of doing. The problem is not that the means of production are the property of capitalists; or rather, to say that the means of production are the property of the capitalists is merely a euphemism which conceals the fact that capital actively breaks our doing every day, takes our done from us, breaks the social flow of doing which is the pre-condition of our doing. **Our struggle, then, is not the struggle to make ours the property of the means of production, but to dissolve both property and means of production**: to recover or, better, create the conscious and confident sociality of the flow of doing. Capital rules by fetishising, by alienating the done from the doing and the doer and saying ‘this done is a thing and it is mine’. Expropriating the expropriator cannot then be seen as a re-seizure of a thing, but rather as the dissolution of the thing-ness of the done, its (re)integration into the social flow of doing. Capital is the movement of separating, of fetishising, the movement of denying movement. Revolution is the movement against separating, against fetishising, against the denial of movement. Capital is the denial of the social flow of doing, communism is the social movement of doing against its own denial. Under capitalism, doing exists in the mode of being denied. Doing exists as things done, as established forms of social relations, as capital, money, state, the nightmarish perversions of past doing. Dead labour rules over living doing and perverts it into the grotesque form of living labour. This is an explosive contradiction in terms: living implies openness, creativity, while labour implies closure, pre-definition. Communism is the movement of this contradiction, the movement of living against labour. Communism is the movement of that which exists in the mode of being denied.

**Capitalism has infiltrated the debate space means uniqueness flips our way for a predictable model—education planes are crucial to resistance of capitalism**

**Robinson 16** (Global Capitalism and the Restructuring of Education: The Transnational Capitalist Class' Quest to Suppress Critical Thinking Author(s): William I. Robinson Source: Social Justice , 2016, Vol. 43, No. 3 (145) (2016), pp. 1-24 Published by: Social Justice/Global Options Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26405720)//RM

IN RECENT DECADES WORLD CAPITALISM HAS BEEN UNDERGOING A process of globalization, or profound restructuring and expansion. What type of human capital does the emerging global capitalist system require in order for it to function (which is to say, in order for capital accumulation to overcome the technical and political impediments to its continuous expansion)? For one, it needs a cadre of organic intellectuals who are to do the overall thinking and strategizing for the system, as well as a small army of technocrats and administrators who are to resolve problems of system maintenance and development. At the same time, this system needs a very large army, indeed, of people who will supply nothing but their labor, and who are not disposed or equipped to think critically and reflexively about their existence or that of a system sustained on great inequalities and ever more repressive and ubiquitous social control. Finally, it needs a mass of humanity as surplus labor—let us say a few billion people or so—who can serve as a reserve supply of manual and other forms of low-skilled and flexible labor in agriculture, industry, and services; who can be carefully controlled at all times; and who can be discarded when no longer needed. What kind of an educational system would be able to deliver such a mass of humanity endowed with, or lacking in, the sets of skills, knowledge, and mental faculties needed to meet these requirements? Certainly, it would need a core of elite centers of education where the organic intellectuals who administer the system and engage in its ongoing design would study and train. Below it would be a tier of educational institutions producing every sort of vocational and technocratic referred to as "symbolic analysts" ers—that is, people trained in as engineers, computer programmers, change for their services and comfortable lifestyles. Then "precariatized" and thrown basic numeracy and literacy and whose potential for critical threat to the capitalist order. This tier in the educational system would be quite restricted in its pedagogical dual function of supplying the necessary to produce servile critical thinking that could punitive social control. In that the transnational elite The Trifurcation of Humanity The 1 Percent, the 20 Percent, On the eve of the 2015 annual Switzerland, an event attended business, political, and cultural at that, one must be invited), port on global inequality, aptly More" (Oxfam 2015b). The report observed that the wealthiest 1 percent of humanity owned 48 percent in 2009, and that under more than 50 percent of the global wealth by 2016. The obscenity of such concentrations when seen in the context the world's richest 80 billionaires increased from $1.3 trillion of $600 billion in just four The wealth of these 80 billionaires by the bottom half of the world's half of humanity saw its wealth period. In other words, the of billions of dollars from the poorest half of humanity to the richest 80 people on the planet. If such inequality was already "simply staggering," in the words of the report (Oxfam 2015a), it is noteworthy that this polarization of wealth between the bottom half of humanity and the richest 80 people on earth—all but seven of whom are men—actually accelerated since the 2008 financial collapse, so it would seem that the crisis has made the rich many times richer and the poor many times poorer. It is similarly worth noting that the world s top billionaires and the one percent are concentrated in the financial and insurance sector (Warren Buffett and Michael Bloomberg lead the way, followed by the likes of George Soros, a Saudi prince, several Russian oligarchs, and a Brazilian and a Colombian businessman). A major portion of these richest are also concentrated in the pharmaceutical and health care sectors, and here Indian and Chinese billionaires lead the way, together with ones from Turkey, Russia, Switzerland, and elsewhere. And such immense concentrations of wealth translate in manifold ways into political influence: according to Oxfam, the financial and pharmaceutical sectors spent in recent years close to one billion dollars lobbying in the United States alone. The Occupy Wall Street movement of2011-2012 brought to worldwide attention the concentration of the world's wealth in the hands of the one percent with its famous rallying cry, "We are the 99 percent!" However, an equally if not more significant division of the world's population with regard to political and sociological analysis is between that better off—if not necessarily outright wealthy—20 percent of humanity whose basic material needs are met, who enjoy the fruits of the global cornucopia, and who are generally blessed with conditions of security and stability, and the bottom 80 percent of the world's population who face escalating poverty, deprivation, insecurity, and precariousness.The Oxfam report noted that the richest 20 percent of humanity owned 94.5 percent of the world's wealth in 2014, whereas the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just 5.5 percent of that wealth. In simplified terms, the world faces a trifurcated structure of the 1 percent, the 20 percent, and the 80 percent. The global elite has taken note of these extreme inequalities, as evidenced by the inordinate attention received by Thomas Piketty's 2014 study, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, and it is concerned that such polarization may undermine growth and lead to instability and even to rebellion. But there is little or no discussion among the one percent about any fundamental redistribution of wealth and power downward; instead, the elite has turned to expanding the mechanisms of ideological and cultural hegemony as well as repression. Both and constructed in and through industries, and political and to be seduced by the promise and entertainment, backed dissatisfaction lead to rebellion. So what type of a worldwide the global ruling class, presumably a trifurcation of humanity? for elites and power relations ing needs with regard to economy of global capitalism and open-ended evolution Global Capitalism as Epochal Capitalism experiences major obstacles emerge to ongoing named "structural" or "restructuring" structured in order to overcome invest profitably dry up, the capital, typically through adjustment programs imposed measures, free-trade agreements, violence (Greece's struggle Fund-private banking complex US wars of intervention construction of prison-industrial Both forms of violence have opportunities for capitalist The structural crises of capitalism, involve social upheavals, political cultural change. The last global financial collapse 1970s. The year 1968 was of Martin Luther King in Black and Chicano liberation anti-war movements, and massacre of students took great campesino, worker, and students upheavals across the country. Further away, 1968 saw the Prague Spring, the uprising of students and workers in Paris, the height of the Cultural Revolution in China, the Tet Offensive in Vietnam (which marked the beginning of the first major defeat for US imperialism), and the spread of anti-colonial and armed liberation movements throughout Africa and Latin America. All this reflected a crisis of hegemony for the system—a crisis in its political and cultural domination. Then came the economic dimension. By 1973 the US government had to abandon the gold standard; the recently formed Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) imposed its oil embargo, which sent shock waves through the world economy; and stagflation (stagnation plus inflation) set in everywhere. This was, in a nutshell, a severe structural crisis of twentieth-century nation-state capitalism. By the early 1970s a pre-revolutionary situation was percolating in many countries and regions. The popular classes were able to resist attempts by the dominant groups to shift the burden of the 1970s crises on to their shoulders. As the crisis intensified, these dominant groups sought ways to liberate themselves from the social democratic, redistributive forms of class compromise of the previous decades. Analytically speaking, capital sought to free itself of any reciprocal responsibility to labor, and capitalist states sought to shed themselves of the social welfare systems that were established in previous decades. Elites in the rich countries also sought ways to integrate emergent Third World elites into the system (see, e.g., Prashad 2008, Robin son 1996) .These dominant groups launched a neoliberal counter-revolution: an attempt to roll back the social welfare state, to resubordinate labor, and to reconstitute their global hegemony through a newfound transnational mobility of capital and a transformation of the inter-state system. The model of "savage" global capitalism that took hold in the late twentieth century involved a new relation between capital and labor based on the deregulation, informalization, deunionization, and flexibilization of labor, as more and more workers swelled the ranks of the "precariat"—a proletariate existing in permanently precarious conditions.4 Free-trade agreements and neoliberal policies have played a key role in the subordination of labor worldwide and in the creation of this global flexible labor market. The new model of global capitalism has also involved a renewed round of extensive and intensive expansion of the system. In the late twentieth century, the former socialist countries and the revolutionary states of the Third World were integrated into the world market. But even more than extensive expansion, the system has undergone intensive expansion involving commodification of spheres exchange value, such as social health, and education, so and of unloading of surplus The capitalist system has and transformation since the Americas. On the heels the reorganization of political class agents and technologies, expansion through imperialist of humanity and of the and historical materialist educational system, are connected economy (that is, in the material existence), and experience the changing nature of therefore, has impressed that comprise society. The mercantile era spanned tenth centuries, and it lowed by an epoch of classical first industrial revolution, ruling class, and the consolidation system as the political form symbolic date of 1789, the Competitive capitalism gave national monopolies and which organized themselves in a new round of imperialist world markets, resources, mass social struggles around around a new social structure accumulation involving a norms, and political structures tion (McDonough et al. But the Fordist-Keynesian II—with its mechanisms the market, and class compromise—in the 1970s. Emergent "going global," giving way to the current epoch of global capitalism. One key distinctive feature of the global epoch of world capitalism is that the system has all but exhausted its possibilities for extensive expansion, as the whole world has been brought into the orbit of capital, so that globalization now involves an intensive expansion that is reaching depths not seen in previous epochs. The life-world itself, to use Habermas's (1985) phrase, becomes colonized by capital, and the educational system is an institution that facilitates the colonization of the life-world. Transnational Capital and the Transnational State Global capitalism involves a rearticulation of social power relations around the world. This new epoch is characterized above all by the rise of fully transnational capital and the integration of every country and region into a new globalized system of production, finances, and services. We have seen a sequence in the rise of the global economy. Production was the first to transnationalize, starting in the late 1970s, as epitomized by the consolidation of the global assembly line (a delocalized process of manufacturing across multiple countries) and the spread of maquiladoras and zonas francas based on the super-exploitation of cheap, often young female, workers located in countries of the Global South or border communities. Next to transnationalize, in the twentieth and early twenty-first century, were national banking and financial systems, following the deregulation of financial markets in most countries around the world and the creation of countless new financial instruments or tradable forms of finance. There is no longer such a thing as a national financial system. Given its fungible nature and its virtually complete digitalization, money moves almost without friction through the financial circuits of the global economy and therefore plays a key integrative function. Transnational finance capital has become the hegemonic fraction of capital on a world scale; it determines the circuits of capital and it has subordinated productive capital—not to mention governments, political systems, social institutions, and households. More recent is the transnationalization of services. At this time, in fact, the major thrust of free-trade negotiations such as the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), the Trans Adantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), and most ominously, the Trade in Services Agreement (TISA), is to remove remaining national regulation and of transnational capital from nation state and the working social consideration; and But transnational capital or TCC, has emerged as capitalist classes began to the process accelerated in the 1970s crisis, capitals from numerous mechanisms that through foreign direct and boards of directors, transnational of outsourcing, subcontracting, establishment of tens of thousands inter-alia, Robinson 2004,2014).the giant global or transnational global economy. The TCC is grounded in emergent rather than national. There the TCC has become the global scale, and at its apex when they are still local found that in order to survive or another into the emergent services. Power in most countries has gravitated away from local and national fractions of the elite transnationally oriented Transnational fractions have taken state power, through the takeover of political platforms, backed transnationally oriented the political control and their heightened material capitalist globalization, integrating of accumulation as well as as the World Trade Organization) neoliberal states have opened corporate plunder of resources,

This neoliberalization of higher education converts the university worldwide into the domain of the elite and of that 20 percent of global society who have the resources to finance their education and to train for taking commanding roles in global society. At the same time, it heightens the ideological role that education plays in inculcating dull minds with respect for authority, obedience, and a craving for petty consumption and fantasy—that is, the banal culture of global capitalism and its dehumanizing values. Neoliberal restructuring, and most importantly privatization, opens up educational systems to transnational capital, both as a new space for accumulation and as brain trusts for capital itself. Transnational capital has invaded the university and the educational system in every sense, from converting education into a for-profit activity to commissioning and appropriating research (often publicly funded) while simultaneously generating a major new source of financial speculation through students loans (Soederberg 2015).

A critical part of the construction of any counter-hegemonic project will take place in schools and university campuses around the world. Through out the Americas, my own focal point of scholar-activism, teachers have led the struggle against neoliberal educational reform, the privatization of education, the defunding and closure of schools, the deunionization of the profession, and the state repression of students. They have stood alongside the remarkable student mobilizations in Mexico, Chile, Brazil, the United States, and elsewhere. There is a need to infuse student struggles and worker uprisings with a radical global political economy theory and analysis that can contribute to the practices of global social justice and emancipatory struggles—that is, to a Gramscian philosophy of praxis.

**Large-scale threats of future suffering perpetuate capitalist violence and the hegemonic power of the elite, endlessly prolonging suffering. The only response is to interrupt the system, insisting that the urgent bodies across the globe cannot wait**

**Olson ‘15** (Elizabeth Olson, prof of geography @ UNC Chapel Hill ‘Geography and Ethics I: Waiting and Urgency,’ *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 39 no. 4, pp. 517-526)//RM

Though toileting might be thought of as a special case of bodily urgency, geographic research suggests that the body is increasingly set at odds with larger scale ethical concerns, especially **large-scale future events of forecasted suffering**. Emergency planning is a particularly good example in which the large-scale threats of future suffering can **distort moral reasoning**. Žižek (2006) lightly develops this point in the context of the war on terror, where in the presence of fictitious and real ticking clocks and warning systems, the urgent body must be **bypassed** because there are **bigger scales to worry about**:¶ What does this all-pervasive sense of urgency mean ethically? The pressure of events is so overbearing, the stakes are so high, that they nec

essitate a suspension of ordinary ethical concerns. After all, displaying moral qualms when the lives of millions are at stake plays into the hands of the enemy. (Žižek, 2006)¶ In the presence of large-scale future emergency, the urgency to secure the state, the citizenry, the economy, or the climate creates new scales and new temporal orders of response (see Anderson, 2010; Baldwin, 2012; Dalby, 2013; Morrissey, 2012), many of which treat the urgent body as impulsive and thus requiring management. McDonald’s (2013) analysis of three interconnected discourses of ‘climate security’ illustrates how bodily urgency in climate change is also recast as a menacing impulse that might require exclusion from moral reckoning. The logics of climate security, especially those related to national security, ‘can encourage perverse political responses that not only fail to respond effectively to climate change but may present victims of it as a threat’ (McDonald, 2013: 49). **Bodies that are currently suffering cannot be urgent**, because they are **excluded from the potential collectivity** that could be **suffering everywhere in some future time**. Similar bypassing of existing bodily urgency is echoed in writing about violent securitization, such as drone warfare (Shaw and Akhter, 2012), and also in intimate scales like the street and the school, especially in relation to race (Mitchell, 2009; Young et al., 2014).¶ As large-scale urgent concerns are institutionalized, the urgent body is increasingly obscured through technical planning and coordination (Anderson and Adey, 2012). The predominant characteristic of this institutionalization of large-scale emergency is a ‘built-in bias for action’ (Wuthnow, 2010: 212) that circumvents contingencies. The urgent body is at best an assumed eventuality, one that will likely require another state of waiting, such as triage (e.g. Greatbach et al., 2005). Amin (2013) cautions that in much of the West, governmental need to provide evidence of laissez-faire governing on the one hand, and assurance of strength in facing a threatening future on the other, produces ‘just-in-case preparedness’ (Amin, 2013: 151) of neoliberal risk management policies. In the US, ‘personal ingenuity’ is built into emergency response at the expense of the poor and vulnerable for whom ‘[t]he difference between abjection and bearable survival’ (Amin, 2013: 153) will not be determined by emergency planning, but in the material infrastructure of the city.¶ In short, the urgencies of the body provide justifications for social exclusion of the most marginalized based on impulse and perceived threat, while large-scale future emergencies effectively absorb the deliberative power of urgency into the institutions of preparedness and risk avoidance. Žižek references Arendt’s (2006) analysis of the banality of evil to explain the current state of ethical reasoning under the war on terror, noting that people who perform morally reprehensible actions under the conditions of urgency assume a ‘tragic-ethic grandeur’ (Žižek, 2006) by sacrificing their own morality for the good of the state. But his analysis fails to note that bodies are today so rarely legitimate sites for claiming urgency. In the context of the **assumed priority of the large-scale future emergency**, the urgent body becomes **literally nonsense, a non sequitur** within societies, states and worlds that will **always be more urgent**.¶ If the important ethical work of urgency has been to identify that which must not wait, then the capture of the power and persuasiveness of urgency by large-scale future emergencies has consequences for the kinds of normative arguments we can raise on behalf of urgent bodies. How, then, might waiting compare as a normative description and critique in our own urgent time? Waiting can be categorized according to its purpose or outcome (see Corbridge, 2004; Gray, 2011), but it also modifies the place of the individual in society and her importance. As Ramdas (2012: 834) writes, ‘waiting … produces hierarchies which segregate people and places into those which matter and those which do not’. The segregation of waiting might produce effects that counteract suffering, however, and Jeffery (2008: 957) explains that though the ‘politics of waiting’ can be repressive, it can also engender creative political engagement. In his research with educated unemployed Jat youth who spend days and years waiting for desired employment, Jeffery finds that ‘the temporal suffering and sense of ambivalence experienced by young men can generate cultural and political experiments that, in turn, have marked social and spatial effects’ (Jeffery, 2010: 186). Though this is not the same as claiming normative neutrality for waiting, it does suggest that waiting is more ethically ambivalent and open than urgency.¶ In other contexts, however, our descriptions of waiting indicate a strong condemnation of its effects upon the subjects of study. Waiting can demobilize radical reform, **depoliticizing ‘the insurrectionary possibilities of the present by delaying the revolutionary imperative to a future moment that is forever drifting towards infinity’** (Springer, 2014: 407). Yonucu’s (2011) analysis of the self-destructive activities of disrespected working-class youth in Istanbul suggests that this sense of infinite waiting can lead not only to depoliticization, but also to a disbelief in the possibility of a future self of any value. Waiting, like urgency, can **undermine the possibility of self-care** two-fold, first by making people wait for essential needs, and again by reinforcing that waiting is ‘[s]omething to be ashamed of because it may be noted or taken as evidence of indolence or low status, seen as a symptom of rejection or a signal to exclude’ (Bauman, 2004: 109). This is why Auyero (2012) suggests that waiting creates an ideal state subject, providing ‘temporal processes in and through which political subordination is produced’ (Auyero, 2012: loc. 90; see also Secor, 2007). Furthermore, Auyero notes, it is not only political subordination, but the subjective effect of waiting that secures domination, as citizens and non-citizens find themselves ‘waiting hopefully and then frustratedly for others to make decisions, and in effect surrendering to the authority of others’ (Auyero, 2012: loc. 123).¶ Waiting can therefore function as a potentially important spatial technology of the elite and powerful, mobilized not only for the purpose of **governing individuals**, but also to **retain claims over moral urgency**. But there is **growing resistance** to the capture of claims of urgency by the elite, and it is important to note that even in cases where the material conditions of containment are currently impenetrable, arguments based on human value are at the forefront of **reclaiming urgency for the body**. In detention centers, clandestine prisons, state borders and refugee camps, geographers point to ongoing struggles against the ethical impossibility of bodily urgency and a rejection of states of waiting (see Conlon, 2011; Darling, 2009, 2011; Garmany, 2012; Mountz et al., 2013; Schuster, 2011). Ramakrishnan’s (2014) analysis of a Delhi resettlement colony and Shewly’s (2013) discussion of the enclave between India and Bangladesh describe people who refuse to give up their own status as legitimately urgent, even in the context of larger scale politics. Similarly, Tyler’s (2013) account of desperate female detainees stripping off their clothes to expose their humanness and suffering in the Yarl’s Wood Immigration Removal Centre in the UK suggests that demands for recognition are not just about politics, but also about the acknowledgement of humanness and the irrevocable possibility of being that which cannot wait. The continued existence of places like Yarl’s Wood and similar institutions in the USA nonetheless points to the challenge of exposing the urgent body as a moral priority when it is so easily hidden from view, and also reminds us that our research can help to explain the relationships between normative dimensions and the political and social conditions of struggle.¶ In closing, geographic depictions of waiting do seem to evocatively describe otherwise obscured suffering (e.g. Bennett, 2011), but it is striking how rarely these descriptions also use the language of urgency. Given the discussion above, what might be accomplished – and risked – by incorporating urgency more overtly and deliberately into our discussions of waiting, surplus and abandoned bodies? Urgency can clarify the implicit but understated ethical consequences and normativity associated with waiting, and encourage explicit discussion about harmful suffering. Waiting can be productive or unproductive for radical praxis, but urgency compels and requires response. Geographers could be instrumental in reclaiming the ethical work of urgency in ways that leave it open for critique, clarifying common spatial misunderstandings and representations. There is good reason to be thoughtful in this process, since moral outrage towards inhumanity can itself obscure differentiated experiences of being human, dividing up ‘those for whom we feel urgent unreasoned concern and those whose lives and deaths simply do not touch us, or do not appear as lives at all’ (Butler, 2009: 50). But when the urgent body is rendered as only waiting, both materially and discursively, it is just as easily cast as impulsive, disgusting, animalistic (see also McKittrick, 2006). Feminist theory insists that the urgent body, whose encounters of violence are ‘usually framed as **private, apolitical and mundane’** (Pain, 2014: 8), are as deeply **political, public, and exceptional** as other forms of violence (Phillips, 2008; Pratt, 2005). Insisting that **a suffering body, now, is that which cannot wait**, has the **ethical effect of drawing it into consideration alongside the political, public and exceptional scope of large-scale futures**. It may help us insist on the body, both as a single unit and a plurality, as a legitimate scale of normative priority and social care.¶ In this report, I have explored old and new reflections on the ethical work of urgency and waiting. Geographic research suggests a contemporary popular bias towards the urgency of large-scale futures, institutionalized in ways that further obscure and discredit the urgencies of the body. This bias also justifies the production of new waiting places in our material landscape, places like the detention center and the waiting room. In some cases, waiting is normatively neutral, even providing opportunities for alternative politics. In others, the technologies of waiting serve to manage potentially problematic bodies, leading to suspended suffering and even to extermination (e.g. Wright, 2013). One of my aims has been to suggest that **moral reasoning is important** both because it **exposes normative biases against subjugated people**, and because it potentially **provides routes toward struggle where claims to urgency seem to foreclose** the **possibilities** of alleviation of suffering. **Saving the world still should require a debate about whose world is being saved, when, and at what cost – and this requires a debate about what really cannot wait**. My next report will extend some of these concerns by reviewing how feelings of urgency, as well as hope, fear, and other emotions, have played a role in geography and ethical reasoning.¶ I conclude, however, by pulling together past and present. In 1972, Gilbert White asked why geographers were not engaging ‘the truly urgent questions’ (1972: 101) such as racial repression, decaying cities, economic inequality, and global environmental destruction. His question highlights just how much the discipline has changed, but it is also unnerving in its echoes of our contemporary problems. Since White’s writing, our moral reasoning has been stretched to consider the future body and the more-than-human, alongside the presently urgent body – topics and concerns that I have not taken up in this review but which will provide their own new possibilities for urgent concerns. My own hope presently is drawn from an acknowledgement that the **temporal characteristics of contemporary capitalism** can be interrupted in creative ways (Sharma, 2014), with the possibility of squaring the urgent body with our large-scale future concerns. **Temporal alternatives already exist in ongoing and emerging revolutions** and the disruption of claims of cycles and circular political processes (e.g. Lombard, 2013; Reyes, 2012). Though **calls for urgency will** certainly be used to obscure evasion of responsibility (e.g. Gilmore, 2008: 56, fn 6), they may also **serve as fertile ground for radical critique**, a truly fierce **urgency for now.**