#### The aff must pass through the WTO, which reinforces neoliberal defense of the global network of capital; the aff’s claims to intermittent changes to the mechanisms of structural domination does nothing to challenge the system itself

**Fukada 10** [Yasuo Fukuda, Professor of Graduate School of Economics at Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo, Pluto Journals, "WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE," 10/27/10, https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf]

Introduction The objectives of the World Trade Organization (WTO) regime are to liberalize trade in goods and services and force [economically] developing countries to introduce neo-liberal policies. The purpose is to advance deregulation, privatization, and free trade. T. Friedman (2006) characterized globalization after 2000 as the world becoming flat, whereby every company, organization, or individual can gain entry into a global marketplace, and where all people are free to start businesses which may benefit from a worldwide commercial network. However, this is just one side of globalization under the WTO regime. Multinational corporations as monopoly capital reap most of the benefits of the “flat” world economy. WTO Agreements have ushered in a new era of corporate globalization. The aim of this article is to show that corporate globalization represents a new stage of imperialism, whereby monopoly capital not only controls the world market, but writes the market rules as well. This new form of imperialism is nothing less than a decaying stage of capitalism in which, quite apart from people being guaranteed the chance to lead happy and stable lives, the very potential for doing so is undermined and destroyed. Finally, principles of localization are presented as an alternative to corporate globalization. A New Stage of Imperialism Studies on imperialism can be traced back to J. A. Hobson (1902) and R. Hilferding (1909). Based on their works, Lenin (1917) characterized imperialism as a regime of governance by monopoly capital, concluding that imperialism is a decaying stage of capitalism. Lenin outlined five pillars by which to define imperialism. The first is monopoly capital gaining control of the major industries of a country. The growth of monopoly capital is a consequence of market concentration caused by competition among firms. Once market concentration reaches a certain point, it becomes possible for a small number of winners to form collusions, such as cartels, which transform the nature of the economy, leading to the dominance of monopoly capital. The second pillar is the formation of business relationships between industrial and financial monopoly capital. Monopoly capital also forms cozy relationships with government through the financing of political campaigns and through revolving doors. In short, monopoly capital wields governing power over national economies through market concentration, collusions among large firms, and direct political influence. The third pillar is foreign investment. Drawing on its political influence, monopoly capital effects the transfer of wealth from workers, farmers, small to medium-sized businesses, and the self-employed to monopoly capital. The resulting distortion of income distribution causes disproportionate growth among industries-especially between manufacturing and farming-and suppresses consumption. This leads to over-accumulation, which forces monopoly capital to export merchandise and invest abroad. The fourth pillar is global divisions among monopoly capital through cartels. These divisions occur in the same way as those which take place at the national level; competition among large firms, and the market concentration which follows, leads to the formation of global cartel agreements. WRPE 1-3b text 486 27/10/2010 12:50 WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM 487 WRPE 1.3 Produced and distributed by Pluto Journals WRPE.plutojournals.org The fifth pillar is colonization of less-developed countries by the Great Powers, operating at the behest of monopoly capital. Such colonization is an outcome of global competition among opposing elements of monopoly capital. Monopoly capital takes advantage of colonization to monopolize control of natural resources and export markets, and as a means to protect capital invested in less-developed countries against appropriation. Figure 1 shows how the five pillars are related. The figure starts with monopoly capital as governing powers, from which follows a causal relationship down to the last outcome, competition for colonization. In other words, colonization is the final outcome of the governing power of monopoly capital. This is why Lenin considered monopoly capital to be the key to imperialism.1 monopoly capital as governing power ↓ distorted income distribution and unbalanced growth ↓ accumulation of redundant capital ↓ merchandise export and foreign investments ↓ global competition and global collusion ↓ struggles for colonization Figure 1 Lenin’s “Imperialism” Looking at contemporary capitalism from the viewpoint of Lenin’s “Imperialism,” it is clear that four of the five pillars (excepting the fifth) are still applicable to capitalism under the WTO regime. First, a small number of multinational corporations typically control more than half the market-share of major industries. For example, in the commercial seed market, the world’s top three corporations (Monsanto, DuPont, and Syngenta of Switzerland) control almost half of the world market. Cargill, along with its top four competitors, handle 85 percent of world grain trade. In the pharmaceutical industry, the top ten corporations hold a combined 54.8 percent share of the world market (ETC Group 2008). In banking, the world’s top 45 banks account for nearly 40 percent of the gross tier 1 capital of the top 1,000, and about 45 percent of the total assets (The Banker, June 24, 2009). It hardly needs saying that these companies enhance their power considerably through close relationships with governments, and through political contributions, lobbying, revolving doors, and the like. WRPE 1-3b text 487 27/10/2010 12:50 488 Yasuo Fukuda World Review of Political Economy Second, industrial and financial monopoly capital establish political action groups as a means to advance common political goals. The negotiation of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) represents a typical example of this sort of collusion between major companies of both the industrial and financial spheres. Third, no monopoly capital can survive without strategic foreign investment, including direct as well as portfolio investment. For instance, automobile companies will not survive without gaining access to Chinese and Indian markets. Fourth, in the course of intense competition over dominant market shares, large multinational corporations often collude to form price cartels (Connor 2001; Levenstein and Suslow 2001). The cartel-based character of monopoly capital culminated during GATT Uruguay Round negotiations, as large businesses cooperated to set market-rules specifically tailored to their own ends. There is no colonization occurring under the WTO regime. Modern capitalism lacks the fifth pillar of early 20th century imperialism. However, this does not mean that modern capitalism is without imperialism. Monopoly capital has gained new methods of obtaining the governing power over developing countries in place of colonization. First, major multinational corporations subcontract to firms in developing countries, thereby assimilating these firms into global business networks. For example, big food retailers such as Wal-Mart and Tesco have established global supply chain management networks which subcontract to farmers in developing countries, thereby bringing these farmers under centralized managerial control (South Centre and Traidcraft 2008). Here, prices fetched at farm gates are determined by monopolists at the top of the supply chain. Second, monopoly capital now dictates the rules of trade by directly involving itself in the crafting of trade policy. Big business coalitions took part in drafting the WTO Agreements. In the case of GATS, multinational corporations, including Citigroup, J. P. Morgan Chase, and Barclays Bank, drafted the proposal under the authorization of US and EU governments, and then used lobbying to push the agreement through at the time of negotiations (Balanyá et al. 2003). In the case of the negotiations for the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), it was the US Intellectual Property Committee (USIPC), a US business group, which wrote the initial draft, at the request of the US Trade Representative (Weissman 1996). Those party to the USIPC include Monsanto, Pfizer, DuPont, and IBM. Market and trade rules amount to a form of infrastructure vis-à-vis the markets. The body which decides the rules of trade has a considerable advantage over other stakeholders. Under the current setting, it is large multinationals, especially the agents of US monopoly capital, which control the rules of trade, specifically through cozy relationships with the US government.

#### Capitalism causes resource wars, economic collapse, population crisis, ecological degradation, kills value to life, and magnifies all secondary antagonisms - prioritize strategies that can survive collapse by 2050

#### Parr 13 [Adrian Parr, 2013, The Wrath of Capital, 2013, p. 145-147]

A quick snapshot of the twenty-first century so far: an economic meltdown; a frantic sell-off of public land to the energy business as President George W Bush exited the White House; a prolonged, costly, and unjustified war in Iraq; the Greek economy in ruins; an escalation of global food prices; bee colonies in global extinction; 925 million hungry reported in 2010; as of 2005, the world's five hundred richest individuals with a combined income greater than that of the poorest 416 million people, the richest 10 percent accounting for 54 percent of global income; a planet on the verge of boiling point; melting ice caps; increases in extreme weather conditions; and the list goes on and on and on.2 Sounds like a ticking time bomb, doesn't it? Well it is. It is shameful to think that massive die-outs of future generations will put to pale comparison the 6 million murdered during the Holocaust; the millions killed in two world wars; the genocides in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Darfur; the 1 million left homeless and the 316,000 killed by the 2010 earthquake in Haiti. The time has come to wake up to the warning signs.3 The real issue climate change poses is that we do not enjoy the luxury of incremental change anymore. We are in the last decade where we can do something about the situation. Paul Gilding, the former head of Greenpeace International and a core faculty member of Cambridge University's Programme for Sustainability, explains that "two degrees of warming is an inadequate goal and a plan for failure;' adding that "returning to below one degree of warming . . . is the solution to the problem:'4 Once we move higher than 2°C of warming, which is what is projected to occur by 2050, positive feedback mechanisms will begin to kick in, and then we will be at the point of no return. We therefore need to start thinking very differently right now. We do not see the crisis for what it is; we only see it as an isolated symptom that we need to make a few minor changes to deal with. This was the message that Venezuela's president Hugo Chavez delivered at the COP15 United Nations Climate Summit in Copenhagen on Decembe . r i6, 2009, when he declared: "Let's talk about the cause. We should not avoid responsibilities, we should not avoid the depth of this problem. And I'll bring it up again, the cause of this disastrous panorama is the metabolic, destructive system of the capital and its model: capitalism:'s The structural conditions in which we operate are advanced capitalism. Given this fact, a few adjustments here and there to that system are not enough to solve the problems that climate change and environmental degradation pose.6 Adaptability, modifications, and displacement, as I have consistently shown throughout this book, constitute the very essence of capitalism. Capitalism adapts without doing away with the threat. Under capitalism, one deals with threat not by challenging it, but by buying favors from it, as in voluntary carbon-offset schemes. In the process, one gives up on one's autonomy and reverts to being a child. Voluntarily offsetting a bit of carbon here and there, eating vegan, or recycling our waste, although well intended, are not solutions to the problem, but a symptom of the free market's ineffectiveness. By casting a scathing look at the neoliberal options on display, I have tried to show how all these options are ineffective. We are not buying indulgences because we have a choice; choices abound, and yet they all lead us down one path and through the golden gates of capitalist heaven. For these reasons, I have underscored everyone's implication in this structure-myself included. If anything, the book has been an act of outrage- outrage at the deceit and the double bind that the "choices" under capitalism present, for there is no choice when everything is expendable. There is nothing substantial about the future when all you can do is survive by facing the absence of your own future and by sharing strength, stamina, and courage with the people around you. All the rest is false hope. In many respects, writing this book has been an anxious exercise because I am fully aware that reducing the issues of environmental degradation and climate change to the domain of analysis can stave off the institution of useful solutions. But in my defense I would also like to propose that each and every one of us has certain skills that can contribute to making the solutions that we introduce in response to climate change and environmental degradation more effective and more realistic. In light of that view, I close with the following proposition, which I mean in the most optimistic sense possible: our politics must start from the point that after 2050 it may all be over.

#### The alternative is to vote neg to engage in radical critique to accomplish the withering away of global capitalism

**Meszaros 8** [Istvan Meszaros, Chair of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, 2008, The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time, 2008, p323-328]

The unreality of postulating the sustainable solution of the grave problems of our social order within the formal and legal framework and corresponding constraints of parliamentary politics arises from the fundamental misconception of the structural determinations of capital’s rule, as represented in all varieties that assert the dualism of civil society and the political state. The difficulty, insurmountable within the parliamentary framework is this that since capital is actually in control of all vital aspects of the social metabolism, it can afford to define the separately constituted sphere of political legitimation as a strictly formal and legal matter, thereby necessarily excluding the possibility of being legitimately challenged in its substantive sphere of socioeconomic reproductive operation. Directly or indirectly, capital controls everything, including the parliamentary legislative process, even if the latter is supposed to be fully independent from capital in many theories that fictitiously hypostatize the “democratic equality” of all political forces participating in the legislative process. To envisage a very different relationship to the powers of decision making in our societies, now completely dominated by the forces of capital in every domain, it is necessary to radically challenge capital itself as the overall controller of social metabolic reproduction.¶ What makes this problem worse for all those who are looking for significant change on the margins of the established political system is that the latter can claim for itself genuine constitutional legitimacy in its present mode of functioning, based on the historically constituted inversion of the actual state of the material reproductive affairs. For inasmuch as the capital is not only the “personification of capital” but simultaneously functions also “as the personification of the social character of labor, of the total workshop as such,” the system can claim to represent the vitally necessary productive power of society vis-à-vis the individuals as the basis of their continued existence, incorporating the interest of all. In this way capital asserts itself not only as the de facto but also the de jure power of society, in its capacity as the objectively given necessary condition of societal reproduction, and thereby as the constitutional foundation to its own political order. The fact that the constitutional legitimacy of capital is historically founded on the ruthless expropriation of the conditions of social metabolic reproduction- the means and material of labor-from the producers, and therefore capital’s claimed “constitutionality” (like the origin of all constitutions) is unconstitutional, is an unpalatable truth which fades away in the mist of a remote past. The “social productive powers of labor, or productive power or social labor, first develop historically with the specifically capitalist mode of production, hence appear as something immanent in the capital-relation and inseparable from it.¶ This is how capital’s mode of social metabolic reproduction becomes eternalized and legitimated as a lawfully unchallengeable system. Legitimate contest is admissible only in relation to some minor aspects of the unalterable overall structure. The real state of affairs on the plane of socioeconomic reproduction-i.e., the actually exercised productive power of labor and its absolute necessity for securing capital’s own reproduction- disappears from sight. Partly because of the ignorance of the very far from legitimate historical origin of capital’s “primitive accumulation” and the concomitant, frequently violent, expropriation of property as the precondition of the system’s present mode of functioning; and partly because of the mystifying nature of the established productive and distributive relations. As Marx notes: The objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker; rather, he appears as subsumed under them. Capital employs Labor. Even this relation is in its simplicity is a personification of things and a reification of persons.¶ None of this can be challenged and remedied within the framework of parliamentary political reform. It would be quite absurd to expect the abolition of the “personification of things and the reification of persons” by political decree, and just as absurd to expect the proclamation of such an intended reform within the framework of capital’s political institutions. For the capital system cannot function without the perverse overturning of the relationship between persons and things: capital’s alienated and reified powers dominate the masses of the people. Similarly it would be a miracle if the workers who confront capital in the labor process as “isolated workers” could reacquire mastery over the social productive powers of their labor by some political decree, or even by a whole series of parliamentary reforms enacted under capital’s order of social metabolic control. For in these matters there can be no way of avoiding the irreconcilable conflict over the material stakes of “either/or”¶ Capital can neither abdicate its-usurped-social productive powers in favor of labor, nor can I share them with labor, thanks to some wishful but utterly fictitious “political compromise.” For they constitute the overall controlling power of societal reproduction in the form of “the rule of wealth over society.” Thus it is impossible to escape, in the domain of the fundamental social metabolism, the severe logic of either/or. For either wealth, in the shape of capital, continues to rule over human society, taking it to the brink of self-destruction, or the society of associated producers learns to rule over alienated and reified wealth, with productive powers arising from the self-determinated social labor of its individual-but not longer isolated-members. Capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence. It cannot possibly be politically constrained by parliament in its power of social metabolic control. This is why the only mode of political representation compatible with capital’s mode of functioning is one that effectively denies the possibility of contesting its material power. And precisely because capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence, it has nothing to fear from the reforms that can be enacted within its parliamentary political framework.¶ Since the vital issue on which everything else hinges is that “the objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker” buy, on the contrary, “he appears as subsumed under them,” no meaningful change is feasible without addressing the issue both in a form of politics capable of matching capital’s extra-parliamentary powers and modes of action, and in the domain of material reproduction. Thus the only challenge that could affect the power of capital, in a sustainable manner, is one which would simultaneously aim at assuming the system’s key productive functions, and at acquiring control over the corresponding political decision making processes in all spheres, instead of being hopelessly constrained by the circular confinement of institutionally legitimated political action to parliamentary legislation.¶ There is a great deal of critique of formerly leftwing political figures and of their now fully accommodating parties in the political debates of the last decades. However, what is problematic about such debates is that by overemphasizing the role of personal ambition and failure, they often continue to envisage remedying the situation with in the same political institutional framework that, in fact, greatly favors the criticized “personal betrayals” and the painful “party derailments.” Unfortunately, though the advocated and hoped for personal and government changes tend to reproduce the same deplorable results.¶ All this could not be very surprising. The reason why the now established political institutions successfully resist significant change for the better is because they are themselves part of the problem and not of the solution. For in their immanent nature they are the embodiment of the underlying structural determinations and contradictions through which the modern capitalist state- with its ubiquitous network of bureaucratic constituents- has been articulated and stabilized in the course of the last four hundred years. Naturally, the state was formed not as a one-sided mechanical result but through its necessary reciprocal interrelationship to the material ground of capital’s historical unfolding, as not only being shaped by the latter but also actively shaping it as much as historically feasible under the prevailing- and precisely through the interrelationship also changing- circumstances.¶ Given the insuperably centrifugal determination of capital’s productive microcosms, even at the level of the giant quasi-monopolistic transnational corporations, only the modern state could assume and fulfill the required function of being the overall command structure of the capital system.**¶** Inevitably, that meant the complete alienation of the power of overall decision making from the producers. Even the “particular personifications of capital” were strictly mandated to act in accord with the structural imperatives of their system. Indeed the modern state, as constituted on the material ground of the capital system, is the paradigm of alienation as regards the power of comprehensive decision making. It would be therefore extremely naïve to imagine that the capitalist state could willingly hand over the alienated power of systemic decision making to any rival actor who operates within the legislative framework of parliament.¶ Thus, in order to envisage a meaningful and historically sustainable societal change, it is necessary to submit to a radical critique both the material reproductive and the political inter-determinations of the entire system, and not simply some of the contingent and limited political practices. The combined totality of the material reproductive determinations and the all-embracing political command structure of the state together constitutes the overpowering reality of the capital system. In this sense, in view of the unavoidable question arising from the challenge of systemic determinations, with regard to both socioeconomic reproduction and the state, the need for a comprehensive political transformation-in close conjunction to the meaningful exercise of society’s vital productive functions without which far-reaching and lasting political change is inconceivable-becomes inseparable from the problem characterized as the withering away of the state. Accordingly, in the historic task of accomplishing “the withering away of the state,” self-management through full participation, and the permanently sustainable overcoming of parliamentarism by a positive form of substantive decision-making are inseparable.¶ This is a vital concern and not “romantic faithfulness to Marx’s unrealizable dream,” as some people try to discredit and dismiss it. In truth, the “withering away of the state” refers to nothing mysterious or remote but to a perfectly tangible process that must be initiated right in our own historical time. It means, in plain language, the progressive reacquisition of the alienated power of political decision making by the individuals in their enterprise of moving toward a genuine socialist society. Without the reacquisition of this power- to which not only the capitalist state but also the paralyzing inertia of the structurally well-entrenched material reproductive practices are fundamentally opposed- neither the new mode of political control of society as a whole by its individuals is conceivable, nor indeed the nonadversarial and thereby cohesive and plannable everyday operation of the particular productive and distributive units by the self-managing freely associated producers. Radically superseding adversariality, and thereby securing the material and political ground of globally viable planning- an absolute must for the very survival of humanity, not to mention the potentially enriched self realization- of its individual members- is synonymous with the withering away of the state as an ongoing historical enterprise

#### The Role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best methodologically and performatively deconstructs the capitalist mode of production. Prefer this:

#### [1] Capitalism alienates people from each other by relating them through exchange, and separating them from their desires, this renders people as expendable, and means that as long as capitalism exists under any ethical framework everything will be permissible, makes my framing a prerequisite to accessing theirs.

#### [2] Capitalist logic is ingrained in our psyche meaning that it controls what we perceive as true, this means that we must deconstruct it before we’re able to make normative decisions because it underpins all that, makes my framing a prerequisite before accessing theirs.