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### L: Reform bad

#### Capitalism is unsustainable — reforms are a “dead end” that claim to solve but distract from the only ethical action: complete refusal

Peterson 18

John Peterson (editor at “socialist revolution”, and wrote an official academic book about capitalism called “The revolutionary philosophy of Marxism”), jan 29 2018, "You Can’t Reform Capitalism—It Must Be Overthrown," In Defence of Marxism, https://www.marxist.com/you-can-t-reform-capitalism-it-must-be-overthrown.htm, // HW AW

Interest in socialism has skyrocketed over the last two years. Millions of people yearn for change and want to fight back against capitalism. They are looking for ideas and an organization that can help them do just that. But there is as yet no viable point of reference, no mass socialist party, no clear and confident exit indicated out of the burning building. As a result, most people doubt whether a serious challenge to the system and its institutions can be mounted, let alone its total overturn. This explains the revival of interest in reformism. [Editorial of [Socialist Revolution](https://socialistrevolution.org/you-cant-reform-capitalism-it-must-be-overthrown) issue 4] As Marxists, we support any and all reforms that improve the lives of the workers and poor, even within the limits of capitalism. But there is a difference between fighting for concrete reforms that raise class consciousness, confidence, and unity, and believing that capitalism can be “reformed” out of existence**. We do not content ourselves with a “kinder, gentler” form of wage slavery.** A system that cannot productively make use of the diverse talents of every individual for the greater good, and which condemns millions to “enforced idleness” has no right to rule over the majority. We should also understand that those **social welfare programs that do exist are by-products of revolutionary struggle and are maintained solely to prevent the threat of revolution**. Our historic aim is not to win a few more crumbs for the destitute, but to ensure that everyone on the planet has food, clothing, shelter, education, and long, productive, healthy lives. To be sure, reformism is a natural first stage of political awakening. The idea that we should try to tone down this or that “excess” of capitalism seems the only “pragmatic” thing to do. But there is a difference between the reformism of the average person, who can’t yet conceive of any system that goes beyond what they have experienced so far in their lives, and that of committed reformists who consciously reject the need for revolution, or at best, postpone it to the indefinite future. Having no confidence in themselves or the working class, **they eviscerate Lenin of his revolutionary essence and embrace the ideas of the German Social-Democrat Karl Kautsky**. Ultimately, as with all utopian socialists and reformists, **their aim is to “pressure” the capitalists and their politicians to “do the right thing.” However, history provides ample evidence that this is a dead end.** As Leon Trotsky succinctly put it, “No amount of ‘pressure’ can make the bourgeoisie stop being the bourgeoisie: it must be overthrown.” Nevermind that in the midst of an organic crisis of capitalism, there is no material basis for reforms, only counterreforms. Some on the left believe they have stumbled upon a “third way” between reformism and revolution. They propose that the way forward lies in reviving the ideas of the “New Left,” specifically, those of André Gorz and his conception of “non-reformist reforms.” Now, if what they mean by this is a reform that doesn’t limit itself to capitalism, cannot be fully realized within this system, and therefore helps people draw the conclusion that a socialist revolution is necessary, then this would effectively be a classical Marxist “transitional demand” by another name. But that’s not what they mean. They envision reforms that can somehow “decommodify” this or that strategic sector of the capitalist economy, thus “undermining its hegemony,” in a “war of position” waged from within the limits of the system. Take, as an example, the much-needed struggle for universal socialized healthcare. Those activists who fight for “Medicare for All” in the abstract—in isolation from the broader fight for a mass socialist party and class struggle trade unionism—end up merely trying to exert “pressure” on capitalist politicians. Canvassing is an important way to meet and engage workers and to explain the ideas of socialism. But **if the concrete result is simply to get signatures for a petition “urging” the Democrats to “do the right thing,” then not a single step towards universal healthcare is taken, never mind socialism**. The Democrats are a party of big business. They are not about to “decommodify” the health insurance and provision industries, which are among the most profitable sectors of the capitalist economy. To sow any illusions whatsoever in the Democratic Party is to sow confusion and disappointment. Those who argue for “non-reformist reforms” also have a formalistic understanding of what a revolution is and is not. As a result, they focus on the so-called “war of position” instead of prioritizing the building of a class-independent mass revolutionary party in advance of the revolution. **They have no perspective of future mass movements of the workers, of a revival of the class struggle in the unions and in politics. While critical of capitalism, they don’t fully explain the system or how it can be changed through working-class organization, mobilization, and revolution. They do not deny that the system is exhausted and reactionary, but they grudgingly accept it nonetheless**. This is a perspective of cynical pessimism and surrender, veiled in the language of academic sagacity. The idea that the workers are “not ready” for socialism is a cop-out. Millions came out in support of Bernie Sanders’s call for “revolution against the billionaire class.” It was his capitulation to the Democratic Party that led to mass abstention, protest votes and the eventual victory of Donald Trump, not a lack of enthusiasm for socialism and revolution. Fortunately for humanity, working-class consciousness can, does, and will catch up with a bang, and this will completely transform the situation. When precisely this will happen is impossible to say. But in society, as in nature, similar conditions lead to similar results. The task of socialists is to painstakingly prepare for such dramatic changes in consciousness. Our role is not to artificially try to “build working class power” or “spark” the movement, but to prepare ourselves to help channel the pent-up energy of the working class into useful revolutionary change once it inevitably moves into action to change society. We must also not forget that **betrayal is inherent in reformism**. In one European country after another in the recent period, the reformists have played the role of derailing revolutionary energy into channels that are safe for capitalism, even before they get anywhere near power. In an epoch of crisis and counterreforms, “**non-reformist reforms” will end up as run-of-the-mill reformism without reforms**. As Marxists, we must enter a friendly and patient dialogue with those who have honest reformist illusions but aren’t committed reformists. Most Americans, even on the left, have never been presented with a revolutionary socialist program. But illusions in reformism cannot last forever. American workers are pragmatic by nature and will judge parties and politicians on the basis of their experience. At a certain stage, if revolutionary socialists are present in sufficient numbers to reach the broader working class with our ideas, millions will enthusiastically embrace the need for socialist revolution. The task of Marxists is to help shorten the time needed to draw these conclusions—but we do not have all the time in the world to do so. That capitalism passes through different phases of development is absolutely true. But to propose, as some on the left do, that it is only a “neoliberal” version of capitalism that has failed is patently wrong. Capitalism remains capitalism from its dynamic infancy to its senile decay. It is predicated on the merciless exploitation of wage labor and is more than happy to make use of even crueler modes of exploitation in its relentless quest to accumulate, concentrate, and expand capital. To argue for the continuation of any form of this system is to settle for a status quo of poverty, ignorance, exploitation, and oppression. This at a time when the objective potential for an entirely different way of organizing society is abundantly evident. In essence, this is what is meant by the concept of “late capitalism,” which reflects the instinctive understanding among the youth the “old society is pregnant with the new.” In an article titled, “How to Be an Anticapitalist Today,” published in Jacobin, the author concludes: “Give up the fantasy of smashing capitalism. Capitalism is not smashable, at least if you really want to construct an emancipatory future.” The American workers and youth can do without this kind of learned defeatism. A better future may seem out of reach as the economic, political, and social crisis grinds on, with even worse to come. But as the immortal revolutionary John Brown expressed it, “I cannot remember a night so dark as to have hindered the coming day, nor a storm so furious or dreadful as to prevent the return of warm sunshine and a cloudless sky.” That is the sort of revolutionary optimism we must be filled with. As Leon Trotsky explained, the crisis of humanity is the crisis of working-class leadership. A bold leadership with a confident vision of the socialist future is what we must build. History and the youth are on our side. The sooner we get this over with, the sooner future generations will get to live in a world of superabundance without the state, money, or compulsion of any kind. Join the International Marxist Tendency and help us fight for these ideas in the socialist movement.

### L: Kessler/Debris

#### The Aff’s attempts to stop the Kessler syndrome are rooted in their desire to preserve endless expansion into the galaxy. Despite their regulation, the profits are too big to stop— the fines will be paid, and loopholes will be found to preserve the domination of the capitalist elite. As long as the private sector exists, it will always take advantage of expansion besides natural blocks like the Kessler. The plan cleans up the road capitalism is driving on to its next destination.

Frieden and Rogowski 14

Jerry Frieden (professor of international peace at Harvard) and ronald rogowski (political scientist and professor at UCLA), 2014 " Modern Capitalism: Enthusiasts, Opponents, and Reformers ," Harvard, https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/jfrieden/files/frieden\_rogowski\_page\_proofs\_0.pdf, // HW AW

Enthusiasts The principal supporters of the new order — both internationally and domestically — were again, not surprisingly, its principal beneficiaries**. International financial, commercial, and industrial interests were able to take advantage of opportunities around the world**, in an environment that largely welcomed global flows of goods, capital, and people. Within most countries, a consensus formed around the orthodoxy of the age. This orthodoxy privileged a country’s international economic relations, even at the expense of some national concerns. The consensus included a commitment to the gold standard, to respect for cross-border property rights, to strong involvement in international commerce, and in most cases to free migration of persons. In the developed nations of Europe and North America, this consensus was embraced by most economic and political leaders, as well as by large portions of the middle classes and even among workers, especially ones whose livelihoods were closely tied to international trade and investment.16 Many European labor movements were, indeed, supportive of trade liberalization — in part because it meant cheaper food, in part because it meant greater access 13 The rapidity of growth is even more impressive on a per-person basis. According to Maddison Historical GDP Data: 264, world per capita GDP grew by barely 50 percent from $435 in 1000 to $667 in 1820, and then more than doubled to $1,510 by 1913. All data are in 1990 international dollars. 14 The sobriquet conveniently overlooks the expansionary wars of Prussia, the bloodshed of the Paris Commune, and the outright slaughter of the US Civil War (in which probably one in every twelve adult males perished); but these events, admittedly, paled in comparison to the butchery of World War I. 15 This“Great Depression”is more accurately described as a “Great Deflation,” as nominal prices declined, especially for primary commodities. 16 The US “realigning” election of 1896 turned largely on fidelity to the gold standard (Populists and most Democrats having rallied behind William Jennings Bryan’s advocacy of silver), and most urban workers rejected Bryan and adhered to gold-standard orthodoxy. jeffry frieden and ronald rogowski 396 C:/ITOOLS/WMS/CUP-NEW/4336916/WORKINGFOLDER/NEON-V2/9781107019645C12.3D 397 [384—425] 6.9.2013 9:48PM to foreign markets for their manufactures, and above all because it steadily raised their real wage.17 In the poorer nations of the world — Latin America, parts of Asia, around the Mediterranean — the orthodox consensus was largely restricted to a narrow elite. It also was quite loose with regard to trade liberalization — plenty of business leaders, especially in North and South America, had no problem with protecting industry, even while generally favoring both the gold standard and close commercial and financial ties with Europe. In any event, this internationalist elite typically exercised tight control over their countries’ political and economic orders. **If there was dissent from below — especially inasmuch as the sacrifices made to sustain a country’s foreign commitments were imposed on those with little say in the matter — it was ignored or suppressed.** Nonetheless, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century witnessed a remarkable convergence among the economic and political leaders of most of the world’s countries. Almost all accepted that an open international economy was highly desirable; and that it was sensible and advisable for their nations to adjust their economic policies in order to maintain their ties to the international economy. At times this might mean imposing difficult austerity measures on a recalcitrant populace. In extremis, even the most internationalist of ruling groups might find themselves forced to go off gold — as southern European and Latin American governments did with some regularity. But the goal remained full participation in the British-led global trading, financial, and monetary order; and this goal was more often achieved than not. As an indication, by the early 1900s, virtually every nation of any economic importance — save only China and Persia — was on the gold standard. The statist alternative If most of the world admired and emulated the British model of unfettered capitalism, we must note that quite a different way emerged in this period, one that turned out both to be extremely important and, in some cases, to have a dark underside. This was state-led, or state-stimulated, industrialization: in its extreme form, **state capitalism**. Conservative leaders who saw the great advantages (not least in military power) that industrialization could bring, yet feared the social disruption it seemed inevitably to unleash, often 17 Europe, relative to any other part of the world at that time, was abundant in labor: Central Europe had almost 120 inhabitants per square kilometer, southern Europe 70, northwestern Europe 55; East Asia, the next most densely populated region, had 45 inhabitants per square kilometer (United Nations 1961: 41). Modern capitalism: enthusiasts, opponents, and reformers 397 C:/ITOOLS/WMS/CUP-NEW/4336916/WORKINGFOLDER/NEON-V2/9781107019645C12.3D 398 [384—425] 6.9.2013 9:48PM decided to “guide” the process; and strong preexisting states permitted them to do so. These “conservative modernizers”sharply accelerated the pace of industrial development by accumulating and channeling capital, often through favored banks, using state power to build infrastructure, and working in tandem with leaders of major industrial corporations. At the same time, to contain and defuse opposition in traditional sectors, these leaders pursued a three-pronged strategy: (a) toleration or encouragement of a re-ordered system of guilds; (b) state provision of extensive social insurance benefits; and (c) severe limits on popular participation in politics. In short, the conservative modernizers constructed a powerful state that accelerated capitalist development, sheltered the most threatened traditional sectors, and provided extensive social benefits, but opposed democracy. The almost ideal-typical example is Wilhelmine Germany (and, before 1867, Prussia) under Otto von Bismarck. Even before Bismarck came to power in 1862, rapid capitalist industrialization had begun in Prussia’s Ruhr district: coal, iron and steel, and above all railways developed rapidly from about 1850, the period now often called the Gründerzeit (Founding Era). Characteristically, the Prussian state invested heavily in many of the crucial early railways, but they remained under private management. The Ruhr’s rapid development intensified the conflicts that had peaked in the 1848 Revolution, and the political threat to the existing order again seemed dire. While the Prussian monarchy had severely limited popular participation by the trick of retaining universal manhood suffrage (granted in 1848) while imposing a “three-class” electoral system that empowered the wealthy,18 even under that system the parliamentary representation of the mostly liberal Left steadily increased, until a majority of the Prussian state parliament 18 In each parliamentary district, all adult males were listed in the order of how much direct tax they had paid in the previous year (most to least), and the total amount of direct tax collected in the district was also calculated. Officials then proceeded down the list until one-third of the total direct taxes had been accounted for. These were “voters of the first class,” and they were rarely more than 10 percent of the electorate; indeed, in areas dominated by large landowners, sometimes a single person. Proceeding on down the list until the next third of direct taxes had been accounted for, one attained a list of “voters of the second class.” The taxpayers who provided the final third of total taxes (almost always the great majority of voters) were “voters of the third class.” At the polls, each group voted separately, and not for parliamentary candidates directly, but (among each group) for three members of an “electoral college.” After the popular votes were counted, the winning nine “electors” assembled and chose the actual MP. Thus, in practice, the wealthiest minority of voters normally held two-thirds of the votes that really mattered in electing the district’s representative. jeffry frieden and ronald rogowski 398 C:/ITOOLS/WMS/CUP-NEW/4336916/WORKINGFOLDER/NEON-V2/9781107019645C12.3D 399 [384—425] 6.9.2013 9:48PM refused supply: If the monarchy would not concede important powers, especially over the military, no money would be appropriated. In this crisis, the King summoned Bismarck as Prime Minister. Bismarck simply **ignored the constitution, appropriated the money (especially for the military), assured himself of the support of the bankers** and industrialists, and won a successful and popular war against tiny Denmark over SchleswigHolstein. Buoyed by this victory, Bismarck called new elections, won a parliamentary majority, and forced passage of an Indemnity Bill that retroactively approved all he had done. From that point he never looked back. The foundation of all Bismarck achieved, including Germany’s rapid rise to the very front rank of European powers, was his scheme of state-capitalist industrialization at home. Together with his close friend, the brilliant Jewish banker Gerson Bleichröder19 — who may fairly be called the “German Hamilton” — Bismarck reorganized German banking into a few large and interlocked conglomerates that could readily finance rapid industrial expansion.20 Bismarck also involved the Prussian state directly in the leading industrial enterprises (Krupp, Thyssen), worked closely himself with many of the major industrialists, and made sure that government smoothed the path to their further expansion. Perceiving, for example, that the monopolistic freight rates of some of Germany’s private railways were impeding industrial development, Bismarck (helped by Bleichröder) nationalized all of Prussia’s railroads by 1880 and all of Germany’s by 1889. And, of course, the large manufacturers of steel and armaments found much to like in the everescalating expansion of German armaments, including — a point at which even Bismarck drew the line — a big navy. To guard against any repeat of the guild-led insurrections of 1848, and indeed to bind artisans and shopkeepers firmly to the state, Bismarck reversed decades of Prussian policy and re-invigorated those guilds that a modern economy could accommodate. Bakers, pharmacists, grocers, booksellers, 19 It cannot have hurt Bismarck’s chances that he was largely free of the fashionable antiSemitism of the era — at least in his actions, if not always in his speech. He made sure that observant Jews were received regularly at court, exchanged home visits and dinner invitations with Jewish friends, sponsored the ennoblement of leading observant Jews (including first of all Bleichröder in 1872), and — perhaps his most daring move — collaborated with Bleichröder and others to develop what is now the Grunewald area of Berlin (then a swamp) as the one Villenviertel (villa quarter) of the city that did not discriminate against Jewish buyers and, indeed, by 1933, was about 40 percent Jewish. The Grunewald development turned out to be personally lucrative to Bismarck, who (perhaps typically for the time) was not greatly constrained by conflict-of-interest considerations and had put a substantial part of his own money into it. 20 Stern 1977. Modern capitalism: enthusiasts, opponents, and reformers 399 C:/ITOOLS/WMS/CUP-NEW/4336916/WORKINGFOLDER/NEON-V2/9781107019645C12.3D 400 [384—425] 6.9.2013 9:49PM and many other specialties were granted local monopolies by the state and could legally combine to set minimum prices. The state’s guarantee of monopolistic profits extended also to big business: Cartel agreements that divided up the market (e.g., for steel or sugar) and set a common price were legally enforceable in Germany. Protective tariffs, enacted in 1879, shielded both East Prussian estates and West German heavy industry (“rye” and “iron”) from import competition. While the system amounted to a consumer tax on the German economy, both Bismarck and Bleichröder were well aware that private wealth generated yet greater private investment; and indeed the titans of German industry plowed their superprofits back into their own industries and into the broader German economy. The German state also directly subsidized research and development, not least in establishing the world’s first entirely research-oriented university system, with a particular emphasis on physics and chemistry. University researchers often worked closely with industrialists, and among the results were Germany’s early and almost total dominance of the world markets for synthetic dyes, industrial chemicals, and pharmaceuticals. Finally, to contain working-class unrest, and, as he believed, to increase productivity, Bismarck enacted the first state systems of sickness, old-age, and disability insurance in Europe, the beginnings of the modern welfare state. These measures had also an ulterior motive, openly recognized even earlier, when Prussia had become the first country in Europe to outlaw child labor in the 1830s: Healthier workers made better soldiers, and German officialdom paid close attention to any rise in the rate at which conscripts were rejected for service on grounds of disability or infirmity. Bismarck’s system of state-led capitalism spurred a rapid growth of the German economy. Total real output more than tripled in Germany between 1870 and 1913, against a rough doubling in the same years in France and the United Kingdom. Just before World War I, Germany produced as much steel as the rest of Europe put together, more than 90 percent of the world’s output of synthetic dyes, and the world’s most advanced and successful pharmaceuticals. Not surprisingly, other countries tried to imitate Germany’s success. Most were at best pale imitations — Cavour in Italy, the tepid efforts (already mentioned) of the Orleanist monarchy and the Second Empire in France — but one came close to succeeding and another overtook and surpassed the German example. In Czarist Russia, Count Sergei Witte, as Minister of Finance with far more absolute powers than Bismarck ever enjoyed, pursued the same path of rapid railway expansion, cartelized industry, protective jeffry frieden and ronald rogowski 400 C:/ITOOLS/WMS/CUP-NEW/4336916/WORKINGFOLDER/NEON-V2/9781107019645C12.3D 401 [384—425] 6.9.2013 9:49PM tariffs, and forced-draft investment (much of it from, or subsidized by, the state). In Japan, the governments of the Meiji Restoration (also uninhibited by parliamentary institutions) imitated Germany even more explicitly, modeling the Constitution of 1889 directly on those of Prussia and Germany,21 and adopting much of the German Civil Code of 1892 as their own in 1896. Japan also imitated Germany in its state-led industrialization and its strong emphasis on heavy industry and armaments.

### Shell

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause goes unquestioned – and treat this as a no long-term solvency argument – the inequalities of labor relations are fundamental to capitalism. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only party organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct chauvinist tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for global liberation. Merely thinking about linguistics fails to achieve anything

Escalante, Philosophy @ UOregon, 18

[Alyson, M.A., is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>] rVs

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### K First - There is no material world that we can separate from the lens through which we view it. Deconstructing the AFF scholarship is a prior question that has material effects.

#### Therefore the ROB is one of deconstruction – vote for the side which best challenges neoliberal scholarship Springer ‘12

Simon Springer - Department of Geography, University of Otago. “Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism.” Routledge. May 2012. JJN from file \*bracketing in original

Conclusion In arguing for an understanding of neoliberalism as discourse, I do not presume that comprehending neoliberalism separately as a hegemonic ideology, a policy and program, a state form, or as a form of governmentality is wrong or not useful. Rather I have simply attempted to provoke some consideration for the potential reconcilability of the different approaches. My argument should accordingly be read as an effort to destabilize the ostensible incompatibility that some scholars undertaking their separate usage seem keen to assume. Without at least attempting to reconcile the four approaches we risk being deprived of a coherent concept with which to work, and thus concede some measure of credibility to Barnett’s (2005) claim that ‘there is no such thing as neoliberalism’. Such a position renders the entire body of scholarship on neoliberalism questionable, as scholars cannot be sure that they are even discussing the same thing. More perilously, to accept such a claim throws the project of constructing solidarities across space into an uneasy quandary, where the resonant violent geographies of our current moment may go unnoticed, a condition that plays perfectly into the ideological denial maintained by the current capitalist order (Zizek, 2011). In ignoring such relational possibilities for resistance to the contemporary zeitgeist, Barnett (2005) seems keen to engage in disarticulation ad nauseam. Yet deconstruction is meant to be interruptive not debilitating. As Spivak (1996, p. 27) contends, ‘Deconstruction does not say there is no subject, there is no truth, there is no history. ... It is constantly and persistently looking into how truths are formed’. It is about noticing what we inevitably leave out of even the most searching and inclusive accounts of phenomena like neoliberalism, which opens up and allows for discursive understandings. Rather than making nice symmetrical accounts of the ‘real’ at the meeting point of representational performance and structural forces, neoliberalism understood as a discourse is attuned to processual interpretation and ongoing debate. While there are inevitable tensions between the four views of neoliberalism that are not entirely commensurable, their content is not diametrically opposed, and indeed a considered understanding of how power similarly operates in both a Gramscian sense of hegemony and a Foucauldian sense of governmentality points toward a dialectical relationship. Understanding neoliberalism as discourse allows for a much more integral approach to social relations than speech performances alone. This is a discourse that encompasses material forms in state formation through policy and program, and via the subjectivation of individuals on the ground, even if this articulation still takes place through discursive performatives. By formulating discourse in this fashion, we need not revert to a presupposed ‘real-world’ referent to recognize a materiality that is both constituted by and constitutive of discourse. Instead, materiality and discourse become integral, where one cannot exist without the other. It is precisely this understanding of discourse that points to a similitude between poststructuralism and Marxian political economy approaches and their shared concern for power relations. I do not want to conclude that I have worked out all these tensions, my ambition has been much more humble. I have simply sought to open an avenue for dialogue between scholars on either side of the political economy/ poststructuralist divide. The importance of bridging this gap is commensurate with ‘the role of the intellectual ... [in] shaking up habits, ways of acting and thinking, of dispelling commonplace beliefs, of taking a new measure of rules and institutions ... and participating in the formation of a political will’ (Foucault, quoted in Goldstein, 1991, pp. 11– 12). Such reflexivity necessarily involves opening ourselves to the possibility of finding common ground between the epistemic and ontological understandings of political economy and poststructuralism so that together they may assist in disestablishing neoliberalism’s rationalities, deconstructing its strategies, disassembling its technologies, and ultimately destroying its techniques. In changing our minds then, so too might we change the world.

## Ozone CP

### Ozone

#### CP – The use of propellants other than liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen to fuel rocket launches is unjust.

#### That solves all of their ozone and climate impacts because solid fuel rockets are the ones that burn the ozone layer – we'll insert a line from their Grush evidence

. Small pieces of soot and a chemical called alumina are created in the wakes of rocket launches. They then get injected into the stratosphere, the layer of Earth’s atmosphere that begins six miles up and ends around 32 miles high. Research shows that this material may build up in the stratosphere over time and slowly lead to the depletion of a layer of oxygen

#### Liquid hydrogen/oxygen are safe

Mortillaro 21 [Nicole Mortillaro, CBC News Senior Reporter, editor of the Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada, author of several books. "Rocket launches could be affecting our ozone layer, say experts." CBC, 4-22-2021, accessed 1-22-2022, https://www.cbc.ca/news/science/rocket-launches-environment-1.5995252] HWIC

There are different types of rocket propellants. Some, like liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen, produce mainly water vapour and have little environmental impact. These were used in past shuttle launches and even in the Apollo-era Saturn V vehicles.

Then there are those that produce alumina particles in the stratosphere, such as those in solid rocket boosters, which were also used in past shuttle launches, and are still being used today by some launch companies.

Finally, there are those that deposit black soot in the stratosphere, such as kerosene used in SpaceX's Falcon 9 and Russia's Soyuz rockets.

It's the alumina and black soot that is most concerning to experts.