# 1NC-NovDec-AnarchyK

**Links:**

#### Affirmative’s call for state action directly reinforces state power, increasing the legitimacy of State violence.

**Martin 1990,** associate professor at the University of Wollongong, Australia, Brian, Uprooting War MN RL

What should be done to help transform the state system in the direction of self-reliance and self-management? The problem can seem overwhelming. **What difference can the actions of an individual** or small group **make**? Actually **quite** **a** **lot**. **The state system is strong because the actions of many people and groups support it**. Most social activists see state intervention as a solution, often the solution to social problems. What can be done about poverty? More state welfare. What about racial discrimination? Laws and enforcement to stop it. What about environmental degradation? State regulation What about sexual discrimination? Anti-discrimination legislation. What about corporate irresponsibility or excess profit? Added government controls and taxation, or nationalization. What about unemployment? State regulation of the economy: investment incentives, job creation schemes, tariffs What about crime? More police, more prisons, more counselors What about enemy attack? More military spending What about too much military spending? Convince or pressure the government to cut back The obvious point is the most social activists look constantly to the state for solutions to social problems. This point bears laboring, because the orientation of most social action groups tends to reinforce state power. This applies to most antiwar action too. Many of the goals and methods of peace movements have been oriented around action by the state, such as appealing to state elites and advocating neutralism and unilateralism. Indeed, peace movements spend a lot of effort debate which demand to make on the state: nuclear freeze, unilateral or multilateral disarmament nuclear-free zones, or removal of military bases. By appealing to the state, activists indirectly strengthen the roots of many social problems the problem of war in particular. To help transform the state system action groups need to develop strategies which, at a minimum, do mot reinforce state power. **This means ending the incessant appeals for state intervention, and promoting solutions to social problems which strengthen local self-reliance and initiative.** What can be done about poverty? Promote worker and community control over economic resources, and local self-reliance in skills and resources What about racial discrimination? Promote discussion, interaction and nonviolent action at a grassroots level. What about sexual discrimination? Build grassroots campaigns against rape and the gender division of labour, and mount challenges to hierarchical structures which help sustain patriarchy What about corporate irresponsibility or excess profits? Promote worker and community control over production. What about unemployment? Promote community control of community resources for equitable distribution of work and the economic product, and develop worker cooperatives as an alternative to hobs as gifts of employers. What about crime? Work against unequal power and privilege and for meaningful ways of living to undercut the motivation for crime, and promote local community solidarity as a defense against crime. What about enemy attack? Social Defense What about too much military spending? Build local alternatives to the state, use these alternatives to withdraw support from the state and undermine the economic foundation of military spending These grassroots, self-managing solutions to social problems are in many cases no more than suggestive directions. **Detailed grassroots strategies in most cases have not been developed, partly because so little attention has been devoted to them** compared to the strategies relying on state intervention. But the direction should be clear in developing strategies to address problems, aim at building local self-reliance and withdrawing support from the state rather

## **IMPACTS:**

### Reliance on state structures for social policy will result in extinction.

**Katsiaficas**19**97**, Professor at SUNY, The subversion of Politics, George

Making ecologically responsible decisions already calls for rethinking the political power of nation-states and enlarging the democratic control of technology. **The entire species and all life is today at the mercy of those who make decisions about high technology**. Radioactive fallout from Chernobyl was measured in milk in North America less than a month after the catastrophe. Nonetheless, whether a nuclear power plant should be built is an issue that the established system answers through national bureaucracies governed by scientific experts, faceless government employees, and professional politicians who make decisions that will affect life on this planet for seventy generations. No society has democratically determined whether nuclear waste should be produced, even though it will remain carcinogenic and toxic beyond comparison for tens of thousands of years-more time than since the great pyramids of Egypt were built. The average nuclear power plant has a life of less than fifty years, yet for such transitory generation of electricity, we produce toxic repositories, each of which will need to be encased (or somehow dealt with) for thousands of years. Given the insatiable need for energy in contemporary society, this is no trivial problem. **The system’s reliance on nuclear energy rather than on solar, wind, and other nonpolluting sources is conditioned by the need to provide big governments and large corporations with massive projects for the expansion of their powers and the realization of profits**. Solar and wind energy generation is far more efficient than is popularly understood and provides more jobs than nuclear fission. The development of solar and wind energy would generate increased job opportunities from many small investments (rather than one huge one) and profits would be realized by handyman producers, not big capital-whose essential nature requires massive projects. Nuclear power, in turn, demands militarism of society for the security of the installations. Because nuclear weapons can obliterate a nation in a matter of minutes, militaries must be on constant alert, and immense resources must be devoted to them. A more symbolic relationship between large corporations and big governments could not be imagined, nor could a better means to block the possibility of substantive autonomy. Our species’ power have created the potential to destroy the planet at the push of a button, to put holes in the ozone layer, to create and unleash genetically engineered beings, to melt the polar ice caps, or to pollute huge areas (like that around Chernobyl) so badly that they have to be evacuated. For hundreds of years. Tragically, at the same historical moment that the human species has been endowed with powers far beyond any possessed in the past, obsolete decision-making processes are increasingly confined to corporate boardrooms and the inner offices of nonelected bureaucrats. Even it elected representatives are part of the formulation of policy, the outcome is often no different. The unreasonableness of the existing system, its undernocratic nature as discussed above in relation to the issue of nuclear power, can be similarly understood in relations to a number of weighty social decisions, such as the choice to use atomic bombs at the end of World War II, to build the interstate highway system in the United States, create suburbs and abandon the inner cities in the 1950, to fight a Cold War and the Vietnam War, and to maintain astronomical expenditures for national militaries at the end of the Cold War. The future effects of the existing system’s unreasonable its response to its own crisis tendencies, are already visible in plans to invest more resources in capital-intensive programs and existing industry-notably automobiles. Over the next two decades, the European Community plans to spend over 1 trillion on more than seven thousands miles of new highways, seriously threatening the scant remaining green spaces on the continent, including the last habitat for bears in France. Infrastructural expenditures designed to aid transnational corporations have already been made for massive tunnels in the Pyrenees and the Alps, the Oresund bridge connecting Denmark and Sweden, and the tunnel between France and Britain. Such squandering of resources is not simply a European Problem. Canada plans to build a mammoth bridge to Prince Edward Island, and despite the end of the Cold War, the United States spends more on its military than all other nations combined. **Each of these decisions was made in its own time by nonelected persons in conjunction with professional politicians** whose differences from their electoral alternatives were seldom greater than those between Coke and Pepsi. Left to direct-democratic forums of local citizens, probably none of these decisions would have been made with respect to nuclear power, housing policies, abortion rights, and disarmament, autonomous movements have clearly done more to enact what is now recognized as the popular will than did initiatives from within the existing political system. At a minimum, militant protest movements, such as those against segregation, the Vietnam War, and nuclear power, revealed the lack of consensus on specific policies and provided a necessary counterbalance, compelling even the most intransigent politicians to reconsider their positions. In a larger context, the type of subversive social movements portrayed in this book probably constitute more reasonable vehicles for making significant social decisions than corporate profitability, bureaucratic sanction, or votes by the political system’s elected representatives. What I call civil Luddism can sometimes enact greater forms of democratic control than voting once every four years or paying dues to the union. **Although greater freedom and prosperity are both necessary and possible, their realization seems remote. Instead of real autonomy in which regions could plan their future as part of humanity’s creative powers**, we have false autonomy offered us in choices among various consumer products, politicians, and individual careers. In the short run, several factors appear to favor a continuing regeneration of autonomous movements. First, job opportunities and decent housing continue to be denied to a wide cross section of people. The existence of hundreds of thousands of unemployed youth in Europe provides a base from which wave after wave of new activity might emerge. Second, the existing system’s top-heavy impetus preconditions its continuing reliance on massive capital projects. Now that construction of nuclear power plants has virtually come to an end, other projects must be found to satisfy the needs of large capital. With any number of boondoggles looming on the horizon, it appears that the existing system will continue to provide more than sufficient reasons for massive opposition to its destructive imperatives. **The unreasonable character of large capital is exemplified in Royal Dutch Shell.**Yesterday it**stubbornly clung to investments in apartheid.** More recently, it took international protests to persuade Shell not to discard one of its mammoth oil platforms by sinking it in the Atlantic Ocean. Shell’s shadow also was cast over the execution of Nigerian playwright Ken Saro-Wiwa, whose activism exposed the nefarious tip of Shell’s African activities. As suggested by this book’s title the goal of autonomous social movements is the subversion of politics: the decolonization of everyday life and civil society, not the conquest of state power. Based on politics of the first person and a desire to create direct democracy, these movements oppose me false universality of the control center under whose guise behemoth governments and corporations seek to impose their wills. The supervision of politics would mean more democracy-more than citizens of Athens or Florence ever imagined, more than envisioned and enshrined by the American Revolution, and qualitatively more than ever before possible. If Immanuel Wallerstein is once again rights (as he was with respect to the existence of one world system encompassing the Soviet Union) “as the present world system crashes down amidst us in the next 50 years, we must have a substantive alternative to offer that is a collective creation.” Autonomy might be that collective creation. Under such circumstances, it may not be a choice for more democracy but rather a necessary form for the survival of the species and all life.

#### Class and state society creates splits that perpetuate oppression

**Kovel 2** (Alger Hiss Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, awarded Fellowship at the John Guggenheim Foundation, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, pages 123-124) \*Brackets for gendered language\*

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforce­ment and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion (hence we should not talk of 'classism' to go along with 'sexism' and 'racism,' and `species-ism'). This is, first of all, because class is an essentially man-made category, without root in even a mystified biology. We cannot imagine a human world without gender dis­tinctions – although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable – indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because 'class' signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations. Thus there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state.'° Nor can gender inequality be enacted away so long as class society, with its state, demands the super-exploitation of woman's labour. Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what{They} s/he can become,the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history — this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personi­fications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. History is the history of class society — because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (`class struggle'), and lead to the succession of powers. The relation of class can be mystified without end — only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television — yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so funda­mental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away.

**Capitalism is the root cause of every impact – climate change, war, structural inequality, and psychological violence**

**Robinson PhD ’18**(William, American professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State”)/ly

Each major episode of crisis in the world capitalist system has presented the potential for systemic change. Each has involved the breakdown of state legitimacy, escalating class and social struggles, and military conflicts, leading to a restructuring of the system, including new institutional arrangements, class relations, and accumulation activities that eventually result in a restabilization of the system and renewed capitalist expansion. The current crisis shares aspects of earlier system-wide structural crises, such as of the 1880s, the 1930s or the 1970s. But there are six interrelated dimensions to the current crisis that I believe sets it apart from these earlier ones and suggests that a simple restructuring of the system will not lead to its restabilization – that is, our very survival now requires a **revolution against global capitalism** (Robinson, 2014). These six dimensions, in broad strokes, present a “big picture” context in which a global police state is emerging. First, the system is fast **reaching the ecological limits** of its reproduction. We have already passed tipping points in climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and diversity loss. For the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system in such a way that threatens to bring about a **sixth mass extinction** (see, e.g., Foster et al., 2011; Moore, 2015). These ecological dimensions of global crisis have been brought to the forefront of the global agenda by the worldwide environmental justice movement. Communities around the world have come under escalating repression as they face off against transnational corporate plunder of their environment. While capitalism cannot be held solely responsible for the ecological crisis, it is **difficult to** imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be **resolved** within the capitalist system given capital’s implacable **impulse to accumulate** and its accelerated **commodification of nature**. Second, the level of global social polarization and **inequality** is **unprecedented.** The richest one percent of humanity in 2016 controlled over half of the world’s wealth and 20 percent controlled 95 percent of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just five percent (Oxfam, 2017). These escalating inequalities fuel capitalism’s chronic problem of overaccumulation: the TCC cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to chronic stagnation in the world economy (see next section). Such extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge of social control to dominant groups. As Trumpism in the United States as well as the rise of far-right and neo-fascist movements in Europe so well illustrate, cooptation also involves the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that **social anxiety** is channeled towards **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. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend themselves to projects of 21st century fascism. Third, the sheer magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as well as the magnitude and concentrated control over the means of global communication and the production and circulation of symbols, images, and knowledge. Computerized wars, drone warfare, robot soldiers, bunker-buster bombs, a new generation of nuclear weapons, satellite surveillance, cyberwar, spatial control technology, and so forth, have **changed the face of warfare**, and more generally, of systems of social control and repression. We have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society, a point brought home by Edward Snowden’s revelations in 2013, and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication and symbolic production. If global capitalist crisis leads to a new world war the destruction would simply be unprecedented. Fourth, we are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism, in the sense that there are no longer any new territories of significance to integrate into world capitalism and new spaces to commodify are drying up. The capitalist system is by its nature **expansionary.** 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. At the same time, the privatization of education, health, utilities, basic services, and public lands is turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital’s control into “spaces of capital,” so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? New spaces have to be violently cracked open and the peoples in these spaces must be repressed by the global police state. Fifth, there is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums” (Davis, 2007) pushed out of the productive economy, **thrown into the margins,** and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction, into a mortal cycle of **dispossession-exploitation exclusion**. Crises provide capital with the opportunity to accelerate the process of forcing greater productivity out of fewer workers. The processes by which surplus labor is generated have accelerated under globalization. Spatial reorganization has helped transnational capital to break the territorial-bound power of organized labor and impose new capital–labor relations based on fragmentation, flexibilization, and the cheapening of labor. These developments, combined with a massive new round of primitive accumulation and displacement of hundreds of millions, have given rise to a new global army of superfluous labor that goes well beyond the traditional reserve army of labor that Marx discussed. 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.1 Dominant groups face the challenge of how to contain both the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity. In addition, surplus humanity cannot consume and so as their ranks expand the problem of overaccumulation becomes exacerbated. Sixth, there is an acute political contradiction in global capitalism: economic globalization takes places within a nation-state system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to substitute for a leading nation-state with enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on transnational capital. In the age of capitalist globalization governments must attract to the national territory transnational corporate investment, which requires providing capital with all the incentives associated with neoliberalism – downward pressure on wages, deregulation, austerity, and so on – that **aggravate inequality, impoverishment, and insecurity** for working classes. Nation-states face a contradiction between the need to promote transnational capital accumulation in their territories and their need to achieve political legitimacy. As a result, states around the world have been experiencing spiraling **crises of legitimacy**. This situation generates bewildering and seemingly contradictory politics and also helps explain the resurgence of far-right and neo-fascist forces that espouse rhetoric of nationalism and protectionism even as they promote neo-liberalism.

## ALT

#### The alt is to embrace the social reproduction of libertarian communism through Mutual Aid Networks: The conditions are set for a global revolution against capitalism if and only if the neoliberal order does not corrupt the movement – means reject the perm on face due to solvency deficit. Cross apply Baker ’19 and Martin ’90- The usage of the state in the aff never leads to the alt.

Zoe Baker ‘19

The anarchist critique of seizing state power is often caricatured as being based on an abstract moral opposition to the state that ignores the harsh realities we are currently facing. Upon carefully reading historical anarchist authors, however, one discovers that the real reason why they argued that revolutionaries should not seize existing state power was because it was impractical for achieving their goals.

These practical arguments were grounded in their understanding of society. Anarchists held that society was constituted by human beings with particular forms of consciousness engaging in activity — exercising capacities to satisfy motivational drives — and in so doing simultaneously transforming themselves and the world around them. For example, when workers go on strike a number of fundamental transformations can occur. Workers can develop their capacities by learning to engage in direct action and self-direct their lives; acquire new motivational drives such as the desire to stand up to their boss or become a dues paying member of a union; and transform their forms of consciousness, by which I mean the particular ways in which they experience, conceptualise and understand the world, such as coming to view their boss as a class enemy or realising that to improve their situation they have to collectively organise with other workers. Through engaging in such activity workers not only transform themselves but also develop new social relations. They form bonds of mutual support and solidarity with fellow workers while they transform the social conditions under which they live, such as earning better wages or making their boss afraid of them. This is often called the theory of praxis or practice and it is one of the many theoretical commitments that anarchists and Marx have in common.

For anarchists one of the main consequences of the theory of practice was that there is an inherent connection between means and ends. The end goal of anarchism — free or libertarian communism — is a stateless classless society in which workers collectively own the means of production and self-manage their workplaces and communities through councils in which everyone has a vote and a direct say in the decisions that affect them. These councils would coordinate action over large areas by associating together into a decentralised system of regional, national and international federations in which as many decisions as possible were made by the local councils themselves. This would be achieved through regular congresses at a regional, national and international level which would be attended by instantly recallable mandated delegates that councils elected to represent them. Crucially, delegates would not be granted the power to make decisions independently and impose them on others. Decision making power would remain in the hands of the council who had elected them.

Such a society would be reproduced over time by human beings engaging in these forms of activity and in so doing continuously creating and re-creating both communist social relations and themselves as people with the right kinds of capacities, drives and forms of consciousness for a communist society. For example, under communism workers within their local councils would make decisions through a system of direct democracy in which every member has a vote. Through participating in these local councils they would not only make decisions but also reproduce themselves as people who are able to and want to make decisions in this manner, such as being able to effectively take minutes, formulate proposals that people will support and make sure that a small minority of people do not do all the talking in meetings.

People who want to and are able to reproduce a communist society will not magically come into existence. A communist society can only emerge through a social revolution that abolishes capitalism and therefore will have to be created by the people who presently live under capitalism. Given this, in order to achieve a communist society the majority of the population has to engage in activities during the struggle against capitalism itself that transform them into people who want to and are able to self-direct their lives and their community through local councils and federations of councils. If this does not happen, then communism will not be created. This is because for communism to exist real people must establish and reproduce it day after day through their own activity.

Revolutionaries therefore have to use means that are constituted by forms of practice that will actually transform individuals into the kinds of people who will be able to and want to create the end goal of communism. If revolutionaries make the mistake of using the wrong or inappropriate means then they will produce people who will create a different society to one they initially intended

## ROTB

#### Thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best criticizes the state and class society

#### Rejecting the aff exposes the cracks within capitalism and open space for change

Holloway 5 [John Holloway Ph.D Political Science-University of Edinburgh and Alex Callinicos Ph.D Philosophy University of Oxford, former Professor of Politics- University of York August 16, 2005 <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>]

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