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#### Two links -

#### Disaster Capitalism uses fear rhetoric created by catastrophe to create new investment opportunities – plan is an example of this phenomenon

Klein 5 (The Nation April 14, 2005) (The Rise of Disaster Capitalism Introduction) http://www.fuckyouusa.com/Writings/The\_Rise\_of\_Disaster\_Capitalism.pdf Naomi Klein is a former Miliband Fellow at the London School of Economics and holds an honorary Doctor of Civil Laws from the University of King’s College, Nova Scotia. She is currently at work on a new book and film on how the climate crisis can spur economic and political transformation. ALG

But if the reconstruction industry is stunningly inept at rebuilding, that may be because rebuilding is not its primary purpose. According to Guttal, "It's not reconstruction at all--it's about reshaping everything." If anything, the stories of corruption and incompetence serve to mask this deeper scandal: the rise of a predatory form of **disaster capitalism** that **uses** the desperation and **fear created by catastrophe to engage** **in radical social and economic engineering**. And on this front, **the reconstruction industry works so quickly** and efficiently **that the privatizations** and land grabs **are** usually **locked in before** **the** local **population knows what hit them**. Kumara, in another e-mail, warns that Sri Lanka is now facing "a second tsunami of corporate globalization and militarization," potentially even more devastating than the first. "We see this as a plan of action amidst the tsunami crisis to hand over the sea and the coast to foreign corporations and tourism, with military assistance from the US Marines." As Deputy Defense Secretary, Paul Wolfowitz designed and oversaw a strikingly similar project in Iraq: **The fires were still burning in Baghdad when** US occupation **officials rewrote** the investment **laws and announced that** the country's **state-owned companies would be privatized**. Some have pointed to this track record to argue that Wolfowitz is unfit to lead the World Bank; in fact, nothing could have prepared him better for his new job. In Iraq, **Wolfowitz was** just **doing what the World Bank** **is already doing in** virtually **every war-torn and disaster-struck country** in the world--albeit with fewer bureaucratic niceties and more ideological bravado."Post-conflict" countries now receive 20-25 percent of the World Bank's total lending, up from 16 percent in 1998--itself an 800 percent increase since 1980, according to a Congressional Research Service study. Rapid response to wars and natural disasters has traditionally been the domain of United Nations agencies, which worked with NGOs to provide emergency aid, build temporary housing and the like. But now reconstruction work has been revealed as a tremendously lucrative industry, too important to be left to the do-gooders at the UN. So today **it is the World Bank**, already **devoted to** the principle of poverty alleviation through **profit-making, that leads** the charge. And **there is no doubt that there are profits to be made** in the reconstruction business. There are massive engineering and supplies contracts ($10 billion to Halliburton in Iraq and Afghanistan alone); "democracy building" has exploded into a $2 billion industry; and times have never been better for public-sector consultants--the private firms that advise governments on selling off their assets, often running government services themselves as subcontractors. (Bearing Point, the favored of these firms in the United States, reported that the revenues for its "public services" division "had quadrupled in just five years," and the profits are huge: $342 million in 2002--a profit margin of 35 percent.) But **shattered countries** are attractive to the World Bank for another reason: They **take orders well**. After a cataclysmic event, **governments** will usually **do whatever it takes to get aid** dollars--**even if it means racking up huge debts and agreeing to** sweeping policy **reforms.** And with the local population struggling to find shelter and food, political organizing against privatization can seem like an unimaginable luxury. Even better from the bank's perspective, many war-ravaged countries are in states of "limited sovereignty": They are considered too unstable and unskilled to manage the **aid** money pouring in, so it **is often put in a trust fund managed by the World Bank**. This is the case in East Timor, where the bank doles out money to the government as long as it shows it is spending responsibly. Apparently, this means slashing public-sector jobs (Timor's government is half the size it was under Indonesian occupation) but lavishing aid money on foreign consultants the bank insists the government hire (researcher Ben Moxham writes, "In one government department, a single international consultant earns in one month the same as his twenty Timorese colleagues earn together in an entire year").

#### Usage of the WTO in “reducing” IPPs is inherently illusory and ends up re-entrenching the developing countries for the growth of companies and is only doing it in attempts to gain more power for the bourgeoisie.

**Naio**, H. (March, 2, 20**12**) The WTO: Development or the Dollar?, <https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/18288>

The World Trade Organisation (Henceforth referred to as the **WTO**) **is nothing if not controversial. Anti-capitalist protesters** have turned out in force to **oppose it**, such as they did in Seattle in 2001. Much of this protest movement has been motivated by frustration towards the WTO’s advocacy of free markets and the reported consequences of this for developing countries. There is however an argument set forth by liberals and other advocates of free market capitalism that the WTO does little to support genuine free markets. This essay will focus on the WTO’s track record with developing countries, with particular analysis on the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) and will look at Marxist approaches in discussing its role in the maintenance of the western economic order. The primary objective of the WTO is to facilitate free trade with as few negative consequences as possible. The preamble to the agreement forming it in fact lists a number of key aspirations for the organisation such as raising the standard of living along with more predictable goals such as the intent to increase demand and by extension also the production of goods and services. (Nanda, 1:2003) The argument of the WTO is that the best means towards achieving development is the adoption of free markets. However, Natya Nanda, of the graduate institute in Geneva makes the distinction between increased trade and free trade. (2:2003) Pointing to a comparison of Vietnam and Haiti, noting that though following WTO guidance to the point of earning official commendation, Haiti’s economy stagnated (and continues to do so). Vietnam on the other hand imposed high custom duties and engaged in protectionism, only to see its economic growth rise by 8 percent annually and considerable poverty reduction. (Nanda, 3:2003) **Development** it seems, **is weakened by** the adoption of **the WTO’s policy**, **which is** at least in part **beneficial to western countries**. This is due to the fact that many **developing** **nations are** simply **not able to compete, regardless of liberalized trade**. (Nanda, 2003:3) One of the most problematic aspects according to Nanda is that **the safeguards put in place by the** **WTO** to prevent backlash from free flow of trade is that it **restricts national economic policy** making quite considerably, often **resulting in a** policy **framework unsuited** **to the** **country’s specific development requirements.** One clear way in which **the WTO** can be seen to **support ‘global capital’** over states is through the use of Trade Related Investment Measures or TRIMS. These agreements strictly restrain the governments ability to reign in corporations working within their borders. (Nanda, 6:2003) Though these agreements only stretch to issues pertaining to investment, there are also considerable attempts to restrict labour and environmental legislation in favour of further liberalised trade. (Spectrezine, 2005) Any and all (including telling people if packaging can be recycled, or tax policy skewed towards hybrid cars, among others) **legislation** intended to shape a consumers decision **is** at least **argued against by the developed nations**. This is a definite issue of concern for many as it prevents governments from effectively dealing with issues that they have to address because of other treaties and agreements such as Kyoto and other environmental initiatives. This goes against the Marxist perspective not only because of how it weakens the ability for government to reign in the excesses of capital and its proponents, but because it does so by allowing (by virtue of laissez faire) sweatshops and other means of subjugation for working people. (Hudis, 1:2000) There are however means by which developing nations can achieve their aims within the WTO, Brazil, a rising economic power has gained wide recognition as a nation able to effectively use the legal frameworks of the WTO to improve its trade and economic development. (Schaffer, 6:2008) Brazil has indeed risen in standing and is often seen as an important leader for developing nations at WTO and is considered to be among the G4 (consisting of the USA, EU, India and Brazil) at the Doha round of negotiations. It is important to note that the reason for Brazil’s prowess in WTO negotiations is because the organisation has a rigorous legal structure intended to prevent mistreatment of members through arbitration, which does not necessarily defend the interests of global capital. Schaffer does however note that WTO legislation affects all facets of national regulation. (9:2008) Given that the WTO is intended to facilitate free trade this will (as mentioned above) often favour corporate interests over those of governments. Brazil’s economic growth has in part at least been the result of increased liberalisation in the mid 90’s though this was balanced by the retention of some control of economic policy. (Schaffer, 13:2008) China too has benefitted soundly from its membership of the WTO, as they have enjoyed the improved access to markets to which she wants to export. China spent more than 15 years and considerable diplomatic effort trying to gain entry to the organisation. (Martin & Ianchovichina, 1205:2001) Accession to the WTO is not easy for any country so for it to be worthwhile there must be a benefit for the entrant. (Evenett & Braga: Cited in Felbermayr & Kohler 2007) The main benefit as outlined by Felbermayr & Kohler is the increase in trade for new entrants into the organisation though they point in contrast to the entry terms which are often clearly in favour of the incumbent members. (1:2007) Some have argued that **membership to the WTO is** **of much greater benefit to heavily industrialised countries than to developing ones** as the mechanisms of the organisation are better geared towards them. The more industrial countries moreover have been able to institute clearer liberal reforms of their economies, and therefore gained demonstrably more from the institutions in place. (Subramanian & Wei, cited in Felbermayr & Kohler, 4:2007) There is however no doubt that there are extensive trade links fostered by countries within the WTO and many would say as a result of the liberalisation incurred by joining it. (Felbermayr & Kohler, 5:2007) Within a Marxist narrative, the declared aims of the WTO and the policy actions that it hast taken, **the WTO is seeking to reduce the state to** little more than **a vehicle for economic development**. (Heuben, 447:2006) The case made is that **the WTO helps to facilitate the growth of corporations at the expense of the third world in particular but of the working classes generally as the primary gain from increased commerce is going to the largest companies**. (Heuben, 455:2006) The role of nations in this picture is to lobby and campaign for free trade and other legislation that is favourable to the corporations based inside them. This is coupled with the desire to maintain areas of influence both economically and politically. (Heuben 456:2006) In order to maintain some sort of hegemonic dominance, the US has attempted to bring as many countries as possible into the WTO in order to force their involvement in the increasingly globalised economic system. **The WTO has come under pressure** in recent years precisely **because of its image as a capitalist vehicle for control.** Much of the protest in Seattle was aimed at that very problem. This is attributed to the lack of transparency in its formation by Philip McMichael of Cornell University. This is particularly interesting given the context of increased globalisation in which the WTO was born. (1:2000) **The nature of the WTO is fundamentally hidden from the public**, with most of its affairs being carried out behind closed doors through bureaucratic tribunals and then **making it so that the rulings issued are forced on the governments, who are in turn forced to undermine social protections and regulations at the bequest of an accountable grouping**. A good example of this is seen in **the** potential **threat to the welfare state** and other such ideas, which **would be sacrificed** subject **to** what McMichael describes as; “**A politically assertive form of capitalism**” (467:2000). This politically assertive capitalism is backed primarily by the US with its entrenched corporate interests but enjoys support from the majority of European states as well. To conclude, the World Trade Organisation is a clear vehicle for the interests of capital through its dominant members, whether it’s by proposing TRIM agreements in or by enforcing patent laws. It is fundamentally better to be a corporate entity working within a WTO nation given the restrictions placed on their governments ability to legislate in any genuine regulatory capacity. **This is to the particular cost of developing countries as they are left having to compete against much much more advanced economies without being able to invest in the benefits that the first world obtained during its developmental phase.**

#### Capitalism is structurally reliant on militarism to absorb surpluses of capital - wholesale destruction of human life as a form of devaluation is the result

Harvey 6 (Harvey, Professor of Anthropology City University of New York, 2006 (David, *The Limits to Capital*, p. 444-5)

The internationalism and multilateralism of the postwar world appears, on the surface, to be very different. Global freedoms for **the movement of capital** (in all forms) **has allowed** instant **access to the ‘spatial fix’** through geographical expansion **within a framework of** uneven **geographical destruction**. The rapid accumulation of capital on this basis led to the creation and in some cases the re-creation of independent regional centers of accumulation – Germany, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, South-East Asia, etc. Regional alliances build once more and compete for shrinking profit opportunities. **The threat of autarky looms** again. And **with it comes the renewed threat of global war**, this time **waged with weapons of immense** and insane **destructive power**, and oriented towards primitive accumulation at the expense of the socialist bloc. **Marxists**, ever since Luxemburg first wrote on the subject, **have long been attracted to** the idea of **military expenditure** as a convenient means **to absorb** surpluses of **capital** and labour power. **The** instantaneous **obsolescence of military hardware**, **and** the **easy manipulation of international tensions** into a political demand for the increase in defense expenditures, **adds luster to the idea**. **Cap**italism, it is sometimes held, **is stabilized through the defense budget**, albeit **in ways that rob society of** **more humane** and socially worth-while **programs**. This line of thinking is cast, unfortunately, in the under-consumptionist mould. I say ‘unfortunately’ not so much because that interpretation is wrong, but because **the present theory suggests a** rather **more sinister** and terrifying **interpretation of military expenditures**: not only must **weapons** be bought and paid for out of surpluses of capital and labour, but they **must** also **be put to use.** For this is the only means capitalism has at its disposal to achieve the levels of devaluation now required. The idea is dreadful in its implications. What better reason could there be to declare that it is time for capitalism to be gone, to give way to some saner more of production

#### Reject any aff impacts - Capitalism’s successes necessitate human extinction and destroy the value to life – impacts don’t matter, we must solve value to life first.

Duzgun 20 Eren Duzgun (teaches Historical Sociology and International Relations at Leiden University, Netherlands), 4-5-2020, "Capitalism, Coronavirus and the Road to Extinction," Socialist Project, https://socialistproject.ca/2020/04/capitalism-coronavirus-and-road-to-extinction/, SJBE

**Covid-19, by contrast, has begun its journey and taken its biggest toll thus far in the most advanced and affluent parts of the world**. This is to say, the contagion is no longer limited to the persistently undernourished, underdeveloped, and war-torn parts of the world; its impact is no longer restricted to a distant wet market or a third world country alone. **Instead, it has emerged and expanded in the very heart of the capitalist world order at a time when capitalism has not only been already firmly established across the globe but has been testing the eco-biological limits of the entire planet. Should things remain the same, Covid-19 and its future cousins are likely to claim the lives of not just ‘some’ people as they did in the past, but of humanity as a whole. In this sense, perhaps for the first time in modern history, the biological blitzkrieg activated by the coronavirus has thrown into sharp relief the immediately existential and undeniably global contradictions and consequences generated by capitalism.** Contradictions on a Global Scale Critical biologists and epidemiologists have put the blame on industrial agriculture as the root cause of the emergence of new pathogens since the 1990s. [According to Rob Wallace](https://climateandcapitalism.com/2020/03/11/capitalist-agriculture-and-covid-19-a-deadly-combination/), giant agribusiness and resource extraction firms have now reached the last virgin forests and smallholder-held farmlands in the world, subordinating them to the logic of capitalist markets. **The loss of the ecological diversity and complexity of these huge tracts of land has increasingly forced wild food operators to hunt in previously untouched parts of the jungle, which, in turn, has increased “the interaction with, and spillover of, previously boxed-in pathogens, including Covid-19.”** Likewise, global warming has forced or allowed pathogens to escape their natural habitat. As a result, new viruses against which we have no immunity “are being sprung free, threatening the whole world.” In short, [as John Vidal writes](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/mar/18/tip-of-the-iceberg-is-our-destruction-of-nature-responsible-for-covid-19-aoe), “we disrupt ecosystems, and we shake viruses loose from their natural hosts. When that happens, they need a new host. Often, we are it.” **That some agribusiness firms have been blatantly risking lives for profit would not come as a surprise to the critical reader**. Even [Bill Gates has been sounding the alarm](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Af6b_wyiwI) about the potentially deadly consequences of irresponsible business practices and new viruses. **Yet, what tends to remain underemphasized in these debates is that the blame belongs neither solely to ‘greedy’ firms that have driven viruses out of their natural habitat, nor to ‘short-sighted’ politicians who have not invested enough in vaccine technology or national health systems. Instead, the problem is rooted in the very structure and rationality of the system as a whole. That is, we may go extinct as a result of the ‘successes’ of the very system ‘we’ created in the first place, i.e., capitalism. How did we end up losing control of an ‘economic’ system of our own making?** This is indeed an anomaly in human history. The conception of the ‘economy’ as an autonomous sphere dictating its own rules over society did not exist in non-capitalist societies. As the economic anthropologist [Karl Polanyi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Polanyi#Works) put it, “neither under tribal, nor feudal, nor mercantile conditions was there… a separate economic system in society.” The economy either “remained nameless” or had “no obvious meaning,” for the economic process and prices were instituted through non-market means, such as kinship, marriage, age-groups, status, political patronage, etc. Even “where markets were most highly developed, as under the mercantile system,” the economic system, as a rule, “[was absorbed in the social system](https://books.google.ca/books?id=SgHuxQEACAAJ)” and showed “no tendency to expand at the expense of the rest.” In this sense, the market with a distinctive logic, autonomy, and dynamic of its own was completely unknown to our ancestors, and indeed, the emergence of the idea of ‘self-regulating’ markets represented a complete reversal of the way in which past economies functioned. **In order for ‘self-regulating’ markets to ‘self-regulate’, a variety of political and institutional arrangements had to be initiated to progressively eliminate the non-market survival strategies that humans previously relied upon.** Most notably, the age-old communal systems of social and moral regulation needed to be eradicated, a process that systematically subordinated the ‘natural and human substance of society’, i.e., land and labour, to market relations for the first time in history. Rise of Capitalism **At the heart of the rise of capitalism, therefore, rested a ‘political’, legal, and violent process that led to the historically unprecedented characterization of land and labour as commodities. Without commodifying land and labour, i.e., without treating the planet’s living substance as commodities, it would have been impossible to view the ‘economy’ as an institutionally and motivationally self-regulating sphere of life, an almost robotic creature functioning at the expense of human lives and livelihoods. Capitalism presupposed from the very beginning a radical transformation in the human use of nature as well as in the provision of life’s essential requirements. In this sense, the danger of global extinction which we have been going through is not a temporary hiccup in an otherwise smoothly operating capitalist ecosystem but has always been a possibility built into the very structure of market society.** On the one hand, by treating land and labour as commodities, by subjecting people’s utilization of land and enjoyment of life to their ability to continuously increase market competitiveness and productivity, capitalism has enabled massive technological advancements in all spheres of life. This, in turn, has generated, above all, an unprecedented potential to feed, clothe, and accommodate an ever-increasing world population. **On the other hand, however,** [**as Ellen Wood argues**](https://monthlyreview.org/1998/07/01/the-agrarian-origins-of-capitalism/)**, by subordinating all other considerations to the imperatives of market competition, capitalism has also created poverty, homelessness, environmental destruction and pandemics**. Billions of people who could be fed and housed are subjected to immense doses of insecurity, living their lives under the constant threat of joblessness, homelessness, loss of status and starvation. **In a similar fashion, the environment that could be protected is systematically destroyed for profit, and killer viruses that could be contained are unleashed.** Undoubtedly, Covid-19 has become the archetypal example that lays bare “the destructive impulses of a system in which the very fundamentals of existence are subjected to the requirements of profit.” **Can the ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ outcomes of capitalism be somewhat reconciled? Indeed, for a brief period in the Global North, it seemed they could be**. During the so-called [Golden Age of Capitalism](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-golden-age-of-capitalism-9780198287414) (1945-70), massive productivity increases (alongside working-class struggles) allowed for steady increases in wages, job security, expansion of welfare state, improvements in the living conditions of the majority of the labouring masses as well as the expansion of civil and political liberties. **Yet, this brief period of generalized prosperity and stability also facilitated the incorporation of the western working classes into the dominant capitalist ideology, causing them to turn a blind eye to the economically destabilizing, environmentally destructive, and socially degrading impact of global capitalism in the Global South.** The main ‘problem’ with the Global South has been, by and large, a question of ‘timing’. **Once capitalism was established and consolidated in the Global North, it has not only led to the birth of new and more effective forms of imperialist control and neocolonial expansion but has also irrevocably undermined the potentially positive outcomes of capitalist development elsewhere.** For example, the [MIT political economist Alice Amsden](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-rise-of-the-rest-9780195170597), a large chunk of whose work in the 1970s and 1980s sought to explain the success of the ‘Asian Tigers’, more recently concluded that the massive technological and infrastructural gap between the North and the South has literally made impossible capitalist ‘development’ of any sort in the vast majority of southern economies since the 1990s. The economic situation in the Global North has gotten progressively worse too. Under the conditions of increased global economic competition wages have been stagnating or declining since the 1970s, while decades of fiscal austerity wiping out most of the economic and social gains of the earlier period. The new reality of high unemployment, stagnant wages, long work hours and precarious jobs has been masked for a while by a debt-driven growth, the unsustainability of which has been bitterly testified by millions of people since the 2008 financial crisis. All in all, market imperatives have been regulating social reproduction almost worldwide for a long time but with no prospect of capitalist ‘development’ for an overwhelming majority of the world’s population in the South and the North alike. **Furthermore, the ecologically disastrous and socially inhumane consequences of capitalism have long outweighed the prospects of material gain in the Global South.** In this respect, what is being painfully realized in the current conjuncture is that the North is no longer able to externalize the worst consequences of such an unsustainable mode of life. The North isn’t and won’t be spared the existential threats posed by global capitalism. **The implication is that any meaningful attempt at solving the present, and future crises needs to take the bull by the horn**. There is literally no choice to be made between ‘capitalism’ and ‘capitalism with a human face’. **As long as the underlying dynamics of our lives remain the same, as long as we keep treating nature and human beings as commodities, no** [**cosmetic surgery**](https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/09/12/why-growth-cant-be-green/) **will do. To the contrary, historical experience suggests that such minimal interventions will sooner or later backfire, re-legitimizing capitalism pure and simple. The only way to ‘re-embed’ our economies and save our lives from ecological collapse is by intervening in the very heart of the beast: land and human beings need to be taken out of the market. The beast is not tameable; it needs to be**[**killed**](https://monthlyreview.org/product/what_every_environmentalist_needs_to_know_about_capitalism/)**.**

#### Thus, the alternative is to affirm a strategy of party organizing – only an accountable and unified Communist party can effectively empower oppressed communities and forward the base-building movement

Escalante ‘18, - a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. (Alyson, "Party Organizing In The 21st Century" Forge News, 9-21-2018, https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/)

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, **empower**ing 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.**

#### Vote negative to abandon hope in capitalism. Movements are already confronting capitalism, and while it seems bleak, the alternative to neo-liberalism can solve.

Saul and Leys ’99 [John S. Saul and Colin Leys in 1999 ([Saul is a member of the editorial working group of Southern Africa Report and Leys is co-editor of the Socialist Register] Sub-Saharan Africa in Global Capitalism,” Monthly Review, Vol. 51.3, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/799saul.htm>)]

Yet the fact remains that more dramatic possibilities are in the air, and even beginning to take organizational form. **Crude predatory capitalism is** already **being confronted**, in Ogoniland and elsewhere, most often in the name of democracy but also with a redistributive thrust that the idea of "democracy" cannot in the end entirely encompass. As the need to attach the demand for socio-economic rights more self-consciously to the demand for political rights becomes even more widely felt, so too can **the** popular **critique** **of power be expected to expand** its focus beyond local abuses of office **to confront global injustices** (from the abusive Nigerian state, in the Ogoni case, via Shell Oil to a fresh perspective on the workings of the global system, perhaps). In Zambia, for example, the broad trade union-led democratic movement that brought down the autocratic Kaunda government throws up only the far more IFI-dominated, austerity-driven and authoritarian Chiluba regime. Can one expect to find Zambians asking much more searching questions about the nature of power, national and global, next time round—while also beginning to imagine struggles that could narrow the sweeping prerogatives of capital which now frame their negative circumstances? And when merely "democratic" challenges to power in countries like Kenya collapse into squabbling, often cast in ethnic terms, between rival opposition leaders—entirely to the electoral advantage of the ruling Moi clique—a younger generation of political activists seems likely to draw lessons relevant for crafting more progressive political practices in the future. In Zimbabwe, for example, one does find the strong trade union movement that has driven the dramatic strike wave in Zimbabwe in recent years arguing (alongside other popular organizations) for the formation of a new party to challenge the rancid Mugabe regime from the left: as Patrick Bond writes of this initiative, "What is crucial is that the opposition's political orientation is potentially both post-nationalist and post-neoliberal, perhaps for the first time in African history."39 No doubt **moves** such as this—**towards** **creating** the broader **united fronts** **capable of pulling together** politically both very **local resistances** **and** the kind of diffuse **national ones** we have noted above—**are required**. In continental terms they are still in their infancy, however. For one thing, finding a language of "popular democracy"40 that is both unifying and empowering enough to link together the very diverse realities of urban and rural Africa will be a challenge, as Mahmood Mamdani has emphasized in recent writings.41 To link that language, in turn, to the kind of socialist discourse—still to be rescued from the debris of recent socialist practice, worldwide and African—that could be expected to illuminate the capitalist underpinnings of Africans' problems will be even more challenging. And yet, **in some circles of African intellectuals**, **this task of recuperation has begun: reaching all the way** **from the deliberations of Codesria**, the prominent Dakar-based progressive research organization (and home base of Samir Amin),42 **to the assertions of the National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa** which regularly evoke just such socialist premises to critique the neo-liberal predilections of the ANC government there. The odds being so long, and the alternative so hard to see, **it might be thought that this projection of a renewed socialist thrust in Africa is pure fantasy. And yet it is hardly realistic to imagine that nothing radical is going to happen.** What the prominent South African historian Colin Bundy wrote several years ago of the struggle to retain a radical vision in his own country seems equally true of the continent as a whole. "There will be many who remain unconvinced," he notes. "They believe that would-be socialists in [Africa] are doomed to defeat: epochally quixotic, tilting forlornly at windmills driven for the rest of history by capitalist energies. To speak of `prospects' for socialism, they say, requires a leap of faith." And "perhaps it does," Bundy concedes; at the very least it "requires stamina, creativity and collective resourcefulness." And yet, as he continues, "**to imagine that a milder mannered capitalist order can secure a decent future for the majority of [Africans] ... or that [Africa] can somehow be absolved its economic history and enter a future like that of Sweden or Taiwan: now that really requires a leap of faith."43**

#### 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.

#### Vote negative - as an intellectual your rejection has emancipatory results relentless criticism allows capitalism to be challenged.

Kovel 2 (Professor of Social Studies at Bard, Joel, The Enemy of Nature, p224)

**Relentless criticism can delegitimate the system** and release people into struggle. And as struggle develops, **victories** that are **no more than incremental by their own terms**- stopping a meeting stopping the IMF, the hopes stirred forth by a campaign such as Ralph Nader’s in 2000 – **can have a** symbolic **effect far greater** **than their external result**, **and constitute points of rupture** with capital. This rupture is not a set of facts added to our knowledge of the world, but a change in our relation to the world. Its **effects are dynamic,** not incremental, **and** like all genuine insights it **changes the balance of forces** and can propagate very swiftly. Thus the release from **inertia can trigger** a rapid cascade of **changes**, so that it could be said that the forces pressing towards radical change need not be linear and incremental, but can be exponential in character. In this way, conscientious and **radical criticism** of the given, even in advance of having blueprints for an alternative, **can be a material force, because it can seize the mind** of the masses **of people.** There is no greater responsibility for intellectuals