

I negate

**The ROB is resisting capitalism. Everything we know has been shaped by capitalist imagination which leads to the co-option of education and therefore it is the judge's highest obligation to reject capitalism in every instance. Giroux 15**

Giroux, Henry A., and Henry A Giroux. "Henry A. Giroux: Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory." Truthout, Truthout, 3 Mar. 2015, [truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/](http://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/).

These throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions.

**The status and exploitation of the labor of part-time workers is shameful and is indicative of the degree to which neoliberalism's culture of cruelty, brutality and iniquitous power now shapes higher education.**

And while there are a number of serious movements among adjuncts and others to fight against this new form of exploited labor, it is fair to say that such resistance will face an uphill battle. The corporatized university will not only fight such efforts in the courts with their bands of lawyers and anti-union thugs; they will also use, as we have seen recently on a number of campuses, the police and other state repressive apparatuses to impose their will on dissenting students and faculty. But if this growing group of what Kate Jenkins calls the "hyper-educated poor" (18) joins with other social movements fighting against militarization, and the war on public goods, public servants and workers, there is a chance for the emergence of a new political formation that may succeed in turning the momentum around in this ongoing battle over academic labor and the fate of higher education in the future. Memory is no longer insurgent; that is, it has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage. While the post-9/11 attacks have taken an even more dangerous turn, **higher education is still a site of**

**intense struggle, but it is fair to say the right wing is winning.** The success of the financial elite in waging this war can be **measured not only by the rise in the stranglehold of neoliberal policies over higher education, the increasing corporatization of the university,** the evisceration of full-time, tenured jobs for faculty, **the dumbing down of the curriculum, the view of students as customers, and** the growing influence of the

military-industrial-academic complex in the service of the financial elite, but also **in the erasing of public memory.** Memory is no

longer insurgent; that is, it has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage. On the contrary, it is either being cleansed or erased by the new apologists for the status quo who urge people to love the United States, which means giving up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle. The current call to cleanse history in the name of a false patriotism that celebrates a new illiteracy as a way of loving the United States is a discourse of anti-memory, a willful attempt at forgetting the past in the

manufactured fog of historical amnesia. This is particularly true when it comes to erasing the work of a number of critical intellectuals who have written about higher education as the practice of freedom, including John Dewey, George S. Counts, W.E.B. Du Bois, the Social Reconstructionists, and others, all of whom viewed higher education as integral to the development of both engaged critical citizens and the university as a democratic public sphere. (19) Under the reign of neoliberalism, with few exceptions, higher education appears to be increasingly decoupling itself from its historical legacy as a crucial public sphere,

responsible for both educating students for the workplace and providing them with the modes of critical discourse, interpretation, judgment, imagination, and experiences that deepen and expand democracy. **As universities adopt the ideology of the transnational**

**corporation and become subordinated to the needs of capital,** the war industries and the Pentagon, they are less concerned about how they might educate students about the ideology and civic practices of democratic governance and the necessity of using knowledge to address the challenges of public life. (20) Instead, as part of the post-9/11

military-industrial-academic complex, **higher education increasingly conjoins military interests and market values,** identities and social relations while the role of the university as a public good, a site of critical dialogue and a place that calls students to think, question, learn how to take risks, and act with compassion and conviction is dismissed as impractical

or subversive. (21) The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States. The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States, extending from Thomas Jefferson to John Dewey to Maxine Greene, who held that freedom flourishes in the worldly space of the public realm only through the work of educated, critical citizens. Within this democratic tradition, education was not confused with training; instead,

**its critical function was propelled by the need to provide students with the knowledge and skills that enable a “politically interested and mobilized citizenry, one**

that has certain solidarities, is capable of acting on its own behalf, and anticipates a future of ever greater social equality across lines of race, gender, and class.” (22) Other prominent **educators** and theorists such as Hannah Arendt, James B. Conant and Cornelius Castoriadis have long believed and rightly argued that we should not allow education to be modeled after the business world.

Dewey, in particular, **warned about the growing influence of the “corporate mentality” and the threat that the business model posed to public spaces, higher education and democracy.**

## Capitalism is the root cause of violence and it is definitionally unable to change

John Bellamy Foster 19 (John Bellamy Foster is an American professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and editor of the Monthly Review. He writes about political economy of capitalism and economic crisis, ecology and ecological crisis, and Marxist theory. ) “Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?” Monthly Review, 2-1-2019, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>. Accessed 7-9-2021, WWEY

**Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere.** Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.<sup>4</sup> Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. **Real wages** for most workers in the United States **have barely budged in forty**

**years** despite steadily rising productivity. **Work intensity has increased, while** work and safety

**protections** on the job **have been** systematically **jettisoned.** Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment

in the form of contract labor in the gig economy. Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”<sup>7</sup> The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.<sup>8</sup> Around \$21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”<sup>9</sup> Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S.

population.<sup>10</sup> **In every region** of the world, **inequality has increased sharply** in recent decades.<sup>11</sup> The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.<sup>12</sup> More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat.<sup>13</sup> The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent

larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.<sup>13</sup> **Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water**

**and air are** increasingly **out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries** in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of

dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States. New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation,

attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world. In the United States and other high-income countries, **life expectancy is in decline, with**

**a** remarkable **resurgence of** <sup>Victorian</sup> **illnesses related to poverty and exploitation.** In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping

cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.<sup>16</sup> Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid-century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”<sup>17</sup> These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”<sup>18</sup> At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.<sup>19</sup> The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s *Hard Times*: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”<sup>20</sup> Having been reduced to

intellectual dungeons, **many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools** in the United States **are mere**

**pipelines for prisons** or the military. More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, **constituting a new Jim Crow.**

the total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 58 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 60 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.<sup>22</sup> Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet. Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women's bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.<sup>23</sup> The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about "fake news" on all sides.<sup>24</sup> Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.<sup>25</sup> The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated "dark money" emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world's leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Beran and Paul Swezey stated in *Monopoly Capital* in 1986, "is democratic in form and plutocratic in content."<sup>26</sup> In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.<sup>27</sup> War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.<sup>28</sup> Torture and assassinations have been reinitiated by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1963, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.<sup>29</sup> Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling elites and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.<sup>30</sup> More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.<sup>31</sup> Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.<sup>32</sup> Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.<sup>33</sup> Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a "planet of slums."<sup>34</sup> Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to \$103 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at \$7.5 trillion).<sup>35</sup> The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.<sup>36</sup> It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world's wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.<sup>37</sup> What climatologist James Hansen calls the "species extirminations" resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.<sup>38</sup> If present climate-change trends continue, the "global carbon budget" associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.<sup>39</sup> The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth's energy balance, are simply incalculable.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth's climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.<sup>41</sup> Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist

countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity. **Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers' labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers' own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative "externalities,"** unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, "capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs."<sup>42</sup>

The aim of the 1ac's politics is the strike – that bolsters capital's control and is parasitic on political organizing.

**Eidlin 20** Barry Eidlin (assistant professor of sociology at McGill University and the author of *Labor and the Class*

*Idea in the United States and Canada*), 1-6-2020, "Why Unions Are Good – But Not Good Enough," Jacobin, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing>  
Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of "the working class" or "working-class activity," we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, **unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory's central goals: overthrowing capitalism. Unions by their very existence affirm and reinforce capitalist class society. As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers, unions only exist in relation to capitalists.**

This makes them **almost by definition reformist institutions designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform it.** Many unions have adapted to this conservative, managerial role. Others have played key roles in challenging capital's power. Some have even played insurgent roles at one moment and managerial roles at others. When unions have organized workplace insurgencies, this has sometimes translated into political pressure that expanded democracy and led to large-scale policy reforms. In the few revolutionary historical moments that we can identify, worker organization, whether called unions or something else, has been essential. Thus, labor unions and movements have long been a central focus of Marxist debate. At its core, the debate centers around the role of unions in class formation, the creation of the revolutionary working-class agent. The debate focuses on four key questions. First, to what degree do unions simply reflect existing relations of production and class struggle, or actively shape those relations? Second, if unions actively shape class struggle, why and under what conditions do they enhance or inhibit it? Third, how do unions shape class identities, and how does this affect unions' scope of action? Fourth, what is the relation between unions and politics? This question is comprised of two sub-questions: to what degree do unions help or hinder struggles in the workplace becoming broader political struggles? And how should unions relate to political parties, the more conventional vehicle for advancing political demands? The following is a chapter from *The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx* (Oxford University Press, 2019). It assesses Marxist debates surrounding trade unions, oriented by the four questions mentioned previously. It proceeds historically, first examining how Marx and Engels conceived of the roles and limitations of trade unions, then tracing how others within Marxism have pursued these debates as class relations and politics have changed over time. While the chapter includes some history of labor unions and movements themselves, the central focus is on how Marxist theorists thought of and related to those movements. Marx and Engels wrote extensively about the unions of their time, although never systematically. The majority of their writings on unions responded to concrete labor struggles of their time. From their earliest works, they grasped unions' necessity and limitations in creating a working-class agent capable of advancing class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This departed from previous variants of socialism, often based in idealized views of rebuilding a rapidly eroding community of artisanal producers, which did not emphasize class organization or class struggle. Writing in *The Condition of the Working Class in England* about emerging forms of unionism, Engels observed that even though workers' primary struggles were over material issues such as wages, they pointed to a deeper social and political conflict: What

gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They imply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order. At the same time, Engels saw that, even as union struggles "[kept alive] the opposition of the workers to the ... omnipotence of the bourgeoisie," so too did they "[compel] the admission that something more is needed than Trades Unions And strikes to break the power of the ruling class." Here Engels articulates the crux of the problem. First, unions are essential for working-class formation, creating a collective actor both opposed to the bourgeoisie and capable of challenging it for power. Second, they are an insufficient vehicle for creating and mobilizing that collective actor.

Recognizing a right to strike reduces revolutionary potential and fractures class organizing – turns their case.

**Crépon 19** Mark Crépon (French philosopher), translated by Micol Bez "The Right to Strike and Legal War in Walter Benjamin's

"Toward the Critique of Violence," Critical Times, 2:2, August 2019, DOI 10.1215/26410478-7708331

If we wish to understand how the question of the right to strike arises for Walter Benjamin in the seventh paragraph of his essay "Zur Kritik der Gewalt," it is important to first analyze the previous paragraph, which concerns the state's monopoly on violence. It is here that Benjamin questions the argument that such a monopoly derives from the impossibility of a system of legal ends to preserve itself as long as the pursuit of natural ends through violent means remains. Benjamin responds to this dogmatic thesis with the following hypothesis, arguably one of his most important reflections: "To counter it, one would perhaps have to consider the surprising possibility that law's interest in monopolizing violence vis-à-vis the individual is explained by the intention not of preserving legal ends, but rather of preserving law itself. [This is the possibility] that violence, when it does not lie in the hands of

law, poses a danger to law, not by virtue of the ends that it may pursue but by virtue of its mere existence outside of law."<sup>1</sup> In other words, nothing would endanger the law more than the possibility of its authority being contested by a violence over which it has no control. The function of the law would therefore be first and foremost, to contain violence within its own boundaries. It is in this context that, to demonstrate this surprising hypothesis, Benjamin invokes two examples: the right to strike guaranteed by the state and the law of war. Let us return to the place that the right to strike occupies within class struggles. To begin with, the very idea of such a struggle implies certain forms of violence. The strike could then be understood as one of recognizable form that this violence can take. However, this analytical framework is undermined as soon as this form of violence becomes regulated by a "right to strike" such as the one recognized by law in France in 1864. What this recognition engages is, in fact, the will of the state to control the possible "violence" of the strike. Thus, the "right" of the right to strike appears as the best, if not the only, way for the state to

circumscribe within (and via) the law the relative violence of class struggles. We might consider this to be the perfect illustration of the aforementioned hypothesis. Yet, there are two lines of questioning that destabilize this hypothesis that we would do well to consider. First, is it legitimate to present the strike as a form of violence? Who has a vested interest in such a representation? In other words, how can we trace a clear and unequivocal demarcation between violence and nonviolence? Are we not always bound to find residues of violence, even in those actions that we would be tempted to consider nonviolent? The second line of questioning is just as important and is rooted in the distinction established by Georges Sorel, in his Reflections on Violence, between the "political strike" and the "proletarian general strike," to which Benjamin dedicates a set of complementary analyses in §13 of his essay. Here, again, we are faced with a question of limits. What is at stake is the possibility for a certain type of strike (the proletarian general strike) to exceed the limits of the right to strike—turning, in other words, the right to strike against the law itself. The phenomenon is that of an autoimmune process, in which the right to strike that is meant to protect the law against the possible violence of class struggles is transformed into a means for the destruction of the law. The difference between the two types of strikes is nevertheless introduced with a condition: "The validity of this statement, however, is not unrestricted because it is not unconditional," notes Benjamin in §7. We would be mistaken in believing that the right to strike is granted and guaranteed unconditionally. Rather, it is structurally subjected to a conflict of interpretations, those of the workers, on the one hand, and of the state on the other. From the point of view of the state, the partial strike cannot under any circumstance be understood as a right to exercise violence, but rather as the right to extract oneself from a preexisting (and verifiable) violence: that of the employer. In this sense, the partial strike should be considered a nonviolent action, what Benjamin named a "pure means." The interpretations diverge on two main points. The first clearly depends on the alleged "violence of the employer," a predicate that begs the question: Who might have the authority to recognize such violence? Evidently it is not the employer. The danger is that the state would similarly lack the incentive to make such a judgment call. It is nearly impossible, in fact, to find a single instance of a strike in which this recognition of violence was not subject to considerable controversy. The political game is thus the following: the state

legislated the right to strike in order to contain class struggles, with the condition that workers must have "good reason" to strike. However, it is unlikely that a state systematically allied with (and it is unlikely that a state accomplice to) employers will ever recognize reasons as good, and, as a consequence, it will deem any innovation of the right to strike as illegitimate. Workers will therefore be seen as abusing a right granted by the state, and in so doing transforming it into violent means. On this point, Benjamin's analyses remain extremely pertinent and profoundly contemporary. They unveil the enduring strategy of governments confronted with a strike (in education, transportation, or healthcare, for example) who, after claiming to understand the reasons for the protest and the grievances of the workers, deny that the arguments constitute sufficient reason for a strike that will likely paralyze this or that sector of the economy. They deny, in other words, that the conditions denounced by the workers display an intrinsic violence that justifies the strike. Let us note here a point that Benjamin does not mention, but that is part of Sorel's reflections: this denial inevitably contaminates the (socialist) left once it gains power. What might previously have seemed a good reason to strike when it was the opposition is deemed an insufficient one once it is the ruling party. In the face of popular protest, it always invokes a lack of sufficient rationale, allowing it to avoid recognizing the intrinsic violence of a given social or economic situation, or of a new policy. And it is because it refuses to see this violence and to take responsibility for it that the left regularly loses workers' support.

**It is no longer, and was never, enough to try to work within capitalist boundaries. Thus, the alt is generating a system of market socialism – which ensures production and access to all basic goods, and places power in the hands of workers**

**Eagleton** 11 [TERRY EAGLETON (prominent British literary theorist, critic and public intellectual. He is currently Distinguished Professor of English Literature at Lancaster University, Professor of Cultural Theory at the National University of Ireland and Distinguished Visiting Professor of English Literature at The University of Notre Dame). "Why Marx Was Right." 2011 by Yale University. New Haven & London] AJ

There is, however, another sense in which socialism is thought by some to be unworkable. Even if you were to build it under affluent conditions, how could you possibly run a complex modern economy without markets? The answer for a growing number of Marxists is that you do not need to. Markets in their view would remain an integral part of a socialist economy. So-called market socialism envisages a future in which

the **means of production would be socially owned**, but where self-governing cooperatives would compete with one another in the marketplace. In this way, some of the virtues of the market could be retained, while some of its vices could be shed. At the level of individual enterprises, cooperation would ensure increased efficiency, since the evidence suggests that it is almost always as efficient as capitalist enterprise and often much more so. **At the level of the economy as a whole, competition ensures that the**

informational, **allocation** and incentive **problems** associated **with the traditional Stalinist model of central planning do not arise**.

Some Marxists claim that Marx himself was a market socialist, at least in the sense that he believed that the market would linger on during the transitional period following a socialist revolution. He also considered that markets had been emancipatory as well as exploitative, helping to free men and women from their previous dependence on lords and masters. Markets strip the aura of mystery from social relations, laying bare their bleak reality. So keen was Marx on this point that the philosopher Hannah Arendt once described the opening pages of the Communist

Manifesto as "the greatest praise of capitalism you ever saw." Σ Market socialists also point out that markets are by no means specific to capitalism. Even Trotsky, so some of his disciples may be surprised to hear, supported the market, though only in the period of transition to socialism and in combination with economic planning. It was needed, he thought, as a check on the adequacy and rationality of planning, since "economic accounting is unthinkable without market relations." ¶ Along with the Soviet Left Opposition,

he was a strong critic of the so-called command economy. **Market socialism does away with private property**, social **classes and exploitation. It also places economic power in to the hands of the actual**

**producers**. In all of these ways, it is a welcome advance on a capitalist economy. For some Marxists, however, it retains too many features of that economy to be palatable. Under market socialism there would still be commodity production, inequality, unemployment and the sway of market forces beyond human control. How would workers not simply be transformed into collective capitalists, maximizing their profits, cutting quality, ignoring social needs and pandering to consumerism in the drive for constant accumulation? How would one avoid the chronic short-termism of markets, their habit of ignoring the overall social picture and the long-term antisocial effects of their own fragmented decisions? Education and state monitoring might diminish these dangers, but some Marxists look instead to an economy which

would be neither centrally planned nor market-governed. π On this model, **resources would be allocated by negotiations** between producers,

consumers, environmentalists and other relevant parties, in networks of workplace, neighbourhood and consumer councils. **The broad parameters of the**

**economy**, including decisions on the overall allocation of resources, rates of growth and investment, energy, transport and ecological policies and the like, **would be set by representative assemblies** at a local, regional and national level. These general decisions about, say, allocation would then be **devolved**

**downwards to regional and local levels**, where more detailed planning would be progressively worked out. **At every stage, public**

**debate** over alternative economic plans and policies **would be essential**. In this way, **what and how we**

**produce could be determined by social need rather than private profit**. Under capitalism, we are deprived of the power to

decide whether we want to produce more hospitals or more breakfast cereals. Under socialism, this freedom would be regularly exercised. Power in such assemblies would pass by democratic election from the bottom up rather than from the top down. Democratically elected bodies representing each branch of commerce or production would negotiate with a national economic commission to achieve an agreed set of investment decisions. Prices would be determined not centrally, but by production units on the basis of input from consumers, users, interest groups and so on. Some champions of such so-called participatory

economics accept a kind of mixed socialist economy: **goods which are of vital concern** to the community (food, health, pharmaceuticals, education,

transport, energy, subsistence products, financial institutions, the media and the like) **need to be brought under democratic public**

**control**, since those who run them tend to behave antisocially if they sniff the chance of enlarged profits in doing so. Less socially indispensable goods, however (consumer items, luxury products), could be left to the operations of the market. Some market socialists find this whole scheme too complex to be workable. As Oscar Wilde once remarked, the trouble with socialism is that it takes up too many

evenings. Yet one needs at least to take account of the role of **modern information technology** in oiling the wheels of such a system. Even the former vice-president of Procter & Gamble

has acknowledged that it **makes workers' self-management a real possibility**. ¶ Besides, Pat Devine reminds us of just how much time is

currently consumed by capitalist administration and organisation. Ω There is no obvious reason why the amount of time taken up by a socialist alternative should be greater. Some advocates of the participatory model hold that everyone should be remunerated equally for the same amount of work, despite differences of talent, training and occupation. As Michael Albert puts it, "The doctor working in a plush setting with comfortable and fulfilling circumstances earns more than the assembly worker working in a horrible din, risking life and limb, and enduring boredom and denigration, regardless of how long or how hard each works." ∞ ≠ There is, in fact, a strong case for paying those who engage in boring, heavy, dirty or dangerous work more than, say, medics or academics whose labours are considerably more rewarding. *Much of this dirty and dangerous work could perhaps be carried out by former members of the royal family*. We need to reverse our priorities. Since I have just mentioned the media as ripe for public ownership, let us take this as an exemplary case. Over half a century ago, in an excellent little book entitled *Communications*, ∞ ∞ Raymond Williams outlined a socialist plan for the arts and media which rejected state control of its content on the one hand and the sovereignty of the profit motive on the other. Instead, the active contributors in this field would have control of their own means of expression and communication. The actual "plant" of the arts and media—radio stations, concert halls, TV networks, theatres, newspaper offices and so on—would be taken into public ownership (of which there are a variety of forms), and their

management invested in democratically elected bodies. These would include both members of the public and representatives of media or artistic bodies. These

**commissions, which would be strictly independent of the state, would then be**

**responsible for awarding public resources** and "leasing" the socially owned facilities either to individual

practitioners or to independent, democratically self-governing companies of actors, journalists, musicians and the like. These

**men and women could then produce work free of both state regulation and the**

**distorting pressures of the market**. Among other things, we would be free of the situation in which a bunch of power-crazed, avicious bullies dictate

through their privately owned media outlets what the public should believe—which is to say, their own self-interested opinions and the system they support. We will know that socialism has established itself when we are able to look back with utter incredulity on the idea that a handful of commercial thugs were given free rein to corrupt the minds of the public with Neanderthal political views convenient for their own bank balances but for little else. Much of the media under capitalism avoid difficult, controversial or innovative work because it is bad for profits. Instead, they settle for banality, sensationalism and gut prejudice.

Socialist media, by contrast, would not ban everything but Schoenberg, Racine and endless dramatized versions of Marx's Capital. There would be popular theatre, TV and newspapers galore. "Popular" does not necessarily mean "inferior." Nelson Mandela is popular but not inferior. Plenty of ordinary people read highly specialist journals littered with jargon unintelligible to outsiders. It is just that these journals tend to be about angling, farm equipment or dog breeding rather than aesthetics or endocrinology. The popular becomes junk and kitsch when the media feel the need to hijack as large a slice of the market as quickly and painlessly as possible. And this need is for the most part commercially driven.