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#### [Malott 18] Capitalism is a bundle of contradictions strapped together by brutal expansion and violence – internal contradictions of labor and capital fuels the expansion and exploitation but simultaneously creates the tools of its own destruction – only dialectics take into account of the internal contradictions that propel the state of being

Malott 18[ (Curry Malott is an Associate Professor in the department of Educational Foundations and Policy Studies at West Chester University of Pennsylvania, US. His teaching and research focus on Marxist educational theory and the history of education.) “What Is Dialectical Materialism? An Introduction.” Liberation School, 4 Apr. 2018, liberationschool.org/what-is-dialectical-materialism-an-introduction/?fbclid=IwAR2ZhW5ws9\_sfJOSFxuy5YD7kUMY7PQKjWY0JUnTONE4mbIM\_0-rzuJJfPk. Accessed 9 July 2021.] PW
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What is Marx’s method? In developing his method, Marx challenged what he considered to be vulgar materialism for its tendency to ignore the totality and the relationship between consciousness and material reality. A philosophical term, the “totality” refers to the total of existence in any given moment. At the same time, Marx rejected pure idealism for substituting material reality with the idea of reality (i.e. with abstract thought). Idealism therefore leads to the false assumption that alienation or estrangement can be overcome in the realm of thought alone, as if we could change our material reality by changing our ideas and beliefs. Rather, Marx’s dialectical method is based on “the unifying truth of both” (1844/1988, 154). What this means is that “it is not enough that thought should seek to realize itself; reality must also strive toward thought.” In other words, Marx’s method entails the examination of the relationship between ideas and material reality, specifically as it pertains to class struggle and the emancipation of the proletariat. Marx’s dialectics are called “dialectical materialism” in contrast with Hegel’s dialectics. Marx wrote that he “discover[ed] the rational kernel within the mystical shell” (1867/1967, 29) of Hegel’s dialectics. To realize this revolution the working-class must not only understand the interaction of forces behind the development of society, but it must understand itself as one of those forces. The dialectic is a powerful weapon because it breaks through the capitalist illusion of individualism and atomism and disrupts the idea that isolated facts speak for themselves. Only by situating facts or ideas in the historical totality of society do they begin to make real sense. To comprehend this revolutionary movement we must conceive the interaction of forces as much more than the interaction of static and independent entities. When the parts of the totality change, their relationship to the totality changes, and they themselves change. Dialectics presents reality as an ongoing social process; nothing is ever static or fixed. Dialectics is both a method–or a way of investigating and understanding phenomena–and a fact of existence. For Engels, what is most central to dialectics is the tendency toward perpetual “motion and development” (1894/1987, 131). What follows is a summary of the dialectical theory of movement and change. The concept around which the dialectical understanding of development revolves is the negation of the negation, which will be taken up first, before turning to the concept of sublation. The unity of opposites or the interpenetration of opposites, a central driving force of the dialectic is then explored. Finally, we look at the tendency toward the transformation of quantity into quality, which in turn allows us to understand the negation of the negation more deeply. The negation of the negation The tendency toward the negation of the negation is arguably at the heart of dialectical development. Engels, for example, notes that the negation of the negation is “extremely general—and for this reason extremely far-reaching and important” (1894/1987, 131). The negation of the negation refers specifically to the way that phenomena and structures produce their opposites. For example, in the first volume of Capital, Marx (1867/1967) writes that capitalist private property is the negation of individual private property, or property held by the proprietor or individual laborer. Peasant proprietors, as small-scale industrial producers, tended to own private property and produced their own means of subsistence. This small-scale, scattered, petty industry of the peasants was limited in terms of its ability to foster economic growth. The advent of the capitalist era included the expropriation of the peasants from their means of production. The logic of the feudal system and exchange created the agencies of its own annihilation. While feudalism was overcome in capitalism, aspects of it were preserved but reconfigured in a way to facilitate economic growth. For example, the private property of peasants was abolished, but private property itself was not. Capitalism concentrates and centralizes property, tending towards monopoly. Bigger capitalists buy out or otherwise out maneuver smaller capitalists. At the same time, capitalism creates its antagonist: the working class. As capital grows so too does the working class. These contradictions provide the basis for the second negation: the expropriation of the expropriators, or the transformation of capitalism into socialism. Under socialism the means of production that existed under capitalism are preserved. Instead of being held in private they are held in common. In place of exploitation the means of production are put in the service of meeting the many needs of the producers. This process is called sublation. When something is sublated it is both overcome yet preserved. We can also see sublation at work in Marx’s theory of monopoly. Monopolies create the material basis for socialism as they aggregate and concentrate productive forces. Socialist revolution expropriates these from the capitalists, but instead of breaking them up into smaller enterprises, the working class takes control of them as they are. If this is still a bit confusing at this point, it should be clearer after we go through the other components of dialectics. Of course, capitalism is not going to automatically transform into socialism, even though its own internal logic orients its development in that general direction. Capitalist crises and contradictions are necessary for socialist revolutions but they are not sufficient. If they were sufficient, then we would already be living under socialism! The interpenetration of opposites What compels entities to be in a constant state of motion are their internal contradictions, or the forces generated by the unity of opposites. The most central or essential contradiction within capitalism is between labor and capital. Labor and capital are opposites because they have contradictory drives. For example, historically, labor has spontaneously sought to decrease the rate of exploitation by collectively bargaining for higher wages, better conditions, benefits, and so on. When successful, these decrease profit margins. Capital, on the other hand, seeks to always increase the rate of exploitation. Labor and capital are therefore compelled by opposite and antagonistic drives. This antagonism can be managed and mediated by unions and state regulation, but it can only be overcome through the negation of the negation. Labor and capital, as such, do not have an independent existence apart from each other. To be a worker is by definition to be exploited by capital, and to be a capitalist is by definition to exploit workers. The relationship between labor and capital is therefore internal and constitutes the totality. As a relation of exploitation, capital is a unity of contradictions. The dialectical development of this relationship over time is the movement of the balances of forces within capitalism. A common mistake is to conceptualize the movement generated from antagonistically-related social classes as the interaction of separate forces external to each other. This leads to the false belief that the role of the working-class revolution today is to destroy capitalism and replace it with socialism. Socialism can only be created out of what already exists. Marx and Engels believed that socialism would first emerge out of the most developed capitalist countries. This did not turn out to be true, as socialism emerged first in Russia, an underdeveloped, predominantly feudal-based country. Socialism, nevertheless, was ushered in by the producers and created out of an old society, not separate from it. Quantity into quality The tendency toward the transformation of quantity into quality offers deeper insight into the negation of the negation. So far, we have seen how the essential contradiction within capitalism is the labor/capital relationship, which is an example of the unity of opposites. We also saw the sublation of private property from one negated mode of production to the next. Investigating the interrelationship of these two issues will provide the basis for our example of the transformation of quantity into quality. The inherently unequal relationship between labor and capital was established, in part, through the violence of expropriating peasants from their means of production. Without direct access to the means of production, former peasants were forced to sell their ability to work for a wage, thereby becoming part of the working class. Although beyond the scope of this short introduction, it’s crucial to note that the violence of slavery, colonialism, and settler colonialism were equally important in establishing capitalism. The competition between capitalists drives technological development. Because the price of any given commodity tends to center around the average amount of time its production requires, devising new technologies that can reduce the number of labor hours it takes to produce whatever commodity is a tendency internal to capitalism. In the short term this gives the capitalist at the technological forefront a competitive advantage because they can sell the commodity below its social value. But as soon as the new technology gets integrated into the entire branch or branches of industry, the average amount of time that it takes to produce whatever commodity lowers, and the competition begins anew. While new labor-saving technologies can be super profitable for individual capitalists in the short term, in the long term it reduces the number of labor hours simultaneously set into motion. It also means that more capital is invested into machinery rather than workers. And since workers produce value and machines do not, this contributes to the tendency of the falling rate of profit. When the amount of labor hours it takes to transform a given quantity of raw materials into whatever commodity is reduced, the composition of capital shifts quantitatively, by degree. Historically, individual capitalists have countered the falling rate of their profit margins in many ways such as devising schemes to reduce the price they pay for labor even while its value remains the same thereby pushing the laborer into depravity and impoverishment. The capitalist, driven to counter the falling rate of profit by extracting more and more value from the laborer, thereby deepens capital’s crisis. The internal drive of capital to forever expand the accumulation of surplus value brings the unity of opposites, labor and capital, into growing conflict with each other. This movement is the developmental process at the heart of the dialectics of capitalism. While the capitalist has an interest in maintaining the contradiction and creating the illusion of capital’s permanence, the objective interest of labor is to resolve the contradiction, thereby changing the quality of production relations. This is quantity into quality and the center of struggle between labor and capital. The quantitative changes provide the basis or possibility of qualitative change. Conclusion One of the reasons why dialectical materialism is so important is because it embodies a deep revolutionary optimism. Drawing attention to the fact that the future already exists as an unrealized potential within the present demystifies the seeming permanence of capitalism. In other words, it reveals the defeat of imperialism as a real potential and not a fantasy. For example, it is a fact that the most advanced means of production, labor saving technologies, as they currently exist, are able to meet the basic needs of every person in the world. In this way, the future liberation of humanity from exploitation and material oppression already exists. The practicality of the aforementioned optimism resides in the fact that Marx’s method correctly locates the agent of revolutionary transformation within the working class, the many.

#### [Badiou 08]“The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it” – truth is the process from theory to practice, pure theorization divorced of practice and rebellions are essentially reactionary and leads to useless accumulation of ideas and idealist absurdities. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best method that rebels against the capitalist reactionaries

Badiou 08 [(Alain Badiou, a professor emeritus of philosophy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris, works with Organisation Politique, a postparty organization.)“The Maoism of Alain Badiou.” The Marxist-Leninist, The Marxist-Leninist, 24 Mar. 2008, marxistleninist.wordpress.com/2008/03/23/the-maoism-of-alain-badiou/. Accessed 4 Sept. 2021.] Comrade PW

Practice, Theory, Knowledge We are already handed something essential here: every Marxist statement is—in a single, dividing movement—observation and directive. As a concentrate of real practice, it equals its movement in order to return to it. Since all that is draws its being only from its becoming, equally, theory as knowledge of what is has being only by moving toward that of which it is the theory. Every knowledge is orientation, every description is prescription. The sentence, “it is right to rebel against the reactionaries,” bears witness to this more than any other. In it we find expressed the fact that Marxism, prior to being the full-fledged science of social formation, is the distillate of what rebellion demands: that one consider it right, that reason be rendered to it. Marxism is both a taking sides and the systematization of a partisan experience. The existence of a science of social formations bears no interest for the masses unless it reflects and concentrates their real revolutionary movement. Marxism must be conceived as the accumulated wisdom of popular revolutions, the reason they engender, the fixation and detailing of their target. Mao Zedong’s sentence clearly situates rebellion as the originary place of correct ideas, and reactionaries as those whose destruction is legitimated by theory. Mao’s sentence situates Marxist truth within the unity of theory and practice. Marxist truth is that from which rebellion draws its rightness, its reason, to demolish the enemy. It repudiates any equality in the face of truth. In a single movement, which is knowledge in its specific division into description and directive, it judges, pronounces the sentence, and immerses itself in its execution. Rebels possess knowledge, according to their aforementioned essential movement, their power and their duty: to annihilate the reactionaries. Marx’s Capital does not say anything different: the proletarians are right to violently overthrow the capitalists. Marxist truth is not a conciliatory truth. It is, in and of itself, dictatorship and, if need be, terror. Mao Zedong’s sentence reminds us that, for a Marxist, the link from theory to practice (from reason to rebellion) is an internal condition of theory itself, because truth is a real process, it is rebellion against the reactionaries. There is hardly a truer and more profound statement in Hegel than the following: “The absolute Idea has turned out to be the identity of the theoretical Idea and the practical Idea. Each of these by itself is still one-sided” (Hegel, [Science of Logic](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/hl/hlconten.htm)). For Hegel, absolute truth is the contradictory unity of theory and practice. It is the uninterrupted and divided process of being and the act. Lenin salutes this enthusiastically: “The unity of the theoretical idea (of knowledge) and of practice—this NB—and this unity precisely in the theory of knowledge, for the resulting sum is the “absolute idea” (Lenin, [Philosophical Notebooks](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm)). Let us read this sentence very carefully, since, remarkably, it divides the word “knowledge” into two. That is a crucial point, on which we shall often return: knowledge, as theory, is (dialectically) opposed to practice. Theory and practice form a unity, that is to say, for the dialectic, a unity of opposites. But this knowledge (theory/)practice contradiction is in turn the very object of the theory of knowledge. In other words, the inner nature of the process of knowledge is constituted by the theory/practice contradiction. Or again, practice, which as such is dialectically opposed to knowledge (to theory), is nevertheless an integral part of knowledge qua process. In all Marxist texts we encounter this scission, this double occurrence of the word “knowledge,” designating either theory in its dialectical correlation to practice or the overall process of this dialectic, that is, the contradictory movement of these two terms, theory and practice. Consider Mao, [“Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?”](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-9/mswv9_01.htm): “Often, correct knowledge can be arrived at only after many repetitions of the process . . . leading from practice to knowledge and then back to practice. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge, the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge” (Mao Zedong, Five Philosophical Essays). The movement of knowledge is the practice-knowledge-practice trajectory. Here “knowledge” designates one of the terms in the process but equally the process taken as a whole, a process that in turn includes two occurrences of practice, initial and final. To stabilize our vocabulary,2 and remain within the tradition, we will call “theory” the term in the theory/practice contradiction whose overall movement will be the process of “knowledge.” We will say: Knowledge is the dialectical process practice/theory. On this basis we may expose the reactionary illusion entertained by those who imagine they can circumvent the strategic thesis of the primacy of practice. It is clear that whoever is not within the real revolutionary movement, whoever is not practically internal to the rebellion against the reactionaries, knows nothing, even if he theorizes. Mao Zedong did indeed affirm that in the theory/practice contradiction—that is, in a phase of the real process—theory could temporarily play the main role: “The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, ‘Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'” (Mao, [On Contradiction](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm)). Does this mean that, at that moment, theory amounts to an intrinsic revolutionary possibility, that pure “Marxist theoreticians” can and must emerge? Absolutely not. It means that, in the theory/practice contradiction that constitutes the process of knowledge, theory is the principal aspect of the contradiction; that the systematization of practical revolutionary experiences is what allows one to advance; that it is useless to continue quantitatively to accumulate these experiences, to repeat them, because what is on the agenda is the qualitative leap, the rational synthesis immediately followed by its application, that is, its verification. But without these experiences, without organized practice (because organization alone allows the centralization of experiences), there is no systematization, no knowledge at all. Without a generalized application there is no testing ground, no verification, no truth. In that case “theory” can only give birth to idealist absurdities. We thus come back to our starting point: practice is internal to the rational movement of truth. In its opposition to theory, it is part of knowledge. It is this intuition that accounts for Lenin’s enthusiastic reception of the Hegelian conception of the absolute Idea, to the point that he makes Marx into the mere continuation of Hegel. (“Marx, consequently, clearly sides with Hegel in introducing the criterion of practice into the theory of knowledge,” Lenin, [Philosophical Notebooks](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm).) Mao Zedong’s sentence lends its precision to Lenin’s enthusiasm. It is the general historical content of Hegel’s dialectical statement. It is not just any practice that internally anchors theory, it is the rebellion against the reactionaries. Theory, in turn, does not externally legislate on practice, on rebellion: it incorporates itself in the rebellion by the mediating release of its reason. In this sense, it is true that the sentence says it all, an all that summarizes Marxism’s class position, its concrete revolutionary significance. An all outside which stands anyone who tries to consider Marxism not from the standpoint of rebellion but from that of the break; not from the standpoint of history but from that of the system; not from the standpoint of the primacy of practice but from that of the primacy of theory; not as the concentrated form of the wisdom of the working people but as its a priori condition.

#### [Giri 13] The focus on “resist the colonized conception of humanity by focusing on relationality” as the basis for revolutionary movement are neither radical nor revolutionary but instead make peace with capitalism – still built within the capitalist mode of production and creates a false sense of empowerment

Giri 13 [(Saroj Giri is a lecturer in Political Science, University of Delhi, Delhi. He writes on contemporary social and political issues and is an activist.)Communism, occupy and the question of form | ephemera. (2013). Retrieved September 30, 2021, from Ephemerajournal.org website: <http://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/communism-occupy-and-question-form>] Comrade PW

Indeed, if not for the reality of the Occupy movement, the idea of a form is otherwise sought to be strictly avoided since it is likened to an ‘empty and formal structure’ marking certain ‘kinds of exclusions’ (Butler, 2000: 144). It would be likened to ‘an ideal big Other, or an ideal small other, which is more fundamental than any of its social formulations’ (ibid.). Any conception of Occupy as form or a nascent party will then get regarded as an imposition on the decentred practices of encampments and experiments in ‘prefigurative politics’. It would be regarded as ‘Kantian formalism’, the imposition of an abstract political on the social, full of exclusions of ‘autonomous agency’ (Butler, 2000: 144-146). We also encounter the notion of form in Klossowski’s interpretation of Nietzsche, in his discussion on the ‘semiotic of impulses’. Impulses have intensities that fluctuate – these find ‘forms’ in gestures and movements (Klossowski, 1997: 37). These forms ‘cannot be distinguished from the invention of signs, which stabilises them through abbreviation. For in abbreviating them, these signs reduce the impulses, apparently suspending their fluctuation once and for all’ (ibid.). Ultimately, here form and sign or the ‘abbreviation of signs’ lead ‘to the fallacious “unity” of the agent’ (ibid.). Form is again regarded as what restricts, constricts, ‘reduces the impulses’ or abstracts from them. However, we will make a counter argument: that it is not the emphasis on form but the move away from it that abstracts ‘spaces of freedom’ from social relations and from each other. There is no direct access to spaces of freedom without form. Similarly, there is no direct access to impulses and intensities without the forms of gestures and movements. Form cannot be separated from spaces of freedom or impulses. The move away from form leads to a self-contained and interiorized hermeneutics of freedom. Recall Jameson’s description of late capitalism as marked by ‘a coexistence not even of multiple and alternate worlds so much as of unrelated fuzzy sets and semiautonomous subsystems’ (1991: 372)[[3]](http://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/communism-occupy-and-question-form#_ftn3). Each is marked by a strong spatial separation stemming ‘from different zones of time or from unrelated compartments of social and material universe’ (ibid.: 373). In other words, if occupied spaces were to be unrelated compartments, the novelty of the rupture with capitalism would soon be lost. Occupied spaces as the self-contained ‘space of appearance’ of freedom seem to so nicely make peace with capitalism. Negri pointed this out in his critique of Arendt’s ‘space of appearance of freedom’, a term widely used in the context of Occupy: ‘the continuous celebration of the fact that freedom preexists liberation and that the revolution is realized in the formation of the political space becomes the key to a historicist hermeneutics that systematically flattens down, or deforms, the novelty of the event and limits it to the American example’ (Negri, 1999: 16). I would like to consider another approach here. This one too has serious problems with the question of form and would emphasise decentred semiautonomous practices of freedom or occupied spaces. But it keeps the focus on anti-capitalism. For want of a better term, let us call it the approach of resonance. And an initial ‘definition’: a form-sceptic anti-capitalist uncomfortable with a pure micro-politics of resistance can be said to subscribe to the resonance approach. This approach attempts to arrive at the notion of Occupy as a wider movement without however giving up the understanding of occupied spaces as spatially bounded and self-subsisting – not a very fruitful approach from our perspective. Once fixed in their self-subsistence and immanence, these spaces are then presented as resonating with each other. Thus referring to Occupy and other movements, Amin (2013: 3) writes: ‘The street is a microcosm of multiple happenings and resonances from the distant spatial and temporal, a place of ebb and flow, an assemblage of the human and nonhuman’. Resonance from the distant spatial: this is how Occupy as ‘connecting’ all these occupied spaces, hence Occupy as a wider movement, seems to be understood here, if at all[[4]](http://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/communism-occupy-and-question-form#_ftn4). One very significant earlier usage is in The coming insurrection (The Invisible Committee, 2009): ‘Revolutionary movements do not spread by contamination but by resonance. Something that is constituted here resonates with the shock wave emitted by something constituted over there. A body that resonates does so according to its own mode’. Note the emphasis on the body, on space – the ‘here’ and the ‘there’. The ‘own mode’ is not just spatial or territorial self-containment but emphasizes self-subsistence, strength, and immanence. Resonance here feels like a ‘relation’ between two bodies that cannot have a relation, for they exist in their absolute self-subsistence and immanence. What about those who reject the notion of immanence and subscribe to some notion of dialectics and contradiction (among those who reject the form argument)? Take John Holloway[[5]](http://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/communism-occupy-and-question-form#_ftn5). He is critical of ‘pure micropolitics’ and hence is not comfortable with autonomous spaces of freedom, with the spatial boundedness of occupied spaces. He wants to start or ‘move from the particular’ but this, he insists, ‘does not mean a micropolitics’ (2010: 208). Trying to move away from micropolitics to the level of the wider movement, he asks: ‘how do struggles spread?’ And here the form-sceptic Holloway falls back upon the idea of resonance: ‘For one struggle to spill over into another, or to act as the spark that sets another burning, what is needed is a certain resonance, and these resonances do not follow formal organizational lines and are often hard to understand’ (2010: 211). So Occupy cannot be a micropolitics, but nor can it be construed as a form, which will be for Holloway a slide into a reified form and organization. So ultimately, for the resonance approach, the different zones of freedom, or say encampments in Occupy, resonating with each other is taken to be adequate for revolutionary politics. This emanates from one key underlying assumption of this approach: that the (individual) encampment, the ‘space of freedom’ is not in any sense diluted or unreal because of the existence of the larger matrix of capitalist social relations[[6]](http://ephemerajournal.org/contribution/communism-occupy-and-question-form#_ftn6). Captured in the term ‘prefigurative politics’, here freedom co-exists and makes peace, with capitalism, even though it is presented by the resonance theorists as challenging capitalism. Hence, for Graeber discussing Occupy, capital is parasitic upon this freedom (which he assumes already exists under capitalism). Capital ‘represents a certain logic that is actually parasitic upon a million other social relations, without which it couldn’t exist’ (in Wolfe and Graeber, 2012). These social relations are what already exist and upon which he wants to build a new society. So the new society will not be built out of whole cloth but with what is there, what already exists under the rule of capital. Occupy would be ‘a question of building on what we are already doing, expanding the zones of freedom, until freedom becomes the ultimate organizing principle’ (Graeber, 2013a: 295).

#### [Landis 21] Capitalism causes warming and extinction – prioritization of profits, commodification of nature, and its impulse to expand – only the alt solves

Landis 8-10 [(Tina Landis is the author of a new book entitled “[Climate Solutions Beyond Capitalism](https://store.pslweb.org/Climate-Solutions-Beyond-Capitalism_p_69.html).”) (2021, August 11). “Code red” climate report and the failure of capitalism. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from Liberation News website: <https://www.liberationnews.org/code-red-climate-report-and-the-failure-of-capitalism/>] Comrade PW

The [UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/09/climate/un-climate-report-takeaways.html) report released August 9 warns of a “code red for humanity” if we fail to drastically cut greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Compiled by 234 scientists and based on analysis of 14,000 studies, the new report states that even rapidly cutting emissions immediately means warming will continue beyond 2040 — meaning adaptation measures, as well as immediate mitigation efforts, are crucial. The [report](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-i/) states: “Global surface temperature will continue to increase until at least the mid-century under all emissions scenarios considered. Global warming of 1.5°C and 2°C will be exceeded during the 21st century unless deep reductions in carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gas emissions occur in the coming decades.” We are currently on track to reach 3 C warming based on global emissions reduction pledges, which would be catastrophic. The report’s [Interactive Atlas](https://interactive-atlas.ipcc.ch/) forecasts various scenarios for each degree of temperature increase and its impact on precipitation and temperatures in different regions globally and shows the dire impacts if we fail to act now. Every corner of the globe is already experiencing ever worsening impacts of the climate crisis — from droughts and wildfires, to temperature extremes, floods and severe storms. Our [climate is unraveling](https://www.liberationnews.org/inaction-from-government-as-climate-unravels-coast-to-coast/) and still little is being done to turn the tide despite decades of warnings from the scientific community and the existence of actual solutions. The Earth’s systems are rapidly destabilizing faster than previous IPCC reports warned, which tend to be conservative in their predictions. If our so-called “leaders” continue to fail to act, humanity’s future is very uncertain as the life-sustaining systems of the planet falter. The endless growth model of capitalism, that treats everything on the planet as a commodity to be exploited with complete disregard for future generations, is the root cause of climate change. The capitalist “expand-or-die” model is incompatible with sustainability and is rapidly driving the majority of species toward extinction — including our own. Meanwhile, the billionaires play “astronaut” in their “space race” as the working class around the globe suffers in the real world from climate change. And the millionaires in Congress waste precious time debating the bandaid passive solutions in Biden’s infrastructure bill that may achieve some minor reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, but do nothing to steer the train off course from hurtling over the cliff. These millionaire “representatives” have proven time and again to be completely out of touch and unconcerned with the plight of those they claim to represent. From COVID relief and eviction moratoriums to an increased minimum wage, they squabble over even throwing tiny crumbs to the working class while they eagerly hand out trillions to the banks, corporations and military industrial complex. These wealthy politicians, and their billionaire corporate backers, can continue life as usual largely free of the climate impacts that the working class deals with in our “new normal.” They can just go to their second or third home if one burns down or gets washed away in a flood. They can shift their investments so that they actually make profits off these disasters. And they likely don’t even notice the increased costs for food and clean water as droughts impact availability — beyond perhaps seeing an increase in their return on investments in these sectors. Their economic status protects them from the reality that the rest of us face. It is poor communities and communities of color that are forced to live in inadequate housing that isn’t weatherized to withstand temperature extremes or to keep out wildfire smoke. It is working-class people who froze to death in their homes in the deep freeze in Texas in February and working-class people in the Pacific Northwest who died in the severe heatwave in June. It is low-income residents in the rural West whose wells are running dry, unable to afford to drill deeper wells, while Big Agriculture drains the precious aquifer for cash crops. It is the immigrant farmworkers who face lethal heatwaves and wildfire smoke working in the fields of California. It is poor communities and communities of color that are forced to live in floodplain areas where the affordable housing is, who have their homes washed away from the ever increasing severe storms. It is working-class urban communities that live in sweltering heat islands where temperatures are up to 7 F higher than in wealthy neighborhoods with trees and vegetation — which during prolonged heat waves can mean life or death. It is working-class people who are priced out of flood and fire insurance, who are left homeless when climate disasters occur. It is indigenous communities and low-income rural communities that bear the brunt of pollution and ecological destruction from extractive industries that make profits while continuing to fuel the climate crisis. The climate crisis is a class war. The rich can install state-of-the-art air filtration in their mansions so they can breathe easily while the world burns. They can move to higher elevation while the coastal areas are inundated by sea level rise. The 1% richest, the capitalist owners, have caused the climate crisis and their wealth should be used to solve it. We must stand up and demand that the government take action to protect the people from the unfolding catastrophe and do everything possible to stem the crisis. We cannot allow fear to demobilize us. There are real solutions and must join together and demand real action. And if our “leaders” continue to stall and make excuses, we must rise up and replace them with people and a system that truly does represent us. And that system is socialism, where the resources and knowledge of society are used for the benefit of all of humanity and the planet. Under socialism, our representatives would be those most qualified and knowledgeable to do the job, not those who have the millions needed to pay for campaign ads and a marketing team. Our representatives would be scientists, ecologists, engineers, medical doctors, educators, farmers and other leaders from our communities, who understand the problems and the solutions. These are the people we need in leadership — people who are workers themselves — who can mobilize all sectors of society to make the transition to an equitable and ecologically-regenerative society where humanity and all life have a positive, livable future.

#### [Escalante 18] The alt is to embrace the dual power strategy through party organizing – builds popular support by serving the people, offers accountability measures, and unified in the long-term goal of creating a better society to replace capitalism

[Escalante 18 (Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist.)theforgenews. “Party Organizing in the 21st Century.” The Forge News, The Forge News, 21 Sept. 2018, theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/. Accessed 15 Aug. 2021.] Comrade PW

Chauvinism = aggressive/exaggerated patriotism

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

## Case

### UV

#### Time skew – they have both the 1ar and 2ar to go for theory, that’s a total of 7 minutes while I only have 6 minutes to respond

#### Irresolvable – aff gets the last speech meaning judge will always hear what aff gets to say and more likely to default to 2ar interp

### genercal

#### [Noys 08] Their focus on “fluidity” or being “static” creates the very same static dualisms that the aff is critiquing, is blatantly undialectical, and oversimplifies politics

Noys 2008 (Benjamin, Reader in English at the University of Chichester, Through a Glass Darkly: Alain Badiou’s critique of anarchism, https://www.academia.edu/216175/Through\_a\_glass\_darkly\_Alain\_Badiou\_s\_critique\_of\_anarchism)

Badiou’s critique of anarchism operates indirectly; it attacks what Daniel Bensaïd describes as ‘[a] neo-libertarian current, more diffuse but more influential than the direct heirs of anarchism …[which] constitutes a state of mind, a ‘mood’, rather than a well-defined orientation.’ (Bensaïd 2005: 170). One of Badiou’s examples of this tendency, targeted while he was still a Maoist, is Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s book Anti-Oedipus (1972). This book, with its vision of a flux of desire that can escape the constraints of both capitalism and the ‘prison’ of the Freudian Oedipus complex, not only had a significant influence on the libertarians of the movements after May 68 but also on later anarchists and postanarchists. Where anarchists have tended to celebrate their theories of the uncontrollable fluxes of desire Badiou sarcastically comments: ‘Unforeseeable, desiring, irrational: follow your drift, my son, and you will make the Revolution.’ (2004: 76). This point summarises Badiou’s general scepticism towards what he regards as the anarchist faith in the ‘pure’ movement of resistance, a movement that seems to operate without the need for aim or direction but will somehow still result in revolution.¶ Badiou refines this general scepticism in making a series of more precise criticisms of the ‘libertarian current’. He argues that the central problem of this current is that it sets up a simple-minded opposition between power and resistance (or revolt, or rebellion). The result is a sterile set of ‘static dualisms’, from which is derived ‘the catechism of the System and the Flux, the Despot and the Nomad, the Paranoiac, and the Schizo’ (Badiou 2004: 80). In this case Badiou is explicitly referring to a number of oppositions that structure the text of Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus , in which the second term is valorised at the expense of the first. The problem with such dualisms is that they fail to grasp the actual way politics operates: ‘power’ is not one monolithic whole, and neither is ‘resistance’. Instead the task of ‘doing politics’ involves a closer analysis of different forces and contradictions as well as, for Badiou, the formation of the party as a form to handle and organise these contradictions. Whatever we might think of the second point we can, I think, accept the first is well made. While there may be a polemically or motivational gain in presenting politics in terms of a grand opposition, and there may well be times where struggle operates in this form, more often matters are considerably more complex.¶ For Badiou these kind of oppositions are reflective of the limits of the French political scene of the 1970s: namely the opposition between the structuralist Marxism of Louis Althusser, which finds its model in the French Communist Party, and the philosophy of desire of Deleuze and Guattari that gave voice to, and which finds its model in the dispersion of the little groups of libertarians (‘groupuscules’). In the first we find the relentless and paralysing insistence on the power of structure and, in the second, the celebration of ‘pure’ revolt. We can see here the origin of Badiou’s later contention that the anarchist model mirrors the communist party model. Anarchists oppose their small groups to the supposedly ‘monolithic’ style of the communist party. What they fail to recognise are the fissures and contradictions that run through both power and resistance. In this period Badiou, and the UCFML, are groping towards a new party-form that would be able to negotiate a dialectical reading of politics that could engage with force and place, disruption and structure, without reifying one of the terms against the other.¶ The irony is that defenders of Deleuze and Guattari, or Michel Foucault, whom Badiou also attacks, will argue that they present a model of power and resistance as multiple, fluid, and unstable – precisely not a binary. Badiou, however, is correct to note a tendency to re-constitute new binaries in these modes of thinking: ‘Schizo vs. Paranoid’ (Deleuze and Guattari), ‘Pleb vs. Power’ (Foucault), or ‘Multitude vs. Empire’ (Negri and Hardt). In each case the attempts at anti-dialectical thinking risk becoming merely un-dialectical. Badiou himself certainly changes the terms of his own thinking, but he retains the mistrust of what he regards as this fundamental libertarian or anarchist schema. So, in the later Being and Event (2005) Badiou will critique what he calls ‘speculative leftism’, which believes in the ‘pure’ event of revolt – the miracle of revolt appearing out of nothing.2 Again his point here is there is a faith in the emergence of a force of revolt posed against a static sense of power, without any real attempt to analyse the possibilities and limits the forces that would compose this ‘revolt’. This faith in the miracle of the event of revolt is coupled, Badiou argues, with a sense of the inevitable defeat of such revolts by power. The result is that we are left in the situation of fighting an endless (losing) war – alternating between the eruption of revolt out of nothing and then its inevitable return to nothing.¶ More recently Badiou has focused his criticisms on the thinking of Antonio Negri (author, with Michael Hardt, of Empire (2000)), and his influence on the ‘movement of movements’. Badiou tends to conflate Negri with the ‘movement of movements’, and while it is true that the language and thinking of Negri has had considerable influence it has by no means passed uncontested. Badiou modulates his earlier general criticisms of anarchism / libertarian positions but stays within the same general frame: Negri is not truly opposed to capitalist ‘Empire’ but instead romanticises the power of capitalism:¶ As is well known, for Negri, the Spinozist, there is only one historic substance, so that the capitalist empire is also the scene of an unprecedented communist deployment. This surely has the advantage of authorizing the belief that the worse it gets, the better it gets; or of getting you to (mis)take those demonstrations – fruitlessly convened to meet wherever the powerful re-unite – for the ‘creation’ and the ‘multiform invention’ of new petit-bourgeois proletarians. (Badiou 2006: 45)¶ Therefore Negri cuts the ground from under any truly anti-capitalist politics by being overly fascinated with the mobile power of capital. At the same time he is overly hopeful about the powers of resistance on this ground, offering only a ‘dreamy hallucination’ (Badiou 2003: 126) of the power of the ‘multitude’, which lacks the discipline to properly detach itself from the state.¶ Badiou’s critique of anarchism ranges across a number of repeated and modulated criticisms. At the fundamental level it involves a constrained sense of the possibilities of politics that remains in a dualism of resistance versus power. This monolithic conception prevents a properly political assessment of the complex arrangements of political power and the means by which capitalist and state power might not only be resisted but also overthrown. This static dualism often leaves the origin of revolt unexplained or undetermined. It seems to come from nowhere and also to go nowhere; the ‘miracle’ of revolt is always doomed to defeat or recuperation. Also, this dualism leads to a structure of mirroring between anarchism and state or capitalist power. The invocations of drift and liberation found in the libertarian current are dangerously close to the ideological forms of capitalism itself. For Badiou, this means that anarchism lacks the ability to ‘construct new forms of discipline to replace the discipline of political parties’ (Badiou 2003: 126). Of course anyone knowledgeable of the history of anarchism will recognise these kinds of criticism, particularly as it has often been advanced by Marxists. But it is the vehemence with which Badiou poses these questions in the present context, and his choice of theoretical targets that make them worth considering as critical questions – especially since, as we will see, some voices within the movement have arrived at similar conclusions.

#### Speculative space imaginaries fail.

Shukaitis, 9—Senior Lecturer at the University of Essex, Centre for Work and Organization (Stevphen, “Space is the (non)place: Martians, Marxists, and the outer space of the radical imagination,” The Sociological Review, Vol 57, No 1, 2009, dml)

A more recent example of space as a pole of imaginal recomposition comes in the form of the Association of Autonomous Astronauts (AAA), which formed in 1995 as a response to the continued militarization of space through programmes such as Star Wars. The AAA operated as an umbrella organization, or as a collective name for the autonomous activities of many different groups operating across numerous cities. While the AAA initially emerged very much out of the mail art and pscyhogeography scene, their efforts were intended to take the practice of the collective name and extend it from being an artistic practice to a wider form of organizing and political action (Home, 1997). For the AAA the collective name opened the possibility of creating a collective phantom (Holmes, 2007), one that ‘operates within the wider context of popular culture, and is used as a tool for class war’ (Anonymous 2004). Thus they, in a diffuse sense, proceeded to formulate a five year plan to boldly establish a planetary network to end the monopoly of corporations, governments and the military over travel in space. Although in a certain sense one might say that the AAA ‘failed’ in that they did not actually establish any sort of autonomous network of space exploration, that would be to mistake their stated goals for actual goals rather than as points of imaginal recomposition, a sense in which they were much more successful. Or, as Neil Starman frames it, the AAA was an attempt to turn nostalgia for the future into an avenue for political action, to ‘make good some of the unkept promises of our childhoods’ (2005). People dreamed that they would be able to explore space but, as the Pulp song intones, they only found themselves in dead-end, precarious jobs cleaning toilets or something equally uninteresting.

Among the AAA’s most noted actions was a protest outside the London headquarters of Lockheed Martin against the militarization of space held in 1999 as part of the J18 ‘Carnival Against Capitalism’. It featured the strange sight of police blocking men in space suits from entering the building. This also marked the beginning of the ‘Space 1999 – Ten Days that Shook the Universe’ festival. Given the then waxing expansion of the anti-globalization movement one might think that this would be an opportune moment for the expansion and proliferation of the AAA. Rather, it became the moment when the AAA decided that it was time, according to their own previously charted five-year plan, to move towards self-dissolution. This might seem a bit odd, but as explained by Neil Disconaut:

So why stop now? Well even the wildest of adventures can become routine, startling ideas clichés and the most radical gestures a source of light entertainment. Space imagery has become increasingly banal and retro, featuring in numerous adverts and pop videos. We don’t want to be the space industry’s court jesters when capitalism itself is being openly contested, as seen in Seattle and the City of London in the last year (2000: 13)

The point made here by Disconaut is quite clear. While the AAA was intended to, and did, act as a pole of imaginal recomposition, it was not intended to be an end in itself. One can find something of a parallel to the AAA in the Men in Red radical Ufology group, which grew out of the student movement in Italy in the early 1990s. For Men in Red, radical Ufology starts from a politics founded in disputing the proposition that the universe is made in man’s image, and proceeds to think of ways to engage in autonomous contact with extraterrestrial life forms. In a parallel to the AAA as collective phantom, Men in Red state that they themselves wish to remain at a level that is the same as what they study, namely unidentified. To act as an end in itself would all too easily slip into a form of aesthetic escapism that might be said to characterize many forms of science fiction not particularly concerned with its politics. But the AAA did not want to fall into such a trap, did not want to end up generating more imaginal fodder for the capitalist image machine, and thus chose to dissolve in 2000. ET sold out to a capitalist communication company, but the AAA had no intention of doing so. In other words, the members of AAA sensed the potentiality of space imagery as a point of recomposition at one point, and also realized that it was not permanent and that would it would be strategically better to move to something else.

### Framing

#### Yes Consequentialism

#### 1] you read an UV means that you are anticipating and predicting how I would responde to your aff two implications a] perfcon and b] takes out butterfly effect, it’s predictable and past things disprove

#### 2] capitalist façade – justifies cap bc cap can say “oh yeah the theory of cap makes sense and is benign and beneficial to everyone” but we know in reality and looking at the consequences it’s a different story

#### 2 – gets coopted by capitalism – their idea of complete fluidity allows capitalists to mask their exploitation and brutal violence by claiming that sometimes cap isn’t as violent as it always is when in fact the violence is masked underneath. Justifies things like ethical cap and

#### 3 – The aff’s alternative definition of desire does not alter the specificity of the desiring subject rather it fails to consider the relations between desire, power, and subjectivity. This model of desire results in the reproduction of submission to a ruling ideology of workers resulting in exploitation.

Spivak 88 Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, 1988, pp. 271–313., doi:10.1007/978-1-349-19059-1\_20. – Hebron AL

The link to the workers' struggle is located, simply, in desire. Elsewhere, Deleuze and Guattari have attempted an alternative definition of desire, revising the one offered by psychoanalysis: 'Desire does not lack anything; it does not lack its object. It is, rather, the subject that is lacking desire, or desire that lacks a fixed subject; there is no fixed subject except by repression. Desire and its object are a unity: it is the machine, as a machine of a machine. Desire is machine, the object of desire also a connected machine, so that the product is lifted from the process of producing and something detaches itself from producing to product and gives a leftover to the vagabond, nomad subject.,5 This definition does not alter the specificity of the desiring subject (or leftover subject-effect) that attaches to specific instances of desire or to production of the desiring machine. Moreover, when the connection between desire and the subject is taken as irrelevant or merely reversed, the subject-effect that surreptitiously emerges is much like the generalized ideological subject of the theorist. This may be the legal subject of socialized capital, neither labor nor management, holding a 'strong' passport, using a 'strong' or 'hard' currency, with supposedly unquestioned access to due process. It is certainly not the desiring subject as Other. The failure of Deleuze and Guattari to consider the relations between desire, power and subjectivity renders them incapable of articulating a theory of interests. In this context, their indifference to ideology (a theory of which is necessary for an understanding of interests) is striking but consistent. Foucault's commitment to 'genealogical' speculation prevents him from locating, in 'great names' like Marx and Freud, watersheds in some continuous stream of intellectual history. 6 This commitment has created an unfortunate resistance in Foucault's work to 'mere' ideological critique. Western speculations on the ideological reproduction of social relations belong to that mainstream, and it is within this tradition that Althusser writes: 'The reproduction of labour power requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class "in and by words" [par la parole].,7

#### [S&W 15] Neoliberalism is neither inevitable nor a historic norm – it’s a social project with a long-term goal executed by abstract theorization and strategic planning – to dismantle the global neoliberal project we must do the same and fight back by working beyond the local scale

Srnicek and Williams 15 [(Nick is a Lecturer in Digital Economy in the Department of Digital Humanities. He is interested the development of Marxist economics and engaged in the long tradition of anti-work politics. Alex Williams is a lecturer in the sociology department at City, University of London. ) *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*. P65 – P67. Published in 2015. Accessed August 1st 2021.] Comrade PW

* AT neolib inev

A MONT PELERIN OF THE LEFT? It has often been argued that neoliberalism succeeded (and continues to succeed in spite of its failures) because it is supported by a series of overlapping and powerful interests – the transnational elite, the financiers, the major stockholders of the largest corporations. While these interests have certainly assisted the potency of the neoliberal ideology, such an explanation nevertheless leaves certain questions unanswered. If elite support was sufficient for ideological success, and if neoliberalism was clearly beneficial to elites, there would not have been a forty-year delay between the initial formulation of the ideas and their implementation. Instead, the embedded liberalism of Keynesianism remained ideologically dominant even as it constrained powerful interests. In particular, financial interests were sidelined for a long period after the 1929 crash and ensuing Great Depression. The power dynamics maintaining the Keynesian consensus needed to be taken apart piecemeal. Equally, an explanation of neoliberalism’s success that relies solely on its compatibility with particular elite interests also leaves unexplained why other possible responses to the problems of the 1970s were never implemented. An important element of neoliberalism’s eventual ideological success is that there was both a crisis and a readily available solution. The crisis (stagflation) was one that no government knew how to deal with at the time, while the solution was the preconceived neoliberal ideas that had been fermenting for decades in its ideological ecology. It was not that neoliberals presented a better argument for their position (the myth of rational political discourse); rather, an institutional infrastructure was constructed to project their ideas and establish them as the new common sense of the political elite. In all of this there are important lessons to be learned, which have led some to call for a Mont Pelerin of the left. 66 On the broadest level, this history of neoliberalism serves to demonstrate that the greatest recent success of the right – installing a neoliberal hegemony on a global scale – was accomplished through non–folk-political means. This means, in the first place, that the neoliberals thought in long-term visions. This was a different temporality from both election cycles and the boom-and-bust of individual protests. Instead, what the left can learn from is how the MPS patiently set out explicit objectives and analysed the terrain of their historical conjunction, all in order to propose specific and effective means to alter that terrain. It set its sights on long-term change, waiting forty years for the crisis of Keynesianism and the emergence of Reagan and Thatcher. In taking this approach, the intellectuals of neoliberalism thought abstractly in terms of possibilities: what was impossible during their own time became possible later, partly through their actions and preparations. Secondly, they sought to build a counter-hegemonic project that would overturn the consensus around social democracy and Keynesian policies.