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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

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.] Comrade PW

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.

#### [Ferguson 07] Social contract *is* bourgeoise ideology woven together by the ahistorical representation of individuals, the recreation of commodity relations, and abstraction of equality before law to blur and obscure inequality and violence inherent in the capitalist form

Ferguson 07 [(Dr. Stephen C. Ferguson II is Associate Professor in Liberal Studies at the North Carolina A & T State University. He holds a Bachelor’s degree in Philosophy and History with a minor in Black Studies from the University of Missouri-Columbia and a Master’s and doctorate in philosophy from the University of Kansas.) Ferguson, Stephen. “Social Contract as Bourgeois Ideology.” Academia.edu, 30 Sept. 2017, [www.academia.edu/34728450/Social\_Contract\_as\_Bourgeois\_Ideology. Accessed 26 Nov. 2021](http://www.academia.edu/34728450/Social_Contract_as_Bourgeois_Ideology.%20Accessed%2026%20Nov.%202021).] Comrade PW
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The Poverty of Contractarianism: A Marxist-Leninist Perspective Social contract theory, from a Marxist-Leninist perspective, is a form of bourgeois ideology which functions to justify liberal democratic political philosophy and, more specifically, liberal democratic capitalism. There are three dimensions to a Marxist-Leninist critique of contractarianism. First, the idea of an atomic individual coming into society as a contracting agent is seen as ahistorical. Closely related to this is the second aspect, the abstract individual posited by contract theory is dismissed as a methodological flaw. And, lastly, the juridical equality postulated by contract theorists is grounded on substantive inequality rooted in bourgeois relations of production. Although contract theory — whether in its classical or modern form — is presented as an explanation for the formation of the state and/or civil society, it is necessarily ahistorical in character. The point is not simply that contractarianism is a historical implausibility or absurdity. In this respect there is a great deal of truth to David Hume’s statement against contractarianism: “It is in vain to say, that all governments are, or should be, at first, founded on popular consent, as much as the necessity of human affairs will admit. This favours entirely my pretension. I maintain, that human affairs will never admit of this consent, seldom of the appearance of it; but that conquest or usurpation, that is, in plain terms, force, by dissolving the ancient governments, is the origin of almost all the new ones which were ever established in the world”. 22 However, I want to make a more specific point than Hume. In analyzing the ways and conditions of attaining political legitimacy and authority, all contract theorists have assumed that capitalism is the only natural form of civil society. The social contract doctrine is predicated on viewing bourgeois social relations as absolute rather than transitory. In other words, contract theorists treat capitalism as a mode of production as if it is “the absolutely final form of social production” and “eternally fixed by Nature for every state of society.” 23 As such, it assumes private property is natural and, therefore, sees no need to justify the private ownership of the means of production implicit in bourgeois social relations. 24 Contractarian political theory is universally associated with the rights of individual persons, with consent as the basis of government, and with democratic, republican or constitutional institutions. Contractarianism is grounded on a theory of abstract individualism, that is, a conception of society as no more than an aggregate of individuals (social atomism). C. B. MacPherson points out that the accent on individualism is tied to a view of the individual as essentially “the proprietor of his own person or capacities, owing nothing to society.” 25 The emphasis on individualism is a necessary component of a conception of social life which endorses private property as constitutive of human liberty. MacPherson astutely notes, “Society becomes a lot of free equal individuals related to each other as proprietors of their own capacities and of what they have acquired by their exercise. Society consists of relations of exchange between proprietors.” 26 All individuals are, therefore, naturally free and equal to each other. The distinctiveness of the contractarian approach is precisely that it appears to be universal, that is, to include everyone who is to be incorporated into the new civil order. Each individual who enters into civil society, therefore, acquires the political status of equality before the law. On the basis of dialectical materialism, Marx refused to accept the view that the individual can be studied scientifically abstracted from social relations. Criticizing the German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach, Marx remarks, “But the essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.” 27 Individuals, for Marx, are by necessity social beings. By viewing the individual as a social being, Marx does not negate our individuality. Rather (unlike the aggregate theories of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Adam Smith) a scientific materialist approach begins with social relations as explanans and individuality as explanandum. 28 Who we are, as individuals, is derivative and explained by the character of social relations in which we are enmeshed. In this connection, Marx comments The more deeply we go back in history, the more does the individual, and hence also the producing individual, appear as dependent, as belonging to a greater whole. . . . The human being is in the most literal sense a political animal, not merely a gregarious animal, but an animal which can individuate itself only in the midst of society. 29 Criticizing the abstract individualism grounding liberal political theory, Marx further comments Individuals producing in a society, and hence the socially determined production of individuals, is of course the point of departure. The solitary and isolated hunter or fisherman, who serves Adam Smith and Ricardo as a starting-point, is one of the unimaginative conceits of eighteenth-century Robinsonades; and despite the assertion of social historians, these by no means signify simply a reaction against over-refinement and reversion to a misconceived natural life. As little as Rousseau’s contrat social, which brings naturally independent, autonomous subjects into relations and contract, rests on such naturalism . . . [t]his is . . . nothing but the aesthetic illusion of the small and big Robinsonades. It is, on the contrary, the anticipation of ‘civil society’, which began to evolve in the sixteenth century and in the eighteenth century made giant strides toward maturity. 30 What becomes central in defining the individual as a social being is the ensemble of social relations which the individual is a part of. Material existence (being) is social existence, an ensemble of social relations where the primary relation is the material relations of production. Social being as social relations in addition to determining consciousness molds it in its own image, i.e. consciousness is social consciousness. The assertion that consciousness is social consciousness and existence is social existence does not negate the reality of individual existence and consciousness; however, the social sets an enclosure, a limit, a finity for being and consciousness as determinate individuality. This determinate individuality is a category dependent on and determined by the social. Social relations represent the multifarious ties that arise between social groups, classes, and nations, and also within these groups in the context of their economic, social, political and cultural activities. Individuals, from Marx’s standpoint, enter into social relations precisely as representatives of one or another social community or group. According to Marx, all of the various social relations — economic, political, legal, moral and so forth — are divided into primary relations, which are material and pertain to the base, and secondary relations, which are ideological and pertain to the superstructure. Marx further concludes that in a society of class antagonism, different social groups occupy antagonistic positions in the given system of social relations: slaveholder and slave, feudal lord and serf, capitalist and worker. In general, Marx argues that the individual is [a] personification of economic categories, embodiments of particular classrelations and class-interests. My standpoint, from which the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them. 31 Now, Hobbes — caught between the decline of feudal absolutism and the rise of bourgeois parliamentarianism — has traditionally been seen as an awkward transitional writer who uses contract theory now classically associated with the emergence of liberalism to defend absolute monarchy. It is argued on this basis that Hobbes — by advocating an absolute monarchy — falls outside of the social contract tradition. To put it quite simply, I disagree with this conclusion. The social basis for Hobbes’s justification of the absolute monarchy as the only legitimate form of state power has to be sought in the fact that commodity-money relations had not yet become the dominant social relations that they were to become later with the development of industrial capitalism in England. While Hobbes did not see liberal democracy as the perfect commonwealth, his political philosophy is the necessary basis for the development of contract theory in the writings of Locke and Rousseau and, subsequently, bourgeois liberalism. By rejecting the principle of natural law as representing God’s will and its corollary that the laws of the state, and the state itself, derive their legitimacy from their harmony with this divine natural law, Hobbes laid the groundwork for bourgeois liberalism. Contrary to most commentators and scholars, I agree with the political theorist C. B. MacPherson that Hobbes’s political philosophy is a form of nascent bourgeois ideology. Although Hobbes’s political thought supports absolute monarchy, this should not obscure the fact that Hobbes brilliantly understood “bourgeois man” better than most of his contemporaries and many of his successors. The premises from which Hobbes deduces his psychology and his view of the state are drawn from a philosophical anthropology shaped by bourgeois social relations. C. B. MacPherson explains: The desires for glory and gain . . . lead directly to the famous proposition that the first general inclination of all mankind is ‘a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death.’ From them too may be deduced the proposition of the universality of fear where there is no power to overawe all men, although Hobbes sometimes presents this as the result of a fixed aversion to violent death. From these propositions, and from the premise that man is rational to the extent that he can calculate the consequences of his actions, the whole of Hobbes’s political structure is in turn deduced. . . . Thus the bourgeois assumptions which are found in the premises of Hobbes’s thought lead to the erection of the sovereign state. 32 Hobbes’s magnum opus Leviathan describes as well as anyone what Marx and Engels characterized as the anarchy of capitalism which is based on the contradiction between social production and private appropriation.33 Over and against the doctrine of the divine right of kings, social contract theorists such as Hobbes and Locke posit a secular contractual basis for civil society and the state. Central to the worldview of contract theorists was the equality of all persons, regardless of social status. This equality was reflected in all three of the epoch-making codifications of contract theory — the English Bill of Rights (1689), the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen (1789) and the Bill of Rights appended as the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States (1791). The juridical (formal) equality captured by contract theorists was a reflection of the growing dominance of capitalism as a mode of production. Juridical equality is an abstraction from the material inequality rooted in the private ownership of the means of production. By abstracting away the real material and historical process of the capitalist mode of production, the formal (juridical) equality reflected in contractarianism is allowed to overshadow and, therefore, obscure the material inequality rooted in the private ownership of the means of production. So, although, the social contract tradition from Hobbes to Rawls presupposes the formal equality of all individuals, social and economic inequality are seen as natural and continue after the formation of civil society and the state. Consequently, the social contract doctrine only offers a semblance of freedom. Bourgeois equality of rights and the corresponding democratic institutions are the general political expression of the most simple and abstract aspect of capitalist commodity production. All the conceptions and ideas of freedom, equality, justice and humanism are based on the declaration of the equality of every person as commodity owner, which blurs the exploitation of labor by capital. Bourgeois democracy is the legal replica of the commodity form of the capitalist economic system. When Marx examines capitalism as a mode of production at the level of the circulation of commodities, he finds that it is essentially an exchange of equivalents. Since the magnitude of commodities dictates an equal exchange, with reference to their socially necessary labor-time, the presence of the appearance is no simple chimera. In fact, workers and capitalists “meet in the market, and deal with each other as on the basis of equal rights, with this difference alone, that one is buyer, the other seller; both, therefore, equal in the eyes of the law.” 34 The capitalist meets the worker in the market as a free laborer in the double sense that (1) the laborer is unencumbered by relations of legal ownership (as in slavery) or obligation (as in serfdom) to an individual capitalist and is therefore free to sell his or her labor-power for a time to any buyer, and (2) the laborer is freed or separated from ownership of the means of production, and therefore has nothing to sell but his or her labor-power. In this sense, labor-power is a commodity freely exchanged in the market like all other commodities. Consequently, freedom and equality reign within the sphere of the exchange of commodities. Each seller of a commodity confronts as equal every buyer, each equal as seller or buyer before the laws of the market which dictate that equivalent is exchanged for equivalent, value is exchanged for equal value. Marx ironically writes, This sphere [of simple circulation or of exchange of commodities] . . . within whose boundaries the sale and purchase of labour-power goes on, is in fact a very Eden of the innate rights of man. There alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham. Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labour-power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract as free agents, and the agreement they come to, is but the form in which they give legal expression to their common will. Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own. And Bentham, because each looks only to himself. The only force that brings them together and puts them in relation with each other, is the selfishness, the gain and private interests of each. Each looks to himself only, and no one troubles himself about the rest, and just because they do so, do they all, in accordance with the pre-established harmony of things, or under the auspices of an all-shrewd providence, work together to their mutual advantage, for the common weal and in the interest of all. 35 So, the semblance of equality at the level of the market (or what Marx refers to as the circulation of commodities) acts as a façade concealing the exploitation which occurs in the sphere of production. By developing the law of value beyond the limitations of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, Marx was able to explain the relationship between the proletariat and bourgeoisie according to this law. By distinguishing labor from laborpower, Marx revealed that bourgeois class relations are grounded in the exploitation of labor during the productive process. At the level of production, the worker sells labor-power to the capitalist at its value and the capitalist then uses it in the production of a commodity which becomes the property of the capitalist. The use of labor-power in production produces more value than is paid to the laborer. It produces surplus value. This surplus value (of which profit is a derivative category) becomes the property of the capitalist (the nonproducers) and not of the workers (the direct producers) because the capitalists own the means of production and control the process of production. Capitalism as a mode of production combines within it, on the one hand, a relation of equality in the sphere of exchange and, on the other hand, a relation of dominance in sphere of production, allowing thereby the appropriation by capitalists of a part of the product of labor through the mechanism of the apparently free market. Likewise bourgeois (liberal) democracy (as the political superstructure) combines within it, on the one hand, the recognition of the equality of political rights among all citizens and, on the other hand, the inequality of all citizens as reflected in the differential ownership of the means of production. So, under bourgeois democracy, the exploitation of labor is buttressed by the condition of inequality in the nature of production; which ultimately rests on the private ownership of the means of production. Hence, the juridical forms of bourgeois relations, e.g. equality before the law, both reflect and mask the contradictory character of capitalism. The formal equality espoused by contract theorist is undermined by the acceptance of the inequality in bourgeois (civil) society, which ultimately is founded on the private ownership of the means of production. With social contract theory, the naked fact that the capitalist appropriates the values produced by the workers’ unpaid labor is disguised by the abstract ideas of property ownership, contract and equality of rights.

#### [Ranganathan 16] The aff framing of natural resources as “common resources from future generation” and the drive to create a “cooperative system” mirrors the idea of a global commons – UNCLOS and the current international system proves that the basic assumptions of this “Common Heritage of Mankind” justified nothing but interventionist programs at the interest of the hegemonies

Ranganathan 16 [(Surabhi Ranganathan is a University Senior Lecturer in International Law, a Deputy Director of the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law, and a Fellow and Director of Studies in Law at King's College. She is also a fellow of the Cambridge Centre for Environment, Energy and Natural Resource Governance (C-EENRG).) Ranganathan, S. (2016). Global Commons. European Journal of International Law, 27(3), 693–717. | <https://sci-hub.st/https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chw037|>] Comrade PW

TOC = Tradegy of the Commons

CHM = the Common Heritage of Mankind

Parochialism = relating to the local, limited outlook and perspective

4 Juxtaposing Hardin and Pardo: Politics and Epistemologies At the outset, the concepts of TOC and CHM seem to emerge from different worldviews for all that they address the same subject – commons. TOC outlines the threat of a dystopian future, overrun with people and under-nourished with resources; CHM grounds itself in a techno-utopian vision in which the oceans will supply fresh resources for continued human flourishing. TOC, evidenced in the politics of its author, is a parochial vision of the world that is split into so many inward-looking ‘lifeboats’; CHM is a cosmopolitan vision of spaceship Earth, in which ‘mankind’ is the ultimate subject of law-making. Decolonization, for Hardin, was the context in which TOC would come to bite, and he was supportive of coercive international relations between developed and developing states; decolonization for Pardo presented the need to think about the needs of developing states and enable their access to global resources – CHM was the encapsulation of these hopes. However, I hope that the analysis in the foregoing sections has given cause to complicate, rather than perpetuate, this summary of differences. Both interventions reveal parochial and cosmopolitan tendencies if we consider where, between home and world, their focus lay. Hardin’s parochialism needs no further elaboration, but it is well to keep in mind that, like other practitioners of the dynamic of difference, his imaginary was a global one – his fear was that a failure to adopt a lifeboat ethics would lead to the Earth’s carrying capacity being exceeded by its population. Pardo’s cosmopolitan proposal, on the other hand, emerged from a parochial ambition, namely to establish Malta’s presence in international affairs and obtain for it the benefits that would flow from hosting the headquarters of some international organization on its territory Moreover, Pardo’s intervention, like Hardin’s, had both illiberal and imperial dimensions. Pardo sought to bring the largest possible area of the seabed within a centralized licensing regime, asking states to forsake national claims to extended continental shelves. Moreover, although he dwelled on the possible appropriation and militarization of the seabed by technologically advanced states, and urged that benefits from exploitation should flow to developing states, his envisaged administrative authority vested the right of rule in the hands of the former. He argued for a special agency that would be led by technologically advanced states rather than UNGA oversight in which all states would have an equal vote. His plea, thus, was for a few – advanced – states to govern access to, and use of, a global resource in the name of all. Although this article does not examine later deployments of CHM and TOC, it is worth mentioning that such assertions have also sought to reframe resources lying within national jurisdictions as objects of global governance.135 However, the illiberal and imperial dimensions of Hardin’s intervention were of a different order; he advocated not simply constraints on economic activity in an international area but, rather, an interventionist American (more generally, Western) foreign policy that would effectively determine the reproductive choices of Third World people – and rejected educative ‘family planning’ approaches embraced by UN agencies and organizations like Planned Parenthood.136 His eugenicist assumptions, clothed in assertions of ecological concern, allowed him to simultaneously defend enclosures and heavy consumption by rich Western people and withhold resources from poor and Third World people. A third theme is the role that an integrative approach played in the production and impact of both TOC and CHM. As discussed above, it is by combining facts and theories culled from various disciplines that both Pardo and Hardin developed their imaginaries of the commons. Both emphasized technology and rationality-based theories as the framework within which to understand social and economic issues. Hardin, building on a biological account of individual selfishness and brute rationality (except where tempered by civilizational influences, as among rich Western people), joined to assertions about the deleterious impact of technological advances that lowered mortality rates of poor and Third World peoples and improved access to food and other resources, argued against both laissez-faire and welfare economics, advocating the far-reaching enclosure of resources and coercive taxes on the use of public goods.

#### [Robinson 18] mode of production determines the social relations – the capitalistic mode is an inherently unsustainable and expansionary one – causes extinction via overaccumulation, environmental degradation, and mass social crisis

Robinson 18 [William I, professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. 2018. “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State.”<http://revolutionary-socialism.com/en/accumulation-crisis-and-global-police-state/>] JCH-PF, recut by PW

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

#### [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

### Framework

#### 1 – if I disprove the aff’s normative standard is bad it’s sufficient to vot neg , concede in CX

#### 2 – Yes consequentialism – anything else allows cap to coopt the aff “oh well but we can instill education in a way that make everyone more virtuous and get a more virtuous capitalism”

B] perfcon, they read tricks which means they believe in consequentialism too.

#### 3 – [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 leads to useless accumulation of ideas and idealist absurdities. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best method to rebel against the reactionary bourgeoise

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

A. 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.

### No 1ar theory

#### Moving target – puts me in a double bind where if I over cover they’ll just go for substance and if I undercover they’ll go for theory. Makes being neg impossible since I have to win two layers while they only need to win one

#### 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

#### [ ] Theory debates avoids substance debate and incentives teams to go for theory to win every time, bad for education

#### DTA Solves – they can indict the arguments that are abusive and I have strategic options to respond