**🧢**

(for legal reasons it’s cap)

**Impacts**

Capitalism is the root of all oppression **Taylor 11:**

This leads to the question: **If it isn't in the interest of white workers to be racist, then why do they accept racist ideas?** But **the same question could be asked of any group** of workers. **Why do men accept sexist ideas?** Why do Black workers accept racist anti-immigrant ideas? Why do many Black Caribbean and African immigrant workers think that Black Americans are lazy? **Why do American workers** of all races **accept many racist ideas about Arabs and Muslims?** **If** most people agree that **it would be in the interest of any group of workers to be more united than divided, then why do workers accept reactionary ideas?** There are two primary reasons. The first is competition. **Capitalism operates under the laws of false scarcity**, which simply means **that we are all told there isn't enough to go around, so we must compete with each other for housing, education, jobs and anything** else valued in society**. While the scarcity is false, the competition is real, and** **workers fighting over these items to better themselves or their families are** often **willing to believe** **the worst about other workers** to justify why they should have something and others should not.

Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. “Race, Class and Marxism.” SocialistWorker.org, International Socialist Organization, 4 Jan. 2011, [socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism](http://socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism).

#### **Capitalism causes war, violence, environmental destruction and extinction.**

**Robinson 18** (William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State” Critical Sociology) RE

**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.

#### **Framing – neoliberalism infects policy education – you should prioritize epistemologically challenging it. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best performatively and methodologically deconstructs capitalism.**

Ball 17 Stephen J. Ball (Distinguished Service Professor of Sociology of Education at the University College London, Institute of Education. He was elected Fellow of the British Academy in 2006; and is also Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences; and Society of Educational Studies, and a Laureate of Kappa Delta Phi; he has honorary doctorates from the Universities of Turku (Finland), and Leicester. He is co-founder and Managing Editor of the Journal of Education Policy), 2017, “Laboring to Relate: Neoliberalism, Embodied Policy, and Network Dynamics,” Peabody Journal of Education, 92:1, 29-41, DOI: 10.1080/0161956X.2016.1264802, this part is pgs. 37-39

**Within Ramya Venkataraman’s writing and presentations, there is the deployment and reiteration of a particular discursive ensemble, a set of tightly interrelated and interdependent concepts, ideas, and arguments addressed to educational reform (see Table 3). The ensemble joins up a set of arguments, assertions, and assumptions, in relation to the state and its alternative, that serve as a rationale for the processes of reform of education.** The elements of this ensemble are both local and specific as well as generic and global. **They are reiterated at almost all of the nodes in the global policy network—almost every website or network event rehearses and deploys them**. Although they are articulated and recombined in different ways and given different degrees of emphasis, they have a coherence which underpins network membership. As Marsh and Smith (2000, p. 6) put it, “networks involve the institutionalization of beliefs, values, cultures and particular forms of behaviour.” **These are made up not simply of pragmatic relations, but also constitute moral and epistemic communities.** The ensemble takes as its starting point the failures of the state, and a state of crisis in education (A)—the assertion that the government schools are ineffective and unfair. This starting point is the basis for a set of linked arguments: the replacement of bureaucracy by enterprise, through PPPs (I) and/or forms of private provision (H/G); and the need for assessment (as a way of measuring and managing the system) (B); the deployment of IT, that is, assessment software and big databases (C); at the institutional level the strategic role of leadership skills and sensibilities in driving change and raising quality (D) and to leverage for change from outside agencies, in particular from strategic philanthropy (E). The private sector is given a privileged role in all of this as agents of change and of innovation (F) through direct forms of private provision (H). Leadership, partnerships and assessment are offered as practices that “work”—for which there is evidence or stories of success in other places (J). **The state then reappears in a different form (K) as a competition state (Jessop, 2002), which facilitates, contracts, sets targets, and monitors—that makes and regulates markets. Embedded and represented in these arguments is a version of neoliberal rationality and its “state phobia” as Foucault (2010) calls it, in relation to the “old” state.** Over and against this, the competition state is imagined as lean and frugal. **Bureaucracy is displaced, innovation and creativity are “released” through the participation of business and civil society actors, and interrelated opportunities are created for reform and for profit and for “worldmaking.” The elements of a new policy ecosystem are outlined here—practices, organizations, infrastructure, and incentives that enable a market in state work. All of this is a reworking, or perhaps even an erasure, of the boundaries of state, economy, and civil society**. This rationality and its mobilization and advocacy are also realized and demonstrated in socio-material practices, which are enacted in and through network relationships. Public–private partnerships are excellent examples because they are a kind of assemblage of actors, organizations, and techniques that create and activate relationships. Ramya Venkataraman and McKinsey (India) have been active participants and partners in a variety of PPP initiatives. For example, they have participated in both the Mumbai School Excellence Programme (with Akanksha, MSDF, UNICEF, and the Mumbai Corporation) and in the South Delhi School Excellence Programme (with ARK, Bharti, Centre for Civil Society, Central Square Foundation, The Tech Mahindra Foundation, South Delhi Municipal Corporation). Both of these PPPs involve nonstate actors who take over state schools, loosely modeled on and directly informed by the U.S. charter school and English Academies programs. The work that ARK is doing in the UK is very similar to what we want to do down the road…. We now have 18 academies, with 24 en route; it’ll be 50 by 2015. And the concept of privately running— education that is publicly funded is something that ARK believes it can deliver [inaudible] it’s looking to India, we’re also seeking a similar model in South Africa and Uganda. (Amitav Virmani, Head of ARK [India] now CEO, The Education Alliance) In Mumbai we’ve been involved from end to end in the implementation. There are also other cities and states, which we are currently in discussion with for similar programs …. the state government has taken our help to craft the program …. (Ramya Venkataraman) Although these practices and the forms, stories, and ideas that underpin them are instantiated in a particular way in India in these examples, it is also possible to trace their movement through the global education policy community beyond India. One can follow them through a set of relations clustered around other reform efforts, using the same ingredients in the United States and in England. DISCUSSION This paper focuses on some of the network and discursive labor of one “traveling technocat.” Ramya Venkataraman travels across and beyond India as well as across the business, state, and third sectors, and between local, national, and international institutions. She carries with her a story made up of ideas, practices, and sensibilities that address the reform of Indian education and the Indian state, and articulates new opportunities for business and philanthropy as agents and beneficiaries of reform. **She is embedded in an apparatus of relations, finance, practices, and discourse (plots and stories), “comprising variously entangled scaled agents (of different geographical reaches)” (Cook & Ward, 2012, p. 7), which moves, changes, and develops but which coheres around a neoliberal project of reform and of creative destruction.** We are able to glimpse through these relations some of the work of assembling political rationalities, spatial imaginaries, calculative practices, and subjectivities that are “both the cause and the effect of wider transformative processes” (Cook & Ward, 2012, p. 140). Artifacts, schemes, propositions, and “programmatic” ideas move through these network relations, gaining credibility, support, and funding as they do so. These global forms are phenomena that are distinguished by their “capacity for decontextualization and recontextualization, abstractability and movement, across diverse social and cultural situations and spheres of life” (Ong & Collier, 2005, p. 7). Ramya Venkataraman’s engagements in the reform movement are diffuse, tangled, and contingent, she is a speaker at many sites and events that contribute to a reform assemblage that brings together various “things” and bodies, utterances, modes of expression, and regimes of signs. Such assemblages “stand in a dependent but contingent relationship to the grander problematizations …. They are a distinctive type of experimental matrix of heterogeneous elements, techniques and concepts” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 17). **Here the grand problematization is neoliberalism**. What is evident in Ramya’s activities is the labor involved in animating the assemblage, the efforts of articulation, persuasion, exemplification, legitimation, and problematization. Concomitantly, there is the emergence of an infrastructure of organizations, a sort of shadow state (Wolch, 1990), that can incubate, disseminate, and exchange ideas—teacher certification and training, school leadership, assessment, managing and running schools—over and against the language of more traditional forms of government and support, facilitate and legitimate the activities of non-state actors. **The mix of state, business, and third-sector actors and organizations within policy and governance is changed, not once and for all, but as part of a slow and steady movement from government to governance**. At the same time, new kinds of careers, identities, and mobilities are forged within the processes of reform and the work of networks.

**Strikes uniquely relevant Loomis:**

**Strikes** are special moments. They **shut down production**, whether of manufacturing cars or manufacturing educated citizens. The strike, the **withholding** of **our labor from our bosses, is the greatest power we have as workers**. As unions have weakened in recent decades, we have far fewer strikes today than we did 40 years ago. During the 1970s, there were an average of 289 major strikes per year in the United States. By the 1990s, that fell to 35 per year. In 2003, there were only 13 major strikes. **When a strike** like the CTU action **takes place, it forces people who claim to support the working class to announce which side they are on. Do they really believe in workers’ rights or will they side with employers** if a subway strike blocks their commute to work or a teachers’ strike forces them to find something to do with their children for the day? **Strikes** are moments of tremendous power precisely because they **raise the stakes, bringing private moments of poverty and workplace indignity into the public spotlight**. And **unless you are a millionaire boss, we are all workers with a tremendous amount in common with other workers**, dff we only realize that **all of us**—farmworkers and teachers, insurance agents and construction workers, graduate students and union staffers—**face bad bosses, financial instability, and the desperate need for dignity and respect on the job.**

Loomis, Erik. “Why Strikes Matter.” Literary Hub, 2 Apr. 2019, lithub.com/why-strikes-matter.

**Organization and strikes are key to fight back, the bourgeoisie tries to fracture movements. Blankenship:**

The bourgeoisie has learned that generally speaking it is not to their advantage to use consistent repression to smash the workers’ movement. The working class, unlike the peasantry (which is predominant in the third world) was born of modern industry. Workers from all around an area are brought together to work under one roof. Here is where the workers’ ties are, here is where their discipline is forged and wherein lays the basis for their consciousness. And here is where they organize and where their rudimentary forms of organization–the trade unions–are. Because of its social being, the working class is the most advanced, most revolutionary class and has the power to sustain its revolutionary energy. For the bourgeoisie to crush it with force (which they have tried to do) only calls forth more resistance. **The power and potential of the working class lies in its capacity to organize**. And **the only way the bourgeoisie can rid the working class of this capacity is to shut down every factory, which** of course **they cannot do**.

So if the proletariat has such wonderful capabilities to organize, why does **the bourgeoisie** not fear these partial struggles? The answer is that they **ha[s]**ve some **very subtle, sophisticated (and** for this reason, all the more **brutal) means at their disposal to stop the proletariat. Some of the important weapons in their arsenal are the labor aristocracy in** the **trade unions, misleaders other partial movements and the ma[ss] media**–particularly radio and TV.

**By bribing the trade union leaders with super profits and corrupting them both materially and ideologically, the bourgeoisie has developed an elaborate network of agents to sabotage the workers’ movement from within**. Whether it selling out strikes and organizing drives, pushing bourgeois “political action,” stifling militant fights in the grievance procedure or turning burning issues to the legislature and government agencies (like Arnold Miller did with the miners’ struggle against Black Lung) **the labor aristocracy destroy[s] the workers’ basic organizations, keep them tied to the bourgeoisie and stunt their political development and class consciousness**.

Today, however, things are decidedly changing as early as May 1978, we predicted this process:

Since the trade unions are far more stable organizations than the organizations of the national movements, the misleadership in the trade unions are far more deeply entrenched. Since the political awakening of the 60s, the leadership the national movement has been fluid and has changed rapidly. From the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) to the Black Panther Party, from Kawaida nationalism to Nkrumaism and Pan-Africanism to Marxism, the leading ideology changed rapidly. Incorrect views are rapidly abandoned, while the leadership is wide open. This enabled the communists to guide the national movement to a higher level as the WVO is doing today. This is different from the workers’ movement in the last 20 years.

The deepening economic crisis and the increasing attacks from the bourgeoisie has fueled the resistance of the working class. **The scattered strikes of the iron ore workers, the longshoremen, the Pullman Standard workers, and the coal miners are dealing blows at the attempt of the bourgeoisie to attack the right to strike**. The wage settlements in these strikes have put a big dent in Carter’s “voluntary” wage control policy. **The more the government steps in, the more the state being exposed and its authority being weakened.**

It is under these rapidly developing conditions that the diehard representatives of the labor aristocracy, like Meany, Fitzsimmons, and the Abel/McBride gang, are being shaken off their pedestals after twenty years of unchallenged reign. Even Arnold Miller is being exposed after only brief 6 year stint as a “reform,” second generation, sellout misleader. (Workers Viewpoint, May 1978, p. 27)

**The capitalists** are also skilled at **keep**ing **different movements separated**, isolated a straightjacketed. They promote ‥special interest” groups and constituency politics. Each of these “streamlets of discontent” has its own voice and organization–anti-nuke, environmental, women, oppressed nationality, consumer, etc. The bourgeoisie builds these streamlets up and often funds them (poverty programs, consumer councils) while consciously channeling them into reformism and parliamentarism and fencing them off from revolutionary socialism. **By promoting** their **pluralism, they keep these movements within the boundary of bourgeois legality.**

Blankenship, Irene. Capitalism Destablized – How Do We Prepare To Overthrow the U.S. Government, Oct. 1980, www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-5/cwp-overthrow.htm.

Thus the advocacy. A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right for workers to strike.

**Other perspectives fail, we must begin with the strike. Smith:**

If, therefore, the Russian Revolution teaches us anything, it teaches above all that **the mass strike** is not artificially “made,” not “decided” at random, not “propagated,” but that it **is a historical phenomenon**, which, at a given moment, results from social conditions **with historical inevitability**. It is not, therefore, by abstract speculations on the possibility or impossibility, the utility or the injuriousness of the mass strike, but only by an examination of those factors and social conditions out of which the mass strike grows in the present phase of the class struggle—in other words, it is not by subjective criticism of the mass strike from the standpoint of what is desirable, but **only by objective investigation of the sources of the mass strike from the standpoint of what is historically inevitable, that the problem can be grasped or even discussed.**49

Smith, Sharon. “Marxism, Unions, and Class Struggle.” Marxism, Unions, and Class Struggle | International Socialist Review, July 2011, isreview.org/issue/78/marxism-unions-and-class-struggle.

**And, empirical examples prove that strikes are effective at turning to socialism. Lakey:**

**In the latter part of the nineteenth century Norway** was marginal in Europe, a part of the Swedish kingdom, with a scarcity of resources, little industrial development, and massive poverty. Although the country had parliamentary forms, it **was ruled by the owning class; the Norwegian army was used to suppress strikes.**

**Labor union leadership turned to Marxism**, organizing workers for immediate gains as well as for the overthrow of capitalism. Labor departed from Leninism, however, by its proposal not to collectivize agriculture but instead to protect and extend family farms and encourage the use of cooperatives by farmers. A Labor Party was organized, structurally connected to the unions but tasked with standing for elections and challenging the government in Parliament.

Individual unions developed some strength as industrialization grew in the 1900s. In 1907 the Ironworkers signed the nation's first collective agreement with an employer. Unions joined together in a national federation. Employers then formed a federation of their own and continued to resist labor’s growing demands.

**In the 1920s strikes increased in intensity**. Labor in the town of Hammerfest formed a commune in 1921, led by workers councils; **the army intervened to crush it. The workers’ response verged on becoming a national general strike**. The employers backed by the state beat back the strike, but **workers erupted again in an ironworkers’ strike in 1923-24, accompanied by some sabotage.**

In 1923 the Labor Party, having joined the Communist International (Comintern) at the invitation of V.I. Lenin in 1919, left the Comintern, objecting to what they regarded as high-handed instructions out of touch with Norwegian realities (including to prepare for armed struggle).

Elements of the owning class decided that state repression using the army needed to be supplemented. To do this they formed a social movement called the Patriotic League in 1926, reaching mainly to the middle class. By the 1930s the League recruited as many as 100,000 members for violent "scab protection" in support of strikebreakers.

The Labor Party also reached out, opening its membership to anyone whether or not in a unionized workplace. Many rural farmworkers joined the Labor Party as well as some small farmers. Middle class Marxists and some reformers joined the party. In 1928 workers initiated another wave of strikes and boycotts.

The Great Depression created a higher rate of unemployment in Norway than any other Nordic country. Unlike the U.S., where unemployment reduced the membership of the unions, Norwegian unions grew by acknowledging the inability of the unemployed to pay dues; by 1932, 40% of union members were jobless. This practical implementation of the concept of solidarity became important in the decisive struggle to come.

In Norway the Depression hit bottom **in 1931**. In **April the employers' federation locked their employees out of the factories and mills to try to force the unions to accept a reduction of wages for those still employed. The workers fought back** nonviolently **with massive demonstrations**. The five-month struggle had no clear victor.

In 1932 Vidkun Quisling laid plans for a coup d'etat, wanting to overthrow the prime minister and move the government to the right with military rule. He then backed off, perhaps lacking support. (Quisling was later famous for leading the Norwegian Nazi party that collaborated with Hitler and formed the Norwegian government under German occupation.)

As the depression continued, farmers suffered and found themselves unable to keep up payment on their debts. Turbulence hit the rural sector as crowds gathered nonviolently to prevent eviction of farming families. The Agrarian Party, which included larger farmers and up until now allied with the Conservative Party, began to re-position itself.

**By 1935, Norway was on the brink. The Conservative-led government was losing legitimacy daily and the capitalist class became increasingly desperate as militancy grew among workers and farmers.**

For its part, the Labor Party came under increasing pressure from its members to reduce the suffering in the shorter run, as well as to seek revolution in the longer run. By that time the Labor Party was the largest single Parliamentary party (in a multi-party system) and had the confidence that it could get Norway’s economy moving again as well as lay the groundwork for a socialist society in the future.

**The crisis was resolved in 1935 with the "Basic Agreement” between the National Employers Association and Norwegian Labor. The owners' federation agreed to accept the right of unionization throughout Norway including collective bargaining, and accepted the workers' right to strike** (except during the life of a contract). Labor agreed that the owners would be allowed to guide their firms, believing it would soon be in a position to restrict owners through government regulation.

The Agrarian Party allied itself with Labor, which took the reins of government. It initiated Keynesian measures to expand the economy and started public works to head toward a policy of full employment, which became a keystone of Norwegian economic policy. More middle class people swung to the support of the Labor Party, both because the Party was actively recruiting them now (through family ties to workers, for example), and because some middle class people began to see that Labor produced concrete benefits for the people.

**In 1935 Norway's owning class lost its historic power to dominate the economy and society**. Not until 1965 -- three decades later -- did the Conservative Party return in a governing coalition, having accepted the new rules of the game including a high degree of public ownership of the means of production, extremely progressive taxation, strong business regulation for the public good, and the virtual abolition of poverty.

**The intensifying nonviolent struggle by workers and farmers, plus middle class allies, created a fundamental power shift.**

Lakey, George. “Norwegians Overthrow Capitalist Rule, 1931-35.” Norwegians Overthrow Capitalist Rule, 1931-35 | Global Nonviolent Action Database, 8 Oct. 2011, nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/norwegians-overthrow-capitalist-rule-1931-35.

Revolution is closer than ever – but the masses require a principle of organization.

**Basanta ‘20**

[Comrade Basanta, polit-bureau member of the CPN-Maoist. 06/14/2020. “On American Crisis — 2,” https://www.bannedthought.net/Nepal/CPN-Maoist/2020/OnAmericanCrisis-2-Basanta-Eng.pdf] pat // WDM Valley JS

Nowadays, **the U**nited **S**tates of America **is undergoing** a serious **crisis**. As a consequence of the health crisis brought in by the mishandling of the **Covid-19**, the **unemployment** and the economic crisis caused by lockdown, the Black Lives Matter movement created by the **white** racist **supremacy** on the part of ruling class, the US now has been trapped in a vicious circle of crisis after crisis. The former defence secretary Collin Powel and the former state secretary of the US James Mattis, who were strong pillars and confidants of Donald Trump, have turned sharp critics due to his mishandling of the on-going movement. President Trump has stopped talking with Dr. Anthony Fauci, the health advisor of the President as their row in the handling of pandemic sharpened. President Donald Trump has now been isolated almost from all quarters. Moreover, the political tussle in the upcoming presidential election is going to divide and polarise the US society further and he seems to get trapped in an awful crisis and further isolation causing insanity. No one can deny that the obstinate president can deploy military to cleanse racial opposition in the name of containing the 'anarchists' and 'terrorists'. The present crisis in the US seems like a wakeup call for a bigger crisis in the days ahead.

I feel to offer a red salute to the declaration of the autonomous region made recently in the Capitol Hill of Seattle, America. However, **emotion is not decisive**. The autonomous region established within the framework of the reactionary state power provokes the enemy more than it safeguards the liberation of the oppressed people in CHAZ. This kind of tactical move can be supportive if it is made a part of the overall strategy of revolution. The on-going movement seems to be spontaneous, and it does not have any stated destination. Reform in police does not solve the problem the proletariat and the oppressed black people have been confronting in the US. The solution to the on-going crisis in America is scientific socialism guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and led by a party of the proletariat. Worth noting is that, the **spontaneous movement cannot bring about** any revolutionary **change** in society **but it creates** a situation from the womb of which **a correct** ideological and political **line** and the leadership gestate. The present situation in the US shows that **the objective condition is** getting **favourable for** the success of the **socialist revolution**. But as Che Guevara has said the revolution is not like a mango which automatically falls from the mango tree when it is ripe. What is necessary to develop for the American proletariat at present is the armoury of weapons that help make the revolution a success when they act upon the favourably developing situation.

The first **weapon for** the success of the **socialist revolution** in the US **is** the formation of **a genuine Communist Party** guided by MLM. And the second weapon is a united front led by the party. In the particular situation of America the strong ideological and political **unity** mainly **between** the **proletariats** of white and black colours **along with other oppressed people is a must**. The reactionary cultural makeup of the US society based on white racist supremacy has made this task more challenging. The third weapon is the fighting force. All of these weapons are unlikely to get realised in a single attempt now in America. Nevertheless, the sharpening of contradictions in the US society and the objective necessity of revolution to solve them is creating an objective condition to realise it.

In the given situation, the communist **revolutionaries** in the US **have to** make a conscious effort to **build up a**n ideologically and politically **strong communist party and unite** in it several groups and individuals scattered all across the US. Once the political party and its ideological and political line are built up, then the others will come on its way. The revolutionaries have to take up this task sooner than later for the emancipation of the entire oppressed people in America, including the blacks.

#### **The kritik is a starting point to get away from our attachment to “work” which furthers capitalist exploitation.**

**Livingston 16.** [James Livingston is professor of history at Rutgers University in New Jersey. He is the author of many books, the latest being No More Work: Why Full Employment is a Bad Idea (2016). He lives in New York.] November 25th, 2016. “Fuck work” https://aeon.co/essays/what-if-jobs-are-not-the-solution-but-the-problem//vg

Work means everything to us Americans. For centuries – since, say, 1650 – we’ve believed that it builds character (punctuality, initiative, honesty, self-discipline, and so forth). We’ve also believed that the market in labour, where we go to find work, has been relatively efficient in allocating opportunities and incomes. And we’ve believed that, even if it sucks, a job gives meaning, purpose and structure to our everyday lives – at any rate, we’re pretty sure that it gets us out of bed, pays the bills, makes us feel responsible, and keeps us away from daytime TV. These beliefs are no longer plausible. In fact, they’ve become ridiculous, because there’s not enough work to go around, and what there is of it won’t pay the bills – unless of course you’ve landed a job as a drug dealer or a Wall Street banker, becoming a gangster either way. These days, everybody from Left to Right – from the economist Dean Baker to the social scientist Arthur C Brooks, from Bernie Sanders to Donald Trump – addresses this breakdown of the labour market by advocating ‘full employment’, as if having a job is self-evidently a good thing, no matter how dangerous, demanding or demeaning it is. **But ‘full employment’ is not the way to restore our faith in hard work, or in playing by the rules, or in whatever else sounds good.** The official unemployment rate in the United States is already below 6 per cent, which is pretty close to what economists used to call ‘full employment’, but income inequality hasn’t changed a bit. Shitty jobs for everyone won’t solve any social problems we now face. Don’t take my word for it, look at the numbers. Already a fourth of the adults actually employed in the US are paid wages lower than would lift them above the official poverty line – and so a fifth of American children live in poverty. Almost half of employed adults in this country are eligible for food stamps (most of those who are eligible don’t apply). The market in labour has broken down, along with most others. Those jobs that disappeared in the Great Recession just aren’t coming back, regardless of what the unemployment rate tells you – the net gain in jobs since 2000 still stands at zero – and if they do return from the dead, they’ll be zombies, those contingent, part-time or minimum-wage jobs where the bosses shuffle your shift from week to week: welcome to Wal-Mart, where food stamps are a benefit. And don’t tell me that raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour solves the problem. No one can doubt the moral significance of the movement. But at this rate of pay, you pass the official poverty line only after working 29 hours a week. The current federal minimum wage is $7.25. Working a 40-hour week, you would have to make $10 an hour to reach the official poverty line. What, exactly, is the point of earning a paycheck that isn’t a living wage, except to prove that you have a work ethic? But, wait, isn’t our present dilemma just a passing phase of the business cycle? What about the job market of the future? Haven’t the doomsayers, those damn Malthusians, always been proved wrong by rising productivity, new fields of enterprise, new economic opportunities? Well, yeah – until now, these times. The measurable trends of the past half-century, and the plausible projections for the next half-century, are just too empirically grounded to dismiss as dismal science or ideological hokum. They look like the data on climate change – you can deny them if you like, but you’ll sound like a moron when you do. For example, the Oxford economists who study employment trends tell us that almost half of existing jobs, including those involving ‘non-routine cognitive tasks’ – you know, like thinking – are at risk of death by computerisation within 20 years. They’re elaborating on conclusions reached by two MIT economists in the book Race Against the Machine (2011). Meanwhile, the Silicon Valley types who give TED talks have started speaking of ‘surplus humans’ as a result of the same process – cybernated production. Rise of the Robots, a new book that cites these very sources, is social science, not science fiction. So this Great Recession of ours – don’t kid yourself, it ain’t over – is a moral crisis as well as an economic catastrophe. **You might even say it’s a spiritual impasse, because it makes us ask what social scaffolding other than work will permit the construction of character – or whether character itself is something we must aspire to. But that is why it’s also an intellectual opportunity: it forces us to imagine a world in which the job no longer builds our character, determines our incomes or dominates our daily lives.** What would you do if you didn’t have to work to receive an income? In short, it lets us say: enough already. Fuck work. Certainly this crisis makes us ask: what comes after work? What would you do without your job as the external discipline that organises your waking life – as the social imperative that gets you up and on your way to the factory, the office, the store, the warehouse, the restaurant, wherever you work and, no matter how much you hate it, keeps you coming back? What would you do if you didn’t have to work to receive an income? And what would society and civilisation be like if we didn’t have to ‘earn’ a living – if leisure was not our choice but our lot? Would we hang out at the local Starbucks, laptops open? Or volunteer to teach children in less-developed places, such as Mississippi? Or smoke weed and watch reality TV all day? I’m not proposing a fancy thought experiment here. By now these are practical questions because there aren’t enough jobs. So it’s time we asked even more practical questions. How do you make a living without a job – can you receive income without working for it? Is it possible, to begin with and then, the hard part, is it ethical? If you were raised to believe that work is the index of your value to society – as most of us were – would it feel like cheating to get something for nothing? We already have some provisional answers because we’re all on the dole, more or less. The fastest growing component of household income since 1959 has been ‘transfer payments’ from government. By the turn of the 21st century, 20 per cent of all household income came from this source – from what is otherwise known as welfare or ‘entitlements’. Without this income supplement, half of the adults with full-time jobs would live below the poverty line, and most working Americans would be eligible for food stamps. But are these transfer payments and ‘entitlements’ affordable, in either economic or moral terms? By continuing and enlarging them, do we subsidise sloth, or do we enrich a debate on the rudiments of the good life? Transfer payments or ‘entitlements’, not to mention Wall Street bonuses (talk about getting something for nothing) have taught us how to detach the receipt of income from the production of goods, but now, in plain view of the end of work, the lesson needs rethinking. No matter how you calculate the federal budget, we can afford to be our brother’s keeper. The real question is not whether but how we choose to be. I know what you’re thinking – we can’t afford this! But yeah, we can, very easily. We raise the arbitrary lid on the Social Security contribution, which now stands at $127,200, and we raise taxes on corporate income, reversing the Reagan Revolution. These two steps solve a fake fiscal problem and create an economic surplus where we now can measure a moral deficit. Of course, you will say – along with every economist from Dean Baker to Greg Mankiw, Left to Right – that raising taxes on corporate income is a disincentive to investment and thus job creation. Or that it will drive corporations overseas, where taxes are lower. But in fact raising taxes on corporate income can’t have these effects. Let’s work backward. Corporations have been ‘multinational’ for quite some time. In the 1970s and ’80s, before Ronald Reagan’s signature tax cuts took effect, approximately 60 per cent of manufactured imported goods were produced offshore, overseas, by US companies. That percentage has risen since then, but not by much. Chinese workers aren’t the problem – the homeless, aimless idiocy of corporate accounting is. That is why the Citizens United decision of 2010 applying freedom of speech regulations to campaign spending is hilarious. Money isn’t speech, any more than noise is. The Supreme Court has conjured a living being, a new person, from the remains of the common law, creating a real world more frightening than its cinematic equivalent: say, Frankenstein, Blade Runner or, more recently, Transformers. But the bottom line is this. Most jobs aren’t created by private, corporate investment, so raising taxes on corporate income won’t affect employment. You heard me right. Since the 1920s, economic growth has happened even though net private investment has atrophied. What does that mean? It means that profits are pointless except as a way of announcing to your stockholders (and hostile takeover specialists) that your company is a going concern, a thriving business. You don’t need profits to ‘reinvest’, to finance the expansion of your company’s workforce or output, as the recent history of Apple and most other corporations has amply demonstrated. I know that building my character through work is stupid because crime pays. I might as well become a gangster So investment decisions by CEOs have only a marginal effect on employment. Taxing the profits of corporations to finance a welfare state that permits us to love our neighbours and to be our brothers’ keeper is not an economic problem. It’s something else – it’s an intellectual issue, a moral conundrum. When we place our faith in hard work, we’re wishing for the creation of character; but we’re also hoping, or expecting, that the labour market will allocate incomes fairly and rationally. And there’s the rub, they do go together. Character can be created on the job only when we can see that there’s an intelligible, justifiable relation between past effort, learned skills and present reward. When I see that your income is completely out of proportion to your production of real value, of durable goods the rest of us can use and appreciate (and by ‘durable’ I don’t mean just material things), I begin to doubt that character is a consequence of hard work. When I see, for example, that you’re making millions by laundering drug-cartel money (HSBC), or pushing bad paper on mutual fund managers (AIG, Bear Stearns, Morgan Stanley, Citibank), or preying on low-income borrowers (Bank of America), or buying votes in Congress (all of the above) – just business as usual on Wall Street – while I’m barely making ends meet from the earnings of my full-time job, I realise that my participation in the labour market is irrational. I know that building my character through work is stupid because crime pays. I might as well become a gangster like you. That’s why an economic crisis such as the Great Recession is also a moral problem, a spiritual impasse – and an intellectual opportunity. We’ve placed so many bets on the social, cultural and ethical import of work that when the labour market fails, as it so spectacularly has, we’re at a loss to explain what happened, or to orient ourselves to a different set of meanings for work and for markets. And by ‘we’ I mean pretty much all of us, Left to Right, because everybody wants to put Americans back to work, one way or another – ‘full employment’ is the goal of Right-wing politicians no less than Left-wing economists. The differences between them are over means, not ends, and those ends include intangibles such as the acquisition of character. Which is to say that everybody has doubled down on the benefits of work just as it reaches a vanishing point. Securing ‘full employment’ has become a bipartisan goal at the very moment it has become both impossible and unnecessary. Sort of like securing slavery in the 1850s or segregation in the 1950s. Why? Because work means everything to us inhabitants of modern market societies – regardless of whether it still produces solid character and allocates incomes rationally, and quite apart from the need to make a living**. It’s been the medium of most of our thinking about the good life** since Plato correlated craftsmanship and the possibility of ideas as such. It’s been our way of defying death, by making and repairing the durable things, the significant things we know will last beyond our allotted time on earth because they teach us, as we make or repair them, that the world beyond us – the world before and after us – has its own reality principles. Think about the scope of this idea. Work has been a way of demonstrating differences between males and females, for example by merging the meanings of fatherhood and ‘breadwinner’, and then, more recently, prying them apart. Since the 17th century, masculinity and femininity have been defined – not necessarily achieved – by their places in a moral economy, as working men who got paid wages for their production of value on the job, or as working women who got paid nothing for their production and maintenance of families. Of course, these definitions are now changing, as the meaning of ‘family’ changes, along with profound and parallel changes in the labour market – the entry of women is just one of those – and in attitudes toward sexuality. When work disappears, the genders produced by the labour market are blurred. When socially necessary labour declines, what we once called women’s work – education, healthcare, service – becomes our basic industry, not a ‘tertiary’ dimension of the measurable economy. **The labour of love, caring for one another and learning how to be our brother’s keeper – socially beneficial labour – becomes not merely possible but eminently necessary, and not just within families, where affection is routinely available.** No, I mean out there, in the wide, wide world. **Work has also been the American way of producing ‘racial capitalism’, as the historians now call it, by means of slave labour, convict labour, sharecropping, then segregated labour markets** – in other words, **a ‘free enterprise system’ built on the ruins of black bodies, an economic edifice animated, saturated and determined by racism. There never was a free market in labour in these united states. Like every other market, it was always hedged by lawful, systematic discrimination against black folk. You might even say that this hedged market produced the still-deployed stereotypes of African-American laziness, by excluding black workers from remunerative employment, confining them to the ghettos of the eight-hour day.** And yet, and yet. **Though work has often entailed subjugation**, obedience and hierarchy (see above), it’s also where many of us, probably most of us, have consistently expressed our deepest human desire, to be free of externally imposed authority or obligation, to be self-sufficient. **We have defined ourselves for centuries by what we do, by what we produce.** But by now we must know that this definition of ourselves entails the principle of productivity – from each according to his abilities, to each according to his creation of real value through work – **and commits us to the inane idea that we’re worth only as much as the labour market can register, as a price. By now we must also know that this principle plots a certain course to endless growth and its faithful attendant, environmental degradation.** How would human nature change as the aristocratic privilege of leisure becomes the birthright of all? Until now, the principle of productivity has functioned as the reality principle that made the American Dream seem plausible. ‘Work hard, play by the rules, get ahead’, or, ‘You get what you pay for, you make your own way, you rightly receive what you’ve honestly earned’ – such homilies and exhortations used to make sense of the world. At any rate they didn’t sound delusional. By now they do. Adherence to the principle of productivity therefore threatens public health as well as the planet (actually, these are the same thing). By committing us to what is impossible, it makes for madness. The Nobel Prize-winning economist Angus Deaton said something like this when he explained anomalous mortality rates among white people in the Bible Belt by claiming that they’ve ‘lost the narrative of their lives’ – by suggesting that they’ve lost faith in the American Dream. For them, the work ethic is a death sentence because they can’t live by it. So the impending end of work raises the most fundamental questions about what it means to be human. To begin with, what purposes could we choose if the job – economic necessity – didn’t consume most of our waking hours and creative energies? What evident yet unknown possibilities would then appear? How would human nature itself change as the ancient, aristocratic privilege of leisure becomes the birthright of human beings as such? Sigmund Freud insisted that love and work were the essential ingredients of healthy human being. Of course he was right. But can love survive the end of work as the willing partner of the good life? Can we let people get something for nothing and still treat them as our brothers and sisters – as members of a beloved community? Can you imagine the moment when you’ve just met an attractive stranger at a party, or you’re online looking for someone, anyone, but you don’t ask: ‘So, what do you do?’ We won’t have any answers until we acknowledge that work now means everything to us – and that hereafter it can’t.

**The role of the judge is to endorse pedagogy which furthers class struggle**

**Zavarzadeh, 2003**

**(Ma’sud, professor at Syracuse, “The Pedagogy of Totality,” *Red Critique*, Fall/Winter,** [**http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/thepedagogyoftotality.htm**](http://www.redcritique.org/FallWinter2003/thepedagogyoftotality.htm)**)**

**To put "class" back into teaching of the "event" is to move beyond dissipating history through "trauma" and anecdotes of affect and thus put an end to the teaching of savviness, which masquerades as a curing of ignorance. The task of the pedagogy of totality is to teach the abstract relations that structure the concrete material reality and not be distracted by the details of appearance because "abstractions reflect nature more deeply, truly and completely" and bring the student closer to grasping social totality: "the relations of production in their totality" (Marx, Wage-Labour and Capital, 29), which is constituted by class antagonism, and therefore its unity is a "unity of opposites" (Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics", 358). The hostility to conceptual analysis and particularly to class critique in contemporary pedagogy goes well beyond the teach-ins on the "event". It is the fundamental dogma of "radical" bourgeois pedagogy. Henry Giroux, for example, wipes out class from pedagogy on the grounds that "class" is part of what he calls "totalizing" politics (Impure Acts 25-26). To be so totally opposed to totalizing is, of course, itself a totalization. But totalizing in opposing totalization does not seem to bother Giroux and other anti-totalizing pedagogues because the issue, ultimately, is really not epistemological ("totalizing") but economic (class). In contemporary pedagogy "totalizing" is an epistemological cover for the class cleansing of pedagogy. […] Pedagogy is most effective when its lessons are situated in the conceptual analysis of objective social totality and grounded in historical materialist critique. Totalization is essential to transformative pedagogy because it is through totalization that the student—the future worker—is enabled to "see society from the center, as a coherent whole" and therefore "act in such a way as to change reality" (Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness, 69). Changing reality in a sustained way, requires knowing it historically and objectively, that is, conceptually as a totality in structure and not simply reacting to it as a galaxy of signifiers (as textualists have done); as the working of power in networks of discourses (Foucault), or as a spontaneous reality that is available to us in its full immediacy (as activists have done with eclecticism and sentimentality). Pedagogy, in other words, is always partisan and the only question is whose side (in the great class struggles) it takes and why: "Who does not know that talk about this or that institution being non-partisan is generally nothing but the humbug of the ruling classes, who want to gloss over the fact that existing institutions are already imbued, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, with a very definite political spirit?" (Lenin, "The Tasks of the Revolutionary Youth"). Criticism of totality as a closural space that excludes "difference" and thus leads to "totalitarianism" is based on an anti-materialist reading of difference as "contingency" (Richard Rorty, Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity, 3-69); as "hybridity" (Homi Bhabha, The Location of Culture); as "differance"—the play of "traces" in the differing and deferral of the sign (Derrida, "Differance"); or the performativity of identity (Judith Butler, Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"). These and other versions of difference (Anthony Giddens, Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives) in contemporary pedagogy, are based on cultural heterogeneities that deflect the difference that makes all the differences: the social division of labor under capitalism. The pedagogy of totality writes the foundational difference of class, which explains all these differences, back into teaching and foregrounds it not as aleatory signs (which is the epistemology of all these differences) but as a historical necessity for capital, which divides people with rigid clarity in the regime of wage labor (Marx and Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, 40-60). Social totality, as I have suggested, is a totality with a materialist (class) difference. It is a resistance against the ferocity of "contingency", "performativity", "hybridity", and "differance" which, with the spiritual aroma of religion, have re-written the world in cynicism, in pathos, and ironically but always in the interest of the transnational bourgeoisie. […] A pedagogy that understand class—as an objectivity—will be able to contribute to its transformation. Without teaching for ending class, which is possible only through understanding it as objective, all acts of pedagogy become acts of cultural adjustment to the dominant social conditions—acts of learning "how power works" (Giroux, Impure Acts, 139) in order to manipulate it and make it work for them. Giroux calls the arts and crafts of manipulating power, "critical pedagogy" and call its manipulators "critical citizens". This is a citizenry, however, that is always concerned with how power works on "them", through "them" and for "them" (not the collective). It is obsessed with "power" and never concerned with "exploitation". It is, in the language of bourgeois stratification, an "upper middle class" citizenry for whom the question of poverty (exploitation) is non-existent, and the only question is the question of personal liberty (power), as Giroux makes even more clear in his stories in Breaking into the Movies: Film and the Culture of Politics; Public Spaces, Private Lives.**

#### **The judge voting neg as an educator rejects capitalism’s attempt to discursively dominate the debate space and creates a non-capitalist space that allows us to theorize alternatives**

**Hesketh 2016** (Chris – Senior Lecturer in International Relations (International Political Economy). He received his BA, MA and PhD all from the University of Nottingha, The survival of non-capitalism,<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0263775816639313>)

However, an opposing view argues that in constructing an alternative theoretical framework, it is vital to loosen the grip of unilinear trajectories of development that can result in a highly capitalocentric viewpoint. Capitalocentrism is defined as a ‘dominant economic discourse that attributes positive value to those activities associated with capitalist economic activity however defined, and assigns lesser value to all other processes of producing and distributing goods and services by identifying them in relation to capitalism’ (Gibson-Graham, 2006b: 41**). Such a view allows for capital to become totalising in its power as it does not account sufficiently for the wider social forces at play.** If theory is to play a part in emancipatory activity it should, in the words of Gibson-Graham (2006b: 126), ‘**proliferate possibility, not foreclose it’.** Despite the radical intentions of all of the above scholars, the primary intellectual focus in nearly all of these cases is on capital itself (how capitalism can be defined, how capitalism exploits, how capitalism survives and grows, how capital interacts and solidifies feudal modes of exploitation). The argument here is that this overwhelming focus on capitalism can lead quickly to a problem: the assumption of subsumption. In other words, all forms of political economy, all other forms of cultural life, and all sites of socio-political activity are portrayed as being overwhelmed by, subsumed into, the dynamics of capitalism.2 This is evident in all three forms of analysis to a greater or lesser degree. As Gibson-Graham et al. (2001: 15) have noted, ‘Representations of the relation of capitalism to non-capitalist forms of economy are usually structured by a binary hierarchy of valuation that operates to demote and devalue the latter’. Non-capitalism – defined in terms of social relations that are not mediated by an impersonal market and where collective forms of production, appropriation and distribution exist – are thus rendered unlikely or impossible. This type of theorising can naturally translate into a problematic social function. As Gibson-Graham (2006a: 57) argue: ‘because transformative efforts are seen as directed at systemic or hegemonic objects (e.g. capitalist societies in their entirety), class transformation is often portrayed as a difficult, indeed, nearly impossible task’. Escobar (2001) has forcefully argued against a global-centric approach, claiming that it erases the identity and agency of place, and contributes to a wider sense of eurocentrism in the study of political economy. How then, can we reconcile these two distinct projects? It will be argued we can productively build on the suggestion by David Ruccio (2009) to construct a complementary approach between the project of Rethinking Marxism (RM) and that of Antonio Gramsci. Whereas Gramsci draws our attention to the manner in which capital rules and is able to be reproduced (which is taken to be a broader synthesis of the above three approaches), the RM project informs us about specific class structures within a society and allows us to understand people as subjects rather than objects of economic development. This is an approach that is particularly apposite for understanding a region like Oaxaca, as despite wider structural influences, important localised cultural practices (with origins in prehispanic land tenure) remain. These include community assemblies, tequios (collective work) and communal obligations in the form of cargos (political posts) that are vital to the functioning of the political economy and social reproduction (Escobar, 2001; Mutersbaugh, 2002). Furthermore, **these are often antithetical to capitalism** An alternative theoretical framework The framework that is drawn upon here, places an emphasis on the need to understand noncapitalist practices in the present, notably as such spaces come into tension with the universal tendency of capitalism to expand, creating a clash of opposing spatial projects (Hesketh, 2013). It is an approach that explicitly rejects the above mentioned assumption of subsumption. The hypothesis advanced here is that non-capitalist spaces can be expanded and learned from (as opposed to remaining static and facing extinction). They are therefore both figurative and pre-figurative spaces. Definitions of social relations that become allencompassing historical stages and that encapsulate all phenomena are thus rejected, as it is submitted that the dividing line between pre-capitalist and capitalist modes of production is more complex (Harrod, 1987: 11). Key to this framework is to re-read economic landscapes/spatial topographies of social relations to see economically diverse activities (Gibson-Graham, 2006a, 2006b). This is a vital starting point as, The co-existence of diverse forms of class processes intimates the possibility of creating nonexploitative class relations on the complex terrain of the present economy. To view the economic landscape less as dominated by capitalism than as **discursively colonized** by the rhetoric of capitalist dominance is to open up ‘realistic’ present possibilities for class transition and transformation (Gibson-Graham et al., 2001: 15). Although waged as part of a discursive struggle, this is not a discourse that is free- floating/ idealistic, but rather is **grounded** in the **material reality** of economic pluralism. Based on this, an alternative strategy for thinking about resistance and transformation is to engage with what Gibson-Graham (2008) have termed ‘place-based globalism’. Such a view starts from the premise that not all places are yoked into a system of meaning, and not entirely subsumed to a global order (as implied often by analyses such as Gunder Frank’s and Banaji’s). As Escobar (2001: 158) puts it, in spite of capitalism operating at all levels of scale, ‘places and non-capitalisms are not completely defined by their relation to capitalism and space’. Such **places thus have the potential to be something other**. **They offer sites of opening for different forms of politics and economics.** Peoples’ experience of non-capitalism in other words can provide a basis for resistance to capitalist encroachment as well as alternative development, and can themselves be expansive. Further to this point, Otero (1999: 22) has claimed that subaltern actors ‘in different parts of the world or in different regions within a country... may have diverse structural capacities depending on their distinctive histories and cultures, or the villages or regions where they develop’. Such geographical sensitivity is often lost by the rush to engage in grand social theory at the macro-historical level. However, this is not to say that the theoretical framework advanced by these scholars is itself totally unproblematic. Such ideas will now be critically engaged with via Antonio Gramsci. Whilst the call to recognise a plurality of economic forms of production and ways of social being is an important one, we also need to be attentive to the wider field of force in which these forms operate (without of course assigning such force a deterministic essence). Therefore, although multiple social relations of production may well exist within a given social formation, this by no means implies that all have equal status and power. As Glassman (2003) reminds us, **we need to be aware of the existence of structural power.** Thus, even where access to land may be retained by a certain group, the wider environment in which resources or infrastructure are provided and the control over the institutions of repressive force remain intact. Autonomous forms of organisation therefore remain mediated by the capitalist state and the wider web of social relations (Dinerstein, 2015: 20). This is where the Gramscian concepts of hegemony and subalternity can be of service tounderstanding space. With regards to subalternity, Modonesi (2010: 45) has pointed out the very term ‘subaltern’ implies a relational character. In other words**, it exists in tension with hegemonic power**. This is not to claim that the hegemonic power determines everything but rather the resources of subaltern groups acquire meaning in struggle against power. As Laclau (1977: 157–158) has argued, this means we cannot essentialise traditional paradigms of social groups, but rather examine how such views become utilised and expressed as new forms of antagonism. In this way, ideas and local practices are transformed into resources for self-determination. Subaltern groups are neither fully autonomous nor fully subsumed to capitalism. However, as Gramsci (1971: 55) cautions, ‘Subaltern groups are always subject to the activity of ruling groups, even when they rebel and rise up: only ‘‘permanent’’ victory breaks their subordination’. Whilst questions may be raised with regards to what would constitute a ‘permanent victory’, this does remind us of the necessity to be cognisant of the wider concentrations of power that may seek to challenge these differential spaces (not devoted to capitalist production). It is also necessary to consider the question of scale. Despite his optimism regarding the possibilities of revolutionary action beginning from non-capitalist sites, Marx was also profoundly aware of the problems of isolation in front of state power (Anderson, 2010: 230). This notion of scaling up activism is not fully addressed in the work of the RM scholars. Instead what we frequently find is a focus on resistance at specific sites of economic activity, whether it is the firm or a particular location (see Gibson-Graham, 2006b, Resnick and Wolff, 2006). What this does not do adequately therefore is to consider the spatial inter-linkages of subaltern struggles, or the wider institutional form that these struggles must take. This is vital if we are to avoid a collapse into what Murray Bookchin (1995) derided as ‘lifestyle anarchism’, characterised by individual, unique expressions of resistance as opposed to a commitment to wider societal change. Again, drawing from Gramsci, **this suggests the need to build an alternative historical bloc**. For Gramsci (1971: 366, 377) **this is not simply a mere alliance of forces but rather involves the interplay of structure and superstructure, whereby shared ideological convictions allow for the material transformation of social life**. To conclude this section, it is argued that the project of Rethinking Marxism is vital to exploring the empirical constitution of alternate forms of economy and class projects, and helps to avoid engaging in capitalocentric theorising. It thus **provides a basis for thinking about alternatives.** The work of Gramsci meanwhile, allows us to understand the political problems of transforming such alternative sites of non-capitalist activity into a political project.

### **Underview:**

Prefer K over theory because 1) Theory incentivises a race to the top. This will make every round a muddled theory debate about subjective “good” norms. 2) it shuts down arguments about actual oppression I.E. someone can read cap and then just lose on theory, even though they’re the ones addressing real world issues, which is what debate is about. 3) K’s allows us to see inherent corruption on things considered to be the norm. Theory tries to establish a norm which may be corrupt. Therefore we have to implement K’s before theory because they allow us to create uncorrupt norms by challenging existing ones.