## FW

#### We need to reorient our pedagogies to be open to challenging neoliberalism and capitalism

Giroux ‘6 (Henry A. Giroux, 11-2-06, Cultural Studies in Dark Times: Public Pedagogy and the Challenge of Neoliberalism, http://firgoa.usc.es/drupal/node/25904) /Bingham-MB

In opposition to these positions, I want to reclaim a tradition in radical educational theory and cultural studies in which pedagogy as a critical practice is central to any viable notion of agency, inclusive democracy, and a broader global public sphere. Pedagogy as both a language of critique and possibility looms large in these critical traditions, not as a technique or a priori set of methods, but as a political and moral practice. As a political practice, pedagogy is viewed as the outgrowth of struggles and illuminates the relationships among power, knowledge, and ideology, while self-consciously, if not self-critically, recognizing the role it plays as a deliberate attempt to influence how and what knowledge and identities are produced within particular sets of social relations. As a moral practice, pedagogy recognizes that what cultural workers, artists, activists, media workers, and others teach cannot be abstracted from what it means to invest in public life, presuppose some notion of the future, or locate oneself in a public discourse. The moral implications of pedagogy also suggest that our responsibility as intellectuals for the public cannot be separated from the consequences of the knowledge we produce, the social relations we legitimate, and the ideologies and identities we offer up to students as well as colleagues. Refusing to decouple politics from pedagogy means, in part, creating those public spaces for engaging students in robust dialogue, challenging them to think critically about received knowledge and energizing them to recognize their own power as individual and social agents. Pedagogy has a relationship to social change in that it should not only help students frame their sense of understanding, imagination, and knowledge within a wider sense of history, politics, and democracy but should also enable them to recognize that they can do something to alleviate human suffering, as the late Susan Sontag (2003) has suggested. Part of this task necessitates that cultural studies theorists and educators anchor their own work, however diverse, in a radical project that seriously engages the promise of an unrealized democracy against its really existing and greviously incomplete forms. Of crucial importance to such a project is rejecting the assumption that theorists can understand social problems without contesting their appearance in public life. More specifically, any viable cultural politics needs a socially committed notion of injustice if we are to take seriously what it means to fight for the idea of the good society. Zygmunt Bauman (2002) is right in arguing that "if there is no room for the idea of wrong society, there is hardly much chance for the idea of good society to be born, let alone make waves" (p. 170). Cultural studies' theorists need to be more forceful, if not more committed, to linking their overall politics to modes of critique and collective action that address the presupposition that democratic societies are never too just, which means that a democratic society must constantly nurture the possibilities for self-critique, collective agency, and forms of citizenship in which people play a fundamental role in shaping the material relations of power and ideological forces that affect their everyday lives. Within the ongoing process of democratization lies the promise of a society that is open to exchange, questioning, and self-criticism, a democracy that is never finished, and one that opposes neoliberal and neoconservative attempts to supplant the concept of an open society with a fundamentalist market-driven or authoritarian one.   Cultural studies theorists who work in higher education need to make clear that the issue is not whether higher education has become contaminated by politics, as much as recognizing that education is already a space of politics, power, and authority. At the same time, they can make visible their opposition to those approaches to pedagogy that reduce it to a set of skills to enhance one's visibility in the corporate sector or an ideological litmus test that measures one's patriotism or ratings on the rapture index. There is a disquieting refusal in the contemporary academy to raise broader questions about the social, economic, and political forces shaping the very terrain of higher education—particularly unbridled market forces, fundamentalist groups, and racist and sexist forces that unequally value diverse groups within relations of academic power.

## Link

#### Appeals to organized labor through unions uphold capitalism

Eidlin, Barry. “Why Unions Are Good — but Not Good Enough.” *Jacobinmag.com*, 6 Jan. 2020, www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing.

Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of “the working class” or “working-class activity,” we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory’s central goals: overthrowing capitalism. Unions by their very existence affirm and reinforce capitalist class society. As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers, unions only exist in relation to capitalists. This makes them almost by definition reformist institutions, designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform it.

#### A right to strike only serves as a reform, capitalism cannot be reformed and attempts to reform the system uphold capitalist ideology.

Richard D. Wolff Is Professor Of Economics Emeritus At The University Of Massachusetts, Amherst, JI Where He Taught Economics From 1973 To 2008. He Is Currently A Visiting Professor In The JI May, 01, 2019

Capitalism’s basic problems are intrinsic. They comprise the employer-employee relationship at its core and that relationship’s results for the broader economy, politics and culture. Modern society’s systemic problem is capitalism, not this or that kind of capitalism. Reforms have replaced one kind of capitalism with another. Beside the problems that reforms could not solve, the reforms themselves proved temporary and insecure. Usually won by employees’ long battles, the reforms get lost because capitalists have the incentives (profits) and resources (profits) to evade, weaken or repeal them. For example, progressive give way to regressive taxes, once-separated commercial investment banking are allowed to recombine, minimum wages are not adjusted to inflations, and so on. Struggles for reforms proposed today increasingly get the response: been there, done that

## Impact

#### **Capitalism exploits the environment leading to global climate change**

Hansen 16 Author for Forbes Drew Hansen, xx-xx-xxxx, "Unless It Changes, Capitalism Will Starve Humanity By 2050," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/drewhansen/2016/02/09/unless-it-changes-capitalism-will-starve-humanity-by-2050/#3f630c777ccc

Capitalism has generated massive wealth for some, but it’s devastated the planet and has failed to improve human well-being at scale. • Species are going extinct at a rate 1,000 times faster than that of the natural rate over the previous 65 million years (see Center for Health and the Global Environment at Harvard Medical School). • Since 2000, 6 million hectares of primary forest have been lost each year. That’s 14,826,322 acres, or just less than the entire state of West Virginia (see the 2010 assessment by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN). • Even in the U.S., 15% of the population lives below the poverty line. For children under the age of 18, that number increases to 20% (see U.S. Census). • The world’s population is expected to reach 10 billion by 2050 (see United Nations' projections). Capitalism is unsustainable in its current form. How do we expect to feed that many people while we exhaust the resources that remain? Human activities are behind the extinction crisis. Commercial agriculture, timber extraction, and infrastructure development are causing habitat loss and our reliance on fossil fuels is a major contributor to climate change. Public corporations are responding to consumer demand and pressure from Wall Street. Professors Christopher Wright and Daniel Nyberg published Climate Change, Capitalism and Corporations last fall, arguing that businesses are locked in a cycle of exploiting the world's resources in ever more creative ways. "Our book shows how large corporations are able to continue engaging in increasingly environmentally exploitative behaviour by obscuring the link between endless economic growth and worsening environmental destruction," they wrote. Yale sociologist Justin Farrell studied 20 years of corporate funding and found that "corporations have used their wealth to amplify contrarian views [of climate change] and create an impression of greater scientific uncertainty than actually exists." Corporate capitalism is committed to the relentless pursuit of growth, even if it ravages the planet and threatens human health. We need to build a new system: one that will balance economic growth with sustainability and human flourishing.

## Alt

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the Party can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct chauvinist tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation

**Escalante 18**  
(Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> cVs)

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

#### FW

#### 1] Capitalism has to come first before justice, there is no justice if people are constantly being exploited by capitalism

#### 2] Capitalism has to come before non-domination because the domination that workers experience is not resolved through the aff, only the alt can really solve

#### 3] Arbitrary interference both by government and employers is inevitable through capitalism because workers can never truly be free and will always be constrained

#### 4] Look to extinction impacts first, preventing ecodoom by fighting capitalism has to be first because people can’t even have justice or freedom if extinct, only the alt can solve

#### 5] Capitalism creates socioeconomic inequality – turns all their impacts because they can’t solve for this inequality through the aff, only the destruction of capitalism and the alternative will effectively solve

**Dean 12** Jodi Dean is a political theorist and professor in the Political Science department at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, the position of Erasmus Professor of the Humanities in the Faculty of Philosophy at Erasmus University Rotterdam. B.A. Princeton University, M.A. & Ph.D. Columbia University, co-editor of Digital Barricades. “The Communist Horizon.” Published October 9th 2012. || COMRADE OES-SW

Why communism? Because the gross inequality ushered in by the extreme capitalism of neoliberal state policy and desperate financialism is visible, undeniable, and global. Increasing in industrialized countries over the last three decades, income inequality is particularly severe in Chile, Mexico, Turkey, and the US, the four industrialized countries with the largest income gaps (Portugal, the UK, and Italy also make the top ten).3 Inequality in the US is so extreme that its Gini coefficient (45) makes it more comparable to Cameroon (44.6) and Jamaica (45.5) than to Germany (30.4) and the UK (34).4 The antagonism that cuts across capitalist countries is so apparent that dominant ideological forces can't obscure it. The US typically positions extreme inequality, indebtedness, and decay elsewhere, offshore. The severe global economic recession, collapse in the housing and mortgage markets, increase in permanent involuntary unemployment, trillion-dollar bank bailouts, and extensive cuts to federal, state, and local budgets, however, have made what we thought was the third world into our world. Contra Zizek, the division cutting across capitalist societies is never visible, never palpable in the US and UK now than it's been since at least the 1920s. We learn that more of our children live in poverty than at any time in recent history (20 percent of children in the US as of 2010), that the wealth of the very, ve11' rich-the top 1 percent-has dramatically increased while income for the rest of us has remained stagnant or declined, that many of the foreclosures the banks force on homeowners are meaningless, illegal acts of expropriation (the banks can't document who owns what so they lack the paper necessary to justify foreclosure proceedings). We read of corporations sitting on piles of cash instead of hiring back their laidoff workforce. Under neoliberalism, they lavishly enjoy their profits rather than put them back into production -what Gerard Dumenil and Dominique Levy call an explicit strategy of "disaccumulation."·3

#### 6] Their appeal to human rights and “freedom” for workers will never make meaningful change to socioeconomic inequalities and upholds neoliberal ideals

Moyn 15 (Samuel Moyn, A Powerless Companion: Human Rights in the Age of Neoliberalism, 77 Law and Contemporary Problems, https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/16073952/moyn.%20powerless%20companion.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, 2015, pg. 160-164)///PSC

A brief, and therefore necessarily superficial, survey of the shortcomings of human rights norms and movements with the structural transformations of the era of market fundamentalism in mind must start with a basic and rarely made point: In their legalized forms, human rights do not purport to provide an egalitarian agenda. It is perfectly possible to imagine a fully achieved local and global regime of human rights protection that simultaneously features the worst hierarchy of wealth and other primary goods known to history. Indeed, in some ways, grasping the paradoxical relationship of human rights and so-called neoliberalism amounts to seeing how thorough a disjuncture there is between an agenda of economic and social rights protection and a more ambitious egalitarian agenda.45 When it comes to the sorts of goals envisioned by the International Covenant for Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, it is not how much they promise but how little that needs to receive more emphasis, since the covenant strives for a minimum floor of protection in domains like housing, health, and food, rather than a fuller bodied egalitarianism. It is popular, and understandable, to focus on those episodes (Pinochet’s Chile, for example) where neoliberal policies have gone along with state repression—which Klein’s indictment of the shock doctrine dramatizes (or sensationalizes). But, in certain ways, it seems much more disturbing to observe that neoliberal victories are perfectly compatible with full respect for not just civil and political liberties, but also for economic and social rights. If one extrapolates the most extreme possible illustration of this point, it is perfectly possible to imagine an alternate reality in which one man personally owns everything, but with all the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights nonetheless honored (through his subsistence spending). Even the much-ridiculed promise in the Universal Declaration’s Article 27 of paid vacations is completely harmonious with a world controlled by a galloping hierarchy of means.46 Society has indeed headed towards a scenario in the last thirty years where a formerly egalitarian impulse has sometimes successfully been displaced, as inequality has spiked, by an agenda in which a set of protections alleviates the most abject destitution. Generalizing drastically, it is fair to say that the present era of world history is one in which a floor has been partially built to save the wretched of the earth from the worst suffering, even as the ceiling for hierarchical wealth concentration has been obliterated.47 The conceptual point, in other words, is that an economic and social rights agenda is different—and much more minimalist—than an egalitarian agenda. It is perfectly possible for one to succeed as the other fails. The historical point is that the ends of the first agenda have often been prioritized—and sometimes achieved—across an era during which the ends of the second agenda have been forsaken. But two crucial qualifications are necessary to understand the historically juxtaposed trajectories of the two agendas. For one thing, for all the progress made in saving humanity from the most extreme sorts of immiseration, much remains to be done even to provide a floor of basic protection. No one wants to trivialize social and economic rights protection, even in the name of a plausible indictment of aphasia concerning broader patterns of wealth and income distribution and rising inequality. Second, even successes in the socioeconomic domain have hardly been due to the application of a normative framework of human rights, the birth of a formal regime of human rights law, or the mobilizational activism of any human rights movement. In fact, the lion’s share of poverty reduction in the last few decades (indeed, given the population numbers involved, in world history by far) is due to a single factor: the policies of the Chinese state.48 And although a wide range of factors account for the remainder of poverty reduction—food and water access, health improvement, and so on—it does not seem as if human rights protection or promotion as frameworks or projects rank high among them, if they figure on the list at all. Now consider this deflationary perspective about the value of economic and social rights agendas (set off from the protection of those rights achieved through other frameworks or thanks to other means) by starting with domestic or national protection and then turning to more transnational and global protection. There is no doubt that, after the first phase of human rights history in the 1970s and 1980s, during which a global dialogue concerning economic and social rights was largely absent, such discourse has surged. But, sadly, this rhetorical and framing (or, more generously, standard-setting) work has caused no shifts in real-world outcomes independently. This is most graphically clear when it comes to the highly prestigious model of judicial enforcement of socioeconomic rights, especially when national judiciaries interpret constitutional norms in the spirit of international human rights law (including by relying on its notion of a minimum core of protection). For many years, South Africa was credited as the laboratory where these developments were pioneered, especially after the landmark Grootboom case.49 In particular, for several years, some leading American academics praised the “democracy-forcing” manner in which South African courts both advanced socioeconomic rights and respected democratic legitimacy when it came to policy choices.50 On this interpretation, courts could invalidate policies that failed to respect a designated minimum core of socioeconomic rights protection while refusing to craft enforcement remedies of their own, thereby prompting democratic branches of government to do so.51 But, especially on this minimalist and noninterventionist model, the final results have been disappointing: it turns out that the South African judiciary, instead of encouraging legislative or political action, forced the democratic branches into a nonresponse. Unfortunately, it is plausible to conclude that judicial enforcement has failed to make a great deal of difference, both in South Africa and beyond.52 In particular, as David Landau has shown, enforcement of economic rights by courts tend to favor the well-off (such as pensioners defending entitlements against state rollback under budgetary pressure) rather than the weakest and most vulnerable.53 Of course, the failure of judicial enforcement of socioeconomic rights does not mean that other attempts to protect socioeconomic rights have necessarily failed. But, so far, there is no powerful evidence confirming the value that a human rights framework brings to the reformulation of citizenship in a welfarist direction thanks to other forces (for example, partisan mobilization, which Simmons has credited for improvement when it comes to political and civil rights).54

#### 7] CAPITALISM PRECLUDES DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS—IT MUST BE ELIMINATED TO REALIZE REAL PROGRESSIVE POLITICS

Joel **Kovel**, Alger Hiss Professor, Social Studies, Bard College, THE ENEMY OF NATURE: THE END OF CAPITALISM OR THE END OF THE WORLD, 20**02**, p. 181.

Because the compass of democracy points to the mobilization of our species power, full democracy will not happen without the overcoming of capitalism. Yet such a demand scarcely appears on today’s parched political landscape. What we generally see are stunted derivatives, as in the vague identification of people of good will as ‘progressive’. The question is: progressing towards what? Towards a virtuous citizenry placing cheeks on corporate power, who then stand about until startled by the next head of the hydra? Towards the gratification of an alternative ‘lifestyle’ caught up in capital’s consumerist regime? Or does it progress beyond the limits of the given? Our progressivism fails not because of its inability to spell out what the ‘beyond’ may be, but through its indifference to the question, because of which it settles into the ecodestructive system on the ground.

NR

#### Capitalism is likely to fail- its an unsustainable model

**Hutton 18** (Will Hutton, September 09, 2018 Observer, Big Innovation Centre, Hertford College, Oxford. “Ten years on, capitalism might not survive the shock of another Lehman” <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/sep/09/ten-years-after-2008-crisis-another-financial-crash>)-- RD

Ten years ago this weekend, frantic efforts were being made to save one of the biggest banks in the world. When chancellor Alistair Darling overruled Barclays’ supreme stupidity in considering the takeover of the stricken Lehman Brothers investment bank – the extent and complexity of its debts would have brought down both it and probably the British banking system – the die was cast. Lehman collapsed and the shockwaves are still felt to this day. Suddenly, the proud buccaneers of high finance were exposed as “sapient nincompoops”, as the great economic commentator Walter Bagehot described the senior executives of Overend, Gurney & Co in the wake of its collapse 150 years earlier. All the assumptions made by a generation of free-market economists, conservative politicians and the financial establishment were shown to be ideological tosh propagated by today’s nincompoops. Yes, **markets** could and did **make vast, earth-shaking mistakes**. Yes, shareholders were so disengaged from the companies in which they invested they, in effect, allowed ownerless banks to be run to create gargantuan, dynastic fortunes for their managers, assuming risks on a scale they did not themselves understand. Yes, the financial system had become a complex interrelated network no stronger than its weakest link – which was very weak. The bill for all these mistakes would be picked up by wider society, with perpetrators suffering nothing – nationalising losses and privatising gain. **The whole effect was to transmute capitalism into a system of value extraction rather than value creation**, with knock-on effects that depressed wages and contractualised work into short-term and zero-hour contracts. The financial system, based in London and New York, had become damnable – the nightmare of our times. The cumulative costs of this have become so large they can scarcely be comprehended. The total cost across the west of recapitalising bust banks, offering guarantees and making good disappeared liquidity is estimated at $14tn. The recession that followed was the deepest since the 1930s, with the slowest subsequent recovery. Worse, conservative politicians – most successfully in Britain – succeeded in pinning the blame not on the architects and operators of modern finance but on the excesses of the state, the rationale for “austerity”. High government spending, alleged chancellor George Osborne and prime minister David Cameron, had caused the government budget deficit to balloon. Wrong. Rather, the deficit was caused by collapsing tax revenues during a monumental recession. The same nincompoopery that had created modern finance now proclaimed that the stock of public debt – despite it being proportionally higher for most of the previous three centuries and at times of higher interest rates – represented an existential threat. In the UK, public spending per head on services will have fallen by a quarter by 2020 as a result of the consequent spending cuts – tax increases could not be countenanced – with what remains of Britain’s social contract ripped apart. The distress and disaffection helped to fuel the margin that won the referendum for Leave. As profound was the rupturing of the Faustian bargain between finance and society that had defined the 30 years up to 2008. The bankers made their fortunes, but wider society was offered boundless credit and booming property prices. Companies did not have to create value through innovation, investment and export; instead, they could ride the credit boom. The result: an overblown, featherbedded service sector delivering ungrounded productivity growth. Post 2008, the wounded system has been unable to deliver at the same pace, although it tries. The illusory productivity has stagnated; and trust in value-extracting business and capitalism, which continues to displace risk on to the shoulders of ordinary people, has fallen to new lows. Small wonder that Jeremy Corbyn did so well in the 2017 general election. Too little has been learned; too little has changed. Even the limited reforms set in train since 2010 have not been fully implemented. Worse, the essential amoral bargain remains in place. Finance can do more or less what it likes, with pay beyond the dreams of avarice for what Lord Adair Turner, former chair of the Financial Services Authority, calls activity that is no better than a system of wealth transference. It is zero-sum: nothing worthwhile is taking place. Yet, if it collapses, be sure that governments will be asked to step in again. Finance can do more or less as it likes, but if it collapses, be sure that governments will be asked to step in again The risks are downplayed. Surely it could not happen again when regulators are more alert and bankers have been required to provide more of their own capital as a cushion against mistakes? Yet just a cursory glance at the markets shows how febrile they are, how exposed to violent movements, how illusory is their much-vaunted liquidity – and how rich the pickings remain for those prepared to take the risks. Note, also, how shaky are the foundations of the new wave of financial products offering “risk diversification”, notably exchange trading funds (ETF). We live in a world in which the price of US Treasury bonds – a market of multi-trillion dollars – can move 10% in 10 minutes. What was bewildering in 2008 was how, as a result of computerised algorithmic buy and sell instructions, everybody had diversified in the same way – so everybody became simultaneous buyers and sellers. That is even more acute today. All that is required is for, say, Turkey or Italy to default on their debts, an ETF to become distressed, or a sequence of Chinese banks to fail (all too imaginable) and **the impact would radiate across the** **network** as it did in 2008. Banks carry far too little capital to insulate themselves from the shocks – and governments, again, would have to step in. Capitalism as it is could not survive. Trump’s America would not collaborate in underwriting a global bailout as the US did in 2008. **The trend towards deglobalisation and trade protection would accelerate.** Brexit Britain, outside the EU and with a huge financial sector, would be devastated. We must urgently minimise risk and reshape our economy. If not, today’s debates and preoccupations will, in the future, be viewed as incredible.

#### COLLAPSE IS ASSURED DO TO CAPITALISM’S UNSUSTAINABLE USE OF RESOURCES LEADING TO ENVIRONMENTAL COLLAPSE AND HUMAN EXTINCTION.

Knight 09

[Alex Knight, Masters in Political Science, Organizer, teacher and writer in Philadelphia. Began organizing students in college on anti-war and environmental issues. A real time Activist. “Is it the end of capitalism”, May 4th, 2009, <http://endofcapitalism.com/about/1-is-this-the-end-of-capitalism/>, Access Date 6/11/13, \\wyo-bb]

Capitalism requires growth. A system that requires growth cannot last forever on a planet that is defined by ecological and social limits. Capitalism is therefore fundamentally unsustainable – sooner or later it will run up against those limits and the system will stop functioning. At this moment we are in the midst of a crisis which is calling into question the future of this system. Now is a perfect opportunity to envision a new way of living in the world that can meet human needs while also respecting the needs of the planet. It is time to build this new world. The current economic crisis which began in 2007 is unlike any previous crisis faced by global capitalism. In earlier downturns there remained a way to grow out of it by expanding production – there were new resources and energy supplies, new markets, and new pools of labor to exploit. The system just needed to expand its reach, because there was plenty of money to make outside its existing grasp. If we study what lies at the root of today’s crisis, we will discover very real limits to growth blocking that path this time. From extreme poverty alongside excessive consumption to exhaustion of resources and ecosystems, the system’s capacity for growth has reached a breaking point. The present economic recession might not be recorded in the history books as the final chapter of capitalism. But the ongoing crisis illustrates that like Humpty-Dumpty, the capitalist system is broken and there’s no sense continuing to use all the King’s horses and all the King’s men to try to put it back together again. It would be wiser to spend those resources developing an economy that works better for our communities and our planet. Contrary to what may be reported in the news, this is not merely a financial crisis. Professor Richard Wolff in his excellent video Capitalism Hits the Fan explains that this crisis did not begin in the financial markets and it hasn’t ended there. When the corporate media cast blame for the recession on abstractions like “toxic assets,” “collateralized debt obligations,” “credit default swaps,” or focus discussion of the problem on the crimes and errors of individual investors and firms, they obscure the true depth of the crisis. This is a crisis of the system itself, meaning the only solution is a total change in the structure of the economy. Capitalism cannot be “fixed,” it must be replaced. Despite unprecedented efforts on the part of the King’s men, who have spared no expense on his recovery, Humpty remains in critical condition today and his long-term prospects are not looking good. Journalist and former Goldman Sachs executive Nomi Prins has been tracking the extent of the Wall St. bailout, and reported in December ’09 that the US government has in the past year committed over $14 trillion to buy up worthless debt from troubled banks. (Putting this in perspective, the entire yearly economy of the United States is also $14 trillion.) Despite these unprecedented giveaways, businesses continue to close their doors or downsize their workforces, pushing the official US unemployment rate over 10% as of November ’09. But this number only includes those jobless workers who are currently looking for full-time employment. A more accurate figure, including the underemployed and those discouraged from actively seeking employment would be 17.5%, or nearly 1 of every 5 American workers out of a job. While the US Congress quickly gave out trillions of dollars to banks and corporations facing hardship, it has thus far created no new job training or unemployment programs to ease the suffering of the millions of workers losing their incomes. Nor does it appear willing to create a public health care program for the nearly 50 million Americans now without access to a doctor. At the same time the US government continues to drag its feet on the issue of climate change, recently joining with China to “wreck” the Copenhagen climate summit (in Bill McKibben’s words) that was attempting to curb global greenhouse gas emissions. Such favoritism towards banks and corporations while neglecting the basic well-being of the public and the planet reflects the sickness of capitalist priorities. In this system, profit is valued more highly than human and non-human life. Capitalism requires growth, and according to an article published in New Scientist, growth is “killing the Earth.” The article included the below graph, showing the size of the global economy (GDP) skyrocketing over the last fifty years. [GRAPH OMITTED] But this tremendous growth in economic output corresponds to an equally rapid growth in damage done to the global environment. Forest loss, fisheries depleted, ozone destruction, species extinctions, carbon dioxide emissions, and the rise of global temperatures all race towards the top of the page, suggesting that if capitalism were able to recover from its current fall and continue on a path of endless growth, there soon might not be any planet left to live on. Luckily for Earth and all those who call it home, there are limits constraining capitalism from further growth. These limits are both ecological and social because they originate both from the planet and communities of people. The ecological limits include shrinking supplies of water, soil, uranium, and fossil fuels like oil, natural gas, and coal. The most important limiting factor is oil, which fuels much of the capitalist economy, including 95% of current transportation. Global capitalism today could not exist without oil, but worldwide oil production appears to be near its ultimate maximum, or “peak.” Peak oil doesn’t mean that there is no more oil, just that the oil remaining underground is deeper, heavier, more remote, and more expensive – so it cannot continue to be pumped at the same rate as before. As demand for oil continues to grow, this supply limit is creating a shortage that cannot be overcome by existing alternative fuels, which has sent oil prices soaring. And without the cheap and plentiful fuel it needs to grow, capitalism as a way of organizing society will become obsolete.

#### Capitalism is empirically proven to have no correlation with conflict reduction – this takes out any war turn

**Anderson & Souva ’10** (Sally Anderson and Mark Souva, The Accountability Effects of Political Institutions and Capitalism on Interstate Conflict, The Journal of Conflict Resolution , August 2010, Vol. 54, No. 4 (August 2010), pp. 543-565) - NR

We argue that extant research testing the relationship between political account ability and interstate conflict initiation and targeting is flawed. First, the primary accountability argument in international politics is selectorate theory, yet some tests of selectorate theory do not use selectorate theory's measure of winning coalition size, opting instead for a measure of democracy. Using a measure of a different concept may lead to faulty inferences regarding the original theory's expectations. Second, some research on selectorate theory's hypotheses on conflict initiation do not analyze the relevant domain of cases; for example, instead of examining all directed dyads, some research examines the country-year and selects on militarized disputes. Third, and most importantly, the essence of selectorate theory's accountability argument of conflict is that as accountability increases, leaders are more selective about entering into international militarized disputes and that once in they try harder to win. In other words, selectorate theory expects a conditional relationship between accountability and the balance of power: as accountability increases, states become more selective about initiating conflict when they are relatively weaker than a potential target. The appropriate way, then, to test political accountability arguments of interstate conflict initiation is by interacting the hypothesized accountability mechanism with the balance of power, but existing research does not do this. We address these research design problems and conduct new tests on the relationship between political institu tions, capitalism, and militarized dispute initiation and targeting. Specifically, we present the first tests of (a) the effect of winning coalition size on dispute initiation conditional on the balance ofpower for all dyads, (b) the effect of capitalism on dis pute initiation conditional on power, (c) the effect of winning coalition size on dispute initiation conditional on both power and the target's winning coalition size, and (d) the effect of winning coalition size on dispute initiation conditional on both capitalism and power. To preview the conclusion, we find limited support for the claim that capitalism influences foreign policy decision making by increasing political account ability but robust support for the influence of political institutions. That is, the original expectations of selectorate theory are supported but extensions of selectorate theory to include capitalism are not supported.2The article proceeds as follows. In the next section, we develop the selectorate theory explanation of interstate conflict and situate capitalism within it. Next, we present a research design to test the central hypotheses that come out of this theory. We, then, present the results of the base model and extensive sensitivity analyses. In the final section, we discuss the implications of this research.

On Schwartzman, 20, not my actual alt

#### On the alt, none of these cards apply, they’re all talking about a fast paced violent revolution, Escalante is calling for community organizing working towards building a party