#### **FW- The role of the ballot is to choose the methodology that best engages with materially improving the lives of individuals**

Wright 2015 (Erik Olin Wright is a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin, How to Be an Anticapitalist Today," No Publication, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/12/erik-olin-wright-real-utopias-anticapitalism-democracy/, Accessed: 4-29-2016, /Kent Denver-MB)

For many people the idea of anticapitalism seems ridiculous. After all, capitalist firms have brought us fantastic technological innovations in recent years: smartphones and streaming movies; driverless cars and social media; Jumbotron screens at football games and video games connecting thousands of players around the world; every conceivable consumer product available on the Internet for rapid home delivery; astounding increases in the productivity of labor through novel automation technologies; and more. And while it’s true that income is unequally distributed in capitalist economies, it is also true that the array of consumption goods available and affordable for the average person, and even for the poor, has increased dramatically almost everywhere. Just compare the United States in the half century between 1965 and 2015: the percentage of Americans with air conditioners, cars, washing machines, dishwashers, televisions, and indoor plumbing increased dramatically. Life expectancy is longer; infant mortality lower. In the twenty-first century, this improvement in basic standards of living has also occurred in poorer regions of the world as well: the material standards of millions of people living in China since it embraced the free market have improved dramatically. What’s more, look what happened when Russia and China tried an alternative to capitalism. Aside from the political oppression and brutality of those regimes, they were economic failures. So, if you care about improving the lives of people, how can you be anticapitalist? That is one story, the standard story. Here is another story: the hallmark of capitalism is poverty in the midst of plenty. This is not the only thing wrong with capitalism, but it is its gravest failing. Widespread poverty — especially amongst children, who clearly bear no responsibility for their plight — is morally reprehensible in rich societies where it could be easily eliminated. Yes, there is economic growth, technological innovation, increasing productivity, and a downward diffusion of consumer goods, but along with capitalist economic growth comes destitution for many whose livelihoods have been destroyed by the advance of capitalism, precariousness for those at the bottom of the labor market, and alienating and tedious work for most. Capitalism has generated massive increases in productivity and extravagant wealth for some, yet many people still struggle to make ends meet. Capitalism is an inequality-enhancing machine as well as a growth machine. Not to mention that it is becoming clearer that capitalism, driven by the relentless search for profits, is destroying the environment. Both of these accounts are anchored in the realities of capitalism. It is not an illusion that capitalism has transformed the material conditions of life in the world and enormously increased human productivity; many people have benefited from this. But equally, it is not an illusion that capitalism generates great harms and perpetuates unnecessary forms of human suffering. The pivotal issue is not whether material conditions on average have improved in the long run within capitalist economies, but rather whether, looking forward from this point in history, things would be better for most people in an alternative kind of economy. It is true that the centralized, authoritarian, state-run economies of twentieth-century Russia and China were in many ways economic failures, but these are not the only possibilities. Where the real disagreement lies — a disagreement that is fundamental — is over whether it is possible to have the productivity, innovation, and dynamism that we see in capitalism without the harms. Margaret Thatcher famously announced in the early 1980s, “There is No Alternative,” but two decades later the World Social Forum declared “Another World is Possible.” I argue that another world — one that would improve the conditions for human flourishing for most people — is indeed possible. In fact, elements of this new world are already being created today, and concrete ways to move from here to there exist. Anticapitalism is possible, not simply as a moral stance toward the harms and injustices of global capitalism, but as a practical stance towards building an alternative for greater human flourishing.

#### Links-

#### Prioritizing human rights never makes changes 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

#### Their appeal to unions is merely a tool of capitalism and uphold capitalist and neoliberal ideology

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.

#### AND 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

#### 1] Critical pedagogy’s decentralized localism disavows any attempt to either see the structure or to unite against it, damning us to interpassivity in the face of the objective violence of capitalism

Cho 2010

[Seehwa, Professor of Education at St. Thomas University, “Politics of Critical Pedagogy and New Social Movements”, Educational Philosophy and Theory, April 2010, p. asp //wyo-tjc]

Another politics predominant in critical pedagogy is one that gives emphasis to grassroots democracy and a non-hierarchical form of authority. This non-hierarchical, rehabilitated, and participatory form of authority is very prevalent in critical pedagogy literature and praxis. There is a strong tendency to negate any structure or any possible hint of authority in critical pedagogy classrooms, as a way to achieve total freedom and elimination of domination. Dialogue and consensus is regarded as the only legitimate and desirable form of decision-making (see Cho, 2006). Again, this politics is a reflection of shifts in the larger social movements and politics of theories. For the last several decades, not only have the broader liberation struggles become fragmented, but also the search for a common front between and among struggles has become nearly impossible, and to be a simplistic totalizing modernism. We no longer should have illusions about systemic solutions from top down, we are told, for the only viable option left is grassroots democracy and localized movements from bottom up. Along with the abandonment of the system, including the State, the individual and local struggles have become the main site of social change. The New Left targets American society as a whole totality, based on the analysis of the total nature of the technocratic system of corporate liberalism. It is ‘a struggle for a redistribution of power at all levels, and to a different conception of the way in which society should be organized’ (Teodori, 1969, p. 37). From this, direct action and grassroots organization emerged as the essential means of struggle and as the democratic mode of political expression, replacing the strategy of coalition building with liberal and labor forces. Participatory democracy is considered as a method capable of guiding and inspiring political action (Teodori, 1969).5 The new social movements also brought new tactics and strategies. The centralized party-led movements were challenged and replaced with spontaneous, decentralized, and grassroots actions and organizations. This anti-organization was partly a product of the 1968 Paris experience, when students were deeply disappointed by the French Communist Party, which sided with the government and called for students to quit the general strike and street uprising and return to the university. The experience of the Communist party in the Soviet Union did not help either. As the communist parties became the establishment, the New Left became deeply skeptical of any centralized organization or leadership. As such, they embraced decentralized direct action and grassroots activism as the only viable option. There was a great deal of ambivalence about leadership in the New Left, and according to Todd Gitlin, this ambivalence along with ‘its inability to engender a coherent political ideology and organization’ was the main reason for the rapid disintegration of the students movements of the 1960s (Gitlin, 1980, p. 185). Seen from a strategic point of view, the recent proliferation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) is a reflection of this localized political trend against top-down and organizational strategy.6 NGOs, aptly called ‘people's organization’, are largely based on bottom-up grassroots movements critical of, or in opposition to national states (Petras, 1997; Hardt & Negri, 2000; Sader, 2004). This decentralized and grassroots activism has become a predominant form of social activism, becoming a fundamental principle of groups, such as the World Social Forum (Mertes, 2004; Leite, 2005). As Brenner (2006) rightly pointed out, this anti-state stance is one of the (dangerous) political legacies since the late 1970s. In summary, there is a clear alignment between the New Left politics and critical pedagogy politics. The New Social Movement differs from the Old social movement of the 1930s in several ways. The significant change is the shift in the focus of social movements. It is no longer simply capitalism, or economic inequality and exploitation, but rather the totality of the system, ‘a struggle for redistribution of power at all levels’ (Teodori, 1969, p. 37). This is why Herbert Marcuse rightfully summed up the sixties as a ‘great refusal’. In terms of its focus, the new social movement focuses on the individual and the self. Self-realization and self-expression are the ideals that the new social movements were to pursue. The other significant change involves the form or organization of social movements. It is no longer a party-led, organized, and centralized struggle, but rather it relies on decentralized, non-hierarchical, and dispersed forms and tactics.

#### 2] Capitalism is a continuation of colonial violence that necessitates the disposition of women and indigenous peoples

Shiva 88 - an Indian scholar, environmental activist, physicist, ecofeminist and author. (Vandana, *Staying Alive: Women Ecology and Survival in India*, Zed Books Ltd., 1988, 1-2, https://www.arvindguptatoys.com/arvindgupta/stayingalive.pdf) //gordon

'Development' was to have been a post-colonial project, a choice for accepting a model of progress in which the entire world remade itself on the model of the colonising modem west, without having to undergo the subjugation and exploitation that colonialism entailed. The assumption was that western style progress was possible for all. Development, as the improved well-being of all, was thus equated with the westernisation of economic categories - of needs, of Productivity, of growth. Concepts and categories about economic development and natural resource utilisation that had emerged in the specific context of industrialisation and capitalist growth in a centre of colonial power, were raised to the level of universal assumptions and applicability in the entirely different context of basic needs satisfaction for the people of the newly independent Third World countries. Yet, as Rosa Luxemberg has pointed out, early industrial development in western Europe necessitated the permanent occupation of the colonies by the colonial powers and the destruction of the local 'natural economy'.1 According to her, colonialism is a constant necessary condition for capitalist growth: without colonies, capital accumulation would grind to a halt. 'Development' as capital accumulation and the commercialisation of the economy for the generation of 'surplus' and profits thus involved the reproduction not merely-of a particular form of creation of wealth, but also of the associated creation of poverty and dispossession. A replication of economic development based on commercialisation of resource use for commodity production in the newly independent countries created the internal colonies.2 Development was thus reduced to a continuation of the process of colonisation; it became an extension of the project of wealth creation in modern western patriarchy's economic vision, which was based on the exploitation or exclusion of women (of the west and non-west), on the exploitation and degradation of nature, and on the exploitation and erosion of other cultures. 'Development' could not but entail destruction for women, nature and subjugated cultures, which is why, throughout the Third World, women, peasants and tribals are struggling for liberation from ‘development’ just as they earlier struggled for liberation from colonisation.

#### 3] They concede in CX that the state of Israel not Palestine is performing this oppression, the Palestinian government recognizing the unconditional right to strike does not actually protect the people from Israel mooting any solvency