

A2 CAP K

2AC Short

First on the K, our framework is plan-focus, means we get to weigh the aff against the K, key to most fairness and education, the role of the ballot is the best policy option

No prior questions --- pragmatic utility of the plan is sufficient to vote aff

Owen 2 – David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7

Commenting on the 'philosophical turn' in IR, Wæver remarks that '[a] frenzy for words like "epistemology" and "ontology" often signals this philosophical turn', although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.⁴ However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, 'theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program' in that it 'dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory'.⁵ The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since 'whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry'.⁶ Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in

IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

Also no link ...

the plan is not “part and parcel” of capitalism. Surveillance is part and parcel of capitalism, it is used by the state to ensure the logic of productivity and sameness that allows capitalism to exist. We only have to win that we’re a step in the right direction

Perm do the plan then the alt in all other instances

Their alternative is hopeless utopianism – human nature checks it AND cap is organic, their static representations are flawed

Hunter 11 [Mark Hunter is Professor of Humanities at St. Petersburg College. June 21, 2011 To Attack Capitalism Is To Attack Human Nature
http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2011/06/21/to_attack_capitalism_is_to_attack_human_nature_99087.html]

McCarragher's denunciation of capitalism is in fact an attack on human nature disguised as political discourse. The "pernicious" traits he attributes to capitalism are, in fact, traits globally present in every political/social order—in many cases far worse in non-capitalistic societies—because they are traits of humanity itself. His entire argument against capitalism consists of nothing more than an elaborate correlation-proves-causation fallacy (cum hoc ergo propter hoc - "with this, therefore because of this"). He wants us to believe that since capitalism contains greed it causes greed. Furthermore, McCarragher seems content to overlook the fact that capitalism is an organic economic system not created as much as evolving naturally as a consequence of free individuals interacting with other free individuals. Private property and the production of goods may be a part of capitalism, but its most essential virtue is as a guardian of man's freedom. Criticizing capitalism for its avarice is not unlike condemning representative democracy for its failure to elect the wisest of men - each may occur, but it is not relevant to their fundamental purpose. Both capitalism and representative democracy maximize freedom by diffusing power and responsibility across the broadest spectrum of society. Rigid control is antithetical to freedom and it is this that most vexes the liberal intellectual. What McCarragher is unwilling to come to terms with is that his inherent criticism of capitalism is not so much an indictment of capitalism but rather a revealing supposition he is making about humanity itself. His attack on capitalism masks a general contempt for a free people who in his worldview will inevitably choose a path of greed and avarice unless a coercive political order prevents it. Therefore, any liberal political/economic system proposed to replace capitalism must have at its core a process through which the masses are controlled and coerced to overcome the human attributes so abhorred by the liberal intellectual that he wrongly attributes to capitalism rather than

people. McCarragher presents the reader with a moral crusade cleverly cloaked as political theory. He sees the Deadly Sins ever present in modern capitalism, and like the fourth century ascetic Evagrius Ponticus, McCarragher seems particularly obsessed with man's rapacious gluttony. While capitalism's natural and organic nature is condemned for its "deliberate nurturance of our vilest qualities" he fails to put forth the ramifications of the artificial and contrived alternative. The progressive alternative to capitalism must of necessity resemble Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor because the crux of the matter for both modern liberals and Dostoyevsky is human freedom. The infinite variety that is millions of people making millions of decisions to reflect their own self interest needs to be replaced with a 21st century Ubermensch or new political aristocracy that is able to impose on the masses a sin-free, enlightened order. Redemption comes through man's inability to choose the indulgence of sin, and as such the anointed elite - having removed man's freedom - become the deliverers of man's salvation by taking upon themselves the burden of choice. Mankind, now being absolved of the burden of freedom, can live content without the anxiety of responsibility. However beautiful the veneer of his lofty rhetoric, this "Wellspring" is in the end enslavement. The only way to deliver mankind from the demon Mammon will be by removing the greatest gift of the gods - freedom. In this Faustian exchange we are guaranteed the Marxist security of bread, authoritarian certainty of order and utopian unity of world government. Far from new, McCarragher's Wellspring of Radical Hope is one more self-righteous proclamation by a moral prig intent on delivering mankind to elusive Olympian heights. Beyond the rhetoric, one suspects this experiment would end as other such utopian pursuits have concluded in history - hopeless.

Permutation: do both – capitalism is inevitable, but the plan *reforms it* in ways that make it sustainable.

Wilson 2001

[John. Progressive Author, Founder of the Institute for College Freedom. *How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives*, 2001. GoogleBooks, Pg 121-3]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go in to the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town- the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

Capitalism is ethical—provides means to better lives

Saunders 7 – fellow, Center for Independent Studies (Peter, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html)

What Clive Hamilton airily dismisses as a **growth** fetish' has **resulted in one hour of work today delivering twenty-five times more value** than it did in 1850. **This has freed huge chunks of our time for** leisure, art, sport, learning, and other **'soul-enriching' pursuits**. Despite all the exaggerated talk of an 'imbalance' between work and family life, the average Australian today spends a much greater proportion of his or her lifetime free of work than they would had they belonged to any previous generation in history. There is another sense, too, in which **capitalism has freed individuals so they can pursue worthwhile lives**, and that lies in its record of undermining tyrannies and dictatorships. As examples like Pinochet's Chile and Putin's Russia vividly demonstrate, a free economy does not guarantee a democratic polity or a society governed by the rule of law. But as Milton Friedman once pointed out, these latter conditions are never found in the absence of a free economy.(12) Historically, it was capitalism that delivered humanity from the 'soul-destroying' weight of feudalism. Later, it freed millions from the dead hand of totalitarian socialism. While capitalism may not be a sufficient condition of human freedom, it is almost certainly a necessary one. [continues] **Wherever populations have a chance to move, the flow is always towards capitalism**, not away from it. **The authorities never had a problem keeping West Germans out of East Germany, South Koreans out of North Korea, or Taiwanese out of Communist China.** The attraction of living in a capitalist society is not just that the economy works. It is also that **if your version of the good life leads you to turn your back on capitalism**, you don't have to pick up sticks and move away. If you don't like capitalism, there is no need to bribe people-smugglers to get you out of the country. **You simply** buy a plot of land, **build your mud-brick house, and drop out** (or, like Clive, you set up your own think tank and sell books urging others to drop out).

2AC Long

First on the K, our framework is plan-focus, means we get to weigh the aff against the K, key to most fairness and education, the role of the ballot is the best policy option

No prior questions --- pragmatic utility of the plan is sufficient to vote aff

Owen 2 – David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7

Commenting on the 'philosophical turn' in IR, Wæver remarks that '[a] frenzy for words like "epistemology" and "ontology" often signals this philosophical turn', although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.⁴ However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, 'theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program' in that it 'dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory'.⁵ The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since 'whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry'.⁶ Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in

IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

Also no link ...

the plan is not “part and parcel” of capitalism. The ocean has been exploited and polluted as a result of the flawed environmental policies of the past. The plan moves to *resolve* these problems and is taking steps away from capitalism as a result

Perm do the plan then the alt in all other instances

Their alternative is hopeless utopianism – human nature. AND cap is organic, their static representations are flawed

Hunter 11 [Mark Hunter is Professor of Humanities at St. Petersburg College. June 21, 2011 To Attack Capitalism Is To Attack Human Nature
http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2011/06/21/to_attack_capitalism_is_to_attack_human_nature_99087.html]

McCarragher's denunciation of capitalism is in fact an attack on human nature disguised as political discourse. The "pernicious" traits he attributes to capitalism are, in fact, traits globally present in every political/social order—in many cases far worse in non-capitalistic societies—because they are traits of humanity itself. His entire argument against capitalism consists of nothing more than an elaborate correlation-proves-causation fallacy (cum hoc ergo propter hoc - "with this, therefore because of this"). He wants us to believe that since capitalism contains greed it causes greed. Furthermore, McCarragher seems content to overlook the fact that capitalism is an organic economic system not created as much as evolving naturally as a consequence of free individuals interacting with other free individuals. Private property and the production of goods may be a part of capitalism, but its most essential virtue is as a guardian of man's freedom. Criticizing capitalism for its avarice is not unlike condemning representative democracy for its failure to elect the wisest of men - each may occur, but it is not relevant to their fundamental purpose. Both capitalism and representative democracy maximize freedom by diffusing power and responsibility across the broadest spectrum of society. Rigid control is antithetical to freedom and it is this that most vexes the liberal intellectual. What McCarragher is unwilling to come to terms with is that his inherent criticism of capitalism is not so much an indictment of capitalism but rather a revealing supposition he is making about humanity itself. His attack on capitalism masks a general contempt for a free people who in his worldview will inevitably choose a path of greed and avarice unless a coercive political order prevents it. Therefore, any liberal political/economic system proposed to replace capitalism must have at its core a process

through which the masses are controlled and coerced to overcome the human attributes so abhorred by the liberal intellectual that he wrongly attributes to capitalism rather than people. McCarragher presents the reader with a moral crusade cleverly cloaked as political theory. He sees the Deadly Sins ever present in modern capitalism, and like the fourth century ascetic Evagrius Ponticus, McCarragher seems particularly obsessed with man's rapacious gluttony. While capitalism's natural and organic nature is condemned for its "deliberate nurturance of our vilest qualities" he fails to put forth the ramifications of the artificial and contrived alternative. The progressive alternative to capitalism must of necessity resemble Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor because the crux of the matter for both modern liberals and Dostoyevsky is human freedom. The infinite variety that is millions of people making millions of decisions to reflect their own self interest needs to be replaced with a 21st century Ubermensch or new political aristocracy that is able to impose on the masses a sin-free, enlightened order. Redemption comes through man's inability to choose the indulgence of sin, and as such the anointed elite - having removed man's freedom - become the deliverers of man's salvation by taking upon themselves the burden of choice. Mankind, now being absolved of the burden of freedom, can live content without the anxiety of responsibility. However beautiful the veneer of his lofty rhetoric, this "Wellspring" is in the end enslavement. The only way to deliver mankind from the demon Mammon will be by removing the greatest gift of the gods - freedom. In this Faustian exchange we are guaranteed the Marxist security of bread, authoritarian certainty of order and utopian unity of world government. Far from new, McCarragher's Wellspring of Radical Hope is one more self-righteous proclamation by a moral prig intent on delivering mankind to elusive Olympian heights. Beyond the rhetoric, one suspects this experiment would end as other such utopian pursuits have concluded in history - hopeless.

Permutation: do both – capitalism is inevitable, but the plan reforms it in ways that make it sustainable.

Wilson 2001

[John. Progressive Author, Founder of the Institute for College Freedom. *How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives*, 2001. GoogleBooks, Pg 121-3]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the

far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

Only perm solves: Green investment now is crucial in the short term – starting now is key to avoid extinction from warming. Green investment also leads to a transition from capitalism.

Schwartzman (Professor in the Department of Biology at Howard University, PhD in Geochemistry from Brown University) **11**

(David, Green New Deal: An Ecosocialist Perspective, Capitalism Nature Socialism, Volume 22, Issue 3, 18 Aug, pages 49-56)

Indeed, imposing such non-market limits is imperative, but the struggle to impose them must begin in capitalist societies now, and not be posed simply as the policies of future socialism. Yes, aggressive energy conservation is imperative, especially in the United States and other countries of the global North. We can all live better with a sharp reduction of wasteful consumption, breathe clean air, drink clean water, and eat organic food. Nevertheless, there needs to be a global increase in the power capacity, employing clean energy and not fossil fuels or nuclear power, to insure every child born on this planet has the material requirements for the highest quality of life (Schwartzman and Schwartzman 2011).

But should we anticipate that Green Capitalism, even pushed to its limits by class struggle, could indefinitely postpone the final demise of global capitalism and could actually replace the present unsustainable energy base with a renewable power infrastructure fast enough to avoid catastrophic climate change (C3)? I submit this prospect is highly unlikely. The legacy and political economy of real existing capitalism alone makes *global* solar capitalism a delusion (Schwartzman 2009). While the Pentagon pretends to go “green,” it remains the servant of the imperial system protecting fossil fuel and strategic metals flowing into the MIC, the Military Industrial (Fossil Fuel, Nuclear, State Terror) Complex. The immense power of the MIC is the biggest obstacle to implementing an effective prevention program that has a plausible chance of avoiding C3. The avoidance of C3 requires an end to coal and fossil fuel addiction, giving up the nuclear option, and a rapid conversion to a high-efficiency solar energy infrastructure.

To summarize, the MIC is at present the biggest single obstacle to preventing C3 because: It is the present core of global capital reproduction with its colossal waste of energy and material resources. The fossil fuel and nuclear industries are integrated within the MIC. The MIC has a dominant role in setting the domestic and foreign policy agenda of the United States and other leading capitalist countries. The Pentagon is the “global oil-protection service” for both the U.S. imperial agenda (Klare 2007) and the transnational capital class itself (e.g., Robinson 2004). The MIC's Imperial Agenda blocks the global cooperation and equity required to prevent C3.

Nevertheless, what the struggle for a GND [Green New Deal] can accomplish is very significant, indeed critical to confronting the challenge of preventing C3 [Catastrophic Climate Change]. Humanity cannot afford to wait for socialism to replace capitalism

to begin implementing this prevention program [Italics Original]. And I have argued that starting this prevention program under existing capitalism can open up a path toward ecosocialist transition, indeed a 21st century Socialism worthy of its name. Climate science tells us we must proceed now for any plausible chance of avoiding tipping points plunging us into C3. Green job creation is likewise the creation of a new working-class sector committed to ending the fossil fuel addiction. Such an historic shift to renewable energy supplies would be comparable to the industrial revolution that replaced plant power in the form of wood and agricultural products with coal.

Double bind either the permutation resolves the link or the alt is not strong enough to solve

Capitalism is ethical—provides means to better lives

Saunders 7 – fellow, Center for Independent Studies (Peter, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html)

What Clive Hamilton airily dismisses as a growth fetish' has resulted in one hour of work today delivering twenty-five times more value than it did in 1850. This has freed huge chunks of our time for leisure, art, sport, learning, and other 'soul-enriching' pursuits. Despite all the exaggerated talk of an 'imbalance' between work and family life, the average Australian today spends a much greater proportion of his or her lifetime free of work than they would had they belonged to any previous generation in history. There is another sense, too, in which capitalism has freed individuals so they can pursue worthwhile lives, and that lies in its record of undermining tyrannies and dictatorships. As examples like Pinochet's Chile and Putin's Russia vividly demonstrate, a free economy does not guarantee a democratic polity or a society governed by the rule of law. But as Milton Friedman once pointed out, these latter conditions are never found in the absence of a free economy.(12) Historically, it was capitalism that delivered humanity from the 'soul-destroying' weight of feudalism. Later, it freed millions from the dead hand of totalitarian socialism. While capitalism may not be a sufficient condition of human freedom, it is almost certainly a necessary one. [continues] Wherever populations have a chance to move, the flow is always towards capitalism, not away from it. The authorities never had a problem keeping West Germans out of East Germany, South Koreans out of North Korea, or Taiwanese out of Communist China. The attraction of living in a capitalist society is not just that the economy works. It is also that if your version of the good life leads you to turn your back on capitalism, you don't have to pick up sticks and move away. If you don't like capitalism, there is no need to bribe people-smugglers to get you out of the country. You simply buy a plot of land, build your mud-brick house, and drop out (or, like Clive, you set up your own think tank and sell books urging others to drop out).

Only the permutation can achieve successful progress – pure ideological rejection of all state action only allows exploitation to continue.

Harvey 10 David, Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

The co-revolutionary theory laid out earlier would suggest that there is no way that an anti-capitalist social order can be constructed without seizing state power, radically transforming it and reworking the constitutional and institutional framework that currently supports private property, the market system and endless capital

accumulation. Inter-state competition and geoeconomic and geopolitical struggles over everything from trade and money to questions of hegemony are also either far too significant to be left to local social movements or cast aside as too big to contemplate. How the architecture of the state-finance nexus is to be reworked, along with the pressing question of the common measure of value given by money, cannot be ignored in the quest to construct alternatives to capitalist political economy. To ignore the state and the dynamics of the inter-state system is therefore a ridiculous idea for any anti-capitalist revolutionary movement to accept. The fourth broad trend is constituted by all the social movements that are not so much guided by any particular political philosophy or leanings but by the pragmatic need to resist displacement and dispossession (through gentrification, industrial development, dam construction, water privatisation, the dismantling of social services and public educational opportunities, or whatever). In this instance the focus on daily life in the city, town, village or wherever provides a material base for political organising against the threats that state policies and capitalist interests invariably pose to vulnerable populations. Again, there is a vast array of social movements of this sort, some of which can become radicalised over time as they come to realise more and more that the problems are systemic rather than particular and local. The bringing-together of such social movements into alliances on the land (like the landless movement in Brazil or peasants mobilising against land and resource grabs by capitalist corporations in India) or in urban contexts (the right to the city movements in Brazil and now the United States) suggest the way may be open to create broader alliances to discuss and confront the systemic forces that underpin the particularities of gentrification, dam construction, privatisation or whatever. Driven by pragmatism rather than by ideological preconceptions, these movements nevertheless can arrive at systemic understandings out of their own experience. To the degree that many of them exist in the same space, such as within the metropolis, they can (as supposedly happened with the factory workers in the early stages of the industrial revolution) make common cause and begin to forge, on the basis of their own experience, a consciousness of how capitalism works and what it is that might be done collectively. This is the terrain where the figure of the 'organic intellectual' leader, made so much of in the early twentieth-century Marxist writer Antonio Gramsci's work, the autodidact who comes to understand the world first hand through bitter experiences, but shapes his or her understanding of capitalism more generally, has a great deal to say. To listen to the peasant leaders of the MST in Brazil or the leaders of the anticorporate land grab movement in India is a privileged education. In this instance the task of the educated discontented is to magnify the subaltern voice so that attention can be paid to the circumstances of exploitation and repression and the answers that can be shaped into an anti-capitalist programme.

A2 Global warming/2AC timeframe/FW card

Short timeframe for action means quick policy solutions are key – otherwise runaway warming will cause extinction and prevent radical changes to society [Revolution? Ain't nobody got time for that]

Parenti 13

(Christian, "A Radical Approach to the Climate Crisis" [<http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/a-radical-approach-to-the-climate-crisis>] Summer //mtc)

Several strands of green thinking maintain that capitalism is incapable of a sustainable relationship with non-human nature because, as an economic system, capitalism has a growth imperative while the earth is finite. One finds versions of this argument in the literature of eco-socialism, deep ecology, eco-anarchism, and even among many mainstream greens who, though typically declining to actually name the economic system, are fixated on the dangers of "growth." All this may be true. Capitalism, a system in which privately owned firms must continuously out-produce and out-sell their competitors, may be incapable of accommodating itself to the limits of the natural world. However, that is not the same question as whether capitalism can solve the more immediate climate crisis. Because of its magnitude, the climate crisis can appear as the sum total of all environmental problems—deforestation, over-fishing, freshwater depletion, soil erosion, loss of biodiversity, chemical contamination. But halting greenhouse gas emissions is a much more specific problem, the most pressing subset of the larger apocalyptic panorama. And the very bad news is, time has run out. As I write this, news arrives of an ice-free arctic summer by 2050. Scientists once assumed that would not happen for hundreds of years. Dealing with climate change by first achieving radical social transformation—be it a socialist or anarchist or deep-ecological/neo-primitive revolution, or a nostalgia-based localista conversion back to a mythical small-town capitalism—would be a very long and drawn-out, maybe even multigenerational, struggle. It would be marked by years of mass education and organizing of a scale and intensity not seen in most core capitalist states since the 1960s or even the 1930s. Nor is there any guarantee that the new system would not also degrade the soil, lay waste to the forests, despoil bodies of water, and find itself still addicted to coal and oil. Look at the history of "actually existing socialism" before its collapse in 1991. To put it mildly, the economy was not at peace with nature. Or consider the vexing complexities facing the left social democracies of Latin America. Bolivia, and Ecuador, states run by socialists who are beholden to very powerful, autonomous grassroots movements, are still very dependent on petroleum revenue. A more radical approach to the crisis of climate change begins not with a long-term vision of an alternate society but with an honest engagement with the very compressed timeframe that current climate science implies. In the age of climate change, these are the real parameters of politics. Hard Facts. The scientific consensus, expressed in peer-reviewed and professionally vetted and published scientific literature, runs as follows: For the last 650,000 years atmospheric levels of CO₂—the primary heat-trapping gas—have hovered at around 280 parts per million (ppm). At no point in the preindustrial era did CO₂ concentrations go above 300 ppm. By 1959, they had reached 316 ppm and are now over 400 ppm. And the rate of emissions is accelerating. Since 2000, the world has pumped almost 100 billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere—about a quarter of all CO₂ emissions since 1750. At current rates, CO₂

levels will double by mid-century. ¶ Climate scientists believe that any increase in average global temperatures beyond 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels will lead to dangerous climate change, causing large-scale desertification, crop failure, inundation of coastal cities, mass migration to higher and cooler ground, widespread extinctions of flora and fauna, proliferating disease, and possible social collapse. Furthermore, scientists now understand that the earth's climate system has not evolved in a smooth linear fashion. Paleoclimatology has uncovered evidence of sudden shifts in the earth's climate regimes. Ice ages have stopped and started not in a matter of centuries, but decades. Sea levels (which are actually uneven across the globe) have risen and fallen more rapidly than was once believed. ¶ Throughout the climate system, there exist dangerous positive-feedback loops and tipping points. A positive-feedback loop is a dynamic in which effects compound, accelerate, or amplify the original cause. Tipping points in the climate system reflect the fact that causes can build up while effects lag. Then, when the effects kick in, they do so all at once, causing the relatively sudden shift from one climate regime to another. ¶ Thus, the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says rich countries like the United States must cut emissions 25 percent to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020—only seven years away—and thereafter make precipitous cuts to 90 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. This would require global targets of 10 percent reductions in emissions per annum, starting now. Those sorts of emissions reductions have only occurred during economic depressions. Russia's near total economic collapse in the early 1990s saw a 37 percent decrease in CO2 emissions from 1990 to 1995, under conditions that nobody wants to experience. ¶ The political implications of all this are mind-bending. As daunting as it may sound, it means that it is this society and these institutions that must cut emissions. That means, in the short-term, realistic climate politics are reformist politics, even if they are conceived of as part of a longer-term anti-capitalist project of totally economic re-organization. ¶ Dreaming the Rational ¶ Of course, successful reformism often involves radical means and revolutionary demands. What other sort of political pressure would force the transnational ruling classes to see the scientific truth of the situation? But let us assume for a second that political elites faced enough pressure to force them to act. What would be the rational first steps to stave off climate chaos? ¶

CAP GOOD

Cap Sustainable

Capitalism is self-correcting – profit motive ensures sustainability.

Eichenwald 2 (Kurt Eichenwald, "The Nation: Clay Feet; Could Capitalists Actually Bring Down Capitalism?" 6-30-2002, Lexis-Nexis Universe)

OVER the last few centuries, capitalism has been the heartiest contender in the global bout for economic supremacy. It emerged from its decades-long death match with communism as the unquestioned victor. Its dust-up with socialism barely lasted a few rounds. It flourished in wartime, and survived wrongheaded assaults from embargoes and tariffs. Even terrorism aimed at capitalism's heart failed to deliver a knock-out punch.

But now, a staggering rush of corporate debacles is raising a disturbing question: can capitalism survive the capitalists themselves? The scandals that have oozed out of corporate America with alarming regularity in recent months have repeatedly featured executives betraying the marketplace for their own short-term self-interest. From Enron to Global Crossing, Adelphia to WorldCom, the details differ but the stories boil down to the same theme: the companies lied about their performance, and investors paid the price. To those inured to corporate wrongdoing -- perhaps by the insider trading scandals or the savings and loan debacle of recent decades -- the latest scourge of white-collar malfeasance might seem like more of the same, with greedy executives cutting corners to make a profit. But in truth, the corporate calamities of the new millennium are of a different ilk, one that challenges the credibility of the financial reporting system, and in turn the faith of investors in the capital markets -- the very engine that has driven capitalism to its success. It wasn't supposed to be like this. In the wake of the stock market crash in 1929 and the ensuing revelation of the scams and rigged dealings that had helped inflate the market, America faced what appeared to be capitalism's chief vulnerability. Through Senate hearings in the early 1930's with the special counsel Ferdinand Pecora, investors learned about stock price manipulation, insider trading and profiteering through so-called investment trusts, all of which had made fortunes for the capitalists, while costing investors their savings. How did it happen? Capitalism, at its most basic, dictates that the company producing the best product at the lowest price wins. For capitalists, victory is measured solely in profits. Left to their own devices, it was clear, some capitalists would aggressively pursue profits even if it meant cheating the investors who provided all the capital. So, the game stayed the same, but the government put in referees. Congress passed the Securities Exchange Act of 1933 and 1934, and created a new federal agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, to enforce those laws. Disclosure became the centerpiece of the system. Companies could pretty much make whatever business decision they wanted, so long as the material information was revealed to investors in periodic filings with the S.E.C. The result was an entire bulwark of protections: the board of directors entrusted with overseeing corporate managements, the independent accounting firms relied upon to insure the numbers were accurate, the government regulators in place to supervise the rules. Despite all the apparent bricks and mortar of these protections, they turned out to be as permanent and impenetrable as smoke. At bottom, the system still relied on faith -- just in someone besides the top executives or company owners. The trust was given to the competence of the directors, the integrity of the accountants and the abilities of regulators. That was evident back in 1933, when a member of Congress asked Col. A. H. Carter, senior partner of Deloitte Haskins & Sells: if accountants would be auditing the companies, who would be auditing the accountants? The reply was noble -- and proved to be hollow. "Our conscience," Colonel Carter said. By the late 90's, as is now becoming clear, that foundation of personal integrity had been eroded by easy profits. Eventually, driven by shareholder expectations and their own stock-option packages, some executives began hiding losses incurred in the faltering economy, manipulating the numbers they reported to investors. The fact that their companies are, in all probability, bad apples among many, many honest corporations makes little difference. By being deceptive on their disclosures for short-term gain, these capitalists have led investors to question the reliability of all the reported data -- and the reliability of the checks and balances instituted to keep the data valid. Not only has the accounting branch of the market been tarred by Arthur Anderson's enabling of Enron's schemes, but, from company to company, insular boards of directors, incompetent internal auditors and underfunded regulatory oversight have allowed the perception of stringent standards and protections to wither. IT is not as if corporate cheating comes out of nowhere. History holds many tales of businessmen who begin breaking the rules in boom times, when rising stock prices literally give them a sense of invincibility. Then, as the markets turn -- and they always turn -- these men try to preserve their power and wealth with more wrongdoing. They keep believing that stock prices will rise and cover their misdeeds. They really seem to think they won't get caught. This time, the crisis in investor confidence is becoming a primary policy issue for the leaders of the industrialized world -- a world largely formed on the American model, and that the United States has insisted virtually everyone else follow, too. "It's a preoccupation of all the leaders that this is creating at this time a lack of confidence in the markets, and people are not sure about the way that information is transmitted to the public," Jean Chretien, the prime minister of Canada, said on the first day of a summit of the Group of Eight leading industrialized nations. Workers are going to take it on the chin. WorldCom started laying off 17,000 people on Friday. Many more people, at many other companies, are worried. And investors -- shaken by the past and uncertain where the next disaster might emerge -- are moving their money about,

dumping many stocks and moving cash into safer havens, like Treasury bonds. Could the short-term, self-rewarding mentality of a handful of capitalists truly destroy capitalism? Bring on hundreds of bankruptcies, force banks under, end the giving of loans? Destroy America as we know it? Not very likely. The system has a built-in corrective factor, which kicks in when abuses go too far. Harm to investor confidence harms the market, which harms the ability of corporations to raise the capital they need to grow and be profitable. Eventually, the capitalists' desire get investor confidence back wins the day. Already, after years of sniffing at naysayers who wagged fingers about fundamentals, investors seem to be discovering a new affection for stodgy old stock analysis. "Nobody was paying attention to seemingly boring topics like accounting and corporate governance," said Troy Paredes, an associate professor at Washington University School of Law. "People are realizing that those are the things that matter." At the same time, a range of proposals has emerged from Wall Street and Washington to overhaul corporate America. The S.E.C. is making moves to get tough on accounting standards. But still, there are some capitalists who are keeping their eyes on their short-term prize, betting that, despite all the evidence of corporate lies, investors need no substantial changes to justify keeping their confidence in the market. Many Wall Street firms are lobbying to cut back the power and authority of state securities regulators, the very individuals who historically have been particularly hard-nosed in their dedication to proper disclosure and investor protection. Meanwhile, accounting firms are doing their all to beat back efforts to strengthen their regulation. On Capitol Hill, there were rumors that tough accounting legislation was dead -- until WorldCom exploded. ULTIMATELY, capitalism will almost certainly survive this onslaught from the capitalists -- if only because survival is the most profitable outcome for all involved. Investors may well emerge wiser, less willing to jump into the latest fad and more concerned about the fundamentals. In the end, though, the experts say, that will only last as long as the memory of this period, which will wash away the next time unbridled exuberance creates a booming market. "People eventually will emerge from this more discriminating about how they invest," said David Hawkins, a professor at Harvard Business School and Merrill Lynch's accounting consultant. "But this isn't the last time we'll go through this. People will forget, and it will all happen again."

Cap Good – Environment

Cap is not the root cause of environmental destruction, it actually helps the environment.

Payne 95

Rodger A. Payne. (Assistant professor of political science at the University of Louisville. He is director of the Grawemeyer Award in Ideas Improving World Order and a past recipient of a Social Science Research Council-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship in International Peace and Security.) "Freedom and the Environment". National Endowment for Democracy and the Johns Hopkins University Press. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v006/6.3payne.html#authbio.

5) Open markets. All democracies have had market-based economic systems; it therefore seems reasonable to consider any potential [End Page 48] advantages of markets when assessing the "green" characteristics of democracies. Such consideration seems particularly apposite when one recalls that many of the ardent environmentalist critics of democracy named earlier have cited its emphasis on private property and open markets as a grave shortcoming. In fact, however, capitalism is not the cause of environmental degradation. After all, nonmarket economies have exploited the environment quite ruthlessly, and mounting evidence indicates that some businesses in open economies are finding strong incentives to protect the environment. Additionally, democratic governments are increasingly utilizing market incentives to address ecological problems. The key question is how to account for the diffused environmental costs ("externalities") of economic activity. To begin with, green consumerism can reshape corporate conduct by offering incentives for environmentally sound business practices. An increasing number of consumers are "voting with their pocketbooks" and thereby successfully urging business to take responsibility for reducing waste and pollution. For example, McDonald's, responding in part to schoolchildren mailing styrofoam sandwich containers to its executives, revamped its product packaging and modified its "waste stream" in conjunction with recommendations offered by an environmental organization. Germany and other states have developed standardized labeling symbols so that consumers can identify and purchase products that are less harmful to the environment. Nonetheless, the future influence of green consumerism is at best unknown, and could be limited by a variety of informational complexities. 15 Much more importantly, the marketing of environmental goods and services is becoming a major industry, and some enterprises are seeing the economic advantages of reducing waste and increasing operational efficiency. Corporations can profit from selling preventive and cleanup technologies and information to other businesses. This is already a large and growing source of world trade. For instance, while West European nations, Japan, and the United States together traded about \$20 billion worth of pollution-control devices in 1990, just two years later Germany alone was trading more than that amount. Domestic environmental transactions offer an even larger market. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) calculates that its member states individually spend between 0.8 and 1.5 percent of GDP on public and private pollution abatement and control. The overall total approached \$250 billion in 1992, and could shoot up by half again by 1997.

Capitalism is the only way to protect the environment.

Boston Globe, 95

Thomas C Palmer Jr, staff writer. "Capitalism called key to saving environment" LexisNexis

What many activists perceive as the enemy of the environment - capitalism - is in fact the only form of government that can sustain it, political scientist James Q. Wilson said. "Capitalism is the necessary, but not

sufficient, condition for environmental protection," Wilson said Friday night, accepting an award at the Gordon Public Policy Center at Brandeis University. "It is necessary because history has shown neither communism nor any other form of organized society can better protect air, water, land and life, he said. But it is insufficient because "it's hard to own a gray whale" or a scenic view, Wilson said. In the absence of ownership and the protective actions that go with it, "collective actions," or laws and regulations to protect elements of the environment, are necessary, he said. For 25 years a teacher at Harvard University and the author of "The Moral Sense," "Thinking About Crime" and many other books, Wilson decamped to his home state of California in 1990 and teaches at the University of California at Los Angeles. He joked that in this century several nations - like Korea, Vietnam and Germany - have "volunteered" to be cut in half, thus offering an experiment in which some forms of government perform better with respect to issues like the environment. Early environmentalists such as Barry Commoner and Rachel Carson blamed capitalism for environmental degradation, he said. "Then the Iron Curtain came down. We discovered a vast toxic waste dump. Capitalism works to protect the environment over the long run because it is a necessary condition for democracy, which allows individuals to act politically against those who would harm air or water quality, he said. Capitalism also brings relative prosperity, he said, allowing people to afford things other than basic necessities. "High-yield agriculture has led to one of the greatest reforestations in the history of man," Wilson said, referring to New England. Also, "it is easier to regulate a private firm than a government agency," he said, noting that Southern California Edison is always ahead of its publicly owned counterpart, Southern California Water and Power, in adopting new technologies. He attacked the press for scaring the public needlessly and for discouraging "policy entrepreneurs" who experiment with new solutions. Partly as a result of these exaggerations, Wilson said, "We cannot even carry on a debate . . . without grabbing each other's lapels, whitening our knuckles, and shouting in each other's faces."

Capitalism is necessary to sustainable solutions to environmental degradation

Barry 2007

[John. Professor of Politics at the University of Belfast. "Towards a Model of Green Political Economy: from Ecological Modernization to Economic Security" *The International Journal of Green Economics*, Vol 1 N4. 2007. Available via Ebscohost]

Economic analysis has been one of the weakest and least developed areas of broadly green/sustainable development thinking. For example, whatever analysis there is within the green political canon is largely utopian – usually based on an argument for the complete transformation of modern society and economy as the only way to deal with ecological catastrophe, an often linked to a critique of the socioeconomic failings of capitalism that echoed a broadly radical Marxist/socialist or anarchist analysis; or underdeveloped – due, in part, to the need to outline and develop other aspects of green political theory. However, this gap within green thinking has recently been filled by a number of scholars, activists, think tanks, and environmental NGOs who have outlined various models of green political economy to underpin sustainable development political aims, principles and objectives. The aim of this article is to offer a draft of a realistic, but critical, version of green political economy to underpin the economic dimensions of radical views about sustainable development. It is written explicitly with a view to encouraging others to think through this aspect of sustainable development in a collaborative manner. Combined realism and radicalism marks this article, which starts with the point that we cannot build or seek to create a sustainable economy ab nihlo, but must begin from where we are, with the structures, institutions, modes of production, laws and regulations that we already have. Of course, this does not mean simply accepting these as immutable or set in stone; after all, some of the current institutions, principles and structures underpinning the dominant economic model are the very causes of unsustainable development. We do need to recognise, however, that we must work with (and 'through' – in the terms of the original German Green Party's slogan of 'marching through the institutions') these existing structures, as well as change and reform and in some cases, abandon them as either unnecessary or positively harmful to the creation and maintenance of a sustainable economy and society. Equally, this article also recognises that an alternative economy and society must be based in the

reality that most people (in the West) will not democratically vote for a completely different type of society and economy. That reality must also accept that a 'green economy' is one that is recognisable to most people and that indeed safeguards and guarantees not just their basic needs but also aspirations (within limits). The realistic character of the thinking behind this article accepts that consumption and materialistic lifestyles are here to stay (so long as they do not transgress any of the critical thresholds of the triple bottom line) and indeed there is little to be gained by proposing alternative economic systems, which start from a complete rejection of consumption and materialism. The appeal to realism is in part an attempt to correct the common misperception (and self-perception) of green politics and economics requiring an excessive degree of self-denial and a puritanical asceticism (Goodin, 1992, p.18; Allison, 1991, p.170–178). While rejecting the claim that green political theory calls for the complete disavowal of materialistic lifestyles, it is true that green politics does require the collective reassessment of such lifestyles, and does require a degree of shared sacrifice. It does not mean, however, that we necessarily require the complete and across-the-board rejection of materialistic lifestyles. There must be room and tolerance in a green economy for people to live 'ungreen lives' so long as they do not 'harm' others, threaten long-term ecological sustainability or create unjust levels of socioeconomic inequalities. Thus, realism in this context is in part another name for the acceptance of a broadly 'liberal' or 'post-liberal' (but certainly not anti-liberal) green perspective.¹

Cap Good – Growth

Economic growth and continued production are the only way to prevent extinction.

Zey 98 (Michael, Executive Director – Expansionary Institute, Professor of Management – Montclair State University, *Seizing the Future*, p. 34, 39-40)

However, no outside force guarantees the continued progress of the human species, nor does anything mandate that the human species must even continue to exist. In fact, history is littered with races and civilizations that have disappeared without a trace. So, too, could the human species. There is no guarantee that the human species will survive even if we posit, as many have, a special purpose to the species' existence. Therefore, the species innately comprehends that it must engage in purposive actions in order to maintain its level of growth and progress. Humanity's future is conditioned by what I call the Imperative of Growth, a principle I will herewith describe along with its several corollaries. The Imperative of Growth states that in order to survive, any nation, indeed, the human race, must grow, both materially and intellectually. The Macroindustrial Era represents growth in the areas of both technology and human development, a natural stage in the evolution of the species' continued extension of its control over itself and its environment. Although 5 billion strong, our continued existence depends on our ability to continue the progress we have been making at higher and higher levels. Systems, whether organizations, societies, or cells, have three basic directions in which to move. They can grow, decline, or temporarily reside in a state of equilibrium. These are the choices. Choosing any alternative to growth, for instance, stabilization of production/consumption through zero-growth policies, could have alarmingly pernicious side effects, including extinction. The fifth corollary of the Imperative of Growth claims that a society can remain in a state of equilibrium only temporarily. In reality, a society seemingly in a phase where it neither improves nor regresses is actually in a transition to either growth or decline. Such periods easily seduce their contemporaries into a false sense of security, that their institutions will last forever, they have all the science they need, and there are no more challenges. In fact, during such periods some imagine that they have reached their "golden age," perhaps even the "end of history." During such periods of supposed equilibrium, the population ceases to prepare itself for new challenges and becomes risk averse. Importantly, they reject the idea that growth and progress are necessary for their survival! The sixth corollary evolves from the fifth. If the system chooses not to grow, it will decline and eventually disappear, either because other organisms or systems overtake it or because it is impossible to maintain itself even at static levels without in some way deteriorating. This is the Law of Spiraling Regression. It is indeed a curiosity of the late-twentieth-century culture that this truism has been ignored. In the morass of claims about the risks of technological growth and its impact on the ecosystem, the mainstream media and orthodox academics have decided not to consider what harm the full pursuance of zero growth or non growth might inflict on the sociotechnical system, which includes our technological infrastructure, culture, and standard of living.

Cap Good – Ethics

Capitalism is ethical—provides means to better lives

Saunders 7 – fellow, Center for Independent Studies (Peter, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html)

What Clive Hamilton airily dismisses as a 'growth fetish' has resulted in one hour of work today delivering twenty-five times more value than it did in 1850. This has freed huge chunks of our time for leisure, art, sport, learning, and other 'soul-enriching' pursuits. Despite all the exaggerated talk of an 'imbalance' between work and family life, the average Australian today spends a much greater proportion of his or her lifetime free of work than they would had they belonged to any previous generation in history. There is another sense, too, in which capitalism has freed individuals so they can pursue worthwhile lives, and that lies in its record of undermining tyrannies and dictatorships. As examples like Pinochet's Chile and Putin's Russia vividly demonstrate, a free economy does not guarantee a democratic polity or a society governed by the rule of law. But as Milton Friedman once pointed out, these latter conditions are never found in the absence of a free economy.⁽¹²⁾ Historically, it was capitalism that delivered humanity from the 'soul-destroying' weight of feudalism. Later, it freed millions from the dead hand of totalitarian socialism. While capitalism may not be a sufficient condition of human freedom, it is almost certainly a necessary one. [continues] Wherever populations have a chance to move, the flow is always towards capitalism, not away from it. The authorities never had a problem keeping West Germans out of East Germany, South Koreans out of North Korea, or Taiwanese out of Communist China. The attraction of living in a capitalist society is not just that the economy works. It is also that if your version of the good life leads you to turn your back on capitalism, you don't have to pick up sticks and move away. If you don't like capitalism, there is no need to bribe people-smugglers to get you out of the country. You simply buy a plot of land, build your mud-brick house, and drop out (or, like Clive, you set up your own think tank and sell books urging others to drop out).

Cap Good – War

Free market capitalism creates the largest incentives for peace.

Bandow '5 (Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, November 10th, 2005, Spreading Capitalism Is Good for Peace, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/spreading-capitalism-is-good-peace>)

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets.¶ The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism.¶ But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets.¶ An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanuel Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems.¶ Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq.¶ But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states.¶ Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of *Economic Freedom in the World*, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor.¶ The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches.¶ Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.¶ Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences.¶ Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains.¶ His conclusion hasn't gone unchallenged. Author R.J. Rummel, an avid proponent of the democratic peace theory, challenges Gartzke's methodology and worries that it "may well lead intelligent and policy-wise analysts and commentators to draw the wrong conclusions about the importance of democratization."¶ Gartzke responds in detail, noting that he relied on the same data as most democratic peace theorists. If it is true that democratic states don't go to war, then it also is true that "states with advanced free market economies never go to war with each other, either."¶ The point is not that democracy is valueless. Free political systems naturally entail free elections and are more likely to protect other forms of liberty - civil and economic, for instance.¶ However, democracy alone doesn't yield peace. To believe it does is dangerous: There's no panacea for creating a conflict-free world.¶ That doesn't mean that nothing can be done. But promoting open international markets - that is, spreading capitalism - is the best means to encourage peace as well as prosperity.¶ Notes Gartzke: "Warfare among developing nations will remain unaffected by the capitalist peace as long as the economies of many developing countries remain fettered by governmental control." Freeing those economies is critical.¶ It's a particularly important lesson for the anti-capitalist left. For the most part, the enemies of economic liberty also most stridently denounce war, often in near-pacifist terms. Yet they oppose the very economic policies most likely to encourage peaceful market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war.¶ Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

Capitalism solves war – different avenues of competition.

Gartzke 7 (Eric, associate professor of political science and a member of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, "The Capitalist Peace", *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 1, January 2007, Pp. 166–191)

if war is a product of incompatible interests and failed or abortive bargaining, peace ensues when states lack differences worthy of costly conflict, or when circumstances favor successful diplomacy. Realists and others argue that state interests are inherently incompatible, but this need be so only if state interests are narrowly defined or when conquest promises tangible benefits. Peace can result from at least three attributes of mature capitalist economies. First, the historic impetus to territorial expansion is tempered by the rising importance of intellectual and financial capital, factors that are more expediently enticed than conquered. Land does little to increase the worth of the advanced economies while resource competition is more cheaply pursued through markets than by means of military occupation. At the same time, development actually increases the ability of states to project power when incompatible policy objectives exist. Development affects who states fight (and what they fight over) more than the overall frequency of warfare. Second, substantial overlap in the foreign policy goals of developed nations in the post–World War II period further limits the scope and scale of conflict. Lacking territorial tensions, consensus about how to order the international system has allowed liberal states to cooperate and to accommodate minor differences. Whether this affinity among liberal states will persist in the next century is a question open to debate. Finally, the rise of global capital markets creates a new mechanism for competition and communication for states that might otherwise be forced to fight. Separately, these processes influence patterns of warfare in the modern world. Together, they explain the absence of war among states in the developed world and account for the dyadic observation of the democratic peace.

Permutation – Reformism

Only the permutation can achieve successful progress – pure ideological rejection of all state action only allows exploitation to continue.

Harvey 10 David, Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, (The Enigma of Capital, and the crises of capitalism 224-228)

The co-revolutionary theory laid out earlier would suggest that there is no way that an anti-capitalist social order can be constructed without seizing state power, radically transforming it and reworking the constitutional and institutional framework that currently supports private property, the market system and endless capital accumulation. Inter-state competition and geoeconomic and geopolitical struggles over everything from trade and money to questions of hegemony are also either far too significant to be left to local social movements or cast aside as too big to contemplate. How the architecture of the state-finance nexus is to be reworked, along with the pressing question of the common measure of value given by money, cannot be ignored in the quest to construct alternatives to capitalist political economy. To ignore the state and the dynamics of the inter-state system is therefore a ridiculous idea for any anti-capitalist revolutionary movement to accept. The fourth broad trend is constituted by all the social movements that are not so much guided by any particular political philosophy or leanings but by the pragmatic need to resist displacement and dispossession (through gentrification, industrial development, dam construction, water privatisation, the dismantling of social services and public educational opportunities, or whatever). In this instance the focus on daily life in the city, town, village or wherever provides a material base for political organising against the threats that state policies and capitalist interests invariably pose to vulnerable populations. Again, there is a vast array of social movements of this sort, some of which can become radicalised over time as they come to realise more and more that the problems are systemic rather than particular and local. The bringing-together of such social movements into alliances on the land (like the landless movement in Brazil or peasants mobilising against land and resource grabs by capitalist corporations in India) or in urban contexts (the right to the city movements in Brazil and now the United States) suggest the way may be open to create broader alliances to discuss and confront the systemic forces that underpin the particularities of gentrification, dam construction, privatisation or whatever. Driven by pragmatism rather than by ideological preconceptions, these movements nevertheless can arrive at systemic understandings out of their own experience. To the degree that many of them exist in the same space, such as within the metropolis, they can (as supposedly happened with the factory workers in the early stages of the industrial revolution) make common cause and begin to forge, on the basis of their own experience, a consciousness of how capitalism works and what it is that might be done collectively. This is the terrain where the figure of the 'organic intellectual' leader, made so much of in the early twentieth-century Marxist writer Antonio Gramsci's work, the autodidact who comes to understand the world first hand through bitter experiences, but shapes his or her understanding of capitalism more generally, has a great deal to say. To listen to the peasant leaders of the MST in Brazil or the leaders of the anticorporate land grab movement in India is a privileged education. In this instance the task of the educated discontented is to magnify the subaltern voice so that attention can be paid to the circumstances of exploitation and repression and the answers that can be shaped into an anti-capitalist programme.

LINK DEBATE

No link

the plan is not “part and parcel” of capitalism. The ocean has been exploited and polluted as a result of the flawed environmental policies of the past. The plan moves to *resolve* these problems.

ALT DEBATE

No Alternative

Alternatives to capitalism fail – lack of individual choice results in tyranny or failure

Meltzer 9, Professor of Political Economy at Carnegie Mellon University's School of Business, Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, First Recipient of the AEI Irving Kristol Award, and Chairman of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission, (Allan, March 12, "Why Capitalism?" 2008-2009 Bradley Lecture Series, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.29525,filter.all/pub_detail.asp)

Alternatives to Capitalism Critics of capitalism emphasize their dislike of greed and self-interest. They talk a great deal about social justice and fairness, but they do not propose an acceptable alternative to achieve their ends. The alternatives that have been tried are types of Socialism or Communism or other types of authoritarian rule. Anti-capitalist proposals suffer from two crippling drawbacks. First, they ignore the Kantian principle about human imperfection. Second, they ignore individual differences. In place of individual choice under capitalism, they substitute rigid direction done to achieve some proclaimed end such as equality, fairness, or justice. These ends are not precise and, most important, individuals differ about what is fair and just. In practice, the rulers' choices are enforced, often using fear, terror, prison, or other punishment. The history of the twentieth century illustrates how enforcement of promised ends became the justification for deplorable means. And the ends were not realized. Transferring resource allocation decisions to government bureaus does not eliminate crime, greed, self-dealing, conflict of interest, and corruption. Experience tells us these problems remain. The form may change, but as Kant recognized, the problems continue. Ludwig von Mises recognized in the 1920s that fixing prices and planning resource use omitted an essential part of the allocation problem. Capitalism allocates by letting relative prices adjust to equal the tradeoffs expressed by buyers' demands. Fixing prices eliminates the possibility of efficient allocation and replaces consumer choice with official decisions. Some gain, but others lose; the losers want to make choices other than those that are dictated to them. Not all Socialist societies have been brutal. In the nineteenth century, followers of Robert Owen, the Amana people, and many others chose a Socialist system. Israeli pioneers chose a collectivist system, the kibbutz. None of these arrangements produced sustainable growth. None survived. All faced the problem of imposing allocative decisions that satisfied the decision-making group, sometimes a majority, often not. Capitalism recognizes that where individual wants differ, the market responds to the mass; minorities are free to develop their favored outcome. Walk down the aisles of a modern supermarket. There are products that satisfy many different tastes or beliefs. Theodor Adorno was a leading critic of postwar capitalism as it developed in his native Germany, in Europe, and in the United States. He found the popular culture vulgar, and he distrusted the workers' choices. He wanted a Socialism that he hoped would uphold the values he shared with other intellectuals. Capitalism, he said, valued work too highly and true leisure too little. He disliked jazz, so he was not opposed to Hitler's ban in the 1930s. But Adorno offered no way of achieving the culture he desired other than to impose his tastes on others and ban all choices he disliked. This appealed to people who shared his view. Many preferred American pop culture whenever they had the right to choose. Capitalism permits choices and the freedom to make them. Some radio stations play jazz, some offer opera and symphonies, and many play pop music. Under capitalism, advertisers choose what they sponsor, and they sponsor programs that people choose to hear or watch. Under Socialism, the public watches and hears what someone chooses for them. The public had little choice. In Western Europe change did not come until boats outside territorial limits offered choice. The Templeton Foundation recently ran an advertisement reporting the answers several prominent intellectuals gave to the question: "Does the free market corrode moral character?" Several respondents recognized that free markets operate within a political system, a legal framework, and the rule of law. The slave trade and slavery became illegal in the nineteenth century. Before this a majority enslaved a minority. This is a major blot on the morality of democratic choice that public opinion and the law eventually removed. In the United States those who benefitted did not abandon slave owning until forced by a war. Most respondents to the Templeton question took a mixed stand. The philosopher John Gray recognized that greed and envy are driving forces under capitalism, but they often produce growth and raise living standards so that many benefit. But greed leads to outcomes like Enron and WorldCom that critics take as a characteristic of the system rather than as a characteristic of some individuals that remains under Socialism. Michael Walzer recognized that political activity also corrodes moral character, but he claimed it was regulated more effectively. One of the respondents discussed whether

capitalism was more or less likely to foster or sustain moral abuses than other social arrangements. Bernard-Henri Levy maintained that alternatives to the market such as fascism and Communism were far worse. None of the respondents mentioned Kant's view that mankind includes a range of individuals who differ in their moral character. Institutional and social arrangements like democracy and capitalism influence the moral choices individuals make or reject. No democratic capitalist country produced any crimes comparable to the murders committed by Hitler's Germany, Mao's China, or Lenin and Stalin's Soviet Union. As Lord Acton warned, concentrated power corrupts officials. Some use concentrated power to impose their will. Some allow their comrades to act as tyrants. Others proclaim that ends such as equality justify force to control opposition. Communism proclaimed a vision of equality that it never approached. It was unattainable because individuals differ about what is good. And what is good to them and for them is not the same as what is socially desirable to critics of capitalism. Kant's principle warns that utopian visions are unattainable. Capitalism does not offer a vision of perfection and harmony. Democratic capitalism combines freedom, opportunity, growth, and progress with restrictions on less desirable behavior. It creates societies that treat men and women as they are, not as in some utopian vision. In *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Karl Popper showed why utopian visions become totalitarian. All deviations from the utopian ideal must be prevented. The Enrons, WorldComs, and others of that kind show that dishonest individuals rise along with honest individuals. Those who use these examples to criticize capitalism do not use the same standard to criticize all governments as failed arrangements when a Watergate or bribery is uncovered. Nor do they criticize government when politicians promise but do not produce or achieve. We live after twenty-five to forty years of talk about energy, education, healthcare, and drugs. Governments promise and propose, but little if any progress is visible on these issues.

Alt Fails- Rejecting Cap Bad

The alternative fails – simply “rejecting capitalism” results in greater oppression Hanhnel 2007

[Robin. Prof Economics at American. “Eco-Localism: A Constructive Critique” *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, Vol 18 N2. 2007. Ebsco//GBS-JV]

Some anti-capitalists advocate denouncing capitalism as the root source of many of today's problems. But when asked what kind of economy should replace capitalism, they answer in deliberately vague and general terms: "a just and democratic economy" or "an economy that is not wasteful and destructive of the environment." There are understandable reasons to be concerned about the pitfalls of visionary thinking. But rejecting discussion and debate over how we can better organize our economic activities to achieve economic justice, economic democracy, and environmental sustainability is self-defeating—no more so than today, when the destruction wrought by capitalism to the natural world and the human community is becoming increasingly apparent and impossible to ignore.¶ Some hesitate to spell out how a post-capitalist economy should be run for fear of putting people off. They worry that saying we are anti-capitalist risks alienating people we work with in reform movements, since most people working in reform movements assume the capitalist system is sound and only flawed in its application. However, it makes little sense to risk putting people off by saying we reject the capitalist system itself without trying to explain in concrete terms what we want instead. Others eschew debates about economic vision for fear it will lead to sectarianism that divides us unnecessarily and distracts us from focusing on more urgent tasks. Given the history of sectarianism on the Left, there is every reason to fear this dynamic. But we must guard against sectarianism on many issues, and the advice to table economic vision would only be sensible if it were true that deliberations on this issue were unnecessary. Still others claim that specifying how societies or communities can create economic systems that incorporate social justice, environmental health, and other democratic values is totalitarian, because it robs those who will live in post-capitalist economies of their democratic right to manage their economy as they see fit when the time comes. This argument is nonsense. Since when did discussing difficult and momentous issues in advance impede deliberative democracy rather than advance it? I can't see that this would be a problem unless those debating such matters attempt to impose their formulae on future generations. And nobody I know who discusses democratic post-capitalist possibilities has any such pretensions.¶ Of course there is a time and place for everything. There are venues where pontificating on the inherent evils of the capitalist system is inappropriate and counterproductive. Similarly, there are venues where discussing arrangements for how those in worker councils could manage themselves or how different groups of workers and consumers might coordinate their interrelated activities fairly and efficiently is out of place. The question is not whether every commentary, speech, conference document, article, or book must explain how a problem today is linked to capitalism, or how it could be solved in an alternative economy. Rather, it is whether theorizing about economic vision and testing our convictions in the flesh, where possible, plays an important role in the movement to replace the economics of competition and greed with the economics of equitable cooperation. The simplest argument for the value of visionary thinking lies in the question: How can we know what steps to take unless we know where we want to go? For those of us who believe we are attempting to build a bridge from the economics of competition and greed to the economics of equitable cooperation, we must have some idea of where we want the bridge to end as well as where it must begin. But the strongest reason for embracing the issue of what we would do when capitalism falters is our track record of failure. This is not the first time people have been entreated to jettison capitalism for a better alternative. While communist economies were not failures for the reasons widely believed, they were colossal failures nonetheless. And they were certainly not the desirable alternative to capitalism that was promised. So people have every reason to be skeptical of those who claim there is a desirable alternative to capitalism. They also have every right to demand more than platitudes and generalities.¶ Reasonable people—not only doubting Thomases—want to know how our alternative to capitalism would differ from the last one and how it would work in concrete terms. Literally billions of people were misled by

our anti-capitalist predecessors, with terrible consequences. We should not deceive ourselves that many today are willing to accept our assurances on faith that we have it right this time. We avoid contentious issues about the alternative to capitalism only at our own peril.

Alt Fails – Transition Wars

Capitalist elites will resist the alt, causing global transition wars

Harris 2 [Lee, Policy Review, December, p3(13) The intellectual origins of America-Bashing]

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe.

Alt Fails – Totalizing

Total rejection of capitalism fragments resistance and makes it impossible to overcome a universalized system.

Gibson-Graham 96 (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Professor of Culture & Society @ University of West Sydney, “The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, 1996)

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could begin to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

Alt Fails – Violence

Alternatives to Capitalism lead to Violence.

Rummel 4 – prof. emeritus of political science at the University of Hawaii [Rudolph, The Killing Machine that is Marxism, Online]

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide. In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly than all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster. The Khmer Rouge – (Cambodian communists) who ruled Cambodia for four years – provide insight into why Marxists believed it necessary and moral to massacre so many of their fellow humans. Their Marxism was married to absolute power. They believed without a shred of doubt that they knew the truth, that they would bring about the greatest human welfare and happiness, and that to realize this utopia, they had to mercilessly tear down the old feudal or capitalist order and Buddhist culture, and then totally rebuild a communist society. Nothing could be allowed to stand in the way of this achievement. Government – the Communist Party – was above any law. All other institutions, religions, cultural norms, traditions and sentiments were expendable. The Marxists saw the construction of this utopia as a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism and inequality – and, as in a real war, noncombatants would unfortunately get caught in the battle. There would be necessary enemy casualties: the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, "wreckers," intellectuals, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, the rich and landlords. As in a war, millions might die, but these deaths would be justified by the end, as in the defeat of Hitler in World War II. To the ruling Marxists, the goal of a communist utopia was enough to justify all the deaths. The irony is that in practice, even after decades of total control, Marxism did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made living conditions worse than before the revolution. It is not by chance that the world's greatest famines have happened within the Soviet Union (about 5 million dead from 1921-23 and 7 million from 1932-3, including 2 million outside Ukraine) and communist China (about 30 million dead from 1959-61). Overall, in the last century almost 55 million people died in various Marxist famines and associated epidemics – a little over 10 million of them were intentionally starved to death, and the rest died as an unintended result of Marxist collectivization and agricultural policies. What is astonishing is that this "currency" of death by Marxism is not thousands or even hundreds of thousands, but millions of deaths. This is almost incomprehensible – it is as though the whole population of the American New England and Middle Atlantic States, or California and Texas, had been wiped out. And that around 35 million people escaped Marxist countries as refugees was an unequalled vote against Marxist utopian pretensions.

PERM DEBATE

Perm do both- Cap representation

Perm: do both

Their depiction of capitalism as monolithic makes it impossible to overcome – only concrete alternatives solve - plan is a step in the right direction

Gibson-Graham, 1996 (Katherine Gibson, Senior Fellow of Human Geography at Australian National University; Julie Graham, professor of Geography at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst; “The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It)”, p. 1-3)

Understanding capitalism has always been a project of the left, especially within the Marxian tradition. There, where knowledges of “capitalism” arguably originated, theory is accorded an explicit social role. From Marx to Lenin to the neo-Marxists of the post-World War II period, theorists have understood their work as contributing – whether proximately or distantly – to anticapitalist projects of political action. In this sense economic theory has related to politics as a subordinate and a servant: we understand the world in order to change it. Given the avowed servitude of left theory to left political action it is ironic (though not surprising) that understandings and images of capitalism can quite readily be viewed as contributing to a crisis in left politics. Indeed, and this is the argument we wish to make in this book, the project of understanding the beast has itself produced a beast, or even a bestiary; and the process of producing knowledge in service to politics has estranged rather than united understanding and action. Bringing these together again, or allowing them to touch in different ways, is one of our motivating aspirations.

“Capitalism” occupies a special and privileged place in the language of social representation. References to “capitalist society” are a commonplace of left and even mainstream social description, as are references – to the market, to the global economy, to postindustrial society – in which an unnamed capitalism is implicitly invoked as the defining and unifying moment of a complex economic and social formation. Just as the economic system in eastern Europe used confidently to be described as communist or socialist, so a general confidence in economic classification characterizes representations of an increasingly capitalist world system. But what might be seen as the grounds of this confidence, if we put aside notions of “reality” as the authentic origin of its representations? Why might it seem problematic to say that the United States is a Christian nation, or a heterosexual one, despite the widespread belief that Christianity and heterosexuality are dominant or majority practices in their respective domains, while at the same time it seems legitimate and indeed “accurate” to say that the US is a capitalist country? What is it about the former expressions, and their critical history, that makes them visible as “regulatory fictions,” ways of erasing or obscuring difference, while the latter is seen as accurate representation? Why, moreover, have embracing and holistic expressions for social structure like patriarchy fallen into relative disuse among feminist theorists (see Pringle 1995; Barrett and Phillips 1992) while similar conceptions of capitalism as a system or “structure of power” are still prevalent and resilient? These sorts of questions, by virtue of their scarcity and scant claims to legitimacy, have produced us a motive for this book. The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes “capitalism” as an economic and social descriptor. Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term – passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism – as well as systemic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of “capitalist hegemony” deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelyhood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, “capitalist hegemony” operates not only as a constituent of, but also as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imagination. What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted? If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate the world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem).

Perm - Inevitable

Permutation: do both – capitalism is inevitable, but the plan *reforms it* in ways that make it sustainable.

Wilson 2001

[John. Progressive Author, Founder of the Institute for College Freedom. *How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives*, 2001. GoogleBooks, Pg 121-3]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

Permutation – Work within cap ECO

Capitalism is inevitable – only working within the system can prevent environmental destruction.

Wilson 2K (John K. Wilson, Institute for College Freedom, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People,” 2000, p. 15-16)

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion.

We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. **The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances.** To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But **the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself.**

A2 ROOT CAUSE CLAIMS

A2 root cause- environment

Cap is not the root cause of environmental destruction, it actually helps the environment.

Payne 95

Rodger A. Payne. (Assistant professor of political science at the University of Louisville. He is director of the Grawemeyer Award in Ideas Improving World Order and a past recipient of a Social Science Research Council-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship in International Peace and Security.) "Freedom and the Environment". National Endowment for Democracy and the Johns Hopkins University Press. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_democracy/v006/6.3payne.html#authbio.

5) Open markets. All democracies have had market-based economic systems; it therefore seems reasonable to consider any potential [End Page 48] advantages of markets when assessing the "green" characteristics of democracies. Such consideration seems particularly apposite when one recalls that many of the ardent environmentalist critics of democracy named earlier have cited its emphasis on private property and open markets as a grave shortcoming. In fact, however, capitalism is not the cause of environmental degradation. After all, nonmarket economies have exploited the environment quite ruthlessly, and mounting evidence indicates that some businesses in open economies are finding strong incentives to protect the environment. Additionally, democratic governments are increasingly utilizing market incentives to address ecological problems. The key question is how to account for the diffused environmental costs ("externalities") of economic activity. To begin with, green consumerism can reshape corporate conduct by offering incentives for environmentally sound business practices. An increasing number of consumers are "voting with their pocketbooks" and thereby successfully urging business to take responsibility for reducing waste and pollution. For example, McDonald's, responding in part to schoolchildren mailing styrofoam sandwich containers to its executives, revamped its product packaging and modified its "waste stream" in conjunction with recommendations offered by an environmental organization. Germany and other states have developed standardized labeling symbols so that consumers can identify and purchase products that are less harmful to the environment. Nonetheless, the future influence of green consumerism is at best unknown, and could be limited by a variety of informational complexities. 15 Much more importantly, the marketing of environmental goods and services is becoming a major industry, and some enterprises are seeing the economic advantages of reducing waste and increasing operational efficiency. Corporations can profit from selling preventive and cleanup technologies and information to other businesses. This is already a large and growing source of world trade. For instance, while West European nations, Japan, and the United States together traded about \$20 billion worth of pollution-control devices in 1990, just two years later Germany alone was trading more than that amount. Domestic environmental transactions offer an even larger market. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) calculates that its member states individually spend between 0.8 and 1.5 percent of GDP on public and private pollution abatement and control. The overall total approached \$250 billion in 1992, and could shoot up by half again by 1997.

A2 root cause- war

Turn – Capitalism solves war and not root cause – interdependency, democracy and constructive competition

Griswold, 05 (Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at Cato, "Peace on earth? Try free trade among men", <http://www.freetrade.org/node/282>)

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital.

IMPACT LEVEL

War and Poverty

Armed Conflict decreasing

Marshall and Cole, 2008 (Monty, Research Prof. Public Policy and Dir. Research Center for Global Policy @ George Mason U., and Benjamin, GMU, Foreign Policy Bulletin: The Documentary Record of United States Foreign Policy, "Global Report on Conflict, Governance and State Fragility 2008", doi:10.1017/S1052703608000014)

The Global Report series and its signature State Fragility Index and Matrix first appeared in the March 2007 edition of the Foreign Policy Bulletin. It was designed by Monty G. Marshall and Jack Goldstone at the Center for Global Policy, George Mason University, and patterned after the Peace and Conflict series created by Marshall and Ted Robert Gurr in 2001. These global report series were designed to satisfy the imperative for knowing the contrasting conditions characterizing the many states comprising the emerging global system and gauging general system performance in an era of dynamic globalization. The original report published in 2000 sparked controversy within the global policy community with its prescient observation, and presentation of supporting evidence, that "the extent of warfare among and within states lessened by nearly half in the first decade after the [end of the] Cold War." This claim was initially dismissed as either mistaken or misinformed by most officials and analysts in the United Nations Secretariat when it was brought to their attention. The claim clearly challenged the prevailing perception of increasing global disorder and that the world was becoming a more, not less, dangerous place. It took several years before critical reaction turned away from examining the claim itself to offering explanations for the global decrease in warfare. In the current Global Report, we continue the original claim by observing that global warfare has remained in decline through 2007 and has diminished by over sixty percent since its peak in the late 1980s. Consistent with the decline in major armed conflicts has been the continuing increase in the number and consolidation of democratic regimes, rising to ninety-four at the end of 2007 (nearly sixty percent of the 162 countries examined in this report). Some cause for concern must also be reported: the number of ongoing armed conflicts may be showing signs of leveling off, the frequency of onsets of new armed conflicts in the world has not decreased substantially since the end of the Cold War in 1991, and the occurrence of "high casualty terrorist bombings" has continued to increase through 2007. It appears that, while world politics have been successful in gaining peaceful settlements to many of the world's armed conflicts, several long-running wars continue to resist peaceful settlement and new armed conflicts continue to break out regularly.

Turn – Capitalism solves war and not root cause – interdependency, democracy and constructive competition

Griswold, 05 (Daniel, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at Cato, "Peace on earth? Try free trade among men", <http://www.freetrade.org/node/282>)

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on

armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital.

Poverty is on the decline

Chen and Ravillion '17 (Shaohua, Senior Statistician in Development Econ. Research Group @ World Bank, and Martin, Dir. World Bank's Development Research Group, 2020 FOCUS BRIEF on the World's Poor and Hungry People, "THE CHANGING PROFILE OF POVERTY IN THE WORLD", October, http://www.ifpri.org/2020Chinaconference/pdf/beijingbrief_ravallion2.pdf)

In absolute terms, the number of people in the developing world living on less than US\$1 a day fell from slightly less than 1.5 billion in 1981 to 970 million in 2004, which marks the first time the poverty count has gone below 1 billion (Figure 1a). The choice of poverty line, however, matters. The number living on less than US\$2 a day actually rose by about 100 million over this period, to 2.5 billion in 2004. As a share of the population, global US\$1-a-day poverty fell from 40 percent in 1981 to 18 percent in 2004, and US\$2-a-day poverty fell from 67 percent in 1981 to 48 percent in 2004 (Figure 1b). For both poverty lines, the trend of poverty reduction is about 0.8 percentage points per year over 1981–2004. This rate exceeds the rate of poverty reduction of 0.6 percentage points per year that would be required to halve the 1990 US\$1-a-day poverty rate by 2015— the first of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG1). So, in the aggregate, the world is on track to achieve MDG1.

Environment

1. Turn Environment

Capitalism encourages efficiency and waste reduction

Walberg and Bast, 03 (Herbert J. Walberg, distinguished visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution, and Joseph L. Bast, C.E.O. of the Heartland Institute, October 23, 2003, "Education and Capitalism: How Overcoming Our Fear of Markets and Economics Can Improve America's Schools", page X)

WHY CAPITALISM PROTECTS THE ENVIRONMENT What has made this vast improvement in environmental quality possible in the United States? Why have countries without capitalist institutions made less progress? The security of personal possessions made possible by the capitalist institution of private-property rights is a key reason why capitalism protects the environment. Where property rights are secure, the owners of property (land as well as other physical assets) are more likely to invest in improvements that increase the property's long-term value. Why plant trees if your right to eventually harvest them is at risk? Why manage a forest for sustained yields in the future if someone else will capture the profit of their eventual harvest? Evidence that secure property rights are the key to good stewardship of assets is all around us. Privately owned houses are better maintained than rental units. Privately owned cars and trucks are better maintained than fleet vehicles (owned by an employer) and leased vehicles. In the former Soviet Union, privately owned gardens—representing only a small share of the land devoted to agriculture—produced as much as half of the fruits and vegetables produced by the entire country. In virtually every neighborhood in the United States, most front yards are neatly groomed and often elaborately landscaped, whereas the strip of public land between the sidewalk and the street is often weedy, poorly trimmed, and neglected. Markets, the second capitalist institution, tend to increase efficiency and reduce waste by putting resources under the control of those who value them most highly. This tends to ratchet downward the amount of any resource that is not used or consumed during production, a practice that produces cleaner-burning fuels and machines, lower-emission manufacturing processes, fewer byproducts shipped to landfills, and so on. A good example of this is the fact that the amount of energy required to produce a dollar of goods and services in the United States fell 1.3 percent a year from 1985 to 2000 and is expected to fall 1.6 percent per year from 2000 to 2020.⁴⁸ Finally, the wealth created by the institutions of capitalism makes it possible to invest more resources to protect the environment. Once again, the United States is the best example of this tendency. The cost of complying with environmental regulations in 2000 was approximately \$267 billion, or nearly \$2,000 for every household.⁴⁹ Only a capitalist society can afford to spend so much.

Environmental collapse causes extinction

Diner, '94 [Maj. David, Instructor at the US Army JAG School, 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161]

[*173] Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [I]like a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole."⁷⁹ By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

Cap solves the environment – studies prove environmental degradation is decreasing

Gardner '8 (Dan, Halifax Daily, "Environmentalists fight a battle already won", 1-9, L/N)

Seymour Garte, a professor of environmental and occupational health at the University of Pittsburgh, tells a story about listening to a lecture a few years ago. The subject was air pollution in Europe. For Garte, a toxicologist, this was a bit outside his field, and as the lecturer showed one slide after another, he was surprised to see they all showed pollution declining. "Every year, for every chemical, at every site, and for every method of measurement, the amount of pollution was decreasing," Garte writes in *Where We Stand: A Surprising Look at the State of the Planet*. So he raised his hand. Wasn't there some sort of mistake here? The lecturer "looked at me with the weary patience that an expert in any field feels when asked a stupid question by a non-expert. He explained that of course it is real, and 'everyone knows that air pollution levels are constantly decreasing everywhere.'" Unfortunately, the expert was wrong about that last bit. Everyone does not know that. Even Garte, a scientist working in a related field, did not know that. From this experience came Garte's book, which catalogues basic facts about the state of the environment and public health. "Our air and water have been getting cleaner consistently," he says on the phone from Pittsburgh. "We have cut down the amount of toxic emissions and the number of toxic waste dumps is decreasing. Lifespan is increasing all over the world. Infant mortality is decreasing all over the world. Hunger is decreasing all over the world." Forest cover is increasing in many countries. Endangered species are being saved. Acid rain is declining. The ozone emergency has passed. Many environmentalists worry that this kind of talk invites complacency, which is a reasonable concern given that right-wing think-tanks have published many books like Garte's precisely to make the case that economic growth magically eliminates environmental problems and so there's no need to do anything but cut taxes and regulations. "Other people have said this, mostly on the right and mostly people who are apologists for industry and for not really paying attention to the environment," Garte acknowledges. But he takes the good news about the environment in a very different direction. "The reason things are getting better is not that it happened by itself. It is the result of very hard work by environmentalists, by activists, by scientists who did the research. And it happened because of government regulations. These regulations have worked." The key is a democratic government that responds to pressure from below. Simply put, democracy is good for the environment, a point Garte illustrates by comparing environmental trends in the West with those in the former Communist Bloc. As in the West, industrialization made the air of Communist countries blacker and the water fouler. But unlike the West, pollution only got worse and worse. "The absolute disaster that happened in Eastern Europe is what we would have had here in the West if we had not had our environmental movement." This is a key reason why Garte believes the positive trends we have witnessed over the last several decades will continue. "We see a big increase in the amount of people living in democratic countries and democracy is good for public health. So as we increase the number of democracies we're going to see a continued improvement in public health and the environment." Continued improvements can also be expected in the developed world, Garte argues, mainly because "the environmental wars that we had in the 1970s and early 1980s are over, and the environmentalists won." "If you look at what's going on in business, of the top 100 companies in the country, 40 per cent put out sustainability reports last year. I'm sure it will be 80 per cent next year. Sustainability is the 'in' word. Now, is this real or is it greenwashing? I think in many cases it is real because it turns out that being sustainable, being efficient and caring about how you use energy and materials saves money. There's no conflict any more and smart people in industry have understood this for years. There are partnerships between groups like Environmental Defense and DuPont. Who could have imagined that 25 years ago?" Of course it's easy to find examples of decidedly unenlightened behaviour, among both corporations and politicians. Successive Canadian governments have talked a good game on climate change, for example, but done absolutely nothing substantial, while the Bush administration has behaved the way a government run by oilmen could be expected to behave. But the basic concepts of environmentalism have spread so widely and shifted public attitudes so profoundly that even the toughest growth-above-all right-wingers have been forced to change with the times. As Garte notes, Reagan-era Republicans sought to crush the Environmental Protection Agency and erase environmental regulations. By that standard, George W. Bush is practically a tree-hugger. "I've spoken at conservative venues, like the American Enterprise Institute, which is not known for its support for regulations" -- Garte stops to laugh

at the understatement -- "and they like the first part of my message but they're a little more wary about the second part. But even they will admit that regulations have had some value in some cases. They weren't saying that 20 years ago." Increasingly, the dividing line on the environment is not between the left and the right, or between greens and industry. The dividing line is between optimists and pessimists, and Garte knows which side he's on. "There are solutions. We found solutions in the past and I know we can find them in the future."

FRAMEWORK

Anti politics DA turn to alt first

Failure to prioritize detailed policy prescription cedes the public sphere to the most aggressive forces – makes perpetual war inevitable

Boggs 2000 (Carl Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles, the end of politics, 250-1)

But it is a very deceptive and misleading minimalism. While Oakeshott debunks political mechanisms and rational planning, as either useless or dangerous, the actually existing power structure-replete with its own centralized state apparatus, institutional hierarchies, conscious designs, and indeed, rational plans-remains **fully intact**, insulated from the minimalist critique. In other words, ideologies and plans are perfectly acceptable for elites who preside over established governing systems, but not for ordinary citizens or groups anxious to challenge the status quo. Such one-sided minimalism gives carte blanche to elites who naturally desire as much space to maneuver as possible. The flight from “abstract principles” rules out ethical attacks on injustices that may pervade the status quo (slavery or imperialist wars, for example) insofar as those injustices might be seen as too deeply embedded in the social and institutional matrix of the time to be the target of oppositional political action. If politics is reduced to nothing other than a process of everyday muddling-through, then people are condemned to accept the harsh realities of an exploitative and authoritarian system, with no choice but to yield to the dictates of “conventional wisdom”. Systematic attempts to ameliorate oppressive conditions would, in Oakeshott’s view, turn into a political nightmare. A belief that totalitarianism might result from extreme attempts to put society in order is one thing; to argue that all politicized efforts to change the world are necessary doomed either to impotence or totalitarianism requires a completely different (and indefensible) set of premises. Oakeshott’s minimalism poses yet another, but still related, range of problems: the shrinkage of politics hardly suggests that corporate colonization, social hierarchies, or centralized state and military institutions will magically disappear from people’s lives. Far from it: the public space vacated by ordinary citizens, well informed and ready to fight for their interests, simply gives elites more room to consolidate their own power and privilege. Beyond that, the fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian civil society, not too far removed from the excessive individualism, social Darwinism and urban violence of the American landscape could open the door to a modern Leviathan intent on restoring order and unity in the face of social disintegration. Viewed in this light, the contemporary drift towards antipolitics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more authoritarian and reactionary guise- or it could simply end up reinforcing the dominant state-corporate system. In either case, the state would probably become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.¹⁶ And either outcome would run counter to the facile antirationalism of Oakeshott’s Burkean muddling-through theories.

The impact is extinction, the refusal to engage in traditional politics is an abdication of social responsibility that makes all social crises inevitable

Boggs, 97 (Carl, National University, Los Angeles, Theory and Society, “The great retreat: Decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America”, December, Volume 26, Number 6,

<http://www.springerlink.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/m7254768m63h16r0/fulltext.pdf>)

The decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America poses a series of great dilemmas and challenges. Many ideological currents scrutinized here – localism, metaphysics, spontaneism, post-modernism, Deep Ecology – intersect with and reinforce each other. While these currents have deep origins in popular movements of the 1960s and 1970s, they remain very much alive in the 1990s. Despite their different outlooks and trajectories, they all share one thing in common: a depoliticized

expression of struggles to combat and overcome alienation. The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, **urgent problems** that are destroying the fabric of American society **will go unsolved** – perhaps even unrecognized – **only to fester more ominously in the future**. And such problems (**ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases,** technological displacement of workers) **cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context** of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or sidestep these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions. 74 In the meantime, **the fate of the world hangs in the balance**. The unyielding truth is that, **even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies**. This last point demands further elaboration. **The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives**. Far from it: **the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites** – an already familiar dynamic in many lesser-developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a *reassertion* of politics in more virulent guise – or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society. 75

Ethics/Morals Not First

No prior questions --- pragmatic utility of the plan is sufficient to vote aff

Owen 2 – David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7

Commenting on the 'philosophical turn' in IR, Wæver remarks that '[a] frenzy for words like "epistemology" and "ontology" often signals this philosophical turn', although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.⁴ However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, 'theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program' in that it 'dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory'.⁵ The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since 'whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry'.⁶ Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) 'the Highlander view'—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology

stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. **This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.**

Cede the Political

Un-pragmatic anti-capitalist rhetoric strengthens the right and prevents change.

Wilson 2K-coordinator of the Independent Press Association's Campus Journalism Project, author of lots of books [John K, How the left can win arguments and influence people: a tactical manual for pragmatic progressives, 2000, pg. 13-14]

Unfortunately, progressives spend most of their time attacking capitalism rather than taking credit for all the reforms that led to America's economic growth. If Americans were convinced that social programs and investment in people (rather than corporate welfare and investment in weaponry) **helped create the current economic growth, they would be far more willing to pursue additional progressive policies.** **Instead, the left allows conservatives to dismiss these social investments as "too costly" or "big government."** **It is crucial not to allow the right to define these progressive programs as "anticapitalist" and then attempt to destroy them. The Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton era's attempt to "get the government off our back" was an effort** (fortunately, largely a failure) **to corrupt the highly successful progressive capitalism in America.** While the Reagan/Gingrich/Clinton **"reforms" subsidized the dramatic growth in the wealth of the richest Americans and had a devastating impact on the very poor,** they didn't change the basic institutions of progressive capitalism. **It may take several generations to recover from the damage done** to the poor, **but even the far right has been unable** (so far) **to destroy progressive middle-class institutions such as Social Security or public schools.**

Framework

Role of the ballot is to evaluate the desirability of the plan based on hypothetical consideration of the consequences of the plan being enacted.

Debate is process for learning how to make better decisions – our decisions affect our own lives and the lives of those around us. Simply discussing the capitalist system, and neglecting the political process turns us into spectators who are powerless to produce real change.

Rorty 98 – professor emeritus of comparative literature and philosophy, by courtesy, at Stanford University (Richard, "ACHIEVING OUR COUNTRY: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-Century America", 1998, Pg. 7-9)

Such people find pride in American citizenship impossible, and vigorous participation in electoral politics pointless. They associate American patriotism with an endorsement of atrocities: the importation of African slaves, the slaughter of Native Americans, the rape of ancient forests, and the Vietnam War. Many of them think of national pride as appropriate only for chauvinists: for the sort of American who rejoices that America can still orchestrate something like the Gulf War, can still bring deadly force to bear whenever and wherever it chooses. **When young intellectuals watch John Wayne war movies after reading Heidegger, Foucault, Stephenson, or Silko, they often become convinced that they live in a violent, inhuman, corrupt country. They begin to think of themselves as a saving remnant-as the happy few who have the insight to see through nationalist rhetoric to the ghastly reality of contemporary America. But this insight does not move them to formulate a legislative program, to join a political movement, or to share in a national hope.** The contrast between national hope and national self-mockery and self-disgust becomes vivid when one compares novels like Snow Crash and Almanac of the Dead with socialist novels of the first half of the century-books like The Jungle, An American Tragedy, and The Grapes of Wrath. The latter were written in the belief that the tone of the Gettysburg Address was absolutely right, but that our country would have to transform itself in order to fulfill Lincoln's hopes. Transformation would be needed because the rise of industrial capitalism had made the individualist rhetoric of America's first century obsolete. The authors of these novels thought that this rhetoric should be replaced by one in which America is destined to become the first cooperative commonwealth, the first classless society. This America would be one in which income and wealth are equitably distributed, and in which the government ensures equality of opportunity as well as individual liberty. This new, quasi-communitarian rhetoric was at the heart of the Progressive Movement and the New Deal. It set the tone for the American Left during the first six decades of the twentieth century. Walt Whitman and John Dewey, as we shall see, did a great deal to shape this rhetoric. The difference between early twentieth-century leftist intellectuals and the majority of their contemporary counterparts is the difference between agents and spectators. **In the early decades of this century, when an intellectual stepped back from his or her country's history and looked at it through skeptical eyes, the chances were that he or she was about to propose a new political initiative.** Henry Adams was, of course, the great exception-the great abstainer from politics. But William James thought that Adams' diagnosis of the First Gilded Age as a symptom of irreversible moral and political decline was merely perverse. James's pragmatist theory of truth was in part a reaction against the sort of detached spectators' hip which Adams affected. For James, **disgust with American hypocrisy and self-deception was pointless unless accompanied by an effort to give America reason to be proud of itself in the future. The kind of proto- Heideggerian cultural pessimism which Adams cultivated seemed, to James, decadent and cowardly. "Democracy," James wrote, "is a kind of religion, and we are bound not to admit its failure. Faiths and utopias are the noblest exercise of human reason, and no one with a spark of reason in him will sit down fatalistically before the croaker's picture."**²