

The border industrial complex is a profit-driven perpetual crisis-  
NNIRR 21 [NNIRR, xx-xx-2021, Corporate Interests at the Border, No Publication,  
<https://nnirr.org/programs/seeking-border-justice/corporate-interests-at-the-border/>, accessed  
7-30-2024]//nats

Within the framework of the “Immigration Industrial Complex,” corporate interests have become interconnected with immigration and border enforcement policy and legislation. Increasing “alliances” of private prison corporations, defense contractors and technology companies with government actors and agencies—elected officials, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Department of Homeland Security and the Border Patrol—have engendered a “hyper-militarization” of the border that continues today as more and more money is spent under the banner of “enforcement.” This nexus of spending, political action and corporate involvement further undermines meaningful immigration reform while simultaneously promoting the violation of human rights at the border. As explained in depth in the Border Militarization Policy section, since the 1920s, the US-Mexico border has been home to expansive military and defense development through various government initiatives, much of which has only increased in scope since 9/11. This site is largely shaped by what is becoming known as the “Immigration Industrial Complex,” which combines facets of the prison industrial complex and the military industrial complex. These networks make use of the War on Terror and War on Drugs narratives in order to demonize and ostracize migrants and legitimize border enforcement, in turn escalating the violation of migrants’ rights in the name of profit. The following sections aid in understanding corporate interests at the border. This graph depicts federal funding for ICE and CBP per year, from 2005 through the proposed 2022 budget (released May 2021) which is to be approved in fall 2021. NNIRR and allies in the immigrant rights movement are enraged with the Biden administration for keeping funding at the same level as during Trump years, breaking with a promise to bring relief to immigrant communities and decrease the funding for enforcement. Who benefits from these numbers? The many corporations with government contracts providing technology, security and military equipment, private prisons and more...

Border technology is a testing ground for private companies  
Molnar 24 [Petra Molnar, 5-21-2024 "The Deadly Digital Frontiers at the Border", Invalid date, TIME,  
<https://time.com/6979557/unregulated-border-technology-migration-essay/>] //nats

We must also pay close attention to the role of the private sector, as big business drives the development of border technologies, and private companies do not have an incentive to regulate these lucrative projects. Surveillance companies set the agenda of what we innovate on and why, presenting technical “solutions” to migration like robo-dogs or AI lie detectors, instead of developing AI to root out racist border guards, or creating technologies for information-sharing or mental health support at the border. Borders are a viable testing ground for technologies. But oftentimes, this technology does not stop there. Projects like robo-dogs chasing people at the border become normalized and bleed over into public life—the New York City Police Department, for instance, proudly announced in 2023 that it will be deploying robo-dogs to “keep New York safe.” One such robo-dog is even painted with polka-dots like a dalmatian. How many more people must die at the hands of a deadly and digital border regime for us to pay attention?

Private companies sell collected border data for profits

Guerrero 24 [Maurizio Guerrero, "Surveillance capitalism has taken over immigration enforcement", 01/09/2024, <https://www.facebook.com/prismreports.org/2024/01/09/surveillance-capitalism-taken-over-immigration-enforcement/>]  
//nats

Other companies have paved the way for LexisNexis Risk Solutions and the taking over of immigration enforcement by surveillance capitalism—or the mining of data to repackage and exploit it for profit without the consent of individuals, shaping their behavior as consumers and, in this case, as non-citizens. The Canadian information conglomerate Thomson Reuters' CLEAR tool also aggregates information about practically all U.S. residents—more than 400 million names and records. Though CLEAR contracted with ICE from 2015 to 2021, Thomson Reuters has a current five-year contract with the Department of Homeland Security, which houses ICE, for more than \$22 million, although allegedly not for CLEAR. The data collected by CLEAR led to "further human rights abuses," according to the Electronic Frontier Foundation, and after years of activists' pressure, Thomson Reuters signed the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in 2022. Similar concerns have not persuaded LexisNexis Risk Solutions and other data aggregators to cancel their contracts with ICE, despite its documented human rights violations. LexisNexis is selling individuals' reports to the agency based on information extracted from 10,000 different databases through a five-year contract potentially worth \$22.1 million until 2026. Another corporation has been central to ICE's surveillance apparatus: Palantir, which, since 2011, provides ICE with artificial intelligence tools to create surveillance reports and has a current five-year contract for almost \$96 million. Between 2008 and 2021, ICE has spent almost \$2.8 billion on data collection and data-sharing initiatives, building a domestic surveillance apparatus that rivals that of the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), according to the Center on Privacy & Technology of Georgetown Law. In the last few years, this surveillance has expanded and decentralized.

Capitalism is the root cause of climate change

Capitalism necessitates environmental collapse

Newman 06

Robert Newman, 2-2-2006, "Robert Newman: It's capitalism or a habitable planet," Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2006/feb/02/energy.comment>

There is no meaningful response to climate change without massive social change. A cap on this and a quota on the other won't do it. Tinker at the edges as we may, we cannot sustain earth's life-support systems within the present economic system. Capitalism is not sustainable by its very nature. It is predicated on infinitely expanding markets, faster consumption and bigger production in a finite planet. And yet this ideological model remains the central organising principle of our lives, and as long as it continues to be so it will automatically undo (with its invisible hand) every single green initiative anybody cares to come up with. Much discussion of energy, with never a word about power, leads to the fallacy of a low-impact, green capitalism somehow put at the service of environmentalism. In reality, power concentrates around wealth. Private ownership of trade and industry means that the decisive political force in the world is private power. The corporation will outflank every puny law and regulation that

seeks to constrain its profitability. It therefore stands in the way of the functioning democracy needed to tackle climate change. Only by breaking up corporate power and bringing it under social control will we be able to overcome the global environmental crisis. On these pages we have been called on to admire capital's ability to take robust action while governments dither. All hail Wal-Mart for imposing a 20% reduction in its own carbon emissions. But the point is that supermarkets are over. We cannot have such long supply lines between us and our food. Not any more. The very model of the supermarket is unsustainable, what with the packaging, food miles and destruction of British farming. Small, independent suppliers, processors and retailers or community-owned shops selling locally produced food provide a social glue and reduce carbon emissions. The same is true of food co-ops such as Manchester's bulk-distribution scheme serving former "food deserts". All hail BP and Shell for having got beyond petroleum to become non-profit eco-networks supplying green energy. But fail to cheer the Fortune 500 corporations that will save us all and ecologists are denounced as anti-business. Many career environmentalists fear that an anti-capitalist position is what's alienating the mainstream from their irresistible arguments. But is it not more likely that people are stunned into inaction by the bizarre discrepancy between how extreme the crisis described and how insipid the solutions proposed? Go on a march to the House of Commons. Write a letter to your MP. And what system does your MP hold with? Name one that isn't pro-capitalist. Oh, all right then, smartarse. But name five. We are caught between the Scylla and Charybdis of climate change and peak oil. Once we pass the planetary oil production spike (when oil begins rapidly to deplete and demand outstrips supply), there will be less and less net energy available to humankind. Petroleum geologists reckon we will pass the world oil spike sometime between 2006 and 2010. It will take, argues peak-oil expert Richard Heinberg, a second world war effort if many of us are to come through this epoch. Not least because modern agribusiness puts hundreds of calories of fossil-fuel energy into the fields for each calorie of food energy produced. Catch-22, of course, is that the very worst fate that could befall our species is the discovery of huge new reserves of oil, or even the burning into the sky of all the oil that's already known about, because the climate chaos that would unleash would make the mere collapse of industrial society a sideshow bagatelle. Therefore, since we've got to make the switch from oil anyway, why not do it now? Solutions need to come from people themselves. But once set up, local autonomous groups need to be supported by technology transfers from state to community level. Otherwise it's too expensive to get solar panels on your roof, let alone set up a local energy grid. Far from utopian, this has a precedent: back in the 1920s the London boroughs of Wandsworth and Battersea had their own electricity-generating grid for their residents. So long as energy corporations exist, however, they will fight tooth and nail to stop whole postal districts seceding from the national grid. Nor will the banks and the CBI be neutral bystanders, happy to observe the inroads participatory democracy makes in reducing carbon emissions, or a trade union striking for carbon quotas. There are many organisational projects we can learn from. The Just Transition Alliance, for example, was set up by black and Latino groups in the US working with labour unions to negotiate alliances between "frontline workers and frontline communities", that is to say between union members who work in polluting industries and stand to lose their jobs if the plant is shut down, and those who live next to the same plant and stand to lose their health if it's not. We have to start planning seriously not just a system of personal carbon rationing but at what limit to set our national carbon ration. Given a fixed UK carbon allowance, what do we spend it on? What kinds of infrastructure do we wish to build, retool or demolish? What kinds of organisational structures will work as climate change makes pretty

much all communities more or less "fenceline" and almost all jobs more or less "frontline"? (Most of our carbon emissions come when we're at work). To get from here to there we must talk about climate chaos in terms of what needs to be done for the survival of the species rather than where the debate is at now or what people are likely to countenance tomorrow morning. If we are all still in denial about the radical changes coming - and all of us still are - there are sound geological reasons for our denial. We have lived in an era of cheap, abundant energy. There never has and never will again be consumption like we have known. The petroleum interval, this one-off historical blip, this freakish bonanza, has led us to believe that the impossible is possible, that people in northern industrial cities can have suntans in winter and eat apples in summer. But much as the petroleum bubble has got us out of the habit of accepting the existence of zero-sum physical realities, it's wise to remember that they never went away. You can either have capitalism or a habitable planet. One or the other, not both.

Capitalism is causing our world to collapse since those at the top of the society don't care about the long-term consequences of capitalism. Revolution is needed—reform is not good enough

Schutz 19 - Professor of Economics at Rollins College from 1987-2015, and author of *Markets and Power: The Twentieth Century Command Economy and Inequality and Power: The Economics of Class*, as well as articles in the *Review of Radical Political Economics*, the *Forum for Social Economics*, the *Journal of Economic Issues*, and the *Encyclopedia of Political Economy* (Eric A., "Planetary Eco-Collapse and Capitalism: A Contemporary Marxist Perspective," *Forum for Social Economics*, Vol. 49, Issue 3, Taylor & Francis Online) //recut CW

Of course, anything like the revolution needed appears pretty unlikely from the vantage point of the present moment. Perhaps contrary to his reputation, Marx was sympathetic and hopeful of more peaceful and gradual approaches to achieving progress, but in this case he would probably be impatient, to say the least. A "reformist" approach, as is now being ostensibly attempted by most of the world's nations today in, for example, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (the "Paris Agreement"), appears not only ineffective in getting major nations' compliance (the U.S. is about to withdraw) but inadequate even in its intent. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's most recent report [IPCC (2018)] suggests that holding global warming to even its current level would require that global greenhouse gas emissions be cut by half within 12 years and down to zero by 2050. In order to stay below the 2 °C felt by the IPCC to be the limit short of total global catastrophe, emissions would need to be cut to zero within 75 years. In either case billions of tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year must also be removed from the atmosphere by means of technologies as yet undeveloped. The Paris Agreement's aims seem lame at best.

The march of planetary eco-collapse and the impending rise of worldwide social upheaval and worse continue on. As the conclusion to this essay is being written, three record-breaking tropical cyclones have just hit North America and Asia, with serious losses of lives and staggering damages—and scientists expect that increasing cyclone strength will continue with ocean waters warming. Major drought continues throughout the western U.S., but summer rainfall this year in the eastern U.S. has been up by as much as 200% above normal. Farmers in the U.S. midwest are now "terrified," according to one news report, at the near and long term prospects for soybeans, corn and livestock.<sup>11</sup> As events such as these all across the globe make clearer the threat for people everywhere, so too is the role of the world capitalist socio-economic system in all of this becoming clearer as well.

Business-as-usual capitalism directs the flow of human development only in response to private monetary inducements manifest in markets. Such things as pollution and resource over-use on the one hand, or clean, healthful and ecologically sustainable environments on the other, simply do not generally register in the capitalist accounting of things. The system is based primarily on the interests of private owners (that is, capitalists), not a broader public interest such as would be expressed in a fully democratic system—the electoral democracy of capitalist history does not well resist the power of money.<sup>12</sup> Thus, for example, attempts to “internalize externalities” (such as the full costs of atmospheric heat-trapping gases released from fossil fuel burning) seldom succeed very well when a major sector of the capitalist class has a great interest in the industries involved (e.g., in this case, oil, coal and gas producers, the auto industry, road-building, plastics, etc.). Moreover, capitalism has a compulsive expansionism deep within its roots. Firms in both its competitive markets and in the more concentrated markets of its leading industries either expand, die, or get bought out, and utilize every means available—private and public—to accomplish survival and growth. Thus the system, now after two centuries of growth a worldwide system, knows no inherent limits to growth.

This was apparent to Karl Marx, and later theorists following his tradition have stressed the critical importance of these insights for the human dilemma of planetary eco-collapse. Contemporary marxists, having also witnessed firsthand the booming of an entire sector of the capitalist socio-economy devoted to the sales effort, have highlighted as well how the associated commercial culture permeates all of capitalist society and functions to stimulate a nearly unbounded consumerism in people. Commercial culture is itself a primary alienating element in the life world of capitalism, as contemporary marxists have emphasized, and compounds the estrangement already built into the most basic owner–employee relationship of the capitalist firm and the capitalist society’s class structure. Commercialized consumerism thus becomes the substance of a true addiction: a false “cure” for a deep life deprivation, the source of the only “fulfillment” to be found in this system, it is now the opium poppy that would deplete the very earth itself.

Lastly and perhaps most significantly among the critical insights of marxists on the present planetary dilemma, the capitalist system is a class system. The colossal social effort that will be required to avert the worst of the growing global eco-catastrophe is well appreciated by now—the cutting of fossil fuel use and of consumption by the world’s affluent, the massive investments in sustainable energy and environmental clean-up, including in technologies not even yet developed (e.g., CO<sub>2</sub> removal and sequestration), the total reordering of daily life worldwide that will be implied, not to mention the mitigation of the suffering that is already certain to come with the developing environmental catastrophe itself. But at the top of the capitalist system presides a ruling elite not really much concerned with nor responsible to the rest of the people. Their monetary interests being the private interests in which the system mostly operates, their powers consisting of nothing less than the system’s powers, their ideas and attitudes being by and large the ruling ideas and attitudes, and their life-styles being those to which most of the rest of the people aspire, they must be dealt with in order for real progress on this issue to occur. As Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels put it, in words that certainly ring true a 170 years later,

here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its [people]... Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in

other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society. (Marx & Engels, 1848 in MER, 1978, p. 483.)

What is needed is what can only be called "a revolution." Whether that revolution, if there be one, entails great tumult and spectacle, or more hopefully proceeds more gradually and equably through the impendin

The alternative is a revolutionary disruption of normative capitalistic practices.

Preparation for a revolution via disruption is the only way to achieve this.

However, we need to prepare for a socialist revolution because we are not ready. A dual power strategy helps us prepare for revolution while upholding socialist ideals and solves the Aff by creating alternative political institutions that fulfill people's needs, while expanding the base of a communist party and resisting the restoration of failed political systems.

Escalante 19 [Alyson Escalante, "Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach", 2019, Failing That, Invent,

<https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/doa>, Accessed 08/02/2023] // CW

I previously argued that a crucial advantage to dual power strategy is that it gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist institutions which can directly provide for material needs in times of capitalist crisis. Socialist agricultural and food distribution programs can take ground that the capitalist state cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist self-management and political institutions can function independently of capitalism. This approach is not only capable of literally saving lives in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the possibility of a revolutionary project which seeks to destroy rather than reform capitalism. One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that we have twelve years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are inevitable, and we are now in a post-brink world, where damage control is the primary concern. The question is not whether we can escape a future of climate change, but whether we can survive it. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly. In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market-based reforms. The Green New Deal, championed by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and the left-wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends. The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure, National Geographic reports that "Fabricating [solar] panels requires caustic chemicals such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and the process uses water as well as

electricity, the production of which emits greenhouse gases.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure only perpetuates environmental harm. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis. The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the US can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant militarism from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, facilitates constant warfare as imperial states compete for spheres of influence in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the US. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the US military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change. Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even milquetoast capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever-shrinking twelve-year time frame. There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility. The pressing question we now face is: how are we going to save ourselves? Revolution and Dual Power If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America-backed candidates cannot offer real anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far larger and far more well-funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the US, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within twelve years. While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the meantime? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the US today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle. Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a harsh truth, but it is true. Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, we will accomplish nothing in the next twelve years. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these twelve years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put

their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development. Dual power is tooled towards this project best. The Marxist Center network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through tenants organizing and serve the people programs. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop mutual aid programs that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, mutual aid is not enough. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a broader revolutionary movement and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society. To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can abstract notions of mutual aid cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet the needs of its members and the communities in which it operates. Revolutionary institutions that can provide food, housing, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for building a base among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle. What I want to suggest here is that the production of food through dual power institutions should be a central project for this revolutionary movement. There are several reasons why I think this is the case. First, food production allows us to meet the most immanent needs of the masses. The US is plagued by food deserts which deprive huge portions of the population access to fresh food. Poverty exacerbates this further, and the devastating effects of lack of access of healthy food due to poverty are well documented. This is an urgent need that socialists can meet in order to demonstrate to the masses that it is socialists who can serve them where the capitalist state has failed. Second, food production is a major contributor to climate change. Large-scale meat production produces massive amounts of greenhouse gas, and the transportation of food from rural agricultural areas to urban populations centers is a major contributor as well. Urban agricultural projects and the development of sustainable permaculture are not sufficient to fix these problems, as they are not able to overthrow the capitalist system of agricultural production. However, paired with a broader revolutionary movement, these projects allow us to undertake scientific experimentation with meeting food needs, in order to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative food production methods that can eventually replace the current unsustainable capitalist model. After all, if our revolution cannot replace unsustainable production models, we will not be able to resolve climate change any better than the capitalists.

Democratic-centralist dual power organizing builds support to overthrow capitalism.

Escalante 18, Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. Forgenews, "Against Electoralism, For Dual Power!" 2018.



Lenin argues that we must understand the state as an institution which emerges out of class struggle. The ruling class cannot simply secure their rule through immediate seizure of private property. The capitalist class, for example, relies upon a whole host of state institutions to maintain its position as the ruling class. Police, armies, and various other state agencies maintain property relations and protect the power of the ruling class. The proletariat, of course, greatly outnumber the bourgeoisie. As a result of this, the ruling class requires state power. Lenin summarizes this succinctly: "The state is a product and a manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The state arises where, when and insofar as class antagonism objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable." The state exists because the ruling class and the subjugated class cannot exist in harmony. Class struggle is consistently being waged in a non revolutionary manner within capitalist society. Workers unionize, police break strikes. The struggle continues and the ruling class uses the state to wage it. This insight allowed Lenin to realize that the bourgeois state cannot be a venue for achieving socialist gains. If the state exists precisely to ensure the domination of the capitalist class, then the socialists working within the state will necessarily have to bend to the will of the capitalists or be expelled from the state. This insight can explain the shift in Ocasio's rhetoric from (admittedly tepid) socialist ideas to standard democratic party bourgeois politics. Upon gaining entrance into the institutions of the bourgeois state, Ocasio was immediately faced with a decision: hold her ground as a socialist and be incapable of functioning within state machinery designed to crush socialism, or continue to call herself a socialist while adopting the politics of the bourgeoisie. It is obvious which decision Ocasio has made. Lenin was profoundly aware of these limits and forced compromises which working within the bourgeois state requires. As a result, Lenin and the Bolsheviks argued against working with the provisional government, and instead argued for its overthrow. Lenin wrote: "all previous revolutions perfected the state machine, whereas it must be broken, smashed." If we, as socialists, truly fight for a classless world, we must smash the mechanisms which ensure class domination. We must smash the bourgeois state. This realization led the Bolsheviks to reject the opportunism of the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks in the Soviets and they chose to overthrow the provisional government themselves. Shockingly, their revolution was successful. After months of compromise, the workers had grown tired of the opportunist bourgeois socialists. They had seen that the dual power of the soviets and the provisional government was not tenable. One side had to take unitary power. Most importantly, the workers saw that the bourgeois government had done nothing for them: it had smashed their printing presses, it had crushed their demonstrations, it had broken their strikes. Of course, it could do nothing else, the bourgeois state is designed to do precisely this. The events of October, 1917 ought to have concretely proven that the strategy of infiltrating the bourgeois government is untenable. Lenin and the Bolsheviks proved that the workers are willing to throw the bourgeois state away in favor of a dictatorship of the proletariat. And yet, here we are 111 years later and large factions of the largest socialist organization in the United States echo the cowardly and worthless drivelings of the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries. Dual Power Today I am sure that at this point, the opportunists reading this have already begun to type out their typical objection: the world is different than it was in 1917, and the conditions of the United States in no way echo the conditions which enabled the Bolsheviks to achieve revolutionary success. To this tried and true objection, there is one simple answer: you are entirely correct, and that is why we need to abandon electoralism and working within the bourgeois state. What were the conditions which allowed the Bolsheviks to successfully revolt? The

conditions were that of Dual Power. Alongside the capitalist state, there existed a whole set of institutions and councils which met the needs of the workers. The soviets, a parallel socialist government made up of individual councils, successfully took over many governmental responsibilities in some parts of Petrograd. In the radical Viborg district, the Bolshevik controlled soviets provided government services like mail, alongside programs that could meet the needs of workers. When a far right coup was attempted against the provisional government, it was troops loyal to the Bolshevik factions within the soviet who repelled the coup plotters, proving concretely to the workers of Petrograd that the socialists could not only provide for their needs, but also for their defense. In short: the Bolsheviks recognized that instead of integrating into the bourgeois state, they could operate outside of it to build dual power. They could establish programs of elected representatives who would serve the workers. They would not bolster the capitalist state in the name of socialism, they would offer an alternative to it. And so, when the time came for revolt, the masses were already loyal to the Bolsheviks. The only party who had never compromised, who had denounced the unpopular imperialist wars, who had rejected the provisional government entirely, was the party who successfully gained the support of the workers. And so, many of us on the more radical fringes of the socialist movement wonder why it is the the DSA and other socialist opportunists seem to think that we can win by bolstering the capitalist state? We wonder, given this powerful historical precedent, why they devote their energy to getting more Ocasios elected; what good does one more left democrat who will abandon the workers do for us? The answer we receive in return is always the same: we want to win small changes that will make life for the workers easier; we want to protect food stamps and healthcare. And do this, we reply: what makes you think reformism is the only way to do this. When the bourgeois state in California was happy to let black children go to school unfed, the Black Panthers didn't rally around democratic candidates, they became militant and fed the children themselves. In the 40s and 50s, socialists in New York saw people going without healthcare and instead of rallying behind democratic candidates, they built the IWO to provide healthcare directly. Both these groups took up our pressing revolutionary task: building dual power. Imagine if all those hours the DSA poured into electing Ocasio were instead used to feed the people of New York, to provide them with medical care, to ensure their needs were met. Imagine the masses seeing socialism not as a pipe dream we might achieve through electing more imperialists, but as a concrete movement which is currently meeting their needs? The fact is, we are not nearly ready for revolution. Socialists in the United States have failed to meet the needs of the people, and as long as their only concrete interaction with the masses is handing them a voter registration form, they will continue to fail the people. Our task now is not to elect representatives to advocate for the people; it is much more gruelingly laborious than that. Our task is to serve the people. Our task is to build dual power. The movement to do this is underway. Members of the DSA refoundation caucus have begun to move the left of the DSA in this direct, socialist groups like Philly Socialists have begun to build dual power through GED programs and tenants unions, many branches of the Party For Socialism and Liberation have begun to feed the people and provide for their concrete needs, and Red Guard collectives in Los Angeles have built serve the people programs and taken on a stance of militant resistance to gentrification. The movement is growing, its time is coming, and dual power is achievable within our life time. The opportunists are, in a sense, correct. We are not where we were in 1917, but we can begin to move in that direction and dual power can take us there. In order to achieve dual power we have to recognize that Lenin was right: there will be no socialist gains by working within state institutions

designed to crush socialism. Furthermore, we must recognize that the strategies of the electoral opportunists trade off with dual power. Electing candidates drains resources, time, and energy away from actually serving the people. And so, we should commit to undertake the difficult and dangerous task of building dual power. We must reject opportunism, we must name the democratic party as our enemy, we must rally around power directly in the hands of the socialist movement. We do not have a parallel system of soviets in the United States. We can change that. Someday the cry “all power to the soviets” will be heard again. Lets make it happen.

Dual power collapses capitalist institutions — it’s a core part of the strategy.

Hughes 20 [Graham; Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Imperial College London; 8/22/20; “We Need Dual Power”; ; Economic Democracy; accessed 9/16/21; Lowell-TT]

The Dual Power Solution Today, one of the most powerful combinations of radical and revolutionary anti-capitalist, anti-racist strategies that does exactly this, which can actually deal with the roots of these crises, is a set of strategies known as Dual Power. Originally, Dual Power was a term used by Russian Revolutionaries like Lenin and Trotsky to describe a political power of the working class which exists in direct competition with the capitalist state for authority over the population (Colón, et. al., 2017). When it was first used it was essentially a descriptive term, but today Dual Power is used by some socialists and leftists to describe the purposeful building of working-class power which can compete with capitalist power in both politics and economics (Colón, et. al., 2017). In practice, this involves combining models and practices of economic democracy, like cooperatives, community land trusts, and local currencies, with directly democratic structures go local governance, like participatory budgeting and peoples assemblies (Colón, et. al., 2017). The idea behind Dual Power is that in order to have a world capable of meeting everyone’s needs and overcoming racialized capitalism, we need to figure out how to, at the same time, survive within, struggle against, and build beyond that system. We need political and economic organizations that model, or prefigure, the type of just, equitable, and sustainable world we want to live in. Tom Malleon (2014) describes what a world based on participatory and direct democracy combined with practices of economic democracy could look like once we overcome capitalism, and it is beautiful. Building such models or systems now will not only help us demonstrate to people that our systems work better than capitalism, helping to generate uptake for our program, it will also help us meet the needs of our communities immediately. Additionally, these new models of political and economic organization will enable us to build sustainable, long term organizations capable of fighting against and eventually overcoming the power of the capitalist state. By providing for the basic needs of our communities first, outside of the grip of global capitalism, we are able to escape from the control capitalism has over our ability to reproduce ourselves and our communities. This will enhance our ability to engage in political struggle directly against the capitalist state, a struggle that must necessarily happen in order to overcome capitalism. In many ways, these Dual Power strategies take many of the strongest aspects of a number of leftist revolutionary strategies and theories and combines them in mutually reinforcing ways, and has the potential to unite many forces on the left who now fall into separate political tendencies. In all these ways and more, Dual Power has the potential to be the strategies that finally break capitalism.

The ROTB is to vote for the team that best creates resistance against capitalist structure

The political economy of capitalism renders violence anonymous and normalizes the systematic subjugation of millions. Our only ethico-political response must be an obligation to confront capitalism to demystify this violence. Therefore, the Role of the Ballot should be to confront capitalism.

Zizek and Daly 04

Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Senior Lecturer in Politics in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at University College, Northampton, 2004, *Conversations With Zizek*, p. 14-16

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties concerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz, the patronizing reference to the 'developing world'). And Zizek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiqueism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of

social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Žižek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a 'glitch' in an otherwise sound matrix.

Prioritize solving for victims of capitalism because they are inherently ignored in the real world

People recognize the victims of socialism, but never the much higher number of victims of capitalism Austin 07 [Andrew Austin, "The victims of capitalism", 06-22-2007, People's World, <https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/the-victims-of-capitalism/>, Accessed 08/01/2023] // CW

However, comparing what happened in World War II and Indochina with what happened under communism, the relative size of the memorials is about right. This is not to say that bad things didn't happen under socialism; it is to say that what happened under socialism doesn't hold a candle to what has occurred under capitalism. Capitalists reduced the indigenous population in North America (not including Mexico) by over 90 percent — from 14 million human beings, when Europeans first landed on the continent, to fewer than 300,000 by the end of the 19th century. In the Caribbean and South America, the devastation wrought by capitalism was probably six to eight times greater. Capitalists killed and enslaved tens of millions of Africans and plundered the continent. The capitalist wars of the 20th century killed tens of millions of people around the globe. The death toll from World War II alone was around 50 million, the largest numbers of which were working people defending the Soviet Union. Fatalities caused by U.S. armed forces or U.S.-backed surrogate forces in the second half of the 20th century amount to approximately 3 million in Vietnam, 1 million in Cambodia, 1 million in Mozambique, 500,000 to 1 million in Indonesia, 600,000 in Angola, 300,000 in Laos, 250,000 in East Timor, 200,000 in Iraq (the first time around), 200,000 in Afghanistan (the first time around), 150,000 in Guatemala, 100,000 in Nicaragua, 90,000 in El Salvador and tens of thousands in Chile, Argentina, Zaire, Iran, Colombia, Bolivia, Brazil, Panama, Somalia, South Yemen, Western Sahara and so on. (These are the figures Michael Parenti produces in his wonderful little book, "Dirty Truths.") What will the toll be after the U.S. and British armies leave Iraq? Including the consequences of economic sanctions following the first Gulf War, the number of deaths in Iraq caused by the capitalist West over the last decade is easily over 2 million. How many will die after the westerners leave because of the conditions the capitalists established while there? How many more will die in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Palestine? If the past is any indication, the numbers will be horrific. The conflicts being cultivated around the world are the work of global capitalism. Whereas socialism provided an adequate life for all of its citizens, capitalism has always systemically failed to meet the basic needs of people. Children starve to death because capitalist markets cannot adequately distribute food to those who are hungry. Children die from disease because privately owned health care institutions and pharmaceutical companies refuse to treat those who cannot pay. Workers die from unsafe working conditions and their families are sickened by environmental pollution. Where is the memorial to these victims? The entirety of what city would be required for a monument to the victims of capitalism?

Thus, we negate.