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### 1NC – K – Capitalism

#### Anti-trust is based in free-market logics of competition and consumerism that reify neoliberal exploitation. Monopolies are inevitable in a world of government collusion and empire-building, only the alt solves.

Tell 21, PhD, is author of the book “Charter School Report Card.” His main research interests include charter schools, neoliberal education policy, privatization and political economy (Shawgi, July 29th, “EMPTY RHETORIC THAT SEEKS TO MISINFORM AND APPEASE: ON BIDEN'S FARCICAL ANTI-MONOPOLY EXECUTIVE ORDER,” *Hampton Think*, <https://www.hamptonthink.org/read/on-bidens-farcical-anti-monopoly-executive-order?rq=antitrust>, Accessed 09-24-2021)

One of these is the inexorable tendency of competition to lead to monopoly under capitalism. Competition means winners and losers. By definition, not everyone can win when competing. Competition means rivalry for supremacy. Thousands compete in the Olympics, for example, but only a select few (“winners”) go home with a gold medal.[1] It is no accident that the economy, media, and politics are heavily monopolized by a handful of billionaires while billions of people who actually produce the wealth in society and run society remain marginalized and disempowered.

This brutal reality cannot be reversed or overcome with the utterance of a few platitudes, the passage of some policies, or the creation of some agencies that claim to be able to fix the outdated economic system, especially when all of the above come from billionaires themselves.

On July 9, 2021, President Joe Biden issued an Executive Order on Promoting Competition in the American Economy (https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/07/09/executive-order-on-promoting-competition-in-the-american-economy/).

The order is about 7,000 words long and full of anticonscious statements. Disinformation pervades the entire order.

The opening paragraph begins with the following disinformation:

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to promote the interests of American workers, businesses, and consumers, it is hereby ordered….

Here, “American workers, businesses, and consumers” are casually misequated and no mention is made of citizens or humans. The implication is that consumerism is normal, healthy, and desirable, and that workers and big business somehow have the same aims, world outlook, and interests. This conceals the fact that owners of capital and workers have antagonistic irreconcilable interests and that people exist as humans and citizens, not just utilitarian consumers and shoppers in a taken-for-granted system based on chaos, anarchy, and violence.

Disinformation is further escalated in the next paragraph:

A fair, open, and competitive marketplace has long been a cornerstone of the American economy, while excessive market concentration threatens basic economic liberties, democratic accountability, and the welfare of workers, farmers, small businesses, startups, and consumers.

“Market concentration” has been the norm for generations. Monopolies, cartels, and oligopolies have been around since the late 1800s. Mergers and acquisitions have been taking place non-stop for decades. The so-called “free market” largely disappeared long ago. Objectively, there can be no fairness in a system rooted in wage-slavery and empire-building. Wage-slavery is the precondition for the tendency of the rich to get richer and the poor poorer. It is not a recipe for prosperity and security for all. This is also why inequality, tyranny, violence, and surveillance have been growing over the years. Moreover, what “threatens basic economic liberties, democratic accountability, and the welfare of workers, farmers, small businesses, startups, and consumers” is the ongoing political and economic exclusion of people from control over the economy and their lives by the financial oligarchy. There can be no liberty, accountability, and welfare when most people are deprived of real decision-making power and major owners of capital make all the decisions. Problems would not constantly worsen if people had control over their lives. The “best allocation of resources” cannot be made when the economy is carved up, fractured, and controlled by competing owners of capital.

Although recurring economic crises for well over a century have repeatedly discredited “free market” ideology, the 7,000-word executive order is saturated with the language of “choice,” “competition,” and “consumers.” This is the same worn-out language used by privatizers of all hues at home and abroad.

Further, while the executive order gives many examples of “economic consolidation” in numerous sectors, the government is not interested in creating a self-reliant vibrant diverse economy that meets the needs of all. It is not committed to reversing “the harmful effects of monopoly and monopsony.” Numerous antitrust laws have not stopped either. Big mergers and acquisitions have been going on for years. Rather, the executive order is an attempt to restructure economic and political arrangements among different factions of the wealthy elite; it reflects a new stage or form of inter-capitalist rivalry for even greater domination of the economy by fewer owners of capital. In other words, moving forward, the economy will remain monopolized by a few monopolies. Wealth is only going to become more concentrated in fewer hands in the years ahead. Mountains of data from hundreds of sources document growing wealth and income inequality every year.

The bulk of the executive order is filled with endless directives, strategies, rules, and suggestions for how to curb “unfair practices” and promote “fairness” and “competition.” But these all ring hollow given concrete realities and past experience.

Today, governments at all levels have been taken over by global private monopoly interests and have become instruments of decisions made on a supranational basis. There is a fine-tuned revolving door between officials from government and the private sector; they have become synonymous for all essential purposes. The same people who run major corporations also serve in high-level government positions where they advance the narrow interests of the private sector and then they leave government and return to their high-level corporate positions. There is a reason why the majority of members of Congress are millionaires. The Executive Branch in the United States, especially the President’s Office, is a major tool for the expression of the will of the most powerful monopolies. This is why billions of dollars are spent every few years to select the President of the country.

A modern economy must be controlled and directed by workers themselves. Only such an economy can provide for the needs of all and avoid endless economic distortions. Uneven economic development, “unfair” arrangements, “market concentration,” monopolies, oligopolies, and recurring crises cannot be avoided so long as those who actually produce the social product have no control over the social product. Workers have first claim to the wealth they produce and have the right to decide how, where, and when that wealth is used. Major owners of capital are historically superfluous and a big block to progress. They are not needed for a healthy vibrant self-reliant economy that meets the needs of all.

#### All capitalism is racial capitalism---the system of competition the aff perpetuates cannot sustain itself without theft of indigenous land, super-exploitation of black labor, imperial extraction, and racist devaluation of ‘disposable populations.’

\*2 point font and paragraph merging for readability.

\*\*Footnote 14 is inserted below the paragraph it’s cited in, other footnotes excluded for readability.

Burden-Stelly 20, Visiting Scholar in the Race and Capitalism Project at the University of Chicago. She is currently an Assistant Professor of Africana Studies and Political Science at Carleton College (Charisse, July 1st, Modern U.S. Racial Capitalism, *The Monthly Review*, Volume 72, Number 3, Available at: https://monthlyreview.org/2020/07/01/modern-u-s-racial-capitalism/)

Drawing on the intellectual production of twentieth-century Black anticapitalists, I theorize modern U.S. racial capitalism as a racially hierarchical political economy constituting war and militarism, imperialist accumulation, expropriation by domination, and labor superexploitation.14 The racial here specifically refers to Blackness, defined as African descendants’ relationship to the capitalist mode of production—their structural location—and the condition, status, and material realities emanating therefrom.15 It is out of this structural location that the irresolvable contradiction of value minus worth arises. Stated differently, Blackness is a capacious category of surplus value extraction essential to an array of political-economic functions, including accumulation, disaccumulation, debt, planned obsolescence, and absorption of the burdens of economic crises.16 At the same time, Blackness is the quintessential condition of disposability, expendability, and devalorization.

[Footnote 14]: Another feature of modern U.S. racial capitalism is property by dispossession. In Theft Is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory, Robert Nichols draws on the experience of Indigenous peoples in the United States, Canada, and New Zealand to theorize how the “system of landed property” was fundamentally predicated on violent dispossession. While the Anglo-derived legal-political regimes differed in these localities, the “intertwined and co-constitutive” material effects converged in the legalized theft of indigenous territory amounting in “approximately 6 percent of the total land on the surface of Earth.” Such dispossession, Nichols notes, is recursive: “In a standard formulation one would assume that ‘property’ is logically, chronologically, and normatively prior to ‘theft.’ However, in this (colonial) context, theft is the mechanism and means by which property is generated: hence its recursivity. Recursive dispossession is effectively a form of property-generating theft.” As such, theft and dispossession, through property regimes, are an ongoing feature of the Indigenous reality of modern U.S. racial capitalism. Robert Nichols, Theft Is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020), 50–51.

My operationalization of capitalism follows Oliver Cromwell Cox’s explication in Capitalism and American Leadership.17 Modern U.S. racial capitalism arose in the context of the First World War, when, as Cox explains, the United States took advantage of the conflict to capture the markets of South America, Asia, and Africa for its “over-expanded capacity.”18 Cox further expounds upon this auspicious moment of ascendant modern U.S. racial capitalism thus: By 1914, the United States had brought its superb natural resources within reach of intensive exploitation. Under the stimulus of its foreign-trade outlets, the financial assistance of the older capitalist nations, and a flexible system of protective tariffs, the nation developed a magnificent work of transportation and communication so that its mines, factories, and farms became integrated into an effectively producing organism having easy access to its seaports.… [Likewise,] further internal expansion depended upon far greater emphasis on an ever widening foreign commerce.… Major entrepreneurs of the United States proceeded to step up their campaign for expansion abroad. The war accentuated this movement. It accelerated the growth of [modern] American [racial] capitalism and impressed upon its leaders as nothing had before the need for external markets.19 Relatedly, Peter James Hudson argues that the First World War fundamentally changed the terms of order of international finance, allowing New York to compete with London, Paris, and Berlin for the first time in the realm of global banking. This was not least because the Great War “drastically reordered global credit flows,” with the United States transforming from a debtor into a creditor nation.20 In addition to Latin American and Caribbean nations and businesses turning to the United States for financing and credit, domestic saving and investment patterns were altered to the benefit of imperial financial institutions like the City Bank.21 Although the United States is, to use Cox’s terminology, more a “lusty child of an already highly developed capitalism” than an exceptional capitalist power, the nation perfected its techniques of accumulation through its vast natural wealth, large domestic market, imbalance of Northern and Southern economies, and, importantly, through its lack of concern for the political and economic welfare of the overwhelming masses of its population, least of all the descendants of the enslaved.22 Modern U.S. racial capitalism is thus sustained by military expenditure, the maintenance of an extremely low standard of living in “dependent” countries, and the domestic superexploitation of Black toilers and laborers. Cox notes that Black labor has been the “chief human factor” in wealth production; as such, “the dominant economic class has always been at the motivating center of the spreads of racial antagonism. This is to be expected since the economic content of the antagonism, especially at its proliferating source in the South, has been precisely that of labor-capital relations.”23 In a general sense, racial capitalism in the United States constitutes “a peculiar variant of capitalist production” in which Blackness expresses a structural location at the bottom of the labor hierarchy characterized by depressed wages, working conditions, job opportunities, and widespread exclusion from labor unions.24 Furthermore, modern U.S. racial capitalism is rooted in the imbrication of anti-Blackness and antiradicalism. Anti-Blackness describes the reduction of Blackness to a category of abjection and subjection through narrations of absolute biological or cultural difference; ruling-class monopolization of political power; negative and derogatory mass media propaganda; the ascent of discriminatory legislation that maintains and reinscribes inequality, not least various modes of segregation; and social relations in which distrust and antipathy toward those racialized as Black is normalized and in which “interracial mass behavior involving violence assumes a continuously potential danger.”25 Anti-Blackness thus conceals the inherent contradiction of Blackness—value minus worth—obscuring and distorting its structural location by, as Ralph and Singhal remark, contorting it into only a “debilitated condition.”26 Antiradicalism can be understood as the physical and discursive repression and condemnation of anticapitalist and/or left-leaning ideas, politics, practices, and modes of organizing that are construed as subversive, seditious, and otherwise threatening to capitalist society. These include, but are not limited to, internationalism, anti-imperialism, anticolonialism, peace activism, and antisexism. Anti-Blackness and antiradicalism function as the legitimating architecture of modern U.S. racial capitalism, which includes rationalizing discourses, cultural narratives, technologies of repression, legal structures, and social practices that inform and are informed by racial capitalism’s political economy.27 Throughout the twentieth century, anti-Blackness propelled the “Black Scare,” defined as the specter of racial, social, and economic domination of superior whites by inferior Black populations. Antiradicalism, in turn, was enunciated through the “Red Scare,” understood as the threat of communist takeover, infiltration, and disruption of the American way of life.28 For example, in the 1919 Justice Department Report, Radicalism and Sedition Among the Negroes, As Reflected in Their Publications, it was asserted that the radical antigovernment stance of a certain class of Negroes was manifested in their “ill-governed reaction toward race rioting,” “threat of retaliatory measures in connection with lynching,” open demand for social equality, identification with the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), and “outspoken advocacy of the Bolshevik or Soviet doctrine.”29 Here, anti-Blackness, articulated through the fear of the “assertion of race consciousness,” was attached to the IWW and Bolshevism—in other words, to anticapitalism—to make it appear even more subversive and dangerous. Likewise, antiradicalism, expressed through the denigration of the IWW and Soviet Doctrine, was made to seem all the more threatening and antithetical to the social order in its linkage with Black insistence on equality and self-defense against racial terrorism. In this way, “defiance and insolently race-centered condemnation of the white race” and “the Negro seeing red” came to be understood as seditious in the context of modern U.S. racial capitalism. The link between my theory of modern U.S. racial capitalism and Robinson’s catholic theory of racial capitalism, beyond his “suggest[ion] that it was there,” is vivified through the prison abolitionist and scholar Ruth Wilson Gilmore, who writes: “Capitalism…[is] never not racial.… Racial capitalism: a mode of production developed in agriculture, improved by enclosure in the Old World, and captive land and labor in the Americas, perfected in slavery’s time-motion, field factory choreography, its imperative forged on the anvils of imperial war-making monarchs.”30 Racial capitalism, she continues, “requires all kinds of scheming, including hard work by elites and their compradors in the overlapping and interlocking space-economies of the planet’s surface. They build and dismantle and reconfigure states, moving capacity into and out of the public realm. And they think very hard about money on the move.”31 Perhaps more than Gilmore, though, my approach aligns with that of Neville Alexander as described by Hudson.32 Like Alexander, who focused on South Africa, I offer a particularistic understanding of racial capitalism, mine being rooted in the political economy of Blackness and the legitimating architectures of anti-Blackness and antiradicalism in the United States. Gilmore qua Robinson offers a more universalist and transhistorical conception. Like Alexander, my theory of modern U.S. racial capitalism is primarily rooted in (Black) Marxist-Leninists and fellow travelers. This is an important epistemological distinction: whereas Robinson finds Marxism-Leninism to be, at best, inattentive to race, my theory of modern U.S. racial capitalism is rooted in the work of Black freedom fighters who, as Marxist-Leninists, were able to offer potent and enduring analyses and critiques of the conjunctural entanglements of racialism, white supremacy, and anti-Blackness, on the one hand, and capitalist exploitation and class antagonism on the other hand.33 Although Robinson draws on scholars like Fernand Braudel, Henri Pirenne, David Brion Davis, and Eli Heckscher to understand European history, socialist theory, and the European working class, the work of Black Marxists like James Ford, Walter Rodney, Amílcar Cabral, and Paul Robeson offer me those same intellectual, historical, and theoretical resources. Finally, I agree with Alexander that the resolution to racial capitalism is antiracist socialism, not a cultural-metaphysical Black radical tradition. In what remains of this essay, I will draw on the work of Black Marxist-Leninists and anticapitalists to explicate the defining features of modern U.S. racial capitalism—war and militarism, imperialist accumulation, expropriation by domination, labor superexploitation, and property by dispossession. In this, I demonstrate that their critiques and analyses offer a blueprint for theorizing modern U.S. racial capitalism. War and militarism facilitate the endless drive for profit. Military conflicts between imperial powers result in the reapportioning of boundaries, possessions, and spheres of influence that often exacerbate racial and spatial economic subjection. War and militarism also perpetuate the endless construction of “threats,” primarily in racialized and socialist states, against which to defend progress, prosperity, freedom, and security. The manufacturing of conflict legitimates the mobilization of extraordinary violence to expropriate untold resources that produce relations of underdevelopment, dependency, extraversion, and disarticulation in the Global South. Moreover, the ruling elite and labor aristocracy in imperialist countries, not least the United States, wage perpetual war to defend their way of life and standard of living against the racialized majority who, because they would benefit most from the redistribution of the world’s wealth and resources, represent a perpetual threat. Here, Du Bois’s 1915 essay, “The African Roots of War,” is instructive.34 Though he does not directly analyze the United States, he nonetheless demonstrates how racism, white supremacy, and the plunder of Africa underpinned the capitalist imperialist war that engulfed the world from July 1914 to November 1918—a war that catapulted the United States into the center of the capitalist world system. Using Du Bois’s own words, Hubert Harrison, the father of Harlem radicalism, makes the direct link: But since every industrial nation is seeking the same outlet for its products, clashes are inevitable and in these clashes beaks and claws—armies and navies—must come into play. Hence beaks and claws must be provided beforehand against the day of conflict, and hence the exploitation of white men in Europe and America becomes the reason for the exploitation of black and brown and yellow men in African and Asia. And, therefore, it is hypocritical and absurd to pretend that the capitalist nations can ever intend to abolish wars.… For white folk to insist upon the right to manage their own ancestral lands, free from the domination of tyrants, domestic and foreign, is variously described as “democracy” and “self-determination.” For Negroes, Egyptians and Hindus to seek the same thing is impudence.… Truly has it been said that “the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the ‘Color Line.'” And wars are not likely to end; in fact, they are likely to be wider and more terrible—so long as this theory of white domination seeks to hold down the majority of the world’s people under the iron heel of racial oppression.35 For Du Bois, the imperialist rivalry for the booty on offer in Africa drove Berlin’s efforts to consolidate its place in the sun by displacing London in particular. While Vladimir Lenin understood that “the war [was] a product of half a century of development of world capitalism and of billions of threads and connections,” Du Bois expanded this analysis by providing a critique of the racial foundations of capitalist expansion.36 He held that the struggle to the death during the Great War for African resources and labor had begun to “pay dividends” centuries earlier through the enslavement of African peoples, the subsequent conflation of color and inferiority, and the reduction of what was routinely referred to as the “Dark Continent” to a space of backwardness ideally suited for dispossession. He further noted that “with the waning possibility of Big Fortune…at home, arose more magnificently the dream of exploitation abroad,” especially in Africa—a dream shared by white labor and the ruling class.37 In other words, this “democratic despotism” allowed for the white working class to “share the spoil of exploiting ‘chinks and niggers,'” and facilitated the creation of “a new democratic nation composed of united capital and labor” that perpetuated racial capitalism across class lines.38 Moreover, this national unity was strengthened through the disrespect and dehumanization of the racialized toilers and peasants in the plundered colonies that mitigated the exploitation and impoverishment of the white working class in imperial countries. This superexploitation allowed white workers to get a share, however pitiful, of “wealth, power, and luxury…on a scale the world never saw before” and to benefit from the “new wealth” accumulated from the “darker nations of the world” through cross-class consent “for governance by white folk and economic subjection to them”—a consensus solidified through the doctrine of “the natural inferiority of most men to the few.”39 Given the entanglement of racialization and capitalist exploitation, Du Bois averred, “Racial slander must go. Racial prejudice will follow…the domination of one people by another without the other’s consent, be the subject people black or white, must stop. The doctrine of forcible economic expansion over subject people must go.” Insofar as this admonishment applied as much to the United States as to European imperialists, beyond the international proletariat, it was the darker peoples and nations of the world who would challenge racial capitalism, not least “the twenty-five million grandchildren of the European slave trade…and first of all the ten million black folk in the United States.”40

Imperialist accumulation denotes the rapacious conscription of resources and labor for the purpose of superprofits through violent means that are generally reserved for populations deemed racially inferior. On the precipice of the Great Depression, the prominent Black communist James Ford beautifully explicated imperialist accumulation. In his 1929 report on the Second World Congress of the League Against Imperialism, he explained that the extant political economy constituted the consolidation of Africa’s partition and the “complete enslavement of its people”; the arresting of its industrialization, which hindered the development of the “toiling masses”; and the relegation of the continent to a source of raw material, a market for European goods, and a dumping ground for accumulated surplus capital. In the U.S. South, the Black poor were dehumanized by Wall Street, “white big business,” and the “rising Negro bourgeoisie” whose condition of possibility was the subjection of the Black working class. This oppression was exacerbated by rigid racial barriers, disenfranchisement, and lynching. Ford further argued that the West Indies, subjected to U.S. militarism and occupation on behalf of Wall Street, were largely transformed into a marketplace for U.S. goods. Moreover, throughout Africa, the U.S. South, and the Caribbean, Black workers were impressed into forced labor, laying railroads, building roads and bridges, and working in mines; were entrapped on plantations through peonage; and were subjected to convict leasing. In addition, they suffered intolerable working conditions and routinized violence.41

Expropriation by domination designates the seizure and confiscation of land, assets, property, bodies, and other sources of material wealth set to work by relations of economic dependence. This relationship exists both between nations and between groups. A quintessential enunciation of expropriation by domination between groups is We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People, edited by the Black Communist William Patterson (with significant help from his wife and comrade Louise Thompson Patterson) and submitted to the United Nations by the Civil Rights Congress in 1951.42 The petition meticulously documented the past and present expropriation of Black people by the ruling class of modern U.S. racial capitalism through consistent and persistent discrimination in employment, unfair wages, forced ghettoization, inequitable and inferior accommodation and services, and the denial of justice in the courts. It further argued that this process was sustained by genocidal terror, white supremacist law, and the drive of monopoly capitalists for superprofits. Importantly, We Charge Genocide noted that, for primarily economic reasons, the historical and geographical locus of anti-Black genocide was the “Black Belt” of the Southern United States, a region expropriated by the Northern industrial capitalists and by Southern landowners alike. This was due in large part to plantation systems of sharecropping and peonage—legacies of slavery—in which Black political and economic rights were virtually nonexistent, Black laborers were inexorably tied to the land through debt, and the threat of violence and death precluded demands for justice. For Patterson, such expropriation by domination was the basis of “racist contamination that has spread throughout the United States.”43 We Charge Genocide further conveyed that expropriation by domination, a central element of modern U.S. racial capitalism, was more than a domestic concern because such practices “at home must inevitably create racist commodities for export abroad—must inevitably tend toward war.”44

Labor superexploitation can be understood as an economic relationship in which the intensity, form, and racial basis of exploitation differs little from slavery. Its effects are so extreme that it pushes racialized, particularly Black, labor effectively below the level of sheer physical subsistence. As Harrison explained, in the context of modern U.S. racial capitalism, Black workers “form a group that is more essentially proletarian than any other American group” because enslaved Africans were brought to the “new world” to be ruthlessly exploited. This reality fixed their social status as the most despised group, which in turn intensified their subjection.45 Likewise, organizations like the American Negro Labor Congress and the Anti-Imperialist League analyzed that the racial capitalist superexploitation of Black nations like Haiti in the first quarter of the twentieth century for the purposes of consolidating Wall Street control over land, commercial relations, and production was accompanied by the brutalization of Black labor, the export of Jim Crow practices, military occupation, and political repression.46 In effect, superexploitation results from the conjuncture of white supremacy, racialization, and the “badge of slavery,” which exacerbates the conditions of exploitation to which white working classes are subjected. As the Black Marxist Harry Haywood argued in 1948, “the stifling effects of the race factor are most strikingly illustrated by the drastic differences in the economic and cultural status of Negroes and whites.… Beyond all doubt, the oppression of the Negro, which is the basis of the degradation of the ‘poor whites,’ is of separate character demanding a special approach.”47 Superexploitation, he explained further, constitutes a combination of direct exploitation, outright robbery, physical violence, legal coercion, and perpetual indebtedness. It stifles “the free economic and cultural development” of the Black masses “through racist persecution as a basic condition for maintaining” virtual enslavement.48

The entrapment of Black women in domestic labor throughout the twentieth century—a function of their “triple oppression”—is perhaps the most glaring example of labor superexploitation under modern U.S. racial capitalism. In 1936, the lifelong Black radical Louise Thompson explained that Black women’s superexploitation in the capitalist mode of production was based on their race, sex, and subordination in the labor market.49 That same year, Black militants Marvel Cooke and Ella Baker published an article titled “The Bronx Slave Market” in which they studied triple oppression as it related to Black domestic workers. Cooke and Baker explained that the entanglements of racism, sex-based labor subordination, and structural poverty were deeply intensified by the Great Depression and forced Black domestic workers to pauperize their labor for the abysmal wage of less than thirty cents an hour. This form of labor exploitation was unique to the female sex because domestic work was conventional “women’s work,” and it was racialized insofar as the denigration of Black people fitted this group of women for low-wage, unprotected, and contingent labor.50

#### ICT development is dependent on anti-Black labor practices, material extraction, and environmental destruction.

Noble 16, assistant professor in the Department of Information Studies in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at UCLA. (Safiya Umoja, 2016, “A Future for Intersectional Black Feminist Technology Studies”, *Socialist & Feminist Online*, Issue 13.3-14.1, <https://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/safiya-umoja-noble-a-future-for-intersectional-black-feminist-technology-studies/>, accessed 8/26/2021)

\*\*\*note – underlined portion of the card has mention to sexual assault, it will not be highlighted.

The New Scramble for Africa: An Intersectional Analysis of the IT Sector

In the new scramble for Africa’s resources, transnational information and communication industries are racing to control the minerals and land needed for their aggressive expansion and growth—an echo of earlier colonial pursuits by European nations looking to open new markets for cotton and revitalize depressed Western economies.[20] Neocolonial processes remain intact, particularly in places like the Democratic Republic of Congo. That nation’s history of Western plunder began a century and a half earlier, under the rule of King Leopold II of Belgium, when its rubber and ivory resources were extracted for the manufacture of tires and condoms destined for the sprawling automobile and leisure culture of the United States.[21]

Efforts to reclaim autonomy over the Congo and its natural-resource riches were led in part by the pan-Africanist Patrice Lumumba, whose opposition to Belgian and US control of the Congo resulted in his assassination in 1961. This was but one of many efforts to subdue and effectively put down Black liberation movements on the continent of Africa. The foreclosing of African anti-colonial movements by Western state powers was mirrored in the US government’s simultaneously enacted Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO), which systematically assassinated and jailed Black feminist and Black Power liberation and civil rights movement activists in the US from the 1960s to the 1980s. Many of these same strategies are being re-enacted in this historical moment under the USA Patriot Act. The North American activists targeted by COINTELPRO were seeking liberation from interlocking oppressions, and developed relationships of solidarity and mutual aid with many pan-Africanist movements. Since the 1940s, pan-Africanists had been actively engaging in conferences and knowledge production designed to unify the interests of oppressed peoples directly affected by imperialist projects around the globe. This is an important intellectual lineage from which intersectional feminist critiques and activism emerged, their origins evident in the statement issued in 1945 from the Fifth Pan-African Conference:

We condemn the monopoly of capital and the rule of private wealth and industry for profit alone. We welcome economic democracy as the only real democracy. Therefore we shall complain, appeal and we will make the world listen to the facts of our condition. We will fight every way we can for freedom, democracy and social betterment.[22]

These intellectual linkages of critique and resistance demonstrate the connection between colonial projects of the past to the neocolonial, transnational, and neoliberal projects of the contemporary moment. Indeed, the neocolonial projects that fuel extraction industries (and their concomitant environmental and human catastrophes) in places like the Congo today persist in a historical trajectory of global capital’s thirst for expansion at the expense of Black life. Pádraig Carmody details the colonial quest for rubber and ivory in the Congo that led to the slaughter of more than ten million people; Carmody estimates that another three to five million were killed from 1983 to 2003 in wars over minerals and the control of coltan.[23] Coltan, short for columbite-tantalite, is a mineral, more potent than steel which is needed for computers and electronics to release electrical charges in small capacitors.[24] Contemporary global communications infrastructure, including the internet and the billions of devices, appliances, electronics, and “things” connected to it, could not exist without cheap access to coltan. Nevertheless, the bloody “conflict mineral” wars over its control—the rape, violence, and loss of human life involved—are largely invisible byproducts to digital tech users in the West.

In the networked economy of resources needed for global communications infrastructure, Black lives are engaged in some of the most treacherous labor essential to the growth and proliferation of the internet. Capital’s organization in multi-tiered global supply chains[25] obfuscates the direct relationships between Black labor, child labor, civil war, rape, and a smartphone, laptop, or iPad. Electronics companies such as Google, Apple, Dell, Intel, Sony, Nokia, and Ericsson are heavily invested in the computer and electronics hardware manufacturing industries and need raw minerals such as coltan to produce components such as tantalum capacitors for microprocessor chips. But this labor is outsourced, and thus conveniently out of sight and out of mind, going to low-bidders who provide the cheapest labor under favorable neoliberal economic policies. These practices are consistent with other forms of racialized and outsourced internet labor, such as commercial content moderation for large internet companies.[26]

In a transnational and neoliberal context, such practices are not limited to sites located geographically outside the West. David Pellow and Lisa Sun-Hee Park have written a comprehensive study of the underside of Silicon Valley—touted as a panacea of innovation, wealth, and opportunity, when this is the reality only for a choice few.[27] Just as in other areas of the globe, the technology and communications industries headquartered in Silicon Valley achieve their capital accumulation at the expense of overuse and abuse of the environment, gross poverty, and health degradation as they rely on an invisible labor force of immigrants and others living in the transnational, racialized margins:

Power, privilege and wealth are relational, which often means that one person’s riches and leisure time are derived from another’s impoverishment and hard labor; one’s socioeconomic or racial/ethnic group’s access to safe, high-salary jobs and clean neighborhoods is frequently linked to another group’s relegation to dangerous, low-wage occupations and environmentally contaminated communities. This is the essence of environmental racism and environmental injustice: ecological policies and practices are characterized by unfair treatment, discrimination, and oppression.[28]

Intersectional analysis makes these relational elements visible and allows us to trace the connections forged by inequities of wealth and power that bind local communities to others around the globe. Taking an intersectional approach to the internet and its infrastructure bridges the African diaspora, to help us see where and how oppressions are operationalized in similar ways and in the service of shared agents or shared motivations. The internet and its infrastructure are implicated in cases such as the recent public health crisis in Flint, Michigan, where state and corporate abuses, in the interest of multinational companies heavily invested in the technology sector, resulted in poisoned water supplies. The web is functioning as a site of online hyper-surveillance and trolling of Black activists engaged in the #BlackLivesMatter movement in the US and beyond. It is fundamental to Wall Street, where, through the mortgage crisis and Great Recession of 2008, information technology and the gamification of financial markets led to the largest decimation of Black wealth in the history of the United States. It is central to the oppressive working conditions facing Congolese laborers engaged in mineral extraction, in mineral wars, and in creating the greatest site of sexual violence in the world, according to the United Nations. It is evident in the toxic waste sites on the west coast of Africa, in Ghana, where e-waste is shipped in from the West and dumped, poisoning land, water, people, and environments.

These connections need to be made in order to understand the tradeoffs and true costs that come with the overemphasis, financially and in policy, on digital technologies and internet infrastructures. Communications scholar Robert Mejia has critiqued the multiple ways in which electronics and communications devices and infrastructures have material consequences with potent environmental impacts. He notes:

it is imperative that media and cultural studies scholars offer an account of how the 3.7 million gallons of water used per day by Intel in Hillsboro, Oregon, and the millions more used elsewhere, contribute to an ecology hospitable to infectious disease and its natural reservoirs… Knowing that an estimated 632,000 pounds of mercury were disposed of in United States’ landfills between 1997 and 2007, from just discarded personal computers alone, and that about 130 million cellphones are thrown away each year.[29]

The consequences of these ecological disasters are not equitably applied to everyone. The study of the materiality of the internet includes thinking through the specific contexts of who is affected by the social, environmental, economic, and policy arrangements of the digital.[30]

Intellectual investments in thinking of the internet and the digital as disembodied and ephemeral—as if they have no materiality—come at a great cost of erasure and denial. Jean-François Blanchette has written one of the most detailed critical accounts of the development of computing—including the ways in which information is processed, networks are developed and managed, and fiber infrastructure is built and maintained—in order to dislodge the idea that the internet and computing are immaterial or abstract.[31] An intersectional examination of the global information infrastructure underscores that it is predicated upon a complex, globalized, and fundamentally material economy of resource extraction and human labor, from Congolese labor to extract minerals, to Chinese labor working for poverty wages at Foxconn to make Apple’s iPhones, to the exclusion of African American labor from high-wage IT jobs in the United States, to Ghanaians sifting through electronic trash and toxic waste.

#### The new “cold war” battle for tech supremacy with China is a race manufactured to cover up US digital colonialism — only movements against capitalism can reign in US imperialism and prevent the aff’s impact.

Kwet 21, PhD in Sociology from Rhodes University and is a Visiting Fellow of the Information Society Project at Yale Law School (Michael, March 4th, “Digital colonialism: The evolution of US empire,” *The Transnational Institute*, <https://longreads.tni.org/digital-colonialism-the-evolution-of-us-empire>, Accessed 07-08-2021)

A Chinese or US digital empire?

In the West, there is a lot of chatter about “a new Cold War,” with the US and China battling it out for global technological supremacy. Yet, a close look at the tech ecosystem shows that US corporations are overwhelmingly dominant in the global economy.

China, after decades of high growth, generates around 17 percent of global GDP and is predicted to overtake the US by 2028, feeding into claims that American empire is on the decline (a narrative that was previously popular with the rise of Japan). When measuring the Chinese economy by purchasing power parity, it is already larger than the US. However, as economist Sean Starrs points out, this wrongly treats states as self-contained units, “interacting as billiard balls on a table.” In reality, Starrs contends, American economic dominance “hasn’t declined, it globalized.” This is particularly true when looking at Big Tech.

In the post-WWII period, corporate production was spread across transnational production networks. For instance, in the 1990s, companies like Apple began outsourcing electronics manufacturing from the US to China and Taiwan, exploiting sweatshop workers employed by companies like Foxconn. US tech transnationals often design the IP for, say, high-performance router switches (e.g. Cisco) while outsourcing manufacturing capacity to hardware manufacturers in the South.

Starrs profiled the world’s top 2,000 publicly traded companies, as ranked by Forbes Global 2000, and organized them according to 25 sectors, showing the dominance of US transnationals. As of 2013, they dominated in terms of profit shares in 18 of the top 25 sectors. In his forthcoming book American Power Globalized: Rethinking National Power in the Age of Globalization, Starrs shows that the US remains dominant. For IT Software & Services, US profit share is 76 percent versus China’s 10 percent; for Technology Hardware & Equipment, it is 63 percent for the US versus 6 percent for China, and for Electronics, it is 43 and 10 percent, respectively. Other countries, such as South Korea, Japan and Taiwan, often fare better than China in these categories as well.

Portraying the US and China as equal contenders in the battle for global tech supremacy, as is often done, is therefore highly misleading. For example, a 2019 United Nations “Digital Economy” report states that: “Geography of the digital economy is highly concentrated in two countries” — the United States and China. But the report not only ignores factors identified by authors like Starrs it also fails to account for the fact that most of China’s tech industry is dominant inside China, save a handful of major products and services, such as 5G (Huawei), CCTV cameras (Hikvision, Dahua), and social media (TikTok), which also hold large market shares abroad. China also has substantial investments in some foreign tech firms, but this hardly suggests a genuine threat to the dominance of the US, which has a much larger share of foreign investments as well.

In reality, the US is the supreme tech empire. Outside of US and Chinese borders, the US leads in the categories of search engines (Google); web browsers (Google Chrome, Apple Safari); smartphone and tablet operating systems (Google Android, Apple iOS); desktop and laptop operating systems (Microsoft Windows, macOS); office software (Microsoft Office, Google G Suite, Apple iWork); cloud infrastructure and services (Amazon, Microsoft, Google, IBM); social networking platforms (Facebook, Twitter); transportation (Uber, Lyft); business networking (Microsoft LinkedIn); streaming entertainment (Google YouTube, Netflix, Hulu), and online advertising (Google, Facebook) — among others.

The upshot is, whether you are an individual or a business, if you are using a computer, American companies benefit the most. They own the digital ecosystem.

Political domination and the means of violence

The economic power of US tech giants goes hand-in-hand with their influence in the political and social spheres. As with other industries, there is a revolving door between tech executives and the US government, and tech corporations and business alliances spend a great deal lobbying regulators for policies favorable to their specific interests — and digital capitalism in general.

Governments and law enforcement agencies, in turn, form partnerships with tech giants to do their dirty work. In 2013, Edward Snowden famously revealed that Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, PalTalk, YouTube, Skype, AOL, and Apple all shared information with the National Security Agency via the PRISM program. More revelations followed, and the world learned that data stored by corporations and transmitted over the internet is sucked into enormous government databases for exploitation by states. Countries in the South have been targets of NSA surveillance, from the Middle East to Africa and Latin America.

Police and the military also work with tech corporations, who are happy to cash fat checks as providers of surveillance products and services, including in countries across the South. For example, through its little-known Public Safety and Justice Division, Microsoft has built an extensive partnership ecosystem with “law enforcement” surveillance vendors, who run their tech on Microsoft cloud infrastructure. This includes a city-wide command-and-control surveillance platform called “Microsoft Aware” that was purchased by police in Brazil and Singapore and a police vehicle solution with facial recognition cameras that has been rolled out in Cape Town and Durban, South Africa.

Microsoft is also deeply involved with the prison industry. It offers a variety of prison software solutions that cover the entire correctional pipeline, from juvenile “offenders” to pretrial and probation, through jail and prison, as well as those released from prison and put on parole. In Africa, they partnered with a company called Netopia Solutions, which offers aPrison Management Software (PMS) platform that includes “escape management” and prisoner analytics.0

While it is not clear where exactly Netopia’s Prison Management Solution is deployed, Microsoft stated that “Netopia is [a Microsoft partner/vendor] in Morocco with a deep focus on transforming digitally, government services in North and Central Africa.” Morocco has a track record of brutalizing dissidents and torturing prisoners, and the US recently recognized its annexation of Western Sahara, in contravention of international law.

For centuries, imperial powers tested technologies to police and control their citizens on foreign populations first, from SirFrancis Galton’s pioneering work on fingerprinting applied in India and South Africa, to America’s combination of biometrics and innovations in managing statistics and data management that formed the first modern surveillance apparatus to pacify the Philippines. As historian Alfred McCoy has shown, the collection of surveillance technologies deployed in the Philippines offered a testing ground for a model which was eventually brought back to the United States for use against domestic dissidents. Microsoft and its partners’ high-tech surveillance projects suggest that Africans continue to serve as a laboratory for carceral experimentation.

Conclusion

Digital technology and information plays a central role in politics, economy, and social life everywhere. As part of the American empire project, US transnational corporations are reinventing colonialism in the South through their ownership and control of intellectual property, digital intelligence, and the means of computation. Most of the core infrastructure, industries, and functions performed by computers are the private property of American transnational corporations, who are overwhelmingly dominant outside US borders. The largest firms, such as Microsoft and Apple, dominate global supply chains as intellectual monopolies.

An unequal exchange and division of labor ensues, reinforcing dependency in the periphery while perpetuating mass immiseration and global poverty.

Instead of sharing knowledge, transferring technology, and providing the building blocks for shared global prosperity on equal terms, the rich countries and their corporations aim to protect their advantage and shake down the South for cheap labor and rent extraction. By monopolizing the core components of the digital ecosystem, pushing their tech in schools and skills training programs, and partnering with corporate and state elites in the South, Big Tech is capturing emerging markets. They will even profit from surveillance services provided to police departments and prisons, all to make a buck.

#### Capitalism causes extinction---the only alternative is an international workers organization led by the Global South.

Foster 20, Editor of Monthly Review, and a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon (John Bellamy, The Renewal of the Socialist Ideal, *Monthly Review*, September 2020, Volume 72, Number 4)

Any serious treatment of the renewal of socialism today must begin with capitalism’s creative destruction of the bases of all social existence. Since the late 1980s, the world has been engulfed in an epoch of catastrophe capitalism, defined as the accumulation of imminent catastrophe on every side due to the unintended consequences of “the juggernaut of capital.”1 Catastrophe capitalism in this sense is manifested today in the convergence of (1) the planetary ecological crisis, (2) the global epidemiological crisis, and (3) the unending world economic crisis.2 Added to this are the main features of today’s “empire of chaos,” including the extreme system of imperialist exploitation unleashed by global commodity chains; the demise of the relatively stable liberal-democratic state with the rise of neoliberalism and neofascism; and the emergence of a new age of global hegemonic instability accompanied by increased dangers of unlimited war.3

The climate crisis represents what the world scientific consensus refers to as a “no analogue” situation, such that if net carbon emissions from fossil fuel combustion do not reach zero in the next few decades, it will threaten the very existence of industrial civilization and ultimately human survival.4 Nevertheless, the existential crisis is not limited to climate change, but extends to the crossing of other planetary boundaries that together define the global ecological rift in the Earth System as a safe place for humanity. These include: (1) ocean acidification; (2) species extinction (and loss of genetic diversity); (3) destruction of forest ecosystems; (4) loss of fresh water; (5) disruption of the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles; (6) the rapid spread of toxic agents (including radionuclides); and (7) the uncontrolled proliferation of genetically modified organisms.5

This rupturing of planetary boundaries is intrinsic to the system of capital accumulation that recognizes no insurmountable barriers to its unlimited, exponential quantitative advance. Hence, there is no exit from the current capitalist destruction of the overall social and natural conditions of existence that does not require exiting capitalism itself. What is essential is the creation of what István Mészáros in Beyond Capital called a new system of “social metabolic reproduction.”6 This points to socialism as the heir apparent to capitalism in the twenty-first century, but conceived in ways that critically challenge the theory and practice of socialism as it existed in the twentieth century.

The Polarization of the Class System

In the United States, key sectors of monopoly-finance capital have now succeeded in mobilizing elements of the primarily white lower-middle class in the form of a nationalist, racist, misogynist ideology. The result is a nascent neofascist political-class formation, capitalizing on the long history of structural racism arising out of the legacies of slavery, settler colonialism, and global militarism/imperialism. This burgeoning neofascism’s relation to the already existing neoliberal political formation is that of “enemy brothers” characterized by a fierce jockeying for power coupled with a common repression of the working class.7 It is these conditions that have formed the basis of the rise of the New York real-estate mogul and billionaire Donald Trump as the leader of the so-called radical right, leading to the imposition of right-wing policies and a new authoritarian capitalist regime.8 Even if the neoliberal faction of the ruling class wins out in the coming presidential election, ousting Trump and replacing him with Joe Biden, a neoliberal-neofascist alliance, reflecting the internal necessity of the capitalist class, will likely continue to form the basis of state power under monopoly-finance capital.

Appearing simultaneously with this new reactionary political formation in the United States is a resurgent movement for socialism, based in the working-class majority and dissident intellectuals. The demise of U.S. hegemony within the world economy, accelerated by the globalization of production, has undermined the former, imperial-based labor aristocracy among certain privileged sections of the working class, leading to a resurgence of socialism.9 Confronted with what Michael D. Yates has called “the Great Inequality,” the mass of the population in the United States, particularly youth, are faced with rapidly diminishing prospects, finding themselves in a state of uncertainty and often despair, marked by a dramatic increase in “deaths of despair.”10 They are increasingly alienated from a capitalist system that offers them no hope and are attracted to socialism as the only genuine alternative.11 Although the U.S. situation is unique, similar objective forces propelling a resurgence of socialist movements are occurring elsewhere in the system, primarily in the Global South, in an era of continuing economic stagnation, financialization, and universal ecological decline.

But if socialism is seemingly on the rise again in the context of the structural crisis of capital and increased class polarization, the question is: What kind of socialism? In what ways does socialism for the twenty-first century differ from socialism of the twentieth century? Much of what is being referred to as socialism in the United States and elsewhere is of the social-democratic variety, seeking an alliance with left-liberals and thus the existing order, in a vain attempt to make capitalism work better through the promotion of social regulation and social welfare in direct opposition to neoliberalism, but at a time when neoliberalism is itself giving way to neofascism.12 Such movements are bound to fail at the outset in the present historical context, inevitably betraying the hopes that they unleashed, since focused on mere electoral democracy. Fortunately, we are also seeing the growth today of a genuine socialism, evident in extra-electoral struggle, heightened mass action, and the call to go beyond the parameters of the present system so as to reconstitute society as whole.

The general unrest latent at the base of U.S. society was manifested in the uprisings in late May and June of this year, which took the form, practically unheard of in U.S. history since the U.S. Civil War, of massive solidarity protests with millions of people in the streets, and with the white working class, and white youth in particular, crossing the color line *en masse* in response to the police lynching of George Floyd for no other crime than being a Black man.13 This event, coming in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic and the related economic depression, led to the June days of rage in the United States.

But while the movement toward socialism, now taking hold even in the United States at the “barbaric heart” of the system, is gaining ground as a result of objective forces, it lacks an adequate subjective basis.14 A major obstacle in formulating strategic goals of socialism in the world today has to do with twentieth-century socialism’s abandonment of its own ideals as originally articulated in Karl Marx’s vision of communism. To understand this problem, it is necessary to go beyond recent left attempts to address the meaning of communism on a philosophical basis, a question that has led in the last decade to abstract treatments of The Communist Idea, The Communist Hypothesis, and The Communist Horizon by Alain Badiou and others.15 Rather, a more concrete historically based starting point is necessary, focusing directly on the two-phase theory of socialist/communist development that emerged out of Marx’s Critique of the Gotha Programme and V. I. Lenin’s The State and Revolution. Paul M. Sweezy’s article “Communism as an Ideal,” published more than half a century ago in Monthly Review in October 1963, is now a classic text in this regard.16

Marx’s Communism as the Socialist Ideal

In The Critique of the Gotha Programme—written in opposition to the economistic and laborist notions of the branch of German Social Democracy influenced by Ferdinand Lassalle—Marx designated two historical “phases” in the struggle to create a society of associated producers. The first phase was initiated by the “revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat,” reflecting the class-war experience of the Paris Commune and representing a period of workers’ democracy, but one that still carried the “defects” of capitalist class society. In this initial phase, not only would a break with capitalist private property take place, but also a break with the capitalist state as the political command structure of capitalism.17 As a measure of the limited nature of socialist transition in this stage, production and distribution would inevitably take the form of to each according to one’s labor, perpetuating conditions of inequality even while creating the conditions for their transcendence. In contrast, in the later phase, the principle governing society would shift to from each according to one’s ability, to each according to one’s need and the elimination of the wage system.18 Likewise, while the initial phase of socialism/communism would require the formation of a new political command structure in the revolutionary period, the goal in the higher phase was the withering away of the state as a separate apparatus standing above and in antagonistic relation to society, to be replaced with a form of political organization that Frederick Engels referred to as “community,” associated with a communally based form of production.19

In the later, higher phase of the transition of socialism/communism, not only would property be collectively owned and controlled, but the constitutive cells of society would be reconstituted on a communal basis and production would be in the hands of the associated producers. In these conditions, Marx stated, “labor” will have become not a mere “means of life” but “itself…the prime necessity of life.”20 Production would be directed at use values rather than exchange values, in line with a society in which “the free development of each” would be “the condition for the free development of all.” The abolition of capitalist class society and the creation of a society of associated producers would lead to the end of class exploitation, along with the elimination of the divisions between mental and manual labor and between town and country. The monogamous, patriarchal family based on the domestic enslavement of women would also be surmounted.21 Fundamental to Marx’s picture of the higher phase of the society of associated producers was a new social metabolism of humanity and the earth. In his most general statement on the material conditions governing the new society, he wrote: “Freedom, in this sphere [the realm of natural necessity], can consist only in this, that socialized man, the associated producers, govern the human metabolism of nature in a rational way…accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy” in the process of promoting conditions of sustainable human development.22

Writing in The State and Revolution and elsewhere, Lenin deftly captured Marx’s arguments on the lower and higher phases, depicting these as the first and second phases of communism. Lenin went on to emphasize what he called “the scientific distinction between socialism and communism,” whereby “what is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the ‘first,’ or lower phase of communist society,” whereas the term communism, meaning “complete communism,” was most appropriately used for the higher phase.23 Although Lenin closely aligned this distinction with Marx’s analysis, in later official Marxism this came to be rigidified in terms of two entirely separate stages, with the so-called communist stage so removed from the stage of socialism that it became utopianized, no longer seen as part of a continuous or ongoing struggle. Based on a wooden conception of the socialist stage and the intermediary principle of distribution to each according to one’s labor, Joseph Stalin carried out an ideological war against the ideal of real equality, which he characterized as a “reactionary, petty-bourgeois absurdity worthy of a primitive sect of ascetics but not of a socialist society organized on Marxist lines.” This same stance was to persist in the Soviet Union in one way or another all the way to Mikhail Gorbachev.24

Hence, as explained by Michael Lebowitz in The Socialist Imperative, “rather than a continuous struggle to go beyond what Marx called the ‘defects’ inherited from capitalist society, the standard interpretation” of Marxism in the half-century from the late 1930s to the late ’80s “introduced a division of post-capitalist society into two distinct ‘stages,’” determined economistically by the level of development of the productive forces. Fundamental changes in social relations emphasized by Marx as the very essence of the socialist path were abandoned in the process of living with and adapting to the defects carried over from capitalist society. Instead, Marx had insisted on a project aimed at building the community of associated producers “from the outset” as part of an ongoing, if necessarily uneven, process of socialist construction.25

This abandonment of the socialist ideal associated with Marx’s higher phase of communism was wrapped up in a complex way with changing material (and class) conditions and eventually the demise of Soviet-type societies, which tended to stagnate once they ceased to be revolutionary and even resurrected class forms, heralding their eventual collapse as the new class or nomenklatura abandoned the system. As Sweezy argued in 1971, “state ownership and planning are not enough to define a viable socialism, one immune to the threat of retrogression and capable of moving forward on the second leg of the movement to communism.” Something more was needed: the continuous struggle to create a society of equals.26

For Marx, the movement toward a society of associated producers was the very essence of the socialist path embedded in “communist consciousness.”27 Yet, once socialism came to be defined in more restrictive, economistic terms, particularly in the Soviet Union from the late 1930s onward, in which substantial inequality was defended, post-revolutionary society lost the vital connection to the dual struggle for freedom and necessity, and hence became disconnected from the long-term goals of socialism from which it had formerly derived its meaning and coherence.

Based on this experience, it is evident that the only way to build socialism in the twenty-first century is to embrace precisely those aspects of the socialist/communist ideal that allow a theory and practice radical enough to address the urgent needs of the present, while also not losing sight of the needs of the future. If the planetary ecological crisis has taught us anything, it is that what is required is a new social metabolism with the earth, a society of ecological sustainability and substantive equality. This can be seen in the extraordinary achievements of Cuban ecology, as recently shown by Mauricio Betancourt in “The Effect of Cuban Agroecology in Mitigating the Metabolic Rift” in Global Environmental Change.28 This conforms to what Georg Lukács called the necessary “double transformation” of human social relations and the human relations to nature.29 Such an emancipatory project must necessarily pass through various revolutionary phases, which cannot be predicted in advance. Yet, to be successful, a revolution must seek to make itself irreversible through the promotion of an organic system directed at genuine human needs, rooted in substantive equality and the rational regulation of the human social metabolism with nature.30

Freedom as Necessity

Building on G. W. F. Hegel’s philosophy, Engels famously argued in Anti-Dühring that real freedom was grounded in the recognition of necessity. Revolutionary change was the point at which freedom and necessity met in concrete praxis. Although there was such a thing as blind necessity beyond human knowledge, once objective forces were grasped, necessity was no longer blind, but rather offered new paths for human action and freedom. Necessity and freedom fed on each other, requiring new periods of social change and historical transcendence.31 In illustrating this materialist dialectical principle, Lenin acutely observed, “we do not know the necessity of nature in the phenomena of the weather. But while we do not know this necessity, we do know that it exists.”32 We know the human relation to the weather and nature in general inevitably varies with the changing productive relations governing our actions.

Today, the knowledge of anthropogenic climate crisis and of extreme weather events is removing human beings from the realm of blind necessity and demanding that the world’s population engage in the ultimate struggle for freedom and survival against catastrophe capitalism. As Marx stated in the context of the severe metabolic rift imposed on Ireland as a result of British colonialism in the nineteenth century, the ecological crisis presents itself as a case of “ruin or revolution.”33 In the Anthropocene, the ecological rift resulting from the expansion of the capitalist economy now exists on a scale rivaling the biogeochemical cycles of the planet. However, knowledge of these objective developments also allows us to conceive the necessary revolution in the social metabolic reproduction of humanity and the earth. Viewed in this context, Marx’s crucial conception of a “community of associated producers” is not to be viewed as simply a far-off utopian conception or abstract ideal but as the very essence of the necessary human defense in the present and future, representing the insistent demand for a sustainable relation to the earth.34

But where is the agent of revolutionary change? The answer is that we are seeing the emergence of the material preconditions of what can be called a global environmental proletariat. Engels’s Condition of the Working Class in England, published in 1845, was a description and analysis of working-class conditions in Manchester, shortly after the so-called Plug Plot Riots and at the height of radical Chartism. Engels depicted the working-class environment not simply in terms of factory conditions, but much more in terms of urban developments, housing, water supply, sanitation, food and nutrition, and child development. The focus was on the general epidemiological environment enforced by capitalism (what Engels called “social murder” and what Norman Bethune later called “the second sickness”) associated with widespread morbidity and mortality, particularly due to contagious disease.35 Marx, under the direct influence of Engels and as a result of his own social epidemiological studies twenty years later while writing Capital, was to see the metabolic rift as arising not only in relation to the degradation of the soil, but equally, as he put it, in terms of “periodical epidemics” induced by society itself.36

What this tells us—and we could find many other illustrations, from the Russian and Chinese Revolutions to struggles in the Global South today—is that class struggle and revolutionary moments are the product of a coalescence of objective necessity and a demand for freedom emanating from material conditions that are not simply economic but also environmental in the broadest sense. Revolutionary situations are thus most likely to come about when a combination of economic and ecological conditions make social transformations necessary, and where social forces and relations are developed enough to make such changes possible. In this respect, looked at from a global standpoint today, the issue of the environmental proletariat overlaps with and is indistinguishable from the question of the ecological peasantry and the struggles of the Indigenous. Likewise, the struggle for environmental justice that now animates the environmental movement globally is in essence a working-class and peoples’ struggle.37

The environmental proletariat in this sense can be seen as emerging as a force all over the world, as evident in the present period of ecological-epidemiological struggle in relation to COVID-19. Yet, the main locus of revolutionary ecological action in the immediate future remains the Global South, faced with the harsh reality of “imperialism in the Anthropocene.”38 As Samir Amin observed in Modern Imperialism, Monopoly Finance Capital, and Marx’s Law of Value, the triad of the United States, Europe, and Japan is already using the planet’s bio-capacity at four times the world average, pointing toward ecological oblivion. This unsustainable level of consumption of resources in the Global North is only possible because

a good proportion of the bio-capacity of society in the South is taken up by and to the advantage of these centers [in the triad]. In other words, the current expansion of capitalism is destroying the planet and humanity. The expansion’s logical conclusion is either the actual genocide of the peoples of the South—as “overpopulation”—or, at the least, their confinement to ever-increasing poverty. An eco-fascist strand of thought is being developed which gives legitimacy to this kind of “final solution” to the problem.39

A New System of Social Metabolic Reproduction

A revolutionary process of socialist construction aimed at building a new system of social reproduction in conformity with the demands of necessity and freedom cannot occur without an overall “orienting principle” and “measure of achievement” as part of a long-term strategy. It is here, following Mészáros, that the notion of substantive equality or a society of equals, also entailing substantive democracy, comes into play in today’s struggles.40 Such an approach not only stands opposed to capital at its barbaric heart but also opposes any ultimately futile endeavor to stop halfway in the transition to socialism. Immanuel Kant spelled out the dominant liberal view shortly after the French Revolution when he stated that “the general equality of men as subjects in a state coexists quite readily with the greatest inequality in degrees of the possessions men have.… Hence, the general equality of men coexists with great inequality of specific rights of which there may be many.”41 In this way, equality came to be merely formal, existing merely “on paper” as Engels pointed out, not only with respect to the labor contract between capitalist and worker but also in relation to the marriage contract between men and women.42 Such a society establishes, as Marx demonstrated, a “right of inequality, in its content, like every right.”43 The idea of substantive equality, consistent with Marx’s notion of communism, challenges all of this. It demands a change in the constitutive cells of society, which can no longer consist of possessive individualists, or individual capitals, reinforced by a hierarchical state, but must be based on the associated producers and a communal state. Genuine planning and genuine democracy can only start through the constitution of power from the bottom of society. It is only in this way that revolutions become irreversible.

It was the explicit recognition of the challenge and burden of twenty-first-century socialism in these terms that represented the extraordinary threat to the prevailing order constituted by the Venezuelan Revolution led by Hugo Chávez. The Bolivarian Republic challenged capitalism from within through the creation of communal power and popular protagonism, generating a notion of revolution as the creation of an organic society, or a new social metabolic order. Chávez, building on the analyses of Marx and Mészáros, mediated by Lebowitz, introduced the notion of “the elementary triangle of socialism,” or (1) social ownership, (2) social production organized by workers, and (3) satisfaction of communal needs.44 Underlying this was a struggle for substantive equality, abolishing the inequalities of the color line and the gender line, the imperial line, and other lines of oppression, as the essential basis for eliminating the society of unequals.

In “Communism as an Ideal,” Sweezy emphasized the new forms of labor that would necessarily come into being in a society that used abundant human productivity more rationally. Many categories of work, he indicated, would “be eliminated altogether (e.g. coalmining and domestic service), and insofar as possible all jobs must become interesting and creative as only a few are today.” The reduction of the enormous waste and destruction inherent in capitalist production and consumption would open up space for the employment of disposable time in more creative ways.

In a society of equals—one in which everyone stands in the same relation to the means of production and has the same obligation to work and serve the common welfare—all “needs” that emphasize the superiority of the few and involve the subservience of the many will simply disappear and will be replaced by the needs of liberated human beings living together in mutual respect and cooperation.… Society and the human beings who compose it constitute a dialectical whole: neither can change without changing the other. And communism as an ideal comprises a new society and a new [human being].45

More than simply an ideal, such an organizing principle in which substantive equality and substantive democracy are foremost in the conception of socialism/communism is essential not only to create a socialist path to a better future but as a necessary defense of the global population confronted with the question of survival. Dystopian books and novels notwithstanding, it is impossible to imagine the level of environmental catastrophe that will face the world’s peoples, especially those at the bottom of the imperialist hierarchy, if capitalism’s creative destruction of the metabolism of humanity and the earth is not stopped mid–century.

According to a 2020 article on “The Future of the Human Climate Niche” in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, based on existing trends, 3.5 billion people are projected to be living in unlivable heat outside the human climate niche by 2070, under conditions comparable to those of the Sahara desert.46 Even such projections fail to capture the enormous level of destruction that will fall on the majority of humanity under capitalist business as usual. The only answer is to leave the burning house and to build another now.47

The International of Workers and Peoples

Although untold numbers of people are engaged in innumerable struggles against the capitalist juggernaut in their specific localities all around the world, struggles for substantive equality, including battles over race, gender, and class, depend on the fight against imperialism at the global level. Hence, there is a need for a new global organization of workers based on the model of Marx’s First International.48 Such an International for the twenty-first century cannot simply consist of a group of elite intellectuals from the North engaged in World Social Forum-like discussion activities or in the promotion of social-democratic regulatory reforms as in the so-called Socialist and Progressive Internationals. Rather, it needs to be constituted as a workers-based and peoples-based organization, rooted from the beginning in a strong South-South alliance so as to place the struggle against imperialism at the center of the socialist revolt against capitalism, as contemplated by figures such as Chávez and Amin.

In 2011, just prior to his final illness, Chávez was preparing, following his next election, to launch what was to be called the New International (pointedly not a Fifth International) focusing on a South-South alliance and giving a global significance to socialism in the twenty-first century. This would have extended the Bolivarian Alliance for Peoples of Our America to a global level.49 This, however, never saw the light of day due to Chávez’s rapid decline and untimely death.

Meanwhile, a separate conception grew out of the efforts of Amin, working with the World Forum for Alternatives. Amin had long contemplated a Fifth International, an idea he was still presenting as late as May 2018. But in July 2018, only a month before his death, this had been transformed into what he called an Internationale of Workers and Peoples, explicitly recognizing that a pure worker-based International that did not take into account the situation of peoples was inadequate in confronting imperialism.50 This, he stated, would be an organization, not just a movement. It would be aimed at the

alliance of all working peoples of the world and not only those qualified as representatives of the proletariat…including all wage earners of the services, peasants, farmers, and the peoples oppressed by modern capitalism. The construction must also be based on the recognition and respect of diversity, whether of parties, trade unions, or other popular organizations of struggle, guaranteeing their real independence.… In the absence of [such revolutionary] progress the world would continue to be ruled by chaos, barbarian practices, and the destruction of the earth.51

The creation of a New International cannot of course occur in a vacuum but needs to be articulated within and as a product of the building of unified mass organizations expanding at the grassroots level in conjunction with revolutionary movements and delinkings from the capitalist system all over the world. It could not occur, in Amin’s view, without new initiatives from the Global South to create broad alliances, as in the initial organized struggles associated with the Third World movement launched at the Bandung Conference in 1955, and the struggle for a New International Economic Order.52 These three elements—grassroots movements, delinking, and cross-country/cross-continent alliances—are all crucial in his conception of the anti-imperialist struggle. Today this needs to be united with the global ecological movement.

Such a universal struggle against capitalism and imperialism, Amin insisted, must be characterized by audacity and more audacity, breaking with the coordinates of the system at every point, and finding its ideal path in the principle of from each according to one’s ability, to each according to one’s need, as the very definition of human community. Today we live in a time of the perfect coincidence of the struggles for freedom and necessity, leading to a renewed struggle for freedom as necessity. The choice before us is unavoidable: ruin or revolution.

#### The alternative requires rejecting the aff and critically interrogating the neoliberal discourse of the 1AC---resisting capitalist pedagogy in educational spaces is the first step towards a broader movement away from Capitalism.

Giroux 20, McMaster University Professor for Scholarship in the Public Interest and The Paulo Freire Distinguished Scholar in Critical Pedagogy (Henry, June 9th, “Racist Violence Can’t Be Separated from the Violence of Neoliberal Capitalism,” *Truthout*, <https://truthout.org/articles/racist-violence-cant-be-separated-from-the-violence-of-neoliberal-capitalism/>, Accessed 08-24-2021)

As educators, it is crucial for us to examine how we talk, teach, and write about inequality as an object of critique in an age of precarity, uncertainty and the current pandemic crisis. This is especially true at a time when a growing number of authoritarian regimes around the globe substitute replace thoughtful dialogue and critical engagement with the suppression of dissent and a culture of forgetting r. How do we situate our analysis of education as part of a broader discourse and mode of analysis that interrogates the promises, ideals, and claims of a substantive democracy? How do we fight against iniquitous relations of power and wealth that empty power of its emancipatory possibilities, and as Hannah Arendt has argued, “makes most people superfluous as human beings”? How might we understand how neoliberal ideology, with its appropriation of market-based values, regressive notions of freedom and agency, uses language to infiltrate daily life? How does a pandemic pedagogy in the service of neoliberalism produce identities defined by market values, and normalize a notion of responsibility and individuality that convinces people that whatever problem they face they have no one to blame but themselves? Repeated endlessly on right-wing media platforms, the underlying conditions that disproportionately produce chronic illness among poor people of color disappear among a public distracted, if not persuaded, by a pandemic pedagogy that celebrates unchecked self-interest, disdains social responsibility, and turns away from the reality of a society with deep-seated institutional rot and unravelling of social connections and the social contract.

Pandemic pedagogy thrives on inequality and becomes a militarized and heartless normalizing tool to convince the broader public that the lives of the elderly, sick, and vulnerable should be valued according to how much they contribute to the economy. And if they are willing to die in order not to be a drain on the economy, all well and good. Nothing escapes the cruel logic of neoliberalism with its arrogance and hubris on full display as it bathes in the glow of right-wing populism, ultra-nationalism, and neofascism. Its accoutrements of dictatorship are everywhere and can be seen in the swagger of militia that storm state capitals, in police who punch and pepper spray protesters and push elderly men to the ground, and in military forces on the streets without badges reinforcing a climate of fear, repression, and unaccountability. There is more at work here than a lack of humanity on the part of the Trump administration. As the Irish journalist Fintan O’Toole observes, there is also the deepening grip of a culture of cruelty and dehumanization. He writes:

“As a society the American people are being habituated into accepting cruelty on a wide scale. Americans are being taught by Trump and his administration not to see other people as human beings whose lives are as important as their own. Once that line has been crossed – and it is not just Trump and the people around him, but many of Trump’s supporters as well – then we know where that all leads, what the ultimate destination is. There is no mystery about it. We know what happens when a government and its leaders dehumanize large numbers of people.”

Depoliticization and the Authoritarian Turn

Neoliberalism is not only an economic system, it is also an ideological apparatus that relentlessly attempts to structure consciousness, values, desires, and modes of identification in ways that align individuals with its governing structures. Central to this pedagogical project is the attempt to prevent individuals from translating private issues and troubles into broader systemic considerations. By doing this, it becomes difficult for individuals to grasp the historical, social, economic, and political forces at work in shaping a social order as a human activity deeply immersed in specific relations of power. Neoliberalism’s attempt to erase or rewrite historical and social forces makes it difficult for individuals to imagine alternative notions of society, with themselves as collective actors, or view their problems as more than the limitations of faulty character, moral failure, or a problem of personal responsibility. Reducing individuals to isolated, discrete, hermetically-sealed human beings whose lives are shaped only by notions of self-reliance and self-sufficiency is a pedagogical strategy that utterly depoliticizes people, leading them to believe that however a society is shaped, it is part of a natural order. President Trump echoed this “no alternative” narrative when asked about celebrities and rich people having special access to being tested for the coronavirus while few others had access. He replied, “Perhaps that’s been the story of life.”

This individualization of the social with its mounting privatization, gated communities, and social atomization undermines collective action, any viable notion of solidarity, and weakens the notion of global connectivity. The philosopher Byung-Chul Han has rightly argued that contemporary neoliberal society is shaped by a dysfunctional notion of solitude and hermitically-sealed notions of agency, all of which undermine the values and social connections vital to a democracy. He writes:

“Those subject to the neoliberal economy do not constitute a we that is capable of collective action. The mounting egoization and atomization of society is making the space for collective action shrink… The general collapse of the collective and the communal has engulfed it. Solidarity is vanishing. Privatization now reaches into the depths of the soul itself. The erosion of the communal is making all collective efforts more and more unlikely.”

This panoptical nature of hyper-individualism is more aligned with shared fears than shared responsibilities. Under such circumstances, trust and the notion that all life is related become difficult to grasp as the myopic language of private self-interest inures individuals to wider social problems such as extreme inequality. There is no understanding in this discourse of the damage fanatical entrepreneurialism does to our embodied collectivity. Nor is there any value attributed to the important responsibilities, social values, and notion of the common good that exceeds who we are as individuals, or how we have been shaped by diverse social forces in particular ways.

It should be clear that questions of economic and social justice cannot be addressed by a neoliberal pedagogy that enshrines self-interest and privatization while converting every social problem into individualized market solutions or regressive matters of personal responsibility. Under neoliberalism’s disimagination machine, individual responsibility is coupled with an ethos of greed, avarice, and personal gain. One consequence is the tearing up of social solidarities, public values, and an almost pathological disdain for democracy. This radical form of privatization is also a powerful force for the rise of fascist politics because it depoliticizes individuals, immerses them in the logic of social Darwinism, and makes them susceptible to the dehumanization of those considered a threat or disposable.

Just as the spread of the pandemic virus in the United States was not an innocent act of nature, neither is the rise and pervasive grip of inequality. What is clear is that neoliberal support for unbridled individualism has weakened democratic pressures and eroded democracy and equality as governing principles. Moreover, as a mode of public pedagogy, it has undercut social provisions, the social contract, and support for public goods such as education, public health, essential infrastructure, public transportation, and the most basic elements of the welfare state. As a form of pedagogical practice, neoliberalism has morphed into a form of pandemic pedagogy that sacrifices social needs and human life in the name of an economic rationality that values reviving economic growth over human rights. As a lived system of meaning and values, self-reliance and rugged individualism are the only categories available for shaping how individuals view themselves, and their relationship to others and to the planet. The individualization of everyone and the reduction of social problems to private troubles is paralleled by sanctioning a world marked by borders, walls, racism, hate, and a rejection of government intervention in the interest of the common good. Most importantly, neoliberal individualization personalizes power, creating a depoliticized subject whose only obligation as a citizen is defined by consuming and living in a world free from ethical and social responsibilities. In many ways, it does not just empty politics of any substance, it destroys its emancipatory prospects.

The neoliberal strategists use education not only to mask their abuses and the effects of their criminogenic policies, they also – in a time of crisis, when dissatisfaction of the masses might lead to chaos, revolts, and dangerous levels of resistance – move dangerously close to creating the conditions for a fascist politics. The noted theologian Frei Betto is right in stating that under such conditions, “…they cover up the causes of social ills and cover up their effects with ideologies that, by obscuring causes, fuel mood in the face of the effects. That’s why neoliberalism is now showing its authoritarian face – building walls that divide countries and ethnic groups, executive power over legislature and judiciary, disinformation about digital networks, the cult of the homeland, the brazen offensive against human rights.”

Neoliberalism and its regressive notion of individualism and individual responsibility has undermined the belief that human beings both make the world and can change it. The pandemic has ushered in a crisis that undermines that belief and opens the door for rethinking what kind of society and notion of politics will be faithful to the creation of a socialist democracy that speaks to the core values of justice, equality and solidarity. Under such circumstances, private resistance must give way to collective resistance, and personal and political rights must include economic rights. If inequality is to be defeated, the social state must replace the corporate state and social rights must be guaranteed for all. There can be no adequate struggle for economic justice and social equality unless economic inequality on a global level is addressed along with a movement for climate justice, the elimination of systemic racism and a halt to the spiraling militarism that has resulted in endless wars. This can only take place if the anti-democratic ideology of neoliberalism, with its collapse of the public into the private and its institutional structures of domination, are fully addressed and discredited. Étienne Balibar is right in stating that the triumph of neoliberalism has resulted in the “death zones of humanity.” Following Balibar, what must be made clear is that neoliberal capitalism is itself a pandemic and a dangerous harbinger of an updated fascist politics.
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#### Economic threat predictions will cause the US to manipulate regimes in a non-democratic fashion--- feeds the link on the K and turns the whole case, empirically kills millions

**-- While economic growth might be good in the abstract, the way their impact evidence conflates economics with national security is bad---it causes mass violence under the guise of military subjugation---all who don’t conform to the economic order are slaughtered**

**Neocleous,** Prof of Gov, **8** [Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, *Critique of Security*, p101-]

In other words, **the new** international **order moved** very quickly **to reassert** the connection between **economic and national security**: the commitment to the former was simultaneously a commitment to the latter, and vice versa. As the doctrine of national security was being born, **the major player** on the international stage **would aim to** use perhaps its most important power of all – its economic strength – in order to **re-order the world**. And this re-ordering was conducted through the idea of ‘economic security’.99 Despite the fact that ‘econ omic security’ would never be formally deﬁned beyond ‘economic order’ or ‘economic well-being’,100 the signiﬁcant conceptual con sistency between economic security and liberal order-building also had a strategic ideological role. By playing on notions of ‘economic well-being’, economic security seemed to emphasise economic and thus‘human’ needs over military ones. **The reshaping of global capital**, international order and the exercise of state power **could** thus **look** decidedly liberal and **‘humanitarian’. This** appearance **helped co-opt the liberal Left into the process** and, of course, played on individual desire for personal security by using notions such as ‘personal freedom’ and‘social equality’.101 Marx and Engels once highlighted the historical role of the bour geoisie in shaping the world according to its own interests. The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere . . . It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them . . . to become bourgeois in themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.102 In the second half of the twentieth century this ability to ‘batter down all Chinese walls’ would still rest heavily on the logic of capital, but would also come about in part under the guise of security. The whole worldbecame a garden to be cultivated – to be recast according to the logic of security. In the space of ﬁfteen years the concept ‘**economic security’** had **moved** from connoting insurance policies for working people **to** the desire to shape the world in a capitalist fashion – and back again. In fact, it has constantly shifted between these registers ever since, **being used for** the constant reshaping of world order and resulting in a comprehensive level of **intervention and policing all over the globe**. Global order has come to be fabricated and administered according to a security doctrine underpinned by the logic of capitalaccumulation and a bourgeois conception of order. By incorporating within it a particular vision of economic order, the concept of national security implies the interrelatedness of so many different social, econ omic, political and military factors that more or less any development anywhere can be said to impact on liberal order in general and America’s core interests in particular. Not only could bourgeois Europe be recast around the regime of capital, but so too could the whole international order as capital not only nestled, settled and established connections, but also‘secured’ everywhere. **Security** politics thereby **became the basis of** a distinctly liberal philosophy of global ‘**intervention’, fusing** global issues of **economic management with domestic policy** formations **in an ambitious and frequently violent strategy.** Here lies the Janus-faced character of American foreign policy.103 One face is the ‘good liberal cop’: friendly, prosperous and democratic, sending money and help around the globe when problems emerge, so that the world’s nations are shown how they can alleviate their misery and perhaps even enjoy some prosperity. The other face is the ‘bad liberal cop’: should one of these nations decide, either through parliamentary procedure, demands for self-determination or violent revolution to address its own social problems in ways that conﬂict with the interests of capital and the bourgeois concept of liberty, then the authoritarian dimension of liberalism shows its face; **the ‘liberal moment’ becomes the moment of violence**. This Janus-faced character has meant that through the mandate of security the US, as the national security state par excellence, has seen ﬁt to either overtly or covertly re-order the affairs of myriads of nations – those ‘rogue’ or ‘outlaw’ states on the ‘wrong side of history’.104 ‘Extrapolating the ﬁgures as best we can’, one CIA agent commented in 1991,‘**there have been** about 3,000 major covert operations and over **10,000** minor **operations** – all illegal, and all designed **to** disrupt, destabilize, or **modify the activities of other countries’**, adding that ‘every covert operation has been **rationalized in** terms of **U.S.** national **security’**.105 These would include ‘interventions’ in Greece, Italy, France, Turkey, Macedonia, the Ukraine, Cambodia, Indonesia, China, Korea, Burma, Vietnam, Thailand, Ecuador, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Bolivia, Grenada, Paraguay, Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Philippines, Honduras, Haiti, Venezuela, Panama, Angola, Ghana, Congo, South Africa, Albania, Lebanon, Grenada, Libya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and many more, and many of these more than once. Next up are the ‘60 or more’ countries identiﬁed as the bases of ‘terror cells’ by Bush in a speech on 1 June 2002.106 **The methods** used have **varied**: most popular has been the favoured technique of liberal security – ‘making the economy scream’ via controls, interventions and the imposition of neo-liberal regulations. But a wide range of other techniques have been used: **terror bombing**; subversion; rigging elections; **the use of the CIA**’s ‘Health Alteration Committee’ whose mandate was **to ‘incapacitate’ foreign ofﬁcials**; drug-trafﬁcking**;**107 and **the sponsorship of terror groups**, counterinsurgency agencies, **death squads**. Unsurprisingly, some plain old fascist groups **and** parties have been co-opted into the project, from the attempt at **reviving** the remnants of **the Nazi collaborationist Vlasov Army** for use against the USSR to the use of fascist forces to undermine democratically elected governments, such as in Chile; indeed, one of the reasons fascism ﬂowed into Latin America was because of the ideology of national security.108 Concomitantly, ‘national security’ has meant a policy of non-intervention where satisfactory ‘security partnerships’ could be established with certain authoritarian and military regimes: Spain under Franco, the Greek junta, Chile, Iraq, Iran, Korea, Indonesia, Cambodia, Taiwan, South Vietnam, the Philippines, Turkey, the ﬁve Central Asian republics that emerged with the break-up of the USSR, and China. Either way, the whole world was to be included in the new‘secure’ global liberal order. **The result has been the slaughter of untold numbers**. John Stock well, who was part of a CIA project in Angola which led to the deaths of over 20,000 people, puts it like this: Coming to grips with these U.S./CIA activities in broad numbers and ﬁguring out how many people have been killed in the jungles of Laos or the hills of Nicaragua is very difﬁcult. But, adding them up as best we can, **we come up with** a ﬁgure of **six million people killed – and this is a minimum** ﬁgure. Included are: one million killed in the Korean War, two million killed in the Vietnam War, 800,000 killed in Indonesia, one million in Cambodia, 20,000 killed in Angola – the operation I was part of – and 22,000 killed in Nicaragua.109 Note that the six million is a minimum ﬁgure, that he omits to mention rather a lot of other interventions, and that he was writing in 1991. This is security as the slaughter bench of history. All of this has been more than conﬁrmed by events in the twentyﬁrst century: in a speech on 1 June 2002, which became the basis of the ofﬁcial National Security Strategy of the United Statesin September of that year, President **Bush** reiterated that the US has a unilateral right to overthrow any government in the world, and **launched a** new **round of slaughtering** to prove it. While much has been made about the supposedly ‘new’ doctrine of preemption in the early twenty-ﬁrst century, the policy of preemption has a long history as part of national security doctrine. The United States has long maintained the option of pre-emptive actions to counter a sufﬁcient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction – and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves . . . To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adver saries, the United States will, if necessary, act pre emptively.110 In other words, the security policy of the world’s only superpower in **its current ‘war on terror’ is still underpinned by a notion of liberal order-building based on** a certain vision of ‘**economic order’**. The National Security Strategy concerns itself with a ‘single sustainable model for national success’ based on ‘political and economic liberty’, with whole sections devoted to the security beneﬁts of ‘economic liberty’, and the beneﬁts to liberty of the security strategy proposed.111

#### Any argument they make about the validity of economic science is not offense for them, rather the link – money is the only motivation for action which is the very repression of symbolic exchange through massive accumulation

-- Economic rationality allows for the worst form of violence – capitalism is no longer the trading of the real but the symbolic – that turns the case

**Bifo 11** (Franco, pretty clever scholar, activist and Marxist, After the Future, 2011, LB)

More than ever, economic rationality is at odds with social rationality. **Economic science** is not part of the solution to the crisis: it is **the source of the problem**. On July 18th 2009 the headline of The Economist read: “What went wrong with economics?” The text is an attempt to downplay the crisis of the Economics profession, and of economic knowledge. For neoliberal economists the central dogma of growth, profit and competition cannot be questioned, because it is identified with the perfect mathematical rationality of the market. And belief in the intrinsic rationality of the market is crucial in the economic theology of neoliberalism. But the **reduction of social life to** the rational **exchange of economic** values **is** an obsession that has nothing to do with science. It’s a **political strategy** aimed **to identify humans as calculating machines**, aimed to **shape behavior and perception** in such a way **that** money becomes the only motivation of social action. But it is not accurate as a description of social dynamics, and the conflicts, pathologies, and irrationality of human relationships. Rather, it is an attempt at creating the anthropological brand of homo calculans that Foucault (2008) has described in his seminar of 1979/80, published with the title The Birth of Biopolitics. This attempt to identify human beings with calculating devices has produced cultural devastation, and has finally been showed to have been based upon flawed assumptions. Human beings do calculate, but their calculation is not perfectly rational, because the value of goods is not determined by objective reasons, and because decisions are influenced by what Keynes named animal spirits. “We will never really understand important economic events unless we confront the fact that their causes are largely mental in nature,” say Akerlof and Shiller (2009: 1) in their book Animal Spirits, echoing Keynes’s assumption that the rationality of the market is not perfect in itself. Akerlof and Shiller are avowing the crisis of neoliberal thought, but their critique is episteme. Animal Spirits is the title of an other book, by Matteo Pasquinelli (2008). Pasquinelli’s book deals with bodies and digits, and parasites, and goes much deeper in its understanding of the roots of the crisis than its eponymous publication: “Cognitive capitalism emerges in the form of a parasite: it subjects social knowledge and inhibits its emancipatory potential” (Pasquinelli 2008: 93). “Beyond the computer screen, precarious workers and freelancers experience how Free Labor and competition are increasingly devouring their everyday life” (Pasquinelli 2008: 15). Pasquinelli goes to the core of the problem: the **virtualization of social production** has acted as the proliferation of a parasite, **destroying** the **prerequisites of** living **relationships**, absorbing and **neutralizing** the **living energies of** cognitive **workers**. The economic recession is not only the effect of financial craziness, but also the effect of the de-vitalization of the social field. This is why the collapse of the economic system is also the collapse of economic epistemology that has guided the direction of politics in the last two centuries. **Economics cannot understand the** depth of **the crisis**, because below the crisis of financial exchange there is the crisis of symbolic exchange. I mean the **psychotic boom of panic, depression, and suicide, the general decline of desire and social empathy.** The question that rises from the collapse is so radical that the answer cannot be found in the economic conceptual framework. Furthermore, one must ask if economics really is a science? If the word “science” means the creation of concepts for the understanding and description of an object, economics is not a science. Its object does not exist. The economic object (scarcity, salaried labor, and profit) is not an object that exists before and outside the performative action of the economic episteme. Production, consumption, and daily life become part of the economic discourse when labor is detached and opposed to human activity, when it falls under the domination of capitalist rule. The economic object does not pre-exist conceptual activity, and economic description is in fact a normative action. In this sense **Economics is a** technique, a process of **semiotization of the world**, and also a mythology, a narration. Economics is a suggestion and a categorical imperative: Money makes things happen. **It is the** source of action in the world and perhaps the **only power we invest in.** Life seems to depend on it. **Everything** within us **would** like to **say** that **it does not**, that this cannot be. But **the Almighty Dollar has taken command.** The more it is denied the more it shows itself as Almighty. Perhaps in every other respect, in every other value, bankruptcy has been declared, giving money the power of some sacred deity, demanding to be recognized. Economics no longer persuades money to 111 behave. Numbers cannot make the beast lie down and be quiet or sit up and do tricks. At best, economics is a neurosis of money, a symptom contrived to hold the beast in abeyance…. Thus economics shares the language of psychopathology – inflation, depression, lows and highs, slumps and peaks, investments and losses. (Sordello 1983) From the age of the enclosures in England the economic process has been a process of production of scarcity (scarcification). The enclosures were intended to scarcify the land, and the basic means of survival, so that people who so far had been able to cultivate food for their family were forced to become proletarians, then salaried industrial workers. Capitalism is based on the artificial creation of need, and economic science is essentially a technique of scarcification of time, life and food. Inside the condition of scarcity **human beings are subjected to exploitation and** to **the domain of profit-oriented activity.** After scarcifying the land (enclosures) **capitalism has sacrificed time itself, forcing people who don’t have property other than their own life and body, to lend their life-time to capital.** Now the capitalist obsession for growth is making scarce both water and air. Economic science is not the science of prediction: it is the technique of producing, implementing, and pushing scarcity and need. This is why Marx did not speak of economy, but of political economy. The technique of economic scarcification is based on a mythology, a narration that identifies richness as property and acquisition, and subjugates the possibility of living to the lending of time and to the transformation of human activity into salaried work. In recent decades, technological change has slowly eroded the very foundations of economic science. Shifting from the sphere of production of material objects to the semiocapitalist production of immaterial goods, the Economic concepts are losing their foundation and legitimacy. The basic categories of Economics are becoming totally artificial. The theoretical justification of private property, as you read in the writings of John Locke, is based on the need of exclusive consumption. An apple must be privatized, if you want to avoid the danger that someone else eats your apple. But what happens when goods are immaterial, infinitely replicable without cost? Thanks to digitalization and immaterialization of the production process, the economic nomos of private property loses its ground, its raison d’etre, and it can be imposed only by force. Furthermore, the very foundation of salary, the relationship between time needed for production and value of the product, is vanishing. The immaterialization and cognitivization of production makes it almost impossible to quantify the average time needed to produce value. Time and value become incommensurable, and violence becomes the only law able to determine price and salary. The neoliberal school, which has opened the way to the worldwide deregulation of social production, has fostered the mythology of rational expectations in economic exchange, and has touted the idea of a self-regulation of the market, first of all the labor-market. But self-regulation is a lie. In order to increase exploitation, and to destroy social welfare, global capitalism has used political institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO), not to mention the military enforcement of the political decisions of these institutions. Far from being self-regulated, the market is militarily regulated. The mythology of free individuals loyally competing on the base of perfect knowledge of the market is a lie, too. Real human beings are not perfect rational calculating machines. And the myth of rational expectations has finally crashed after the explosion of the real estate mortgage bubble. The theory of rational expectation is crucial in neoliberal thought: the economic agents are supposed to be free to choose in a perfectly rational way the best deal in selling and buying. The fraud perpetrated by the investment agencies has destroyed the lives of millions of Americans, and has exposed the theoretical swindle. **Economic exchange cannot be described as** a **rational** game, **because irrational factors play a crucial role in social life** in general. **Trickery, misleading** information, **and psychic manipulation are** not exceptions, but the professional **tools of advertisers,** financial **agents, and** economic **consultants.** The idea that social relationships can be described in mathematical terms has the force of myth, but it is not science, and it has nothing to do with natural law. Notwithstanding the failure of the theory, neoliberal politics are still in control of the global machine, because **the criminal class** that has seized power **has no intention of stepping down**, and because the social brain is unable to recompose and find the way of self-organization. I read in the New York Times on September 6th 2009: After the mortgage business imploded last year, Wall Street investment banks began searching for another big idea to make money. They think they may have found one. The bankers plan to buy “life settlements,” life insurance policies that ill and elderly people sell for cash, depending on the life expectancy of the insured person. Then they plan to “securitize” these policies, in Wall Street jargon, by packaging hundreds of thousands together into bonds. They will then resell those bonds to investors, like big pension funds, who will receive the payouts when people with the insurance die. The earlier the policyholder dies, the bigger the return, though if people live longer than expected investors could get poor returns or even lose money. Imagine that I buy an insurance policy on my life (something I would absolutely not do). My insurer of course will wish me a long life, so I’ll pay the fee for a long time, while he should pay lots of money to my family if I 113 die. But some enlightened finance guru has the brilliant idea of insuring the insurer. He buys the risk, and he invests on the hope that I die soon. You don’t need the imagination of Philip K. Dick to guess the follow up of the story: financial agents will be motivated to kill me overnight. The talk of recovery is based on necronomy, the economy of death. It’s not new, as **capitalism has always profited from wars**, slaughters and genocides. But now **the equation** becomes **unequivocal. Death is** the **promise, death is** the **investment and** the **hope. Death is the best future that capitalism may secure.** The logic of speculation is different from the logic of spectacle that was dominant in late-modern times. Spectacle is the mirrorization of life, the transfer of life in the mirror of spectacular accumulation. Speculation is the subjugation of the future to its financial mirror, the substitution of present life with future money that will never come, because death will come before. The lesson that we must learn from the first year of the global recession is sad: neoliberal folly is not going away, the financial plungers will not stop their speculation, and corporations will not stop their exploitation, and the **political class**, largely **controlled by** the **corporate lobbies, is unwilling** or unable **to protect society from the final assault.** In 1996 J. G. Ballard (1996: 188) wrote: **“**the most perfect crime of all – when the victims are either willing, or aren’t aware that they are victims**”.** Democracy seems unable to stop the criminal class that has seized control of the economy, because the decisions are no longer made in the sphere of political opinion, but in the inaccessible sphere of economic automatism. The economy has been declared the basic standard of decision, and the economists have systematically identified Economy with the capitalist obsession of growth. No room for political choice has been left, as the corporate principles have been embedded in the technical fabric of language and imagination.

#### The economy is hyperreal – 2008 proves that our continual investment in it despite the possibility of meltdown grants the economy total control over all systems

**Baldwin 2015** (Jon, Professor at London Met, teaches about the Baud man and stuff , Baudrillard and Neoliberalism, <http://www2.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol-12_2/v12-2-baldwin.html>, LB)

**The world’s** leading **economies are in crisis and the** harsh **repercussions of the financial crash** of 2008 **are still being felt.** The global financial meltdown continues and economic inequality has reached extremes not seen for a century. Business and government in their economic activity, commercial or military expansion, corruption, and surveillance are widely distrusted. Many people regret the consumerism and social corrosion of modern life. However **the emancipatory activities of** protest, activism, and both **the** traditional and **radical left, appears** already **exhausted, ineffectual, and have yet to deliver**. Less fortunate **people in the west seem entrapped in** a form of what Baudrillard would call **Stockholm syndrome – expressing empathy for a system that does not have their interests at heart** and which conceals gross inequalities of wealth, power, and opportunity. They seem content to accept exploitative and precarious working conditions, and the compensatory pathologies of narcissistic consumption (retail therapy), media spectacle (a thousand channels and nothing on), fantasies of status and advancement (the mythologies of advertising), and celebrity idolatry (the twittered selfie). Meek acceptance or resignation to a banal, materialistic, nihilistic society appears complete for some. Capital and affluent societies have always had waves of boom and bust – stasis and chaos - but what is crucial about the current financial situation is its scale. **It is a global crisis** and **not** regional **like other previous crashes. It cannot be contained,** assistance is not available from some other region, and austerity measures are already being met with civil disobedience. Dependent on one’s perspective, this heralds one of the greatest catastrophes of recent history or one of the most significant opportunities for radical change. Nobel laureate economist, Joseph Stiglitz, has proposed that the crisis - the fall of Wall Street, the revelation of the machinations of the bankers, and market fundamentalism - presents a legitimation crisis to capitalist society akin to the effect of the fall of the Berlin Wall upon communism. What was the catalyst for the crash? After decades of largely steady growth and expansion the global economy began to reveal signs of distress in 2007. On the 9th August BNP Paribas is the first major bank to acknowledge the risk of exposure to the subprime mortgage market and freezes three of their funds. Subprime lending is typically made to those who may have difficulty maintaining the repayment schedule. These high credit risk loans are characterized by higher interest rates making them lucrative to the institutions granting them. The chief executive of another major bank, Northern Rock, will later claim that this was ‘the day the world changed.’ In 2008 it became apparent that financial difficulty had snowballed and that the world was experiencing the onset of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Day by day there was the utter collapse of huge and household name financial institutions, the failure of core businesses, stock and housing market downturn, and decline in consumer wealth and economic activity. Global retirement funds dropped by 20 per cent in a single week. Economies worldwide slowed, credit was tightened, and international trade declined. Banks had to be bailed out by nation states to avert a meltdown on Wall Street. A number of causes and triggers of the crash were proposed with varying weight given by differing authorities. These involved a complex intersection of economic policies and deregulation. They include the encouragement of home ownership, the relatively easy access to loans for subprime borrowing, and subsequent overvaluation of bundled subprime loans, all of which assumed the housing market would continue to grow indefinitely. There were also questionable modes of trading by buyers and sellers, an ambition for short-term instant profit over longer term growth. **There was a lack of** adequate **capital holdings by banks and** insurance **companies to support the** financial **commitments they made. A**n important **distinction should be made** here **between the individual and the** economic **system itself.** **Often it is** all **too** **easy to scapegoat** a few **individuals for their failings** in the attempt to present the financial system as essentially just and workable. Undoubtedly there were individuals’ idiosyncrasies within the system. **There was** blatant **greed, idiocy, insider dealing, criminal activity, and escalation of** little more than **Ponzi schemes**. There were dealers on cocaine, antidepressants, or anti-anxiety medication, which fuelled exuberance and the taking of risks one would normally avoid. Memorably, Tom Wolfe cites a study that discovered that “traders with unusually high levels of testosterone at the start of the trading day could be counted on to turn a profit by the day’s end.” However, when it came to sex “his demonstration rarely took more than 60 seconds. It went pump pump pump pump pump pump pump pump oo-oo-oo-oo-oo-oooouh uh oo agghhh and bingo – roll off, snore like a bear” (Wolfe, 2013: 19). **Traders treated their customers with disdain**, referring to them as ‘muppets’, ‘guppies’, ‘suckers’, ‘marks’, ‘sheep’, ‘chumps’, ‘lambs’, ‘baby seals’ (Ibid). But these were the only people actually providing ‘liquidity’, that is, ready money. Also worthy of consideration are the hiring policies of financial Human Resources departments with their tried and tested techniques for ensuring they only hire the most aggressive and money-driven of all their candidates, and their ability to weed out anyone with morals, restraint or empathy. **Whilst there is an element of ‘human error’ to the crash ultimately focus should be upon the economic system itself, a system that churns out and feeds off such individuals.**

### Pharma

#### The pharma scenario –

#### Engelhardt doesn’t say extinction – says “decreasing human suffering” in the context of solving things like cancer and Alzheimer’s – not the same.

#### No ev says most pharma mergers meet $10b threshold – doesn’t change industry’s innovative capacity.

#### No warrant to biotech – Jarsulic ev says “chemicals” and “pharma”, so they don’t get the ICAF extinction warrant.

#### Pandemics are inevitable and accelerating because of the neoliberal pharma industry---it creates breeding grounds for pathogenic spread and undermines global preparedness.

Attard 20, Socialist Appeal activist and writer for Marxist.com, (Joe, March 24th, 2020, “Pandemics, profiteering and big pharma: how capitalism plagues public health”, https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm)

“Outbreaks are inevitable, pandemics are optional”

In 1994, Pulitzer-winning journalist Laurie Garrett wrote The Coming Plague: Newly Emerging Diseases in a World Out of Balance. This was followed in 2001 by Betrayal of Trust: The Collapse of Global Public Health. Over these two books, she explained that “human disruption of the global environment, coupled with behaviors that readily spread microbes between people and from animals to humans, guaranteed a global surge in epidemics, even an enormous pandemic. [These] outbreaks were aided and abetted by inept health systems, human behavior, and the complete lack of consistent political and financial support for disease-fighting preparedness everywhere in the world.”[[74]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn74) Though she didn’t put it in these terms, these books were a damning indictment of capitalism and its corrosive effects on public health. Garrett’s warnings were corroborated in a 2018 report by the Global Preparedness Monitoring Board, which warned that “there is a very real threat of a rapidly moving, highly lethal pandemic of a respiratory pathogen killing 50 to 80 million people and wiping out nearly 5% of the world’s economy”.[[75]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn75)

The report continues:

“Between 2011 and 2018, WHO tracked 1,483 epidemic events in 172 countries. Epidemic-prone diseases such as influenza, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS), Ebola, Zika, plague, yellow fever and others, are harbingers of a new era of high-impact, potentially fast-spreading outbreaks that are more frequently detected and increasingly difficult to manage… Any country without basic primary health care, public health services, health infrastructure and effective infection control mechanisms faces the greatest losses, including death, displacement and economic devastation.”[[76]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn76)

In other words, the current COVID-19 crisis is part of a new era in which pandemics will become more common, for the reasons I have described. The world is underprepared for this, and the poorest countries are going to suffer the most. Aside from the emergence of new pathogens, there are other threats on the horizon, including antibiotic-resistant strains of microbes like streptococcus and staphylococcus, cultivated in hospitals in the advanced capitalist countries, due to an over-reliance on antibiotics developed in the post-war period.[[77]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn77) Illnesses of the 19th and 20th century, like TB, are returning with a vengeance in poor communities like Harlem in New York City – and developing antibiotic resistance.[[78]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn78) In the 1990s, a forecast by the University of California predicted that by 2070 the world would have exhausted all antimicrobial drug options, as viruses, bacteria, parasites and fungi would have evolved complete resistance to the human pharmaceutical arsenal.[[79]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn79) This apocalyptic scenario could be avoided, if more was invested in R&D for vaccines and alternative treatments. But as explained, this is not a profitable avenue for big pharma.

Responding to the aforementioned GPMB report, Garrett was sceptical that any of its proposals (which amount to lobbying governments and private enterprise to cooperate more effectively on funding and research) would amount to anything. She wrote: “With no intention of degrading the GPMB’s effort, I must sadly say that this core message has been shouted from the rafters many times before, with little discernible impact on tone-deaf political leaders, financial enterprises, or multinational institutions. There’s no reason to think this time will be any different.”[[80]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm" \l "_ftn80)

Indeed, on a capitalist basis, it is unlikely that the situation will improve. These diseases have been conjured up by the system itself, and the living patterns of modern capitalist societies create ideal conditions for them to spread. Urbanisation has concentrated the vast majority of the planet’s 8bn people into dense populations, where disease can run rampant. And the dramatic increase in worldwide movement of people and goods (facilitated by modern transport, and exacerbated by war and climate change) creates viable channels for microbes to rage across the planet. It only took a matter of days before COVID-19 had spread from one end of the earth to the other. Such a global problem requires an international solution. But, as described, antagonism between different capitalist nations, the private property rights of the major pharmaceutical companies and the profit-based mode of production prevents the kind of coordinated response necessary to fight pandemics.

### Space

#### Mars colonization causes intergalactic war---humans will speciate and wage wars against each other.

Torres ’18 (Phil; Project for Future Human Flourishing; *Space colonization and suﬀering risks: Reassessing the “maxipok rule”*; Futures 100 (2018) 74-85; MSCOTT)

The very same question can and must be asked about our posthuman descendants—indeed, it may be all the more urgent given the cognitive-emotional diversiﬁcation of lifeforms during the deep space diaspora. The picture that emerges from such considera- tions is one in which there will exist at least some, and potentially many, civilizations that are inclined toward violence. Some will engage in violence for imperialistic reasons—for gain—while the impetus for others will be religious, apocalyptic, pro-mortalist, anti- posthumanist, environmentalist, or “psychopathological” in nature. The existence of Machiavellian actors will, in turn, give others a strong incentive to engage in preventive or preemptive strikes against potential predators. To quote Levy and Thompson in Causes of War (2010), “a preventive war is motivated by the perception of a rising adversary, a shift in power, and by the fear that once the adversary is stronger it will attempt to exploit its advantage through coercion or war … and is driven by ‘better-now-than-later’ logic.” In contrast, “preemption involves a military attack in response to the virtual certainty that the adversary is about to strike and by the motivation of gaining the advantages of striking ﬁrst.”

Even more, the motivation to strike ﬁrst need not involve a Machiavellian actor at all; it could involve two or more Tuckerian actors with no malicious inclinations whatsoever. The crucial idea here is what international relations scholars refer to as the security dilemma, whereby, in sum: anarchy generates uncertainty about the present and future intentions of other actors; this leads to fear, resulting in the accumulation of weapons arsenals, etc. for “defensive” purposes; this increases the fear of other actors uncertain of one’s true intentions, thereby producing a spiral eﬀect, or vicious positive feedback cycle, that can foment conﬂict, as other actors increase their own arsenals for “defensive” purposes as well (see Tang, 2009). In other words, two peaceable civilizations could end up warring due merely to a spiral of escalating militarization given a lack of mutual trust. A related concept is Schelling’s dilemma, also known as the “Hobbesian trap,” whereby one actor engages in a ﬁrst strike against a second actor due to a fear of being imminently attacked by the ﬁrst actor. Again, neither might harbor malign goals (although one could), yet they engage in war for purely game theoretic reasons. The classic illustration of this involves a robber with a gun who breaks into a house intending only to steal jewelry; the owner wakes up and confronts the robber with a gun. Neither wishes to shoot the other, yet each fear that they will be shot if they don’t shoot ﬁrst. The result is tragedy.

There is another version of this situation that doesn’t pertain to each actor’s intentions with respect to others. Rather, it arises from a combination of (a) fallibility, and (b) technological capability. For example, civilization A might decide, after suﬃcient deliberation, that civilization B poses no malign threat; yet it might also worry that B is not responsible enough to possess its technological power. Perhaps B is conducting high-powered physics experiments that could produce a dangerous black hole or some other catastrophic phenomenon that would aﬀect A. If eﬀorts by A to convince B not to run such experiments fail, it could be in A’s preservational self-interest to invade, conquer, and/or destroy B. Thinking about this situation in the context of a galaxy of potentially billions of civilizations, it could be in any given civilization’s best interest to annihilate all other civilizations in the universe, just in case they were to cause a galactic- or cosmic-scale disaster by accident. Put diﬀerently, error as well as terror could fuel inter-civilizational conﬂicts.

Even more, the security dilemma/Hobbesian trap predicaments could be exacerbated by potential diﬃculties in interspecies communication, which would further vitiate the trust needed for civilizations not to attack each other. First, the Quinian “in- determinacy of translation” suggests that contact between civilizations could fail to convey the intended meaning, possibly leading to trouble (see Jebari & Olsson-Yaouzis, in press). Second, if two species come to have diﬀerent cognitive spaces or emotional repertoires, this could make understanding the other fundamentally impossible, thereby fueling suspicions about the beliefs, desires, and capacity for deception of the proverbial “Other.” Indeed, the lack of common “ontological ground” could also lead to breakdowns of empathy: trying to understand how an action X makes another species “feel” would be like a human trying to understand “what it’s like to be a bat.” More dangerously, it might not even be clear to species A that species B can have conscious experiences of pain in the ﬁrst place. “So,” A might reason, “why would it be unethical to harm species B?” Species in such situations are not merely aliens to each other but, more signiﬁcantly, alienated from each other.

Yet another issue worth mentioning is that future space weapons could not only enable civilizations to obliterate each other, but phenomena like mind-uploading and life-extension could enable captors to inﬂict “eternal punishment”—that is, until the entropic death of the universe14 —on those captured, thus greatly increasing the stakes of conﬂict. For example, civilization A might not only worry about the aggressive, expansionist proclivities of civilization B, but fear that if it were to resist B’s demands and subsequently succumb to its military advances, the surviving individuals of A would be cast into an artiﬁcial perdition of interminable suﬀering. This could give A an even greater incentive to launch a ﬁrst strike against B—to eliminate the dual threats of dying in war and living in hell.15

To summarize so far: expansion into space will generate phylogenetic and ideological diversity that could yield profoundly disparate types of civilizations. The species who comprise these civilizations could have entirely diﬀerent normative preferences, moral tendencies, and even scientiﬁc institutions. Some will almost certainly be violence-inclined, thus giving others an incentive to strike ﬁrst. Even more, diversity with respect to cognition, emotionality, and language will undercut the mutual trust needed for otherwise irenic civilizations to avoid spirals of militarization or defect in prisoner’s dilemma predicaments. Thus, a colonized cosmos would be an arena poised and spring-loaded for violence. But is there a way to prevent conﬂict from breaking out?

#### Their call for space colonization is rooted in capitalism’s need for endless expansion — this causes war.

**Dickens 10** — Peter Dickens, Associate Lecturer in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Cambridge, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the Universities of Essex and Brighton, 2010 (“The Humanization of the Cosmos—To What End?,” *The Monthly Review*, Volume 62, Issue 6, November, Available Online at <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end/>, Accessed 07-31-2016)

The Cosmos: Capitalism’s New “Outside” **Instead of** indulging in **over-optimistic** and fantastic **visions, we should take** a longer, harder, and more **critical look at what is** happening **and** what **is likely to happen**. We can then begin taking a more measured view of space humanization, and start developing more progressive alternatives. At this point, we must return to the deeper, **underlying processes** which are **at the heart of** the **capitalist** economy and **society**, and which **are generating** this **demand for expansion into** outer **space**. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new and exotic development, the social relationships and mechanisms underlying space-humanization are very familiar. In the early twentieth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that **an “outside” to capitalism is** important for two main reasons. First, it is **needed** as a means of creating massive numbers of new customers who would buy the goods made in the capitalist countries.7 As outlined earlier, **space tech**nology **has** extended and **deepened this process, allowing an increasing number of people to become integral to** the further **expansion of global capitalism**. Luxemburg’s second reason for imperial expansion is the search for cheap supplies of labor and raw materials. Clearly, space fiction fantasies about aliens aside, expansion into the cosmos offers no benefits to capital in the form of fresh sources of labor power.8 But **expansion** into the cosmos **does offer prospects for exploiting new materials** such as those in asteroids, the moon, and perhaps other cosmic entities such as Mars. Neil Smith’s characterization of capital’s relations to nature is useful at this point. The reproduction of material life is wholly dependent on the production and reproduction of surplus value. To this end, capital stalks the Earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of production, but is also in its totality an appendage to the production process…no part of the Earth’s surface, the atmosphere, the oceans, the geological substratum or the biological superstratum are immune from transformation by capital.9 **Capital is now** also **“stalking”** outer **space in the search for new resources and raw materials. Nature on a cosmic scale** now **seems likely to be incorporated into production processes**, these being located mainly on earth. Since Luxemburg wrote, an increasing number of political economists have argued that the importance of a capitalist “outside” is not so much that of creating a new pool of customers or of finding new resources.10 Rather, an outside is needed as a zone into which surplus capital can be invested. Economic and social crisis stems less from the problem of finding new consumers, and more from that of finding, making, and exploiting zones of profitability for surplus capital. Developing “outsides” in this way is also a product of recurring crises, particularly those of declining economic profitability. These crises are followed by attempted “fixes” in distinct geographic regions. The word “fix” is used here both literally and figuratively. On the one hand, capital is being physically invested in new regions. On the other hand, the attempt is to fix capitalism’s crises. Regarding the latter, however, there are, of course, no absolute guarantees that such fixes will really correct an essentially unstable social and economic system. At best, they are short-term solutions. The kind of theory mentioned above also has clear implications for the humanization of the cosmos. **Projects for** the **colonization** of outer space **should be seen as the attempt to make new types of “spatial fix,”** again **in response to** economic, social, and environmental **crises on earth**. Outer space will be “globalized,” i.e., appended to Earth, with new parts of the cosmos being invested in by competing nations and companies. Military power will inevitably be made an integral part of this process, governments protecting the zones for which they are responsible. Some influential commentators argue that the current problem for capitalism is that there is now no “outside.”11 Capitalism is everywhere. Similarly, resistance to capitalism is either everywhere or nowhere. But, as suggested above, the humanization of the cosmos seriously questions these assertions. New “spatial fixes” are due to be opened up in the cosmos, capitalism’s emergent outside. At first, these will include artificial fixes such as satellites, space stations, and space hotels. But during the next twenty years or so, **existing outsides, such as the moon and Mars, will begin attracting investments. The stage would** then **be set for wars in** outer **space between nations and companies attempting** to make their own **cosmic “fixes.”**

#### Space exploration is intertwined with capitalism

**Dickens 10** (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

**At this point, we must return to the deeper**, underlying **processes which are at the heart of the capitalist** economy and **society, and which are generating this demand for expansion into outer space. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new** and exotic **development, the social relationships** and mechanisms **underlying space-humanization are very familiar.** In the early twentieth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that an “outside” to capitalism is important for two main reasons. First, it is needed as a means of creating massive numbers of new customers who would buy the goods made in the capitalist countries.[7](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en79) As outlined earlier, space technology has extended and deepened this process, allowing an increasing number of people to become integral to the further expansion of global capitalism. Luxemburg’s second reason for imperial expansion is the search for cheap supplies of labor and raw materials. Clearly, space fiction fantasies about aliens aside, expansion into the cosmos offers no benefits to capital in the form of fresh sources of labor power.[8](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en78) But **expansion into the cosmos does offer prospects for exploiting new materials such as** those in **asteroids, the moon, and** perhaps other cosmic entities such as **Mars**. Neil Smith’s characterization of capital’s relations to nature is useful at this point. **The reproduction of material life is** wholly **dependent on the production and reproduction of surplus value. To this end, capital stalks the Earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of production, but is also in its totality an appendage to the production process…no part of the Earth**’s surface, the atmosphere, the oceans, the geological substratum or the biological superstratum **are immune from transformation by capital. Capital is now also “stalking” outer space in the search for new resources and raw materials. Nature on a cosmic scale now seems likely to be incorporated into production processes, these being located mainly on earth.**

#### The development and exploration of space always occurs under the rubric of militarization—the logic of sovereignty understands space as just another biopolitical possibility of security management.

**MacDonald 7** [Fraser, Professor at the University of Melbourne, “Anti-Astropolitik – outer space and the orbit of geography,” in Progress in Human Geography 31.5]

In post-Cold-War unipolar times the strategic rationale for the United States to maintain the prohibition against weaponizing space is diminishing (Lambakis, 2003), even if the rest of the world wishes it otherwise. In 2000, a UN General Assembly resolution on the ‘Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space’ was adopted by a majority of 163–0 with 3 abstentions: the United States, Israel and the Federated States of Micronesia (United Nations, 2000). Less than two months later, a US Government committee chaired by Donald Rumsfeld5 issued a report warning that the ‘relative dependence of the US on space makes its space systems potentially attractive targets’; the United States thus faced the danger, it argued, of a ‘Space Pearl Harbor’ (Rumsfeld, 2001: viii). As space warfare was, according to the report, a ‘virtual certainty’, the United States must ‘ensure continuing superiority’ (Rumsfeld, 2001: viii). This argument was qualified by obligatory gestures towards ‘the peaceful use of outer space’ but the report left little doubt about the direction of American space policy. Any **difficult questions about** the further **militarization (and even weaponization) of space could be easily avoided under the guise of** developing ‘**dual-use’** (military/civilian) **technology** and emphasizing the role of military applications in ‘peacekeeping’ operations. Through such rhetoric, NATO’s satellite-guided bombing of a Serbian TV station on 23 April 1999 could have been readily accommodated under the OST injunction to use outer space for ‘peaceful purposes’ (Cervino et al., 2003). Since that time new theatres of operation have been opened up in Afghanistan and Iraq, for further trials of space-enabled warfare that aimed to provide aerial omniscience for the precision delivery of ‘shock and awe’. **What** Benjamin **Lambeth** has **called the ‘accomplishment’ of** air and **space power has** since **been called into question by** the all too apparent **limitations of satellite intelligence** in the tasks of identifying Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction or in stemming the growing number of Allied dead and wounded from modestly armed urban insurgents (Lambeth, 1999; Graham, 2004; Gregory, 2004: 205). For all its limitations, even this imagery has been shielded from independent scrutiny by the military monopolization of commercial satellite outputs (Livingstone and Robinson, 2003). **Yet, far from undermining** Allied confi dence in satellite imagery or in **a ‘cosmic’ view of war** (Kaplan, 2006), it is precisely **these abstract photocartographies of violence – detached from** their visceral and **bloodied ‘accomplishments’** – that **have licensed**, say, the **destruction** of Fallujah (Gregory, 2004: 162; Graham, 2005b). There remains, of course, a great deal more that can be said about the politics of these aerial perspectives than can be discussed here (see, for instance, Gregory, 2004; Kaplan, 2006). The geopolitical **effects of reconnaissance** from space platforms **are by no means confined to particular episodes of military conflict.** Like the high-altitude spy plane, its Cold War precursor, satellite surveillance also gives strategic and diplomatic powers. Unlike aerial photography, however, satellite imagery is ubiquitous and high-resolution, and offers the potential for real-time surveillance. The emerging field of surveillance studies, strongly informed by critical geographical thought, has opened to scrutiny the politics and spaces of electronic observation (see, for instance, the new journal Surveillance and Society). The writings of Foucault, particularly those on panopticism, are an obvious infl uence on this new work (Foucault, 1977; Wood, 2003), but they have seldom been applied to the realm of outer space. As Foucault pointed out, **the** power of Jeremy Bentham’s **panopticon prison design is enacted through the prisoner**–subjects **internalizing the disciplinary gaze**: the presence of the gaoler was immaterial, **as** the burden of **watching was left to the watched.** Similarly, **the power** of panoptic orbital surveillance **lies in its normalizing geopolitical effects.**]n the past, also. The early European colonies in North America did not make their own muskets until they had grown quite large, and European agricultural styles took a lot of adapting. This may not seem advanced technology. But could you make a musket? For that matter, could you make a stone axe?) This means that the high-tech devices needed to survive in the Martian environment are not going to be designed there. The designs are going to come from home. And it is likely that at least a proportion of the devices themselves will also. 3D printing from transmitted designs may solve some problems, though, if the raw materials can be obtained and refined on Mars. (I would imagine that supplies of direct and indirect biological material, such as the petroleum and oil products that are used to make plastics, might pose a serious problem.) If imported equipment is unsuitable or does not work because of some unexpected quirk of the faraway environment, much of it will have to be redesigned and manufactured not where it is needed but where the techniques and expertise are to be found. The more advanced the apparatus (the higher the tech), the more will need to be transported to the colony, adding to the transport costs and creating a need for spares. For all these reasons I am extremely sceptical that a colony of the size that we could send to Mars in the next decades, perhaps in the next century, could sustain itself without frequent supplies and reinforcements from Earth. The obvious reply to this is to drop the requirement that the colony be able to survive without the supplies and reinforcements. But this would undercut one of the main purposes – that of providing a remnant of humanity on Mars with a reasonable chance of surviving an earthly catastrophe. The colony would then be a scientific expedition and the beginning of a preparatory project that might take centuries.

### Solvency

#### Fiat takes away from individual agency and distances ourselves from the real world – reject fiat as the only hope to make debate a productive and connected space.

**Polson ‘12** (Dana Roe Polson, PhD in Language Literacy and Culture, UMBC, Baltimore city public and public charter schools high school teacher, “’Longing for Theory:’ Performance Debate in Action” Dissertain directed by Dr. Christine Mallinson, Assistant Professor,  Language, Literacy, and Culture pp. 256-257  
\*\*Edited for gendered language

One of the ways performance debaters see themselves *doing something* as opposed to *just talking* is a concept they call *in-round solvency*. If something about a debater’s argument is addressed and solved for in the round, then she has *in-round solvency*. The concept of *in-round solvency* only makes sense in non-traditional speeches; traditional debaters would not claim in-round solvency for an argument that depends on the US government to enact. While fiat says that for the sake of the debate round, we will all pretend that there would be no barriers to enact the plan (the opponents cannot argue that there’s no way that would be approved in the real world; fiat says that we assume the plan could be approved), no one is saying that the round itself does enact. **The power of discourse**

**, then, is different in performance debate arguments because the actor is not the USFG, but, in some cases, the debaters themselves; the focus is often not the *state* but the *state of debate*. There is a radical shift in who has potential agency**. As Janice Cooper says, “We talk about specifically affirming... ourselves in this round, like that’s an act of actual in-round solvency, because we in this round are like the most oppressed....” The response of more traditional debaters to performance debate arguments is often to downplay or avoid them. Janice says that she and her partner make “real” arguments, and she hopes that “the debate community will start to realize that, like, we’re not just talking,like we’re actually making real arguments they should actually try to prepare for and actually look out for” (Cooper, interview, p. 15).¶ **I heard more than once the argument that talking about issues of race during a debate round, where it could actually have an impact, is different from talking about (**in the sense of pretending to make) **foreign policy changes**. I think that individual agency is the key to the argument here. The playing-the-game takes away from individual agency; not playing a game, i.e., performance debate, asserts individual agency and is therefore doing something. Kenneth explained this position:¶ A lot of teams like to participate in some hypothetical world where...the affirmative pretends to be the federal government, and ... when the judge signs ~~his~~ [their] ballot affirmative, the plan gets passed, this problem gets solved, and, ... like we stop nuclear war. When the judge signs the ballot, nuclear war gets stopped. And I guess the problem with that is like back to like the objectivity thing, it disconnects you from the real world. Like **it takes away from what you as an individual person can do cause you’re constantly pretending to be something that you’re not.** And so, like, like what [theorist] Carrie Crenshaw says, like using your individual agency to fix problems that you know you have control over. .... By us taking advantage of our individual agency and talking about whiteness and bringing it to the forefront of discussions, like, we [he and his debate partner] do more action than you [an opponent] do, even if you pretend to do something. (Kenneth, interview, p. 19)

# 2nc

#### Turns the case -- Growth causes rushed emerging tech dev — extinction.

De Haan 19, AI Expert, Futurist and Space Enthusiast (Hein, October, “Capitalism: The Enemy of Friendly AI,” *Towards Data Science*, <https://towardsdatascience.com/capitalism-the-enemy-of-friendly-ai-e6b3f40dbe08>, Accessed 08-27-2021)

We need to talk about our future; specifically, our future as influenced by advanced Artificial Intelligence (AI). At some point in our near future, many experts expect humanity will create the first Artificial General Intelligence (AGI): an AI that’s roughly as intelligent as humans are. Relatively shortly after, an Artificial Superintelligence (ASI: an AI much smarter than any human) will most probably arise. Note that humans rule the planet because of their superior intelligence; an ASI might very well take over due to its intelligence being superior to our intelligence. An ASI does not by default share our moral values, and many thinkers, like the late physicist Stephen Hawking, have warned that creating an ASI could lead to the extinction of humankind.

What is Friendly AI?

Let’s start by defining Friendly AI. A term coined by AI researcher Eliezer Yudkowsky, it refers to an ASI that is beneficial to humanity instead of harmful. Like we discussed in the introduction, an ASI does not by default share our morals; a Friendly AI is one that does. The importance of Friendly AI can hardly be overstated, and can be illustrated with a thought experiment called the paperclip maximizer, first described by Nick Bostrom. This thought experiment describes an AGI that is given the seemingly innocent goal of maximizing the number of paperclips in its collection.

The ASI is so successful that it eventually transforms all of Earth into paperclip manufacturing facilities.

In order to more successfully optimize the number of paperclips, the AGI improves its own intelligence in order to become an ASI. This ASI then invents (radical) new ways of manufacturing more and more paperclips; it is so successful that it eventually transforms all of Earth into paperclip manufacturing facilities. Of course, humanity goes extinct as a side effect. It’s not that the ASI hated us; it’s just that we were made out of material it could use for its own purpose.

Note that human extinction can be a side effect of a lot of goals an ASI has, not just maximizing the number of paperclips. Human extinction could even be instrumental to an ASI’s goal. Say you give an ASI the goal of minimizing the amount of spam you get in your inbox. In order to achieve this, the ASI could simply wipe out humanity, as that would guarantee that you’ll never get spam again.

What does capitalism have to do with this?

I hope the paperclip maximizer thought experiment has made it clear that “friendliness” is not a default property of ASI. That’s exactly the problem: building an ASI is a (huge) challenge, but making it friendly (a Friendly AI) requires some challenge on top of that. The point is that capitalism rewards those that are faster to market: companies rush to put their product on the market before a competitor delivers theirs, because they understand that being the first matters.

The monetary reward of being the first company to create ASI will be incredible.

The same will be true for ASI: companies are already investing billions of dollars into AI, but in the future, the total investment will only grow, especially when the possibility of creating ASI becomes more feasible. The monetary reward of being the first company to create ASI will be incredible. An ASI could do so much valuable work so much better and so much faster than any human could that the first mover advantage will be indescribable. Now remember what we discussed: Friendly AI requires an extra challenge on top of ASI. Companies might very well not think too much about friendliness in order to be the first to create ASI, and that’s where the disaster starts.

#### 1---“Extinction outweighs” is a parlor trick designed to hide the structural violence of capitalism---you should actively flip the script and prioritize our impact.

Jackson 12, Professor of Peace Studies and the Director of the National Peace and Conflict Studies Centre at the University of Otago, New Zealand (Richard, August 5th, “The Great Con of National Security,” <https://richardjacksonterrorismblog.wordpress.com/2012/08/05/the-great-con-of-national-security/>, Accessed 09-22-2021)

It may have once been the case that being attacked by another country was a major threat to the lives of ordinary people. It may also be true that there are still some pretty serious dangers out there associated with the spread of nuclear weapons. For the most part, however, most of what you’ve been told about national security and all the big threats which can supposedly kill you is one big con designed to distract you from the things that can really hurt you, such as the poverty, inequality and structural violence of capitalism, global warming, and the manufacture and proliferation of weapons – among others.

The facts are simple and irrefutable: you’re far more likely to die from lack of health care provision than you are from terrorism; from stress and overwork than Iranian or North Korean nuclear missiles; from lack of road safety than from illegal immigrants; from mental illness and suicide than from computer hackers; from domestic violence than from asylum seekers; from the misuse of legal medicines and alcohol abuse than from international drug lords. And yet, politicians and the servile media spend most of their time talking about the threats posed by terrorism, immigration, asylum seekers, the international drug trade, the nuclear programmes of Iran and North Korea, computer hackers, animal rights activism, the threat of China, and a host of other issues which are all about as equally unlikely to affect the health and well-being of you and your family. Along with this obsessive and perennial discussion of so-called ‘national security issues’, the state spends truly vast sums on security measures which have virtually no impact on the actual risk of dying from these threats, and then engages in massive displays of ‘security theatre’ designed to show just how seriously the state takes these threats – such as the x-ray machines and security measures in every public building, surveillance cameras everywhere, missile launchers in urban areas, drones in Afghanistan, armed police in airports, and a thousand other things. This display is meant to convince you that these threats are really, really serious.

And while all this is going on, the rulers of society are hoping that you won’t notice that increasing social and economic inequality in society leads to increased ill health for a growing underclass; that suicide and crime always rise when unemployment rises; that workplaces remain highly dangerous and kill and maim hundreds of people per year; that there are preventable diseases which plague the poorer sections of society; that domestic violence kills and injures thousands of women and children annually; and that globally, poverty and preventable disease kills tens of millions of people needlessly every year. In other words, they are hoping that you won’t notice how much structural violence there is in the world.

More than this, they are hoping that you won’t notice that while literally trillions of dollars are spent on military weapons, foreign wars and security theatre (which also arguably do nothing to make any us any safer, and may even make us marginally less safe), that domestic violence programmes struggle to provide even minimal support for women and children at risk of serious harm from their partners; that underfunded mental health programmes mean long waiting lists to receive basic care for at-risk individuals; that drug and alcohol rehabilitation programmes lack the funding to match the demand for help; that welfare measures aimed at reducing inequality have been inadequate for decades; that health and safety measures at many workplaces remain insufficiently resourced; and that measures to tackle global warming and developing alternative energy remain hopelessly inadequate.

Of course, none of this is surprising. Politicians are a part of the system; they don’t want to change it. For them, all the insecurity, death and ill-health caused by capitalist inequality are a price worth paying to keep the basic social structures as they are. A more egalitarian society based on equality, solidarity, and other non-materialist values would not suit their interests, or the special interests of the lobby groups they are indebted to. It is also true that dealing with economic and social inequality, improving public health, changing international structures of inequality, restructuring the military-industrial complex, and making the necessary economic and political changes to deal with global warming will be extremely difficult and will require long-term commitment and determination. For politicians looking towards the next election, it is clearly much easier to paint immigrants as a threat to social order or pontificate about the ongoing danger of terrorists. It is also more exciting for the media than stories about how poor people and people of colour are discriminated against and suffer worse health as a consequence.

Viewed from this vantage point, national security is one massive confidence trick – misdirection on an epic scale. Its primary function is to distract you from the structures and inequalities in society which are the real threat to the health and wellbeing of you and your family, and to convince you to be permanently afraid so that you will acquiesce to all the security measures which keep you under state control and keep the military-industrial complex ticking along.

#### 2---Utilitarianism under capitalism necessitates the sacrifice of the Global South---only actively prioritizing discardable populations can break this cycle of devastation.

Santos 3, Leading Portuguese social theorist, director of the Center for Social Studies at the University of Coimbra, has written and published widely on the issue of globalization (Boaventura de Sousa, March 26th, “Collective suicide or globalization from below?” *Eurozine*, <https://www.eurozine.com/collective-suicide-or-globalization-from-below/>, Accessed 10-18-2021)

According to the German philosopher Franz Hinkelammert, living in Costa Rica, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to fulfill radically all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it.

Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists.

This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers.

At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of “discardable populations”, referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of “collateral damage”, to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war against Iraq and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, – and much more if the costs of reconstruction are added – enough to pay the health costs of the world’s poorest countries for four years.

Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today’s version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

#### 2---Revolving door---Biden’s DOJ is full of neoliberal shills who will systematically underenforce anti-trust law.

Alsbergas & Moran 21, Research assistants at the Revolving Door Project at the Center for Economic and Policy Research (Elias & Max, February 23rd, “It’s Looking Like the Department of Justice Under Biden Will Have Major Influence from Corporate Law,” *Jacobin Magazine*, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/02/corporate-power-amazon-big-law-department-of-justice-biden>, Accessed 10-16-2021)

It’s kind of trite, but personnel is policy. That goes doubly for the people you keep around you who aren’t on the books. People like Gorelick thrive because their relationships and their work are not scrutinized. This is how Biden is able to get away with the fact that unions helped put him in the Oval Office but some of his highest-level appointees have deep long-standing relationships with people who are anathema to labor’s agenda.

Biden is clearly signaling — and in some cases, moving — in a more left-wing direction on issues including labor, the environment, and so on. He’s certainly moving to the left of where Obama was at this point in his presidency. But a great number of the people who are staffing his administration across the board are still part of the same neoliberal groups that came up under Bill Clinton. They got their start in Democratic Party politics during the Reagan years, and that is still the frame through which they view a lot of these issues.

You’re seeing some of that, maybe, a little bit, begin to change. But absent significant pressure, the path of least resistance, and the path which Biden and his people are going to take, is to bring back the same people who have been doing and failing at these jobs for the last forty years.

#### 3---Economic predictions about anti-trust are worse than a guess---empirics prove capitalist ideology produces inaccurate assessments and serial policy failure.

Rozga 20, J.D. @ BU and former FTC merger review and litigation expert (Kai, August 31st, “How tech forces a reckoning with prediction-based antitrust enforcement,” *Tech Law Decoded*, <https://techlawdecoded.com/how-tech-forces-a-reckoning-with-prediction-based-antitrust-enforcement/>, Accessed 09-12-2021)

The Economism guessing game

The Economism—as some call it—of antitrust has sought to make the analysis in competition cases more rational by requiring that, before intervening in markets, enforcers must make a strong showing of the expected actual effects on competition of a given merger or a monopolist’s conduct. (To be sure, it was not just an intellectual disagreement with the status quo that inspired this movement. It was an ideological one, too, guided by the belief that it was more often than not better to wait for free markets to correct themselves rather than have the government meddle in them.)

On its face, it may seem sensible that the enforcement of laws which serve to protect competition should turn on an assessment of actual competitive effects. But this shift has meant that governments (and also private plaintiffs) bringing an antitrust case are required to present more evidence to explain the competitive dynamics of a market and how the conduct of its actors impacts competition in it. This exacts a heavy toll on everyone involved. Any antitrust litigator can attest to how antitrust cases stand out from others in terms of length, complexity, and scale. They are fact-heavy and data-intensive. And in the end, it is a burden borne by everyone involved in the case—prosecutor, defendant, and judge alike.

But the burden of analyzing actual competitive effects is more than just a hassle. It is responsible for turning antitrust into a guessing game. In merger cases, this is largely a forward-looking exercise: predicting how a combination of two companies will impact competition by comparing the market’s expected competitive state if the merger goes through to its expected competitive state if it does not. In monopolization cases, a similar analysis of the impact on competition of a monopolist’s abusive conduct can either be forward-looking (for preventing future harms) or backward-looking (for righting past wrongs).

And it is through the competitive effects guessing game that Economism was thrust into the forefront of antitrust. That is because a predictive approach to enforcement would not have been possible without the belief that economic theories and models provided the scientific (hard “s”) rigor for understanding how a market operates and how the conduct of its actors impacts competition in it. Depending on how you look at it, making predictions with economic models in antitrust was either the root cause or a necessary by-product of shifting the focus to actual competitive effects. Either way, Economism became the beating heart of antitrust at the same time that the law’s enforcement became premised on making predictions about actual competitive effects.

The unproven and perhaps unprovable premise of Economism

Despite forming its foundational underpinning, the bedrock assumption in modern antitrust that lawyers supported by economic experts are capable of understanding and predicting complex markets remains unproven—if it is even provable. To the contrary, there is good reason for reserving doubt.

In Antifragile, uncertainty expert Nassim Taleb writes: “Man-made complex systems tend to develop cascades and runaway chains of reactions that decrease, even eliminate, predictability … the modern world may be increasing in technological knowledge, but, paradoxically, it is making things a lot more unpredictable.” Taleb is skeptical of what he calls “superfragile” predictions guided by economic theory and models which are inherently “unreliable for decision-making.” To him, “economics is like a fable—a fable writer is there to stimulate ideas, indirectly inspire practice perhaps, but certainly not to direct or determine practice.”

According to Taleb, policymaking that uses economic models to manage complex systems in a top-down fashion is bound to fragilize things—no matter how well-intentioned the intervention might be. His most poignant examples of the dangers of expert-guided prediction-making come from looking at economic policy which, in an attempt to minimize short-term gyrations in the economy and financial markets, instead sets them up for larger blow-ups with systemic consequences. He concludes that “even when an economic theory makes sense, its application cannot be imposed from a model, in a top-down manner.”

In Thinking, Fast and Slow, behavioral economist and decision-making researcher Daniel Kahnemann endorses a similar skepticism about relying on expert judgments to evaluate and make predictions about complex environments. Kahnemann summarizes research in various domains (medical, economic, etc.) finding that, due to limits and biases innate to human cognition, expert judgments amidst uncertainty and unpredictability—what he calls “low-validity” environments—are a dependably ineffective way to predict the future.

Antitrust operates in precisely the sort of environment that the works of Taleb and Kahnemann would suggest is poorly suited for subjective, predictive decision-making. The lawfulness of a merger is determined by predicting whether it will cause prices to go up, a monopolist’s abusive conduct by conjecturing whether prices were inflated over a surmised competitive level—everything heavily reliant on economic theories and models. And the fact-specific inquiry of every antitrust case—especially when any case involving dynamic tech markets—means that its practitioners never get exposed to the sort of “regularity” and “prolonged practice” that Kahnemann concludes is necessary for subjective expert judgments to acquire predictive validity. If anything, low validity is supercharged in digital markets operating in vast ecosystems of constantly-evolving and interrelated markets with complicated relationships among its players.

The works of Taleb and Kahnemann suggest that antitrust technocrats are on a fool’s errand that will result in inaccurate evaluations of market conditions and poor predictions about competitive effects. Bad competition policy will result, if for no other reason than the limits of human cognition and the complexities of the market environments being observed.

Pulling back the curtain on Economism in practice

Practitioners can also draw on their own experiences to find ample support for the skepticism that flows from the works of Taleb and Kahnemann about expert-based, predictive decision-making.

The pitfalls of Economism in antitrust can be seen in everyday practice. In merger cases, economic models are presented to predict future price increases by the merged companies. And parties looking to dodge enforcement actions in close-call cases hire economists to predict how a merger will lower costs, increase output, and improve innovation.

In private antitrust litigation, plaintiffs and defendants alike rely on armies of economists to make out the elements of a case or defend against it. Too often, the result is a series of warring expert reports submitted by uber-qualified economists with stellar reputations who—based on the exact same factual record—reach diametrically opposing positions about a market’s dynamics or likely competitive effects. Equally troubling is how the uncertainty of the expert opinions can be seen fading away by the time the court chooses a winner, as the prevailing view achieves a supreme prescience when cited by the judge in support of its decision.

Alarm bells should be going off. An academic field’s reputation would seem to be put in doubt, and with it the foundation of an influential body of law that shapes our economy and society. Instead, academics and policymakers are more likely to be heard describing the rigor and rationality that they believe neoliberal economic thinking has brought to antitrust enforcement. And while some reforms proposed by the mainstream antitrust community might seem dramatic within the existing paradigm, they are trivial when considering how none tackle the fundamental flaws of the status quo.

And so, paradoxically, as antitrust turns its focus on increasingly difficult-to-predict markets, it does so increasingly with Economism-driven prediction as its lodestar—like a captain that insists on navigating a ship with the stars even when it is obvious that clouds cover the night sky.

#### 1---Framing issue: The economy will grow 28x larger by 2100---avoiding catastrophic warming would require GHG reductions 9x larger than even the most optimistic green growth authors think is possible.

#### 2---No decoupling---their data ignores offshoring.

Alexander & Rutherford 19, Co-director of the Simplicity Institute, is a lecturer at the Office for Environmental Programs, University of Melbourne, Australia, \*Coordinator of the New International Bookshop and a 'Simpler Way' activist (Samuel & Johnathan, A Critique of Techno-Optimism: Efficiency Without Sufficiency is Lost, *The Handbook of Global Governance*, http://samuelalexander.info/publications/)

4. Are Economies Decoupling Growth from Impact?

As noted, ‘decoupling’ is the idea that GDP growth can be, over time, progressively divorced from environmental impacts. In assessing the recent decoupling record, it is imperative to distinguish between ‘relative’ and ‘absolute’ decoupling (Jackson, 2016). Relative decoupling refers to a decline in the ecological impact per unit of economic output. Absolute decoupling refers to a decline in the overall ecological impact of total economic output. While relative decoupling may occur, making each commodity less materially intensive, if the total consumption of commodities increases then there may be no absolute decoupling; indeed, the absolute ecological impact of total economic activity may increase.

Given that the global economy already exceeds the planet’s sustainable carrying capacity by 70% (Global Footprint Network, 2017), large scale absolute decoupling is what is needed. The problem is, the record to date suggests very little absolute decoupling is occurring, let alone at the rates that would be needed for long-term sustainability – an issue we will return to below.

Consider the example of carbon emissions. There is no doubt that significant relative decoupling – i.e. emissions per unit of GDP – has taken place. Tim Jackson (2016: 88) reports that the amount of carbon released per unit of world’s economic output has declined continuously over several decades, from 760 grams of carbon dioxide per dollar in 1965 to just under 500 grams of carbon dioxide per dollar in 2015. That is an average decline in carbon intensity of a little under 1 per cent per year. Nevertheless, despite these efficiency gains, global carbon emissions have continued to rise in absolute terms, more than trebling over the same period. It is true carbon emissions from fossil fuels and industry (excluding land-use change) were flat from 2014-2016 at about 36 billion tonnes, suggesting that emissions might have peaked and could soon start to decline. Unfortunately, however, global emissions have since recommenced their upward trajectory, with indications that record levels were reached in 2017 (Global Carbon Budget, 2017). This shows that – even thirty years after the IPCC was established – the significant relative decoupling of carbon (and energy) intensities has so far failed to translate into actual absolute declines. To date, technological advance is not fulfilling its promise to reduce overall impact.

A similar story holds with respect to global resource consumption, a measure which includes aggregate consumption of biomass, fossil fuels, metal ores and minerals. A review of the evidence found that resource efficiency improvement for the global economy between 1980 and 2009 averaged 0.9% p.a. (Giljum et al., 2014). This, however, represented a per annum efficiency improvement that was less than one third of the rate that would have been needed for ‘absolute’ decoupling (Giljum et al: 328), i.e., growth of GDP without any increase in materials use. As such, over the same period global materials use more than doubled. Furthermore, as a UNEP (2016) report found, this efficiency improvement rate masks a more recent efficiency decline since the turn of the century, from 1.2 kg per one US$ of GDP in 2000 to almost 1.4kg per US$ by 2010 (UNEP, 2016: 40). In other words, far from decoupling – even in relative terms – this report showed that, from the turn of the century, the global economy has undergone a process of material ‘recoupling’. Given the fact that increasing material consumption use ‘is one of the key drivers for environmental problems and is directly or indirectly responsible for problems such as climate change, water scarcity or biodiversity loss’ (Giljum, 2009: 332-3), it should be no surprise that these problems, far from improving at the global level, continue to get worse (Ripple et al, 2017).

It is true that some limited absolute decoupling is underway in certain sectors of some nations, specifically as some developed economies move towards ‘service’, ‘information’, or ‘post-industrial’ modes of production and consumption (see i.e. Steinberger et al, 2013). This is especially the case for localised pollutants, such as wastewater discharge, sulphur dioxide emissions, and carbon monoxide emissions (Dinda, 2004; Bo, 2011). Some of these nations have reduced domestic carbon emissions (i.e. emissions released within the national territory) in absolute terms (Carbon Tracker, 2016).

However, while these reductions are positive steps in the right direction, the achievement is often less impressive on deeper interrogation. Often a large fraction of the decoupling taking place in rich nations is a result of environmental ‘leakage’ – that is, the process whereby wealthy nations have, throughout the globalisation era, increasingly externalised environmental damage via mechanisms such as pollution trading and the outsourcing of environmentally intensive production to developing countries, especially China. While it may be possible to ‘externalise’ impacts from a given nation, the planet, of course, is a closed system in this regard. Accordingly, when ‘externalised’ manufacturing or agricultural commodities – and their associated environmental harms – are ‘internalised’ from an accounting perspective, much of the apparent environmental progress of high consuming countries disappears. For example, it is no good claiming a reduction in national deforestation, say, if a nation is simply importing more wood from abroad rather than cutting down its own trees (Asici, 2013). Similarly, it has hardly environmental progress if the rate of species loss is reduced within a nation if, at the same time, the net import of luxury agricultural crops is driving accelerated species extinction across the globe (Lenzen et al, 2012). The OECDs aggregated carbon reductions between 2000 to 2013 reduce by about half when a consumption based methodology is used and the emissions embedded in imports from ‘pollution havens’ in China and other industrialising nations are fully accounted for (Carbon Tracker, 2016). To the extent that some nations have achieved absolute decoupling in carbon emissions, the problem remains that this process has been too slow and too minor to provide much solace, and as noted above, from the global perspective that ultimately matters, carbon emissions remain on the rise.

#### 3---Tech fails---doesn’t displace fossil fuels and increased consumption offsets efficiency gains.

Parrique et al. 19, Centre for Studies and Research in International Development (CERDI), University of Clermont Auvergne, France; Stockholm Resilience Centre (SRC), Stockholm University, Sweden, Barth J., Briens F., C. Kerschner, Kraus-Polk A., Kuokkanen A., Spangenberg J.H. (Timothee, July, Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and arguments against green growth as a sole strategy for sustainability, *European Environmental Bureau*, https://mk0eeborgicuypctuf7e.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Decoupling-Debunked.pdf)

Not leading to relevant innovations

Innovation is not in and of itself a good thing for ecological sustainability. The desirable type of innovation is eco-innovation or one that results “in a reduction of environmental risk, pollution and other negative impacts of resources use compared to relevant alternatives” (Kemp and Pearson, 2008, p.5). But this is only one type among several. In general, firms have an incentive to innovate to economise on the most expensive factors of production to maximise profits. Because labour and capital are usually relatively more expensive than natural resources, more technological progress will likely continue to be directed towards labour- and capital-saving innovations, with limited benefits, if any, for resource productivity and a potential rise in absolute impacts due to more production. But decoupling will not occur if technological innovations contribute to saving labour and capital while leaving resource use and environmental degradation unchanged.

Another issue is that technologies do not only solve environmental problems but also tend to create new ones. Assuming that resource productivity becomes a priority over labour and capital productivity, there is still nothing preventing technological innovations from creating more damage. For example, research into processes of extractions can lead to better ways to locate resources (imaging technologies and data analytics), to extract them (horizontal drilling, hydraulic fracturing, and automated drilling operations), and to transport them (Arctic shipping routes). These innovations may target resource use but with a result opposite to the objective of decoupling, that is more extraction. And this is not even considering unintended side-effects, which often accompany the development of new technologies

(Grunwald, 2018).

Not disruptive enough

Another problem has to do with the replacement of harmful technologies. Indeed, it is not enough for new technologies to emerge (innovation), they must also come to replace the old ones in a process of “exnovation” (Kimberly, 1981). What is required is a “push and pull strategy” (Rockström et al., 2017): pushing environmentally-friendly technologies into society and pulling harmful ones, like fossil-based infrastructure, out of it.

First, in reality, such a process is slow and difficult to trigger. Most polluting infrastructures (power plants, buildings and city structures, transport systems) require large investments, which then creates inertia and lock-in (Antal and van den Bergh, 2014, p. 3). Let us, for instance, consider the energy, buildings, and transport sectors, which account for the large majority of world energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Initial lifetime for a nuclear or a coal power plant is about 40 years. Buildings can last at least as much. The average lifetime for a car is 12-15 years, and this is about what it takes for an innovation to spread in the vehicle fleet. The wide availability of petrol refuelling stations gives an infrastructural advantage to petrol-based cars, whereas this is the opposite situation for electric, gas, or hydrogen vehicles that would require different and new supporting infrastructures. Building a highway or a nuclear plant is a commitment to emit for at least as long as these infrastructures will last – Davis and Socolow (2014) speak of “committed emissions.”

Energy is a good case in point: using more renewable energy is not the same as using less fossil fuels. The history of energy use is not one of substitutions but rather of successive additions of new sources of energy. As new energy sources are discovered, developed, and deployed, the old sources do not decline, instead, total energy use grows with additional layers on the energy mix cake. York (2012) finds that each unit of energy use from non-fossil fuel sources displaced less than one-quarter of a unit of its fossil-fuel counterpart, showing empirical support for the claim that expanding renewable energies is far from enough to curb fossil fuel consumption. The relative part of coal in the global energy mix has been reduced since the advent of petroleum but this occurred in spite of absolute growth in the use of coal (Krausmann et al., 2009).

#### Socialism is just as popular as capitalism among young Americans — transition is possible.

Salmon 21, Chief financial correspondent at Axios. He writes the weekly Axios Capital newsletter and covers all the ways that money drives the world (Felix, June 25th, “America's continued move toward socialism,” *Axios*, <https://www.axios.com/americas-continued-move-toward-socialism-84a0dda7-4b8d-483a-8c4e-0c2e562c4e67.html>, Accessed 09-17-2021)

Just half of younger Americans now hold a positive view of capitalism — and socialism's appeal in the U.S. continues to grow, driven by Black Americans and women, according to a new Axios/Momentive poll.

Why it matters: The pandemic has caused millions of Americans — including many younger Republicans — to re-evaluate their political and economic worldview. That's likely because of two factors: a renewed focus on deep societal inequalities and the tangible upsides of unprecedented levels of government intervention.

"The pandemic is sure to have lasting impact for decades to come," said Jon Cohen, the chief research officer for Momentive (formerly SurveyMonkey).

The intrigue: Shifts are happening on the right as well as the left, at least among those under 35.

Just 66% of Republicans and GOP-leaners ages 18-34 have a positive view of capitalism, down from 81% in January 2019, when we first polled on these questions.

56% of younger Republicans say the government should pursue policies that reduce the wealth gap, up from just 40% two years ago.

By the numbers: In 2019, 58% of Americans ages 18-34 reacted positively to the word capitalism. That's plunged to 49% today.

Back then, 39% of all U.S. adults viewed socialism positively. That has since ticked up to 41%.

Socialism has positive connotations for 60% of Black Americans, 45% of American women and 33% of non-white Republicans. Those numbers have grown over the past two years from 53%, 41% and 27%, respectively.

Only 48% of American women view capitalism in a positive light, down from 51% two years ago.

Today, 18-34 year-olds are almost evenly split between those who view capitalism positively and those who view it negatively (49% vs. 46%). Two years ago, that margin was a gaping 20 points (58% vs. 38%).

The bottom line: Politicians looking to attack opponents to their left can no longer use the word "socialist" as an all-purpose pejorative. Increasingly, it's worn as a badge of pride.

#### There’s no one-size-fix-all alternative---our task is shaping the best proposals into a unified alternative to capitalism.

Monbiot '19 [George; 4/25/19; columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science); "Dare to declare capitalism dead – before it takes us all down with it," https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/apr/25/capitalism-economic-system-survival-earth/]

So what does a better system look like? I don’t have a complete answer, and I don’t believe any one person does. But I think I see a rough framework emerging. Part of it is provided by the ecological civilisation proposed by Jeremy Lent, one of the greatest thinkers of our age. Other elements come from Kate Raworth’s doughnut economics and the environmental thinking of Naomi Klein, Amitav Ghosh, Angaangaq Angakkorsuaq, Raj Patel and Bill McKibben. Part of the answer lies in the notion of “private sufficiency, public luxury”. Another part arises from the creation of a new conception of justice based on this simple principle: every generation, everywhere, shall have an equal right to the enjoyment of natural wealth.

I believe our task is to identify the best proposals from many different thinkers and shape them into a coherent alternative. Because no economic system is only an economic system but intrudes into every aspect of our lives, we need many minds from various disciplines – economic, environmental, political, cultural, social and logistical – working collaboratively to create a better way of organising ourselves that meets our needs without destroying our home.
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#### Pandemics are inevitable and accelerating because of the neoliberal pharma industry---it creates breeding grounds for pathogenic spread and undermines global preparedness.

Attard 20, Socialist Appeal activist and writer for Marxist.com, (Joe, March 24th, 2020, “Pandemics, profiteering and big pharma: how capitalism plagues public health”, https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm)

“Outbreaks are inevitable, pandemics are optional”

In 1994, Pulitzer-winning journalist Laurie Garrett wrote The Coming Plague: Newly Emerging Diseases in a World Out of Balance. This was followed in 2001 by Betrayal of Trust: The Collapse of Global Public Health. Over these two books, she explained that “human disruption of the global environment, coupled with behaviors that readily spread microbes between people and from animals to humans, guaranteed a global surge in epidemics, even an enormous pandemic. [These] outbreaks were aided and abetted by inept health systems, human behavior, and the complete lack of consistent political and financial support for disease-fighting preparedness everywhere in the world.”[[74]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn74) Though she didn’t put it in these terms, these books were a damning indictment of capitalism and its corrosive effects on public health. Garrett’s warnings were corroborated in a 2018 report by the Global Preparedness Monitoring Board, which warned that “there is a very real threat of a rapidly moving, highly lethal pandemic of a respiratory pathogen killing 50 to 80 million people and wiping out nearly 5% of the world’s economy”.[[75]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn75)

The report continues:

“Between 2011 and 2018, WHO tracked 1,483 epidemic events in 172 countries. Epidemic-prone diseases such as influenza, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS), Ebola, Zika, plague, yellow fever and others, are harbingers of a new era of high-impact, potentially fast-spreading outbreaks that are more frequently detected and increasingly difficult to manage… Any country without basic primary health care, public health services, health infrastructure and effective infection control mechanisms faces the greatest losses, including death, displacement and economic devastation.”[[76]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn76)

In other words, the current COVID-19 crisis is part of a new era in which pandemics will become more common, for the reasons I have described. The world is underprepared for this, and the poorest countries are going to suffer the most. Aside from the emergence of new pathogens, there are other threats on the horizon, including antibiotic-resistant strains of microbes like streptococcus and staphylococcus, cultivated in hospitals in the advanced capitalist countries, due to an over-reliance on antibiotics developed in the post-war period.[[77]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn77) Illnesses of the 19th and 20th century, like TB, are returning with a vengeance in poor communities like Harlem in New York City – and developing antibiotic resistance.[[78]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn78) In the 1990s, a forecast by the University of California predicted that by 2070 the world would have exhausted all antimicrobial drug options, as viruses, bacteria, parasites and fungi would have evolved complete resistance to the human pharmaceutical arsenal.[[79]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn79) This apocalyptic scenario could be avoided, if more was invested in R&D for vaccines and alternative treatments. But as explained, this is not a profitable avenue for big pharma.

Responding to the aforementioned GPMB report, Garrett was sceptical that any of its proposals (which amount to lobbying governments and private enterprise to cooperate more effectively on funding and research) would amount to anything. She wrote: “With no intention of degrading the GPMB’s effort, I must sadly say that this core message has been shouted from the rafters many times before, with little discernible impact on tone-deaf political leaders, financial enterprises, or multinational institutions. There’s no reason to think this time will be any different.”[[80]](https://www.marxist.com/pandemics-profiteering-and-big-pharma-how-capitalism-plagues-public-health.htm#_ftn80)

Indeed, on a capitalist basis, it is unlikely that the situation will improve. These diseases have been conjured up by the system itself, and the living patterns of modern capitalist societies create ideal conditions for them to spread. Urbanisation has concentrated the vast majority of the planet’s 8bn people into dense populations, where disease can run rampant. And the dramatic increase in worldwide movement of people and goods (facilitated by modern transport, and exacerbated by war and climate change) creates viable channels for microbes to rage across the planet. It only took a matter of days before COVID-19 had spread from one end of the earth to the other. Such a global problem requires an international solution. But, as described, antagonism between different capitalist nations, the private property rights of the major pharmaceutical companies and the profit-based mode of production prevents the kind of coordinated response necessary to fight pandemics.

#### Cap turns disease: Growth makes catastrophic outbreaks inevitable AND they only cause extinction under globalization.

Morand & Walther ‘4/20 (\*Serge Morand; PhD, disease ecologist @ Kasetsart University; \*\*Bruno A. Walther; DPhil, Taipei Medical University; 4/20/20; “The accelerated infectious disease risk in the Anthropocene: more outbreaks and wider global spread”; pg. 3-4; Accessible at: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.20.049866>) \*”to” added to preserve grammatical integrity, brackets denote a change

We here want to draw attention to another important and noteworthy feature of the Anthropocene which greatly affects public health, human well-being, and economic performance. These findings are especially pertinent as the world reels from the health, social and economic impact of the current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (El Zowalaty and Järhult, 2020; Ghebreyesus and Swaminathan, 2020; Lorusso et al., 2020). The increasing connectivity of human populations due to international trade and travel (Guimerà et al., 2005; Colizza et al., 2006; Brockmann and Helbing, 2013; Gabrielli et al., 2019), the rapid growth of the transport of wild and domesticated animals worldwide (Rosen and Smith, 2010; Schneider, 2012; Rohr et al., 2019; Levitt, 2020), and other factors such as the increasing encroachment of human populations on hitherto isolated wild animal populations through loss and fragmentation of wild habitats (Patz et al., 2004; Despommier et al., 2006; Pongsiri et al., 2009; Myers et al., 2013) have led to a great acceleration of infectious disease risks, e.g., the increase in emerging infectious diseases and drug-resistant microbes since 1940 (Jones et al., 2008) and the increase in the number of disease outbreaks since 1980 (Smith et al., 2014). To expand the previous analysis (Smith et al., 2014) to the beginning of the Anthropocene, we investigated whether the number of disease outbreaks has increased since the Second World War. In addition, we examined whether the global pattern of infectious disease outbreaks changed possibly due [to] the increasing connectivity of human populations. In other words, have the disease outbreaks become more globalized in the sense that these outbreaks are increasingly shared by countries worldwide? To investigate these questions, we used a the most complete, reliable, and up-to-date global dataset (GIDEON Informatics, 2020) which had already been used in the previous analysis (Smith et al., 2014). This dataset can be used to enumerated the recorded annual number of disease outbreaks. To investigate the changing global patterns of disease outbreaks, we used this dataset to calculate two measures which have been recently introduced into ecological and parasitological studies. These two measures, namely modularity and centrality, quantify the connectivity of bipartite networks. Modularity is defined as the extent to which nodes (specifically, sites and species for presenceabsence matrices) in a compartment are more likely to be connected to each other than to other nodes of the network (Thébault, 2013). The calculation of a modularity measure is useful for global phenomena because it allows the overall level of compartmentalization (or fragmentation) into compartments (or clusters, modules, subgroups, or subsets) of an entire dataset to be quantified. High modularity in a global network means that subgroups of countries and disease outbreaks interact more strongly among themselves (that is, within a compartment) than with the other subgroups (that is, among compartments) (Bordes et al., 2015). Centrality is defined as the degree of the connectedness of a node (e.g., a keystone species in ecological studies; Jordán, 2009; González et al., 2010). In the context of our study, centrality is the degree of the connectedness of a country and those countries connected to it. We estimated the countries which are the potential centres of disease outbreaks by investigating the eigenvector centrality of a given country in a network of countries which share disease outbreaks among each other. Eigenvector centrality is a generalization of degree centrality, which is the number of connections a country has to other countries in terms of sharing disease outbreaks. Eigenvector centrality considers countries to be highly central if the connected countries to them through shared outbreaks are connected to many other well-connected countries (Bonacich and Lloyd, 2001; Wells et al., 2020). Modularity and centrality analyses have been used to investigate various ecological, parasitological and epidemiological questions (e.g., Tylianakis et al., 2007; Jordán, 2009; González et al., 2010; Anderson and Sukhdeo, 2011; Bascompte and Jordano, 2014; Poisot et al., 2014; Bordes et al., 2015; Genrich et al., 2017). Using a widely used world dataset on infectious disease outbreaks, we here present results which demonstrate that the accelerated number of disease outbreaks and their increased global spread are two further threatening aspects of the accelerated infectious disease risk associated with the globalization process which characterizes the Anthropocene.

#### Causes nanobots, pathogens, and asteroid terrorism---there all independent impact scenarios that happen at lightspeed---means deterrence and rationality are impossible.

Torres ’18 (Phil; Project for Future Human Flourishing; *Space colonization and suﬀering risks: Reassessing the “maxipok rule”*; Futures 100 (2018) 74-85; MSCOTT)

One might surmise here that a balance of terror could establish bipolar stability, just as MAD did during the Cold War. Yet this appears implausible given the weapons mentioned above. For example, if one side could release self-replicating nanobots that disarm ~~cripple~~ the target civilization before it can retaliate, the result would be a terror imbalance that, under certain circumstances, would make a ﬁrst strike game theoretically rational. In fact, Kurzweil outlines a scenario in which ecophages destroy the entire biosphere of Earth within ∼90 min. This would involve a two-stage attack: ﬁrst, a small population of nanobots would spread around the globe, and second, at an “optimal” time this population would begin to self-replicate at an exponential pace. To put this in perspective, signal delays between Earth and Mars range from 4 to 24 min, depending on where each planet is in its orbit, and travel times range from 150 to 300 days. Add to this the inevitable lag of bureaucracies and the outcome is a serious credibility-of-deterrence problem. Even more, some future genius could invent a far more eﬀective way of weaponizing nanobots in the next 100 years, at which point humanity will probably have established martian colonies.19 Related scenarios involving designer pathogens that initiate “engineered global pandemics” or planetoid bombs capable of obliterating whole metropolises—or perhaps an entire ecumenopolis, if one ex- ists—could also be imagined, although I will leave this task for the reader.

But the situation is far worse than this, because ecophages, pathogens, and asteroids won’t pose the greatest risks to inter- planetary peace: heliobeams, DEWs, and gravity waves not only could inﬂict catastrophic damage on their targets but they could do this at or near lightspeed. In a ﬂash, one civilization could cripple the other’s key military and/or civilian infrastructure, thus rendering it unable to eﬀectively respond to an attack. Furthermore, since the speed of light imposes an upper bound on information transfer, there could be, in principle, no early-warning systems to alert the target civilization that an attack has commenced, which would severely compromise its ability to initiate defensive measures. One might here wonder: perhaps the attackee could overcome this defensive vulnerability by stationing counterstrike military drones throughout the solar system. They could be programmed to launch a coordinated attack if they fail to receive a “no-strike” signal that is ordinarily sent to them every few minutes. Thus, the destruction of key military infrastructure would result in the cessation of this signal and therefore the initiation of a counterstrike. But this too appears otiose since a ﬁrst strike using, say, DEWs could simply target these drones as well. The result is that threats of retaliation from each civilization would be literally in-credible and the balance of terror would collapse.

Here we should also not overlook the potential for accidents to cause conﬂicts when inter-civilizational tensions are suﬃciently high. The disturbing historical fact is that “pure dumb luck” played a critical role in preventing nuclear war from occurring during the Cold War. Individuals like Vasili Arkhipov and Stanislav Petrov more or less single-handedly averted nuclear holocausts, and an interpretation error in 1995 led Boris Yeltsin to become “the ﬁrst Russian president to ever have the ‘nuclear suitcase’ open in front of him” (Cirincione, 2013). Although intelligence is negatively correlated with accident proneness, and presumably our (post)human descendants will be cognitively enhanced to some extent, even a small probability of error could make disaster almost certain (see Torres, forthcoming). For example, imagine that a mere 500 people have access to a “button” that, if pushed, would initiate a catastrophic ﬁrst strike against the other civilization. If each of these individuals has a mere 0.01 chance per decade of accidentally pushing this button, the result is a staggering 99.3 percent probability that, within 10 years, the strike will occur. So, perhaps Earth and Mars—whose civilizations could potentially coexist for another 10 million centuries, until the sun burns out—won’t be quite as lucky as the US and Soviet Union were for the slightly more than four decades between 1947 and 1991.

The ﬁnal step in the present argument is to project this bi-planetary predicament into the vast reaches of outer space. Consider the billions and billions and billions of populations that could come to occupy a universe with 10 trillion galaxies and 1024 stars, each with its own traditions, boasting of weapons that could destroy entire galaxies or even the entire universe, and embedded in a cosmo-political system of lawless anarchy. There is no supreme governing system to provide security and no policies of deterrence to reliably prevent ﬁrst strikes. It is hard to imagine how such a predicament could avoid constant and catastrophic wars between civilizations both near and far. Indeed, theorists like Waltz (1979) have argued that multipolar state conﬁgurations are less stable and more prone to conﬂict than bipolar conﬁgurations. The reason is that uncertainty increases with the number of actors, and as uncertainty increases, so does distrust of everyone else’s intentions. Hence, the more civilizations there are in the universe, the greater the incentive for Tuckerian actors to preventively or preemptively strike their neighbors—or to induce a vacuum bubble in the hope that an “assembler” on the “other side” can enable some form of post-transition survival. The point is that the future will be marked by radical multipolarity, and this will greatly increase the probability of violence. Yet the diﬃculty of establishing Earth-independent colonies on Mars without catastrophic wars—as outlined above—suggests that our descendants might not make it beyond the solar system. In fact, Deudney (in press) argues that attempts to colonize space could constitute the Great Filter that explains why we see no evidence of intelligent aliens crying out for cosmic companionship in a universe slowly sinking into thermodynamic equilibrium.20