## 1NC

### 1NC — Capitalism Critique

#### THE [FIRST/NEXT] OFF-CASE IS THE CAPITALISM CRITIQUE.

**First, U.S. engagement creates capitalist expansion by advancing a neoliberal agenda.**

**Haiphong 16** (Daniel, activist and radical journalist, “US foreign policy is the military assertion of Capitalist supremacy,” <http://ahtribune.com/politics/991-us-foreign-policy.html>)

US foreign policy has received the least attention in the 2016 elections. When it has been mentioned, the majority of candidates have merely repeated dogma such as "Russian aggression" and the existential threat of "terrorism." Only Donald Trump has deviated from the Washington consensus, questioning the legitimacy of NATO and US belligerence toward China and Russia. Yet even his comments do not go far enough to expose the true motivations behind US foreign policy. The carnage, chaos, and catastrophe of US foreign policy are driven by the interests of capitalism. Investor wealth and capitalist profit are the motivating forces of US foreign policy. **US foreign policy can be divided into two different, but related, policies. The first policy is direct military intervention by sanction, proxy, or invasion on sovereign countries. The second is indirect military intervention through the deployment of military bases, command centers, and intelligence operations to countries already under the boot of US hegemony. Both policies are geared toward creating favorable conditions in the target country for the** supremacy of US capital**.** The US invasion of Iraq is the most blatant examples of the mutual relationship between US foreign policy and the profit motive. Prior to the invasion of Iraq in 2003, the Iraqi government was the sole owner and distributor of the nation's vast oil resources. The destabilization of the Iraqi state opened the door to privatization. Over 80 percent of Iraq's oil is currently exported out of the country under the terms of contracts wielded by corporations such as Exxon and Chevron. A quarter of Iraq's population now lives in poverty as basic services have become a luxury. Additionally, it was estimated in 2013 that defense contractors raked in 138 billion dollars worth of contracts from Washington as a consequence of the war. **"Defense" and oil corporations require the destruction of the sovereign nations such as Iraq to expand market share. Once a nation is compliant, US foreign policy shifts gears away from direct military rule to indirect.** In South Korea, for example, the US maintains an estimated 28,000 US troops to prevent the reunification of the Koran state. The US has nearly 1,000 military bases around the world. Most of the operations conducted by these military installations carry the sole purpose of maintaining oppressive but compliant governments in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The most important measure of compliance is whether a government is run by puppets willing to do the bidding of US capital. If not, then the state in question is subject to US-sponsored destabilization**. At the present moment, there are two powerful nations that stand in the way of full spectrum dominance of US capital. Russia and China** have been the prime targets of US foreign policy. US multinational corporations and banks see Russia and China as the primary obstacles to unfettered global exploitation and profit accumulation. Russia's vast energy resources are exported by state-owned companies such as Gazprom. China's socialist economy is heavily comprised of state-owned industries. Through aggressive national development**, China has become the largest economy in the world in terms of purchasing power.** Russia and China have attracted lucrative economic relationships with nations all over the world. Russia has taken the initiative to form the Eurasian Economic Union which calls continental trade integration. Similarly, **China has been developing an economic infrastructure project called the "New Silk Road."** This project, which most notably involves the development of a transnational railway connecting China to Russia and the European market, is estimated to cost 1 trillion USD in foreign investment. **The strategic plans of** Russia and **China have the US scrambling all over the globe to ensure the world remains locked into the exploitative grips of US multinational corporations.** Washington's Trans Pacific Partnership trade agreement, **the TPP, is the counter response to the rise of China. It includes provisions that allow corporations to sue participating states should their governments do anything to impede corporate profit. The US has instituted a "pivot" to Asia to create the military conditions necessary for such a trade deal. The US pivot has virtually encircled China militarily** with partnerships in the Philippines, Guam, Japan, South Korea, and Australia. The US has conducted a similar policy of encirclement with regards to Russia. A ten day NATO exercise called operation Anaconda began on June 6th in Poland. The operation comprised of thirty thousand troops from twenty four countries. Furthermore, the US has supported the reactionary proxy war in Ukraine that rendered the country ungovernable. Military installations such as AFRICOM and NATO have as their main targets Russia and China. In Africa, the expansion of AFRICOM to all countries on the continent but two has come in direct response to China becoming the world's largest investor in African wealth. The 2011 US-NATO war on Libya was conducted to prevent the Libyan government from moving forward with plans to unify the continent around a single gold currency. Yet despite the commitment on the part of the US to deploy its military around the world to protect the interests of capital, the economic system of capitalism remains mired in crisis. US GDP continues to slow and stall. US influence around the world is increasingly being seen by millions as parasitic and a fetter on real production. **The US capitalist system has reached a stage of terminal decline, whereby its own need to revolutionize technology in order to increase profit has actually sent profit into a downward spiral.** Billions of workers globally either work in low-wage jobs or no jobs at all. **This is the world that US foreign policy protects. A new world will require a coordinated global movement led by the oppressed to suppress the forces of capital that dictate US foreign policy.**

**Second, neoliberal collapse is inevitable but the plan prolongs its life, ensuring structural limits are reached that threaten survival.**

**Li 10** (Minqi, Chinese Political Economist, world-systems analyst, and historical social scientist, currently an associate professor of Economics at the University of Utah “The End of the “End of History”: The Structural Crisis of Capitalism and the Fate of Humanity,” *Science and Society* Vol. 74, No. 3, July 2010, 290–305)

**In 2001, the U. S. stock market bubble started to collapse**, after years of “new economy” boom. The **Bush** administration **took advantage of** the psychological shock of **9/11, and undertook** a series of **“preemptive wars”** (first in Afghanistan and then in Iraq) that ushered in a new era of intensified inter-state conflicts. Towards the end of 2001, **Argentina, which was** regarded as **a neoliberal model country, was hit by a devastating financial crisis**. Decades of neoliberalism had not only undermined the living standards of the working classes, but also destroyed the material fortunes of the urban middle classes (which remained a key social base for neoliberalism in Latin America until the 1990s). **After the** Argentine **crisis, neoliberalism completely lost political legitimacy in Latin America**. This paved the way for the rise of several socialist-oriented governments on the continent. **After** the **2001** global recession, **the global economy** actually **entered** into **a mini–golden age. The** big semi-peripheral economies, the so-called **“BRICs”** (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) **became** the most **dynamic** sector. **The neoliberal global economy was fueled by the super-exploitation of the massive cheap labor force** in the semi-periphery **(especially in China**). **The strategy** worked, to the extent that it **generated massive** amounts of **surplus value** that could be shared by the global capitalist classes. **But it also created a massive “realization problem.”** That is, **as** the **workers** in the “emerging markets” **were deprived of purchasing power**, on a global scale, **there was a persistent lack of effective demand for the industrial output produced in** China and the rest of **the semi-periphery**. After 2001, **the problem was addressed through increasingly higher levels of debt-financed consumption** in the advanced capitalist countries (especially in the United States). **The neoliberal strategy was economically and ecologically unsustainable**. **Economically**, the **debt-financed consumption** in the advanced capitalist countries **could not go on indefinitely. Ecologically, the rise of the BRICs greatly accelerated resource depletion and environmental degradation** on a global scale. **The global ecological system is now on the verge of total collapse**. The world is now in the midst of a prolonged period of economic and political instability that could last several decades. **In the past, the capitalist world system** had responded to similar crises and **managed to undertake successful restructurings**. Is it conceivable that the current crisis will result in a similar restructuring within the system that will bring about a new global “New Deal”? **In three respects, the current world historical conjuncture is fundamentally different** from that of 1945. Back **in 1945, the U**nited **S**tates **was the indisputable hegemonic power**. It enjoyed overwhelming industrial, financial, and military advantages relative to the other big powers and, from the capitalist point of view, its national interests largely coincided with the world system’s common and long-term interests. **Now, U. S. hegemony is in irreversible decline**. But **none of the other big powers is in a position to replace the U**nited **S**tates and function as an effective hegemonic power. Thus, **exactly at a time when the global capitalist system is in deep crisis, the system is** also **deprived of effective leadership**.4 In 1945, **the construction of a global “New Deal” involved primarily accommodating the** economic and political **demands of the western working classes and the non-western elites** (the national bourgeoisies and the westernized intellectuals). In the current conjuncture, **any new global “New Deal” will have to incorporate not only the western working classes but also the massive, non-western working classes. Can the capitalist world system afford such a new “New Deal” if it could not even afford the old one?** Most importantly, **back in 1945, the world’s resources remained abundant and cheap, and there was still ample global space for environmental pollution. Now, not only has resource depletion reached an advanced stage, but the world has also virtually run out of space for any further environmental pollution.**

#### Third, this capitalist militarism guarantees extinction.

Meszaros 3[Istvan, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, June, Monthly Review, “Militarism and the Coming Wars,” <http://monthlyreview.org/2003/06/01/militarism-and-the-coming-wars>]

Today the situation is qualitatively different. For two principal reasons. First, the objective of the feasible **war at the present phase of historical development**, in accordance with the objective requirements of imperialism – **world domination by capital’s most powerful state, in tune with its own political design of ruthless authoritarian “globalization**”(dressed up as “free exchange” in a U.S.-ruled global market) – **is ultimately unwinnable, foreshadowing,** instead, **the destruction of humankind**. This objective by no stretch of imagination could be considered a rational objective in accord with the stipulated rational requirement of the “continuation of politics by other means” conducted by one nation, or by one group of nations against another. **Aggressively imposing the will of one powerful national state over all of the others, even if for cynical tactical reasons the advocated war is absurdly camouflaged as a “purely limited war” leading to other “open ended limited wars,”** can therefore be qualified only as total irrationality. The second reason greatly reinforces the first. For **the weapons** already **available for waging the** war or **wars of the twenty first century are capable of exterminating not only the adversary but the whole of humanity,** the first time ever in history. **Nor should we have the illusion that the existing weaponry marks the very end of the road. Others, even more instantly lethal ones, might appear tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.**  Moreover**, threatening the use of such weapons is by now considered an acceptable state strategic device.** Thus, put reasons one and two together, and **the conclusion is inescapable: envisaging war as the mechanism of global government in today’s world underlines that we find ourselves at the precipice of absolute irrationality from which there can be no return if we accept the ongoing course of development.** What was missing from von Clausewitz’s classic definition of war as the “continuation of politics by other means” was the investigation of the deeper underlying causes of war and the possibility of their avoidance. The challenge to face up to such causes is more urgent today than ever before. For the war of the twenty first century looming ahead of us is not only “not winnable in principle”. Worse than that, it is in principle unwinnable. Consequently, **envisaging the pursuit of war, as the American administration**’s September 17, 2002 strategic document **does, make Hitler’s irrationality look like the model of rationality.**

#### Finally, the alternative is to vote negative to engage in radical critique of capitalism.

Meszaros 8[Istvan, Chair of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time, p323-328]

**The unreality of postulating the sustainable solution of the grave problems of our social order within the formal** and legal **framework** and corresponding constraints **of** parliamentary **politics arises from the fundamental misconception of the structural determinations of capital’s rule**, as represented in all varieties that assert the dualism of civil society and the political state**. The difficulty, insurmountable within the** parliamentary **framework is** this that **since capital is actually in control of all vital aspects of the social metabolism, it can afford to define the separately constituted sphere of political legitimation as a strictly formal and legal matter, thereby necessarily excluding the possibility of being legitimately challenged in its substantive sphere of socioeconomic reproductive operation. Directly or indirectly, capital controls everything, including the** parliamentary **legislative process, even if the latter is supposed to be fully independent from capital** in many theories that fictitiously hypostatize the “democratic equality” of all political forces participating in the legislative process. To envisage a very different relationship to the powers of decision making in our societies, now completely dominated by the forces of capital in every domain, it is necessary to radically challenge capital itself as the overall controller of social metabolic reproduction.¶ What makes this problem worse for all those who are looking for significant change on the margins of the established political system is that the latter can claim for itself genuine constitutional legitimacy in its present mode of functioning, based on the historically constituted inversion of the actual state of the material reproductive affairs. For inasmuch as the capital is not only the “personification of capital” but simultaneously functions also “as the personification of the social character of labor, of the total workshop as such**,” the system can claim to represent the vitally necessary productive power of society vis-à-vis the individuals as the basis of their continued existence, incorporating the interest of all. In this way capital asserts itself not only as the de facto but also the de jure power of society**, in its capacity as the objectively given necessary condition of societal reproduction, and thereby as the constitutional foundation to its own political order. **The fact that the constitutional legitimacy of capital is historically founded on the ruthless expropriation of the conditions of social metabolic reproduction- the means and material of labor-from the producers, and therefore capital’s claimed “constitutionality**” (like the origin of all constitutions) is unconstitutional, is an unpalatable truth which fades away in the mist of a remote **past. The “social productive powers of labor**, or productive power or social labor, first develop historically with the specifically capitalist mode of production, **hence appear as something immanent in the capital-relation and inseparable from it.**¶ **This is how capital’s mode of social metabolic reproduction becomes eternalized and legitimated as a lawfully unchallengeable system**. Legitimate contest is admissible only in relation to some minor aspects of the unalterable overall structure. The real state of affairs on thee plane of socioeconomic reproduction-i.e., the actually exercised productive power of labor and its absolute necessity for securing capital’s own reproduction- disappears from sight. Partly because of the ignorance of the very far from legitimate historical origin of capital’s “primitive accumulation” and the concomitant, frequently violent, expropriation of property as the precondition of the system’s present mode of functioning; and partly because of the mystifying nature of the established productive and distributive relations. As Marx notes: The objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker; rather, he appears as subsumed under them. Capital employs Labor. Even this relation is in its simplicity is a personification of things and a reification of persons.¶ None of this **can be** challenged **and** remedied **within the** framework of parliamentarypolitical reform**. It would be quite absurd to expect the abolition of the “personification of things and the reification of persons” by political decree, and just as absurd to expect the proclamation of such an intended reform within the framework of capital’s political institutions. For the capital system cannot function without the perverse overturning of the relationship between persons and things: capital’s alienated and reified powers dominate the masses of the people. Similarly it would be a miracle if the workers who confront capital in the labor process as “isolated workers” could reacquire mastery over the social productive powers of their labor by some political decree, or even by a whole series of** parliamentary **reforms** enacted under capital’s order of social metabolic control. For in these matters there can be no way of avoiding the irreconcilable conflict over the material stakes of “either/or”¶ **Capital can neither abdicate its-usurped-social productive powers in favor of labor, nor can I share them with labor, thanks to some wishful but utterly fictitious “political compromise**.” For they constitute the overall controlling power of societal reproduction in the form of “the rule of wealth over society**.” Thus it is impossible to escape, in the domain of the fundamental social metabolism, the severe logic of either/or**. For either wealth, in the shape of capital, continues to rule over human society, taking it to the brink of self-destruction, or the society of associated producers learns to rule over alienated and reified wealth, with productive powers arising from the self-determinated social labor of its individual-but not longer isolated-members**. Capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence. It cannot possibly be politically constrained by parliament in its power of** social metabolic control**. This is why the only mode of political representation compatible with capital’s mode of functioning is one that effectively denies the possibility of contesting its material power. And precisely because capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence, it has nothing to fear from the reforms that can be enacted within its parliamentary political framework**.¶ Since the vital issue on which everything else hinges is that “the objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker” buy, on the contrary, “he appears as subsumed under them,” no meaningful change is feasible without addressing the issue both in a form of politics capable of matching capital’s extra-parliamentary powers and modes of action, and in the domain of material reproduction. Thus the only challenge that could affect the power of capital, in a sustainable manner, is one which would simultaneously aim at assuming the system’s key productive functions, and at acquiring control over the corresponding political decision making processes in all spheres, instead of being hopelessly constrained by the circular confinement of institutionally legitimated political action to parliamentary legislation.¶ There is a great deal of critique of formerly leftwing political figures and of their now fully accommodating parties in the political debates of the last decades. However, what is problematic about such debates is that by overemphasizing the role of personal ambition and failure, they often continue to envisage remedying the situation with in the same political institutional framework that, in fact, greatly favors the criticized “personal betrayals” and the painful “party derailments.” Unfortunately**, though the advocated and hoped for personal and government changes tend to reproduce the same deplorable results.**¶ All this could not be very surprising. **The reason why the now established political institutions successfully resist significant change for the better is because they are themselves part of the problem and not of the solution**. For in their immanent nature they are the embodiment of the underlying structural determinations and contradictions through which the modern capitalist state- with its ubiquitous network of bureaucratic constituents- has been articulated and stabilized in the course of the last four hundred years. Naturally, the state was formed not as a one-sided mechanical result but through its necessary reciprocal interrelationship to the material ground of capital’s historical unfolding, as not only being shaped by the latter but also actively shaping it as much as historically feasible under the prevailing- and precisely through the interrelationship also changing- circumstances.¶ Given the insuperably centrifugal determination of capital’s productive microcosms, even at the level of the giant quasi-monopolistic transnational corporations**, only the modern state could assume and fulfill the required function of being the overall command structure of the capital system.**¶Inevitably, that meant the complete alienation of the power of overall decision making from the producers. Even the “particular personifications of capital” were strictly mandated to act in accord with the structural imperatives of their system. Indeed the modern state, as constituted on the material ground of the capital system, is the paradigm of alienation as regards the power of comprehensive decision making. **It would be therefore extremely naïve to imagine that the capitalist state could willingly hand over the alienated power of systemic decision making to any rival actor who operates within the legislative framework** of parliament.¶ Thus**, in order to envisage a meaningful and historically sustainable societal change, it is necessary to** submit to a radical critique **both the material reproductive and the political inter-determinations of the** entire system**, and not simply some of the contingent and limited political practices. The combined totality of the material reproductive determinations and the all-embracing political command structure of the state together constitutes the overpowering reality of the capital system**. In this sense, in view of the unavoidable question arising from the challenge of systemic determinations, with regard to both socioeconomic reproduction and the state**, the need for a comprehensive political transformation**-in close conjunction to the meaningful exercise of society’s vital productive functions without which far-reaching and lasting political change is inconceivable**-becomes inseparable from the problem characterized as the withering away of the state.** Accordingly, in the historic task of accomplishing “the withering away of the state,” self-management through full participation, and the permanently sustainable overcoming of parliamentarism by a positive form of substantive decision-making are inseparable.¶ This is a vital concern and not “romantic faithfulness to Marx’s unrealizable dream,” as some people try to discredit and dismiss it. In truth**, the “withering away of the state” refers to nothing mysterious or remote but to a perfectly tangible process that must be initiated right in our own historical time. It means, in plain language, the progressive reacquisition of the alienated power of political decision making by the individuals** in their enterprise of moving toward a genuine socialist society.Without the reacquisition of this power- to which not only the capitalist state but also the paralyzing inertia of the structurally well-entrenched material reproductive practices are fundamentally opposed- neither the new mode of political control of society as a whole by its individuals is conceivable, nor indeed the nonadversarial and thereby cohesive and plannable everyday operation of the particular productive and distributive units by the self-managing freely associated producers. **Radically superseding adversariality, and thereby securing the material and political ground of globally viable planning- an absolute must for the very survival of humanity, not to mention the potentially enriched self realization- of its individual members- is synonymous with the withering away of the state as an ongoing historical enterprise**.

## 2NC/1NR — Blocks

### They Say: “Framework”

#### 1. The critique is an impact turn — even if we lose framework, we still access our offence.

#### 2. The role of the ballot and judge is to choose between competing political strategies.

#### 3. The central question of the debate is “How do we deal with harms?” Voting aff represents patchwork policy solutions to mitigate harms from capitalism. Voting negative represents reforming the underlying economic system. If we win our link arguments, you cannot separate the plan from its political orientation towards capitalism.

### They Say: “Permutation” / “Reformism”

#### Reformism is a naïve strategy- if the reform is actually worthwhile, it will never be fully actualized- it can only serve to stabilize capitalism.

Herod 7 (Graduate of Columbia University, James, “Getting Free,” Pg. 133-134)

**The picture here**, then, **is one of masses of people organized** into special-purpose organizations and single-issue campaigns who network on a global scale, and **thus supposedly acquire the power to impose changes on the existing ruling-class institutions.** "The movement's unifying goal," the authors claim, "is to bring about sufficient democratic control over states, markets, and corporations to permit people and the planet to survive and begin to shape a viable future." They argue that "the principal strategy of the movement for globalization from below has been to identify the violation of generally held norms, demand that power actors conform to those norms, and threaten the bases of consent on which they depend if they fail to do so." **It is foolish to think that the State Department, General Electric, or the World Bank can be democratized. What is not part of this picture is any thought of dismantling states, markets, or corporations and replacing them with authentically democratic social arrangements**. (Thankfully, dismantling states, markets, and corporations is, however, in the picture for a significant minority of today's protesters against corporate globalization, although this doesn't seem to have been noticed by these authors.) This is a startlingly reformist book, and as with most **reformism, is deeply naive**. **The authors do not fully perceive or understand the true nature of the enemy we face. Having failed to take into consideration the imperatives of a system based on profit taking, they fail to realize that many of the reforms they seek to impose are incompatible with that system**, or that in its current phase, **the system is incapable of accommodating these reforms** without self‑destructing, and consequently, **contemporary capitalists will fanatically fight these reforms because it is a matter of survival for them**. These theorists of globalization from below, however, do not perceive this. **They think these reforms can be imposed**, through protests and the withdrawal of consent. **This is where their use of mainstream sociological categories has gotten in the way.** Although they use the term global capital occasionally, **they are not really aware of capitalism as a historical system, but are rather merely talking abstractly about "established institutions" and "the power of the powerful."** They claim that such power "is based on the active cooperation of some people and the consent and/or acquiescence of others." They believe that this power can be challenged by the withdrawal of consent. "Social movements can be understood as the collective withdrawal of consent to established institutions." This may be true on an abstract level and in the long run (although apartheid in South Africa survived for half a century after the vast majority hated it). But in the here and now, **since they lack any concrete knowledge of what the actual imperatives of contemporary capitalists are** (for their continued survival as capitalists), **our theorists are led to make wildly romantic demands.**

#### Reform inevitably occurs in a capitalist framework – that dooms solvency.

Luxemburg 86 (specialized in Staatswissenschaft, “Reform or Revolution,” [www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1900/reform-revolution/ch08.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1900/reform-revolution/ch08.htm))

Legislative reform and revolution are not different methods of historic development that can be picked out at the pleasure from the counter of history, just as one chooses hot or cold sausages. **Legislative reform and revolution are different factors in the development of class society**. They condition and complement each other, and are at the same time reciprocally exclusive, as are the north and south poles, the bourgeoisie and proletariat. **Every legal constitution is the product of a revolution**. In the history of classes, revolution is the act of political creation, while legislation is the political expression of the life of a society that has already come into being. **Work for reform does not contain its own force independent from revolution**. During every historic period, **work for reforms is carried on only in the direction given to it by the impetus of the last revolution** and continues as long as the impulsion from the last revolution continues to make itself felt. Or, to put it more concretely, in each historic period **work for reforms is carried on only in the framework of the social form created by the last revolution**. Here is the kernel of the problem. It is contrary to history to represent work for reforms as a long-drawn out revolution and revolution as a condensed series of reforms. A social transformation and a legislative reform do not differ according to their duration but according to their content. The secret of historic change through the utilisation of political power resides precisely in the transformation of simple quantitative modification into a new quality, or to speak more concretely, in the passage of an historic period from one given form of society to another. That is why **people who pronounce themselves in favour of** the method of legislative **reform** in place and in contradistinction to the conquest of political power and social revolution, **do not** really **choose a** more tranquil, **calmer and slower road to the same goal, but a different goal**. Instead of taking a stand for the establishment of a new society **they take a stand for surface modifications of the old society**. If we follow the political conceptions of revisionism, we arrive at the same conclusion that is reached when we follow the economic theories of revisionism. Our **program becomes not the realisation of socialism, but the reform of capitalism**; **not the suppression of the wage** labour **system but the diminution of exploitation**, that is, the suppression of the abuses of capitalism instead of suppression of capitalism itself.

#### The root cause of our bad economic condition is capitalism: continuing to engage in ‘reform’ perpetrates capitalism, leading to worsening of conditions – The only solution is to put Chinese and American labor in solidarity with each other.

Hart-Lansdberg 10 (Professor of Economics at Lewis and Clark College, Martin, February, The U.S. Economy and China: Capitalism, Class, and Crisis, Monthly Review, Volume 61, Issue 9)

The U.S. economy is in bad shape and people are understandably seeking solutions. Many, encouraged by mainstream media and politicians, believe that China’s trade policies bear primary responsibility for the structural decay of our economy and that recovery will require, above all, pressuring the Chinese government to implement “market-freeing” policy changes that will bring the U.S.-China trade relationship into balance.¶ Despite its popularity, this nation-state approach to understanding the dynamics of the U.S.-China relationship is seriously flawed. It encourages people to see U.S. industrial problems, falsely, as the outcome of a contest between China and the United States, in which the Chinese government has boosted the well-being of its citizens at U.S. expense, through “unfair” practices. As a consequence, it leads to counterproductive policy recommendations.¶ In this paper, I offer an alternative approach to understanding the U.S.-China trade relationship; one that relies on a class-based analysis of (global) capitalist dynamics. It leads, not surprisingly, to very different economic insights and political challenges. For example, it reveals that the threat to U.S.-based manufacturing activity comes not from China, but from the operation of a transnational, corporate-shaped, regional production system, in which China serves as the region’s final assembly platform.¶ It also reveals that, while both transnational capital and elites in China have greatly benefited from the operation of this system, Chinese workers have paid a high cost; in fact, Chinese workers experience many of the same negative consequences from its operation as do workers in the United States. It also explains why both the Chinese and the U.S. governments have responded to the current world crisis with strategies designed to maintain the status quo, despite the negative effects of this decision on working people.¶ In short, my analysis reveals that it is capitalism—not competition between China and the United States—that is the source of our economic problems. Our challenge, then, which I briefly address in the conclusion, is to draw on the above insights to develop a strategy capable of both illuminating and contesting capitalism’s destructive logic—a task that puts U.S. workers in solidarity, rather than competition, with workers in China.¶ The “Nation-State” Argument¶ Those who argue that U.S. problems owe much to China’s growth strategy tend to reason as follows: Chinese state policies have transformed China into an export powerhouse, with the U.S. market its main target. Initially, Chinese exports were predominately labor intensive, low-technology products, such as textiles and shoes. However, beginning in the mid-1990s, China also became a major exporter of higher valued added, high-technology products, such as computers, cell phones, and other consumer electronics. As BusinessWeek points out, this is far from a “normal” development:¶ America has survived import waves before, from Japan, South Korea, and Mexico. And it has lived with China for two decades. But something very different is happening. The assumption has long been that the US and other industrialized nations will keep leading in knowledge-intensive industries while developing nations focus on lower-skill sectors. That’s now open to debate. “What is stunning about China is that for the first time we have a huge, poor country that can compete both with very low wages and in high tech,” says Harvard University economist Richard B. Freeman. “Combine the two, and America has a problem.”1¶ This one-two punch is said to have devastated the U.S. manufacturing sector, driving firms out of business and undermining both manufacturing employment and wages. Families were forced into greater and greater debt to sustain consumption. And, as a growing share of consumer spending went to the purchase of goods produced in China (and other countries), government efforts to boost employment and production became increasingly ineffective.¶ Financing the resulting trade deficit also required ever greater foreign borrowing, especially from China, which helped accelerate the financialization of the economy and put additional limits on U.S. fiscal and monetary policy. Taken together, these trends contributed to a weaker, more unbalanced and unstable growth process, laying the groundwork for the current crisis.¶ Logically, then, reversal of these trends is key to the revitalization of the U.S. economy, an outcome best achieved through a restructuring of the U.S.-China economic relationship. More specifically, China must be pressed to revalue its currency, open its markets wider to U.S. goods, and play by the accepted rules of “market-based” capitalist competition. These steps can be expected to boost U.S. exports to China, reduce U.S. imports from China, and, as a consequence, renew U.S. manufacturing, boost “family-wage” job creation, reduce domestic and foreign debt, and restore national policy effectiveness.¶ This argument promotes the view, intentionally or not, that our task is to strengthen capitalist market forces in China. As we see next, this view rests on a poor understanding of the forces at work in China (not to mention capitalist dynamics) and the consequences of those forces for U.S. (and Chinese) workers.

### They Say: “Totalizing Criticisms Bad” (Gibson-Graham)

#### Gibson-Graham construct a straw person in order to reject Marxism, making a revolution impossible.

Rene Francisco Poitevin 1 (Doctoral Candidate in Sociology at UC Davis, Rene F., Socialist Review, “The end of anti-capitalism as we knew it: Reflections on postmodern Marxism,” <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3952/is_200101/ai_n8932891/>)

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) begs another question: Who are they going after? Is it capitalism or is it Marx? Their book spends so much time on what is supposedly wrong with Marxism that at times it reads more like The End of Marxism As We Knew It. This approach is typical of a pattern that, to quote Wendy Brown, "responds less to the antidemocratic forces of our time than to a ghostly philosophical standoff between historically abstracted formulations of Marxism and liberalism. In other words, this effort seeks to resolve a problem in a (certain) history of ideas rather than a problem in history."19 Simply put, postmodern Marxist politics has more to do with the micropolitics of the ivory tower than with the plight of the workers who clean their campuses. However, once it becomes clear that a necessary condition for the primacy of postmodern theory and politics is that Marxism has to go (otherwise you do not have to become a postmodern to address their concerns), J.K. Gibson-Graham's anti-Marxist hostility, while actively embracing the Marxist label in order to render it useless, makes a lot of sense. And once again, all this is done with impeccable logic: Given that Marxism is still the only doctrine that calls for the systematic overthrow of capitalism, getting rid of Marx(ism) is also to get rid of the need for revolution with a big "R."20 One of the problems with trying to make the case for postmodern Marxism is that in order to get rid of Marxism and declare its tradition obsolete, you have to distort its legacy by constructing a straw man. This straw man-reading of Marx is predicated upon the double maneuver of collapsing Marxist history into Stalinism, on the one hand, and reducing Marxist theory to "essentialism," "totality," and "teleology," on the other. As J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves acknowledge, without any regrets, "Indeed, as many of our critics sometimes charge, we have constructed a 'straw man.'"21 What is left out of their quasi-humorous dismissal of Marxism is the complicity of such a straw man in the long history of red-baiting and anti-Marxist repression in this country and around the world.

#### Gibson-Graham’s discursive focus is epistemologically flawed and dooms their movement to failure.

Rene Francisco Poitevin 1 (Doctoral Candidate in Sociology at UC Davis, Rene F., Socialist Review, “The end of anti-capitalism as we knew it: Reflections on postmodern Marxism,” <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3952/is_200101/ai_n8932891/>)

A third feature of J.K. Gibson-Graham's work, in particular, and of the whole radical democracy tradition, in general, is its post-structuralist extremism.26 For postmodern Marxists it is not enough to point out that, as both Foucault and Habermas argue, we inhabit an intellectual regime characterized by a paradigm shift from the "philosophy of consciousness" to the "philosophy of language."27 Nor is it good enough for postmodern/post-Marxists to recognize the pitfalls embedded in Hegelian epistemology and argue instead, as Spivak does, for strategic-- uses-of-essentialism as a corrective to the excesses of teleological thinking and fixed notions of class.28 No way. As far as postmodern Marxism is concerned, the only way to compensate for constructions of capitalism that are too totalizing is through the unconditional surrender of the Marxist project. As J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves make clear, "to even conceive of 'capitalism' as 'capitalisms' is still taking 'capitalism' for granted."29 And to try to redistribute the heavy theoretical and political burden placed upon the proletariat by reconfiguring political agency through "race-class-gender," as opposed to just class, is still a futile endeavor: essentialism is still essentialism whether one essentializes around one or three categories. This strand of post-structuralism, one that once again, can be directly traced back to Laclau and Mouffe's Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,30 is predicated on the faulty epistemological premise that what really matters is "discourse." As Laclau and Mouffe clarify, "our analysis rejects the distinction between discursive and nondiscursive practices. It offirms that every object is constituted as an object of discourse."31 The problem with this approach is that once we enter this world of epistemological foundationalism predicated on the claim that there is "nothing but discourse," we enter a world of relativism in which all we can do is "create discursive fixings," as J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves prescribe, that will guarantee that "any particular analysis will never find the ultimate cause of events."32 It is this ideological postmodern insistence on reducing all of social reality to discourse that ultimately overloads its theoretical apparatus and causes it to buckle beneath them. The Amherst School's "provisional ontology" is incapable of escaping the performative trap of trying to get rid of essentialism by essentializing all of reality as "discursive." The postmodern Marxist approach to ontology boils down to substituting in political practice every occurrence of "continuity" with "discontinuity" as a way to get rid of essentialism and macro-narratives. Even Foucault, the great master of discontinuity, distances himself from such mirror-reversal solutions when theorizing the limits of discourse and accounting for the "divergence, the distances, the oppositions, the differences" that constitute the episteme of a period.33

### They Say: “Cap is Inevitable/Human Nature”

#### Capitalism is not an innate part of human nature — it is not inevitable.

Foster & Magdoff 10 [John Bellamy and Fred, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and professor emeritus at the University of Vermont, March, “What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism,” Monthly Review, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism/>]

**Traits fostered by capitalism are commonly viewed as being innate “human nature,” thus making a society organized along other goals than the profit motive unthinkable. But humans are clearly capable of a wide range of characteristics, extending from great cruelty** to great sacrifice for a cause, to caring for non-related others**, to true altruism.** The “killer instinct” that we supposedly inherited from evolutionary ancestors—the “evidence” being chimpanzees’ killing the babies of other chimps—is being questioned by reference to the peaceful characteristics of other hominids such as gorillas and bonobos (as closely related to humans as chimpanzees).34 **Studies** of human babies **have** also **shown that, while selfishness is a human trait, so are cooperation, empathy, altruism, and helpfulness.**35 Regardless of what traits we may have inherited from our hominid ancestors, **research on pre-capitalist societies indicates that very different norms from those in capitalist societies are encouraged and expressed.** As Karl Polanyi summarized the studies: “**The outstanding discovery of recent historical and anthropological research is that man’s economy, as a rule, is submerged in his social relationships. He does not act so as to safeguard his individual interest in the possession of material goods; he acts so as to safeguard his social standing, his social claims, his social assets.**”36 In his 1937 article on “Human Nature” for the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, John Dewey concluded—in terms that have been verified by all subsequent social science—that: The present controversies between those who assert the essential fixity of human nature and those who believe in a greater measure of modifiability center chiefly around the future of war and the future of a competitive economic system motivated by private profit. It is justifiable to say without dogmatism that both anthropology and history give support to those who wish to change these institutions. **It is demonstrable that many of the obstacles to change which have been attributed to human nature are in fact due to the inertia of institutions and to the voluntary desire of powerful classes to maintain the existing status.**37 Capitalism is unique among social systems in its active, extreme cultivation of individual self-interest or “possessive-individualism.”38 **Yet the reality is that non-capitalist human societies have thrived over a long period—for more than 99 percent of the time since the emergence of anatomically modern humans—while encouraging other traits such as sharing and responsibility to the group. There is no reason to doubt that this can happen again.**

### They Say: “Transition Wars”

#### The crackdown won’t happen, capital can’t afford to attack its labor – the alternative is too diffuse for the violence to work – and it would only increase the success of the transition away from the status quo.

Meszaros 95 (professor @ University of Sussex, Istvan, “Beyond Capital,” P 725-727)

Another argument which is often used in favour of permanent accommodation is the threat of extreme authoritarian measures that must be faced by a socialist revolutionary movement. This argument is backed up by emphasizing both the immense destructive power at capital's disposal and the undeniable historical fact that no ruling order ever cedes willingly its position of command over society, using if need be even the most violent form of repression to retain its rule. The weakness of this argument is twofold, despite the factual circumstances which would seem to support it.¶ First, it disregards that the antagonistic confrontation between capital and labour is not a political/military one in which one of the antagonists could be slaughtered on the battlefield or riveted to chains. **Inasmuch as there can be chains in this confrontation, labour is wearing them already**, in that the only type of chains compatible with **the system must be 'flexible' enough to enable the class of labour to produce and be exploited**. Nor can one imagine that the authoritarian might of capital is likely to be used only against a revolutionary socialist movement. The repressive anti-labour measures of the last two decades — not to mention many instances of past historical emergency characterized by the use of violence under the capital system —give a foretaste of worse things to come in the event of extreme confrontations. But this is not a matter of either/or, with some sort of apriori guarantee of a 'fair' and benevolent treatment in the event of labour's willing accommodation and submission. The matter hinges on the gravity of the crisis and on the circumstances under which the antagonistic confrontations unfold. Uncomfortable as this truth may sound to socialists, one of the heaviest chains which labour has to wear today is that it is tied to capital for its continued survival, for as long as it does not succeed in making a strategic break in the direction of a transition to a radically different social metabolic order. But that is even more true of capital, with the qualitative difference that capital cannot make any break towards the establishment of a different social order. For capital, truly, 'there is no alternative' — and there can never be — to its exploitative structural dependency on labour. If nothing else, this fact sets well marked limits to capital's ability to permanently subdue labour by violence, compelling it to use, instead, the earlier mentioned 'flexible chains' against the class of labour. **It can use violence with success selectively, against limited groups of labour, but not against the socialist movement organized as a revolutionary mass movement**. This is why the development of 'communist mass consciousness' (to use Marx's expression), in contrast to the vulnerability of narrow sectarian orientation, is so important.¶ The second point that must be made in this context is equally important. It concerns the innermost determinations of the capital system as a necessarily expansion-oriented and accumulation-driven social metabolic order. The point is that the exercise of power through the repressive machinery of violence is extremely wasteful in the system's own terms of reference; even if undoubtedly it can serve the purpose of redressing the power relations in capital's favour in a situation of emergency. What must weigh heavily in the balance is that **it is impossible to secure the required expansion and capital-accumulation on a permanent basis through the perpetuation of economically wasteful emergency**, apart from its anything but negligible political dangers. The idea of' Big Brother' successfully ruling over labour as a permanent condition is too fantastic even for a work of Orwellian fiction, let alone for the actuality of capital's mode of social metabolic reproduction. For the latter must perish if it is unable to secure its own reproduction through the appropriation of the fruits of ever more productive labour and the concomitant expanded realization of value, which in its turn is inconceivable without a dynamic process of 'productive consumption'. And neither ever-improving labour productivity, with the necessarily increasing socialization of the labour process as its precondition, nor the required — ever-expanding — scale of 'productive consumption' is compatible with the idea of a permanent state of emergency. Moreover, as Chomsky rightly argued many years ago, the surveillance system that must go with a successful enforcement of permanent authoritatian rule involves the absurdity (and, of course, the corresponding cost) of infinite regress in monitoring not only the population at large but also the monitoring personnel itself, as well as the monitors of the monitors,290 etc. We must add here that the idea of capital's permanent rule through the use of violence must also postulate the total unity of global capital against the national labour forces which happen to be effectively under the control of capital's particular units in the existing (but by no means unified) global order. This vacuous postulate of capital's global unity and uniformity arbitrarily brushes aside not only the law of uneven development. It also ignores the abundant historical evidence which shows that the exercise of force on a mass scale — through war — always needed masses of people to be able to impose violence on their counterparts, motivated as a rule for many centuries by national rivalries. Indeed, the national articulation of the global capital system, far from being a historical accident, had a great deal to do with capital's need to maintain control over the labour force with at least some degree of consensus. Otherwise the inter-capitalist rivalries, all the way to the most comprehensive international conflagrations, would be unmanageably risky from the point of view of total social capital, nullifying the inner logic of the system to fight out to the full the conflict of interests and make the strongest prevail in the Hobbesian helium omnium contra omnes. For in every situation of major inter-capitalist confrontation the capital system itself would be in danger of being overthrown by its labour antagonist, in the absence of a sufficiently high degree of consensus — present as a rule to a very high degree in national conflicts — between capital and labour belonging to the same side. (In fact some radical socialists tried to counter this consensus, unsuccessfully, with the programme inviting the workers at the outbreak of the First World War 'to turn their weapons against their national bourgeoisie'.) Thus, to sum up, **all of the arguments in favour of capital's permanent rule through the imposition of violence on a mass scale suffer from having to define their conditions of realization in a self-contradictory way**. Accordingly, as mentioned in Section 18.2.5, to project the rule of capital, in its direct antagonistic confrontation with labour, by way of a completely unstable, hence necessarily transient, state of emergency, as the permanent condition of its future normality, is a mind-boggling notion. To be sure, no one should doubt that **the use of violence may postpone for a shorter or longer period of time the success of labour's positive emancipatory efforts; but it cannot prevent the exhaustion of capital's productive potentialities.** On the contrary, if anything, it can only accelerate their exhaustion if violence is used on a mass scale, thereby radically undermining the objective conditions of capital's rule.

## 2NC/1NR — Impact Turn Answers

### They Say: “Cap Solves War”

#### Capitalist militarism guarantees extinction.

Meszaros 3[Istvan, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, June, Monthly Review, “Militarism and the Coming Wars,” <http://monthlyreview.org/2003/06/01/militarism-and-the-coming-wars>]

Today the situation is qualitatively different. For two principal reasons. First, the objective of the feasible **war at the present phase of historical development**, in accordance with the objective requirements of imperialism – **world domination by capital’s most powerful state, in tune with its own political design of ruthless authoritarian “globalization**”(dressed up as “free exchange” in a U.S.-ruled global market) – **is ultimately unwinnable, foreshadowing,** instead, **the destruction of humankind**. This objective by no stretch of imagination could be considered a rational objective in accord with the stipulated rational requirement of the “continuation of politics by other means” conducted by one nation, or by one group of nations against another. **Aggressively imposing the will of one powerful national state over all of the others, even if for cynical tactical reasons the advocated war is absurdly camouflaged as a “purely limited war” leading to other “open ended limited wars,”** can therefore be qualified only as total irrationality. The second reason greatly reinforces the first. For **the weapons** already **available for waging the** war or **wars of the twenty first century are capable of exterminating not only the adversary but the whole of humanity,** the first time ever in history. **Nor should we have the illusion that the existing weaponry marks the very end of the road. Others, even more instantly lethal ones, might appear tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.**  Moreover**, threatening the use of such weapons is by now considered an acceptable state strategic device.** Thus, put reasons one and two together, and **the conclusion is inescapable: envisaging war as the mechanism of global government in today’s world underlines that we find ourselves at the precipice of absolute irrationality from which there can be no return if we accept the ongoing course of development.** What was missing from von Clausewitz’s classic definition of war as the “continuation of politics by other means” was the investigation of the deeper underlying causes of war and the possibility of their avoidance. The challenge to face up to such causes is more urgent today than ever before. For the war of the twenty first century looming ahead of us is not only “not winnable in principle”. Worse than that, it is in principle unwinnable. Consequently, **envisaging the pursuit of war, as the American administration**’s September 17, 2002 strategic document **does, make Hitler’s irrationality look like the model of rationality.**

#### Capitalism and insecurity are mutually reinforcing- the expansion of new markets guarantees generation of new risks and war.

Goodman 9 (Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology in Sydney James Goodman, “Rethinking Insecurity War and Violence,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/68230825/4/Global-capitalism-and-the-production-of-insecurity, 7-7-12)

Irresistibly, insecurity and coercion force new agendas onto the table, agendas that impose human values against the abstract exchange-values of the cash nexus. Deep divides have opened up between the state – capital nexus and the materiality of everyday life. The juridical claims of new constitutionalism, constructed with greater intensity from the early 1990s, hand-in-hand with the heightened military preparedness, were confronted by the lived reality of marginality in manifold counter-globalist upsurges framed as “ global justice movements ” (Rupert 2003; Goodman 2007). Lately, as noted, we have experienced the intensive exercise of command in the so-called War on Terror, itself confronted by an unprecedented global anti-war movement. Claims for a War on Terror have continued to implode, and are actively opposed both in the United States and worldwide. We may then speculate that naked coercion is itself a measure of weakness, not strength. We can argue that the coercive logic of power exposes the imperial project, making it vulnerable to assault. Ahmad argues we are experiencing “for the ﬁrst time in history, a globalized empire of capital itself, in all its nakedness” (Ahmad 2000: 1). Harvey goes so far as to predict “economic suicide” if the US doctrine of “permanent war” is maintained (Harvey 2003: 207). Wallerstein agrees, arguing that “there is little doubt the United States will continue to decline as a decisive force in world aﬀairs over the next decade” (Wallerstein 2003: 27). Counter-intuitively, decline only seems to embolden the advocates of permanent war. In 2003 the United States and its allies invaded Iraq, ﬂouting the UN Charter, against the largest world protest ever assembled. The mystique of command has remained powerful, and has been electorally popular. In 2004, both the US Presidency and the Australian Government aﬃrmed their electoral base. It was only in 2007, after four years of sustained policy failure, that political blocs began to shift. The very process of collective suicide — in Harvey’s terms — and the ratcheting risks and insecurities this entails; seem to be mutually reinforcing. There is, it seems, a deep insecurity dynamic at play, expressing the commodiﬁcation – militarization process.

#### The doomsaying of the aff is a knee jerk reaction meant to make you feel good about ignoring the 1NC impact – vote negative to align yourself with social justice – not propaganda

Martin 82 (associate prof in [Science, Technology and Society](http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/ssmac/sts/index.html) at the University of Wollongong, Brian, Critique of nuclear extinction, *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, pp. 287-300 <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html>)

Exaggeration to justify concern (I). People involved with any issue or activity tend to exaggerate its importance so as to justify and sustain their concern and involvement. **Nuclear war is only one problem among many pressing problems in the world, which include starvation, poverty, exploitation, racial and sexual inequality and repressive governments.** By concentrating on peace issues, one must by necessity give less attention to other pressing issues. An unconscious **tendency to exaggerate the effects of nuclear war has the effect of reducing conscious or unconscious guilt at not doing more on other issues.** Guilt of this sort is undoubtedly common, especially among those who are active on social issues and who become familiar with the wide range of social problems needing attention. The irony is that those who feel guilt for this reason tend to be those who have least cause to feel so. **One politically effective way to overcome this guilt may be to strengthen and expand links between anti-war struggles and struggles for justice, equality and the like.**

#### The impact to the 1NC outweighs nuclear war – social inequality is consequentially more important to counter

Martin 82 (associate prof in [Science, Technology and Society](http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/ssmac/sts/index.html) at the University of Wollongong, Brian, Critique of nuclear extinction, *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, pp. 287-300 <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html>)

White, western orientation. **Most of the continuing large-scale suffering in the world - caused by poverty, starvation, disease and torture - is borne by the poor, non-white peoples of the third world. A global nuclear war might well kill fewer people than have died of starvation and hunger-related disease in the past 50 or 100 years**.[[22]](http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html#fn22#fn22) Smaller nuclear wars would make this sort of contrast greater.[[23]](http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html#fn23#fn23) **Nuclear war is the one source of possible deaths of millions of people that would affect mainly white, rich, western societies** (China and Japan are the prime possible exceptions). **By comparison, the direct effect of global nuclear war on nonwhite, poor, third world populations would be relatively small.** **White westerners may tend to identify their own plight with that of the rest of the world, and hence exaggerate the threat of destruction wreaked on their own societies into one for all of humanity. White westerners may also tend to see the rest of the world as vitally dependent on themselves for survival, and hence see catastrophe for all as a result of a nuclear war which destroys 'civilisation'.** In practice, poor non-white populations arguably would be better off without the attentions of white, western 'civilisation' - although nuclear war is hardly the way to achieve this.

### They Say: “Cap Solves Environment”

#### Capitalism will cause extinction through environmental destruction.

Foster et al. 10 [editor of Monthly Review and professor of sociology at University of Oregon, John Bellamy, November 2010, Monthly Review, “Capitalism and the Curse of Energy Efficiency: The Return of the Jevons Paradox,” <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/capitalism-and-the-curse-of-energy-efficiency>]

Seen in the context of a capitalist society, the Jevons Paradox therefore demonstrates the fallacy of current notions that the environmental problems facing society can be solved by purely technological means. Mainstream environmental economists often refer to “dematerialization,” or the “decoupling” of economic growth, from consumption of greater energy and resources. Growth in energy efficiency is often taken as a concrete indication that the environmental problem is being solved. Yet savings in materials and energy, in the context of a given process of production, as we have seen, are nothing new; they are part of the everyday history of capitalist development.36 Each new steam engine, as Jevons emphasized, was more efficient than the one before. “Raw materials-savings processes,” environmental sociologist Stephen Bunker noted, “are older than the Industrial Revolution, and they have been dynamic throughout the history of capitalism.” Any notion that reduction in material throughput, per unit of national income, is a new phenomenon is therefore “profoundly ahistorical.”37 What is neglected, then, in simplistic notions that increased energy efficiency normally leads to increased energy savings overall, is the reality of the Jevons Paradox relationship—through which energy savings are used to promote new capital formation and the proliferation of commodities, demanding ever greater resources. Rather than an anomaly, the rule that efficiency increases energy and material use is integral to the “regime of capital” itself.38 As stated in The Weight of Nations, an important empirical study of material outflows in recent decades in five industrial nations (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, the United States, and Japan): “Efficiency gains brought by technology and new management practices have been offset by [increases in] the scale of economic growth.”39 The result is the production of mountains upon mountains of commodities, cheapening unit costs and leading to greater squandering of material resources. Under monopoly capitalism, moreover, such commodities increasingly take the form of artificial use values, promoted by a vast marketing system and designed to instill ever more demand for commodities and the exchange values they represent—as a substitute for the fulfillment of genuine human needs. Unnecessary, wasteful goods are produced by useless toil to enhance purely economic values at the expense of the environment. Any slowdown in this process of ecological destruction, under the present system, spells economic disaster. In Jevons’s eyes, the “momentous choice” raised by a continuation of business as usual was simply “between brief but true [national] greatness and longer continued mediocrity.” He opted for the former—the maximum energy flux. A century and a half later, in our much bigger, more global—but no less expansive—economy, it is no longer simply national supremacy that is at stake, but the fate of the planet itself. To be sure, there are those who maintain that we should “live high now and let the future take care of itself.” To choose this course, though, is to court planetary disaster. The only real answer for humanity (including future generations) and the earth as a whole is to alter the social relations of production, to create a system in which efficiency is no longer a curse—a higher system in which equality, human development, community, and sustainability are the explicit goals.

#### **Capitalism is the main driver of all environmental problems – quick fix solutions can’t solve without addressing the underlying system.**

Magdoff & Foster 10 (prof emeritus of plant and soil sci @ Vermont, prof of sociology, Fred and John Bellamy, “What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism” Monthly Review Vol. 61.10 March)

Some environmentalists feel that it is possible to solve most of our problems by tinkering with our economic system, introducing greater energy efficiency and substituting “green” energy sources for fossil fuels—or coming up with technologies to ameliorate the problems (such as using carbon capture from power plants and injecting it deep into the earth). There is a movement toward “green” practices to use as marketing tools or to keep up with other companies claiming to use such practices. Nevertheless, within the environmental movement, here are some for whom it is clear that mere technical adjustments in the current productive system will not be enough to solve the dramatic and potentially catastrophic problems we face. Curtis White begins his 2009 article in Orion, entitled “The Barbaric Heart: Capitalism and the Crisis of Nature,” with: “There is a fundamental question that environmentalists are not very good at asking, let alone answering: ‘Why is this, the destruction of the natural world, happening?’”23 It is impossible to find real and lasting solutions until we are able satisfactorily to answer this seemingly simple question. It is our contention that most of the critical environmental problems we have are either caused, or made much worse, by the workings of our economic system. Even such issues as population growth and technology are best viewed in terms of their relation to the socioeconomic organization of society. Environmental problems are not a result of human ignorance or innate greed. They do not arise because managers of individual large corporations or developers are morally deficient. Instead, we must look to the fundamental workings of the economic (and political/social) system for explanations. It is precisely the fact that ecological destruction is built into the inner nature and logic of our present system of production that makes it so difficult to solve. In addition, we shall argue that “solutions” proposed for environmental devastation, which would allow the current system of production and distribution to proceed unabated, are not real solutions. In fact, such “solutions” will make things worse because they give the false impression that the problems are on their way to being overcome when the reality is quite different. The overwhelming environmental problems facing the world and its people will not be effectively dealt with until we institute another way for humans to interact with nature—altering the way we make decisions on what and how much to produce. Our most necessary, most rational goals require that we take into account fulfilling basic human needs, and creating just and sustainable conditions on behalf of present and future generations (which also means being concerned about the preservation of other species).

#### Capitalism causes massive resource depletion.

Gebrewold 14 (Tekleberhan Gebrewold, Administrator of Tessenei sub-zone, 9-26-2014, "Resource Depletion and Overuse Part IV and Final," No Publication, http://www.shabait.com/categoryblog/18041--resource-depletion-and-overuse-part-iv-and-final

There are a number of people and organizations that feel that we must drastically reduce the human population because we will soon run out of nonrenewable resources. Behind the difficulty in tapping resources lies the fact that too many people are accessing them. Some maintain that resources are already scarce per capita in the world at large, and, thus, the resource crises and resources wars are actually here, right now. There is no need to look very far to find evidence of frictions, conflicts, and even some wars over access to resources-especially oil and gas, water, and agricultural land. The US wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the US military bases and support provided to local governments in the Middle East and Central Asia have been lately about access to, or control, of oil. These actions and relations are not simply about overpopulation, however, but are rather a continuation of a capitalist colonial and imperial history of exerting influence in these resource rich nations. Basic to the structure of globalized capitalism is that a small minority of the world population in the rich countries dominates large parts of the world, robbing them of their resources. A whole host of countries, including China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, and Indonesia are in conflict over ownership of yet to be discovered, but promising, oil deposits under the sea floor along with other potential resources in the South China Sea. There are also disputed sea floor boundaries in the eastern Mediterranean, where Israel has discovered a large deposit of natural gas. Additionally, there is the potential for conflict over the Caspian basin petroleum deposits. Recently, the melting ice in the Arctic is opening up the Arctic waters to oil exploitation, creating an “Ice Cold War,” as it has been called, involving the United States, Canada, Russia, Denmark, and Norway. Michael Klare, in the book The Race for What’s Left, argues that “the world is entering an era of pervasive, unprecedented resource scarcity”. Usually such conflicts are treated as mere byproducts of growing population and international competition, but a closer analysis demonstrates that capitalism and the incessant drive for expansion that it inculcates, along with its imperialist tendencies, are mainly at fault. Attempts to reduce the environmental problems to the “population bomb” are therefore frequently crude and distorted. A variety of side issues and “straw persons” are put forward, diverting attention from potential stumbling blocks, related to population specifically, out of the way before continuing with this part of discussion. Our starting points should be: David Harvey has explained the problem of concentrating on population issues as follows: “The trouble with focusing exclusively on the control of population numbers is that it has certain political implications. Ideas about environment, population, and resources are not neutral. They are political in origin and have political effects”. One of the peculiar things about those so very concerned with overpopulation and the environment is that they do not seem especially interested in investigating the details of what is actually happening. There is little to no discussion of how the economy functions or of issues involving economic inequality. Also there is apparently no interest in even thinking about an alternative way for people to interact with each other and the environment or how they might organize their economy differently. It is only common sense that the more wealth a person or family has, the more stuff they consume and, therefore, the more resources they use and the more pollution they cause. But the almost unbelievable inequality of wealth and income at the global level has striking effects on the consumption patterns.

### They Say: “Cap Solves Famine”

#### Capitalism makes food crisis and extinction inevitable.

McMillian 9 (PhD in Psychoanalysis from Massey University Chris Disavowed Foundations1/30http://chrismcmillan.org/2009/01/30/hello-world/)

The interaction between bio-fuels and world food prices reflects a deeper, if silent, crisis occurring on this planet. Unrestrained material growth, along with historically exponential population growth, has placed unsustainable pressure on global resources and eco-systems. Yet, if excessive consumption is contaminating the planet, equally horrific is the suffering of a sizable population of the world who are plagued by chronic under-consumption. The contradiction is clear. The planet cannot tolerant the necessary economic growth required to bring the masses out of poverty, but an enlightened humanity cannot accept such poverty. Capitalism, the economic system which his produced this unprecedented economic growth and prosperity (for some) cannot provide solutions to this contradiction. Rather capitalism itself is split between a requirement for continual growth and the maintenance of a system of inequality which produces the hungry, excluded, workers of the world. Under capitalism, there appears little hope neither for the hungry of the modern world, nor for planet Earth itself. Moreover, despite the current financial crisis, there exists no feasible alternative to capitalist political economy. Understood in this manner the situation cannot appear anything other than tragic.

### They Say: “Cap Key to Tech Advances”

#### No motive for meaningful technological innovation under capitalism.

Palecek 9 (Mike, staff @ In Defence of Marxism, 8/12, Capitalism Versus Science)

The ultimate proof of capitalism’s hindrance of science and technology comes not from capitalism, but from the alternative. While the Soviet Union under Stalin was far from the ideal socialist society (something which we have explained extensively elsewhere), its history gives us valuable insight into the potential of a nationalized planned economy. In 1917 the Bolsheviks took control of a backwards, semi-feudal, third world country that had been ruined by the First World War. In a matter of decades, it was transformed into a leading super-power. The USSR would go on to be the first to put a satellite into orbit, the first to put a man in space, and the first to build a permanently manned outpost in space. Soviet scientists pushed the frontiers of knowledge, particularly in the areas of Mathematics, Astronomy, Nuclear Physics, Space Exploration and Chemistry. Many Soviet era scientists have been awarded Nobel prizes in various fields. These successes are particularly stunning, when one considers the state the country was in when capitalism was overthrown. How were such advancements possible? How did the Soviet Union go from having a population that was 90% illiterate, to having more scientists, doctors and engineers per capita than any other country on Earth in just a few decades? The superiority of the nationalized planned economy and the break from the madness of capitalism is the only explanation. The first step in this process was simply the recognition that science was a priority. Under capitalism, the ability of private companies to develop science and technology is limited by a narrow view of what is profitable. Companies do not plan to advance technology, they plan to build a marketable product and will only do what is necessary to bring that product to market. The Soviets immediately recognized the importance of the overall development of science and technology and linked it to the development of the country as a whole. This broad view allowed them to put substantial resources into all areas of study.

#### Technology can’t eliminate class conflict— tech developments are used solely to produce private wealth—Pharmaceuticals, the Internet, etc. prove.

Wilkie 5 (Rob, staff @ Red Critique, Winter/Spring, “The Daydreams of iPod Capitalism,” <http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2005/printversions/thedaydreamsofipodcapitalismprint.htm>)

But it is precisely this obsessed reading of technology as the eliminator of class conflict and the creator of ethical communities of cultural sharing that has made the Internet the "new" concept of global capitalism and so useful to the interests of Big Business. While we are witness to dramatic advances in the technologies of health, communication, transportation and commodity production—developments which could be used to raise the living standards of all—capitalism twists the potential of scientific and technological progress away from the meeting everyone's needs and towards the accumulation of vast fortunes for the owners. As one recent study found, rather than ameliorating class divisions, the "tech" years have seen the gap between the rich and the poor double in the United States (Browning C2) and such divisions literally determine who lives and who dies. For example, while nightly news shows act as virtual mouthpieces for the pharmaceutical companies, touting the latest lifestyle drugs and "extreme" plastic surgery techniques, capitalism reduces basic healthcare technologies such as dentistry and annual checkups to the privilege of a few (Park C05). Technology, in other words, cannot solve the problem of class inequality but only heightens the conflict between capital and labor because under the capitalist system technological developments are used solely for the production of private wealth for the few who own and control them.

### They Say: “Aff Has Better Epistemology”

#### Don’t trust their epistemology – most knowledge produced is dictated by the ideology of capitalism.

McMillian 9 (PhD in Psychoanalysis from Massey University, Chris Disavowed Foundations1/30http://chrismcmillan.org/2009/01/30/hello-world/)

This thesis first seeks to define the problem in terms of the structuration of capitalist political economy which causes, maintains and reproduces the dynamic contradiction between poverty and environmental unsustainability. It shall be argued that these problems are not contingent aberrations, but rather structural necessities for the continued reproduction of the capitalist mode of economy. Despite the contradictions within capitalism, there currently appears to be little prospect of the collapse of capitalism and, more importantly, no feasible alternative to the capitalist mode of political economy. Furthermore, capitalism has become so pervasive – both in terms of economy and ideology – that the space for thinking political economy outside of the epistemological limits of capitalism is rapidly shrinking. In reply, this thesis passionately calls for a return to theory, a return to thinking outside of the limits of power, not simply to restrain that power, but to actively re-engage with societal problems – in this case, the failure of capitalist political economy. The hungry exist not because a lack of resources or a lack of compassion, but rather because the interactions between the limitations of our understanding of capitalism and the ideological structuring of the capitalist empire.

#### Their truth claims are trapped in a capitalist ontology which predetermines how knowledge is produced.

Schiwy & Ennis 2 (PhD Candidate in Romance Studies at Duke**,** PhD Candidate in Lit at Duke, Freya and Michael, Nepantla: Views from the South 3.1 project muse)

**The essays** gathered in this dossier respond to issues raised during the workshop “Knowledges and the Known: Capitalism and the Geopolitics of Knowledge,” held at Duke University in November 2000. They **address concerns about the possibilities for critical knowledge production at a moment when national state structures are reconfiguring into global institutions and when technologies** (like gene prospecting) **and epistemic regimes (like property rights and human rights) are installing the particular as a new universal,** following the legacy of Enlightenment philosophy and Western political theory. They ask how **knowledge production is linked to location and subjectivity** and what the importance of these critical perspectives can be when **neoliberal capitalism increasingly instrumentalizes and commodifies knowledge, reinforcing the growing dependence of universities around the world on corporate money.** It is precisely within this context that Oscar Guardiola-Rivera engages current critical theory from the perspective of coloniality. Although the essays by Catherine Walsh and Javier Sanjinés address contemporary indigenous uprisings in the Andes, these movements are not their object of study. Instead of being about knowledge production *in* the Andes, all three of these articles are efforts to think about epistemology *from* the Andes.[1](http://proxy.lib.wayne.edu:2128/journals/nepantla/v003/3.1schiwy.html#endnote:1)

## 2NC/1NR — Link Extensions/Specific Links

**Link — Engagement (General)**

**Engagement with China is hijacked by neoliberal forces to expand global capitalism.**

**Roden 3** (Mark, Sept, “US–China Relations in the Contemporary Era: An International Political Economy Perspective,” Politics September, vol. 23 no. 3 192-199, Url: http://pol.sagepub.com.libproxy.scu.edu/content/23/3/192.short)

Based on the above Bill Clinton should be regarded as an enormously successful president. By 1996 the national deficit had been brought to its lowest ebb in over a decade and US economic power was in the ascension fuelled by export-led growth (Walker, 1996, p. 350). Michael Cox has forcefully argued that Clinton detractors largely ignored the administration's switch of emphasis ‘from geo-politics to geo-economics’ (M. Cox, 1995). Moreover**, US ideological power waxed rather than waned during the Clinton years. Governments across the globe followed the US lead in lowering trade barriers and adapting themselves to the competitive exigencies of globalisation in its neoliberal form – namely deregulation and enhancing the rights of global capital** vis-à-vis nationally based labour. This trend was compounded by the formation of key institutions integral to an overall policy of promoting free market policies throughout the world. Most significantly, the Clinton administration secured the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994; the 1995 agreement of the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) to develop a free trade zone; and, also in 1995, the formation of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The important point here was that the institutionalisation of US power at the regional and global levels harnessed what were ostensibly competitor economies (such as those of Japan, Germany, and to some extent China) to economic ideas emanating from Washington. It would be wrong to see the promotion of liberal free trade policies in solely negative terms. There were positive aspects. Firstly, the US was engaged in the world and stressing the role of trade and investment in overcoming historical conflicts. As Michael Cox has cogently argued Clinton's involvement in the Northern Ireland peace process was a crucial element in persuading the formerly Marxist Irish Republican Army (IRA) to end that conflict (M. Cox, 1998). Part and parcel of Clinton's free trade policies has been that of fostering socio-economic stability and conditions conducive to the free flow of capital, goods and services. This has had a progressive impact beyond furthering US interests alone. The Clinton years, though driven by economic liberalism and a large dose of ‘enlightened’ self-interest, were also informed by a renewed belief in multilateral institutions and internationalism (Ruggie, 1996). A crucial question in creating a new global economic order and legitimating US leadership in the Clinton era, however, was how to bring China within the institutional framework of the post-Cold War world order while also maximising the opportunities for US firms in a huge emerging market. Previous Section Next Section The IPE of US–China relations in the Clinton era The Clinton administration's overall approach was to bring China within the family of nations assenting to liberal norms. Moreover, despite coming to power castigating George Bush Senior's Republican administration for ‘coddling’ dictators, the IPE of US–China relations were played out in correlation with key structural goals that placed liberal economics above the promotion of liberal politics (Hughes, 1995). Gerard Segal has dubbed the US approach ‘positive conditionality’ – a useful turn of phrase that connotes China's gaining access to trade benefits in return for system-maintaining behaviour (Segal, 1995, p. 71). It was in the light of this strategy that the Clinton administration jettisoned its initial China policy of tying China's Most Favoured Nation (MFN) status to progress on human rights. Linkage, as this policy was known, came to be seen as a harmful impediment to US firms and was further viewed as undercutting the overriding logic of policies pursued by key economic agencies such as the Department of the Treasury, the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR), and the Commerce Department. Indeed, intense bureaucratic rivalries surfaced during Clinton's first term as the administration moved to replace ‘linkage’ with a policy of ‘comprehensive engagement’ in May 1994. The new priority given to geoeconomics was polarised by the administration's decision to give unequivocal support to the annual renewal of China's MFN trade status when voted upon by the US congress. Moreover, the role of the State Department was noticeably downgraded as were protectionist arguments (from both left and right) fuelled by the seemingly intractable trade deficit that existed between the two countries (Lampton, 1994). The intellectual argument for engaging China was perhaps best articulated by Laura D'Andrea Tyson who claimed that congressional revocation of MFN would ‘slow the flow of information about Western culture, ideas, business practices, and perspectives that accompany foreign investment’ (Wall Street Journal, 28 May 1997). **The case for the engagement of China was also the result, however, of established economic forces within the US state. Extensive and highly organised lobbying by business groups took full advantage of the fact that their opponents on the left and right were fragmented** and offering unattractive alternatives. In 1991 around 75 prominent US trade groups formed the Business Coalition for US–China Trade, whose members included lobbying giants such as the US Chamber of Commerce, the US–China Business Council and the 500-member strong National Foreign Trade Council (Sutter, 1998, p. 57). **These groups were particularly visible during the 1994 deliberations over delinking MFN from human rights**. For example the Emergency Committee for American Trade (ECAT) (representing 55 large US corporations with worldwide sales of $55 trillion in 1992) was instrumental in the sending of an open letter to the Clinton administration from 300 captains of industry and business (Sutter, 1998, p. 58). From 1994 to 2000 an agglomeration of US business groups, pro-engagement members of Congress and administration officials successfully ensured that MFN was renewed annually. This occurred despite the often animated protestations of human rights lobbyists and protectionists. The IPE of US–China relations during the Clinton administrations revolved primarily around two fundamental issues. The first was the bilateral trade deficit. The second was China's accession to the World Trade Organisation (WTO). Previous Section Next Section The trade deficit The US–China trade deficit, though real, has been politicised in a way that falsely portrays China as protectionist and belligerent in her approach to free trade. **It is therefore highly significant that key neoliberal scholars have actually applauded China's gradualist approach to reform,** having witnessed events in the former Soviet Union (Overholt, 1993; Lardy, 1994). As Nicholas Lardy points out, the deficit (which stood at $80 billion in 2001) does not represent a Chinese ploy to take advantage of the world trade system but something altogether more benign. The deficit is structural and reflects changes in the positions of the Newly Industrialising Countries (NICs) in Asia taken as a whole. Thus although China's share of world exports in clothing, toys, sporting goods and footwear rose from 14 per cent in 1984 to 39 per cent in 1994, the share in these sectors simultaneously fell in the four Asian Tiger economies (Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea) from 55 per cent to 24 per cent. In short China has merely filled the vacuum left by other Asian nations that have moved into high-technology sectors (Lardy, 1998, p. 188). According to Robert Ross, ‘the cumulative US trade deficit with China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan has not appreciably grown since 1998; only the distribution among the markets has changed’ (Ross, 1997, p. 48). Moreover, China's trade deficit with the US has also reflected the realities of consumer demand in the US where low-value-added goods, manufactured largely in China, have been necessary imports since the 1980s. The US economy had long since moved away from the mass production of toys, plastics and footwear (Lardy, 1994). Thus it was argued that the deficit should not preclude China's entry to the WTO. Previous Section Next Section The World Trade Organisation As a number of observers of US–China relations have noted, China has largely acquiesced in the role of global institutions since the end of the Cultural Revolution (Foot, 1995; Cheung, 1998). **Despite protracted negotiations (beginning in 1986) over China's entry to General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and then the WTO, China has been admitted to the latter on terms largely congruent with neoliberal policy goals.** Conditions for China's entry to the WTO were agreed upon on 15 November 1999. Despite US approval these conditions were initially subject to bilateral agreements between China and Canada and China and the European Union. A six year phase-in period was approved by the US and involves the following: ‘China's agreement to cut duties on a wide range of products; to give foreign companies the right to distribute products within China; and to allow foreign car makers to provide car financing. Most significantly, in terms of US–China relations, general tariffs will be cut between 14.5 per cent and 15 per cent while new sectors of the Chinese economy, such as banking, insurance, the Internet, telecoms, and electronics will be opened to the forces of global competition’ (Far Eastern Economic Review, 25 November 1999). Significantly, since 1999 pro-business and pro-Chinese forces within the lobbying world and within the US Congress have been pushing for an end to the yearly debate over MFN, urging the approval of a Permanent Normal Trade Relations Act (PNTA). In June 2001 this Act was passed with the approval of George W. Bush's Republican administration. **This further ‘normalisation’ of US–China relations, in correlation with China's entry to the WTO, suggests that both nations are moving ever closer in their mutual recognition of the neoliberal ideas underpinning globalisation.** Indeed, the claim that the two countries represent diametrically opposed civilisations heading for imminent collision appears rather premature if not entirely spurious.1 This point has been underscored in recent times by the reactions of Chinese president Jiang Zemin and George W. Bush to the terrorist attacks of September 11 and their joint resolve to ensure a stable global order.

#### Foreign policy promotes globalization to sustain capitalism.

Hendricks-Sturrup 14 (Rachelle, M.S., M.A., “American Foreign Policy and the Role of Capitalism and Globalization,” https://apsa.wufoo.com/cabinet/k7w2w7/w0bQLCNvZg8%3D/globalization\_and\_foreign\_policy\_and\_capitalism.pdf)

As previously noted two of the major purported benefits to globalization are decreased warfare and increased political cooperation and diplomacy. For example, Chen proposed the pax mercatoria theory, where countries become too powerful and rich, or too busy to fight amongst one another. I extend this theory to when countries’ markets become too dependent on one another to fight. Heavy dialogue on foreign policy and national security has evolved within and outside the US since the September 11th terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Virginia. Academic Catherine Scott notes that “Trans- national terrorist groups have been described in ways that resonate with the decentralized, flexible, and information- savvy company that operates smoothly in the newest phase of globalization.” Also, in the immediate aftermath of the September 11th attacks, critics emphasized the “dark side of globalization,” criticizing globalist claims that globalization is natural, and necessary, and a means to survival and prosperity. During that time, the national security measures in the new realm of globalized markets were under increased skepticism, especially due to the fact that history displays similar calamitous events where the force of globalization was resisted (i.e. the 1914 assassination of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo). It is therefore vital that foreign policy and national security measures align with what empowers and sustains globalization. The approaches to US foreign policy and national security by our latest US leaders former President George Bush and President Barack Obama have been heavily scrutinized by the media, the public, and also by other foreign nations and leaders. This was, and currently is, largely due to the massive expectation of a multilateralist transition in foreign policy upon the presidential shift from George Bush to Barack Obama. Foreign policy approaches by both US presidents struggled (and continue to struggle) to overcome the enormous hurdle of combating those countries who choose to ignore or contest American leadership rather than embrace it, and this is heavily inhibits the desired multilateralist agenda. According to President Obama, President Bush failed to recognize during his presidential term just how much globalization has recreated politics around the world, and that terrorism is just one of the new problems among myriad new problems. Both presidents nonetheless, believed that countries both needed and wanted US leadership in this new global era. Academic David Skidmore elaborated on the inherent obstacles faced by our US presidents in their efforts to promote their foreign policy agendas in our new global era: Bush adopted a more unilateralist approach, while Barack Obama adopted a cautious approach towards the role of multilateralism. Both presidents have failed in their attempts, which is mainly a result of structural constraints domestically and abroad obstructing the US’s ability to engage with international institutions. For instance, Skidmore notes that the foreign countries, no longer being as dependent upon America for their security, now insist that “the United States abide by institutional rules and procedures on an equal basis: no more hegemonic prerogatives.” Clearly, the implications of a new global era cascade much further anticipated by our US leaders; US leaders must understand that in order to achieve successful US foreign policy, US leaders must embrace the fact that US leadership is not as warranted as assumed. Globalization is a superpower in itself whose power extends beyond its originator or creator: the US. From an imperialist perspective, the ideals of free trade originally embedded in the US Constitution are now shared globally, beyond US boundaries, and this transnational extension was necessary for the birth and survival of capitalism. This has allowed (as globalists state and believe) other developed and developing nations to be successful financially, and is lauded as a result. Since capitalist globalization has succeeded in it attempts, US leaders must understand the degree in which the capitalist globalization movement has empowered foreign nations, and that this empowerment has resulted perhaps in the unanimous desire for the US to “step down” from their plinth as global leader and become instead an equal almighty in the new global era. This must be thoroughly understood and addressed by our next presidential leader.

**Link — Economic Engagement**

#### Economic engagement with China promotes transnational capital.

Hart-Lansdberg 10 [Martin, Professor of Economics at Lewis and Clark College, Feb, The U.S. Economy and China: Capitalism, Class, and Crisis, Monthly Review, Volume 61, Issue 9]

The transnational production dynamics highlighted above led East Asian countries (other than China) to shift their overall export activity away from the United States and the European Union and towards East Asia, in particular, China. At the same time, they led China to expand and redirect its export activity away from East Asia and toward the United States and the European Union. Between 1992-1993 and 2004-2005, the East Asian share of China’s exports of final goods fell from 49.5 percent to 26.5 percent, while the OECD share (excluding Japan and South Korea) increased from 29.3 percent to 50.1 percent.16¶ Not surprisingly, then, the value of U.S. imports from China has soared, from $16 billion in 1990 to $340 billion in 2007. In 2003, China became the second largest exporter to the United States, trailing only Canada. The position of these two countries has fluctuated since, with China becoming the largest exporter in 2007 and then again in 2009. U.S. exports to China have also grown, but far more slowly: from $5 billion in 1990 to $65 billion in 2007. As a consequence, the U.S. trade deficit with China has grown dramatically: from $11 billion in 1990 to $274 billion in 2007. This is the largest deficit that the United States holds with any country.17¶ While the overwhelming majority of U.S. imports from China have long been manufactures (approximately 96 percent), their composition (as previously noted) has changed over time. The share of “miscellaneous” manufactures, such as toys, clothes, and footwear, fell from 58.5 percent in 1995-1996 to 37.7 percent in 2005-2006.18 Over the same period, the import share of machinery and transportation equipment products rose from 26.3 percent to 44.1 percent. Within this broad category, ICT products dominate. In 2005-2006, ICT products made up 37.6 percent of all U.S. manufactured imports from China.19¶ Not only are Chinese imports to the United States becoming increasingly sophisticated, China is also increasingly the main foreign supplier of such products. For example, in 1995-1996, China accounted for only 6.5 percent of total U.S. ICT imports. In 2005-6, China accounted for 33 percent of the total.20¶ These trends highlight the reason that Chinese exports have received so much attention in the United States. They also reveal, in concert with the previous analysis of East Asia’s transnational accumulation dynamics, that these “sophisticated” Chinese exports are really Chinese only in the sense that they were assembled in China. This point is reinforced by the fact that China’s increased share of the U.S. deficit was matched by a decline in the share accounted for by the rest of East Asia.¶ From 1999 to 2007, China’s share of the total U.S. trade deficit rose from 20.4 percent to 32.1 percent. Over the same period, Japan’s share fell from 21.1 percent to 10.2 percent. And the combined share of the rest of East Asia also fell, from 16 percent to 7.9 percent.21 In short, the threat to U.S.-based manufacturing activity comes not from China, but from the profit maximizing strategy of transnational capital.¶ While East Asian corporations have played the leading role in shaping and expanding the region’s transnational production networks, U.S. companies have also benefited from, and helped to expand, their operation. Some of the biggest beneficiaries are those U.S. firms that import and then market the products exported from China; Wal-Mart and Dell are among the biggest in terms of the dollar value of imports.¶ U.S.-based manufacturing firms that produce machinery and transport equipment also participate in these networks. For example, the share of parts and components in U.S. machinery and transportation equipment exports to China grew from 36.1 percent in 1995-1996 to 50.8 percent in 2005-2006. Over the same period, the share of parts and components in machinery and transportation equipment imports from China actually fell slightly, from 25 percent to 24.2 percent.¶ The same trend exists for ICT products. Parts and components, as a share of U.S. exports of ICT products to China, rose from 51.2 percent to 72.8 percent. Parts and components, as a share of imports in this category, fell slightly, from 23.5 percent to 20.7 percent.22¶ Thus, rather than producing final goods in the United States, U.S.-based manufacturers are increasingly dedicated to supplying the parts and components that China-based producers need to produce those final goods. Prema-chandra Athukorala and Nobuaki Yamashita describe the nuances of this strategy as follows: “[T]he share of parts and components in U.S. [ICT] exports to other East Asian economies, in particular, ASEAN countries, is much higher compared with that of exports to China. This pattern is consistent with case study-based findings that U.S. firms located in East Asian countries and regions undertake further processing and assembly of parts and components originally designed and produced in the USA as part of their engagement in China-centered regional production networks.”23

#### Economic engagement is driven by capitalist profit motives & relies on capitalistic ideals.

Land & Taylor 14 [Chris, University of Essex and Scott, University of Birmingham, “The good old days yet to come: Postalgic times for the new spirit of capitalism,” 2014, https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/33286/6/Land%20%20Taylor%20resubmit%20final%20final%20(2).pdf,]

The complex interweaving of past and future to generate an ideal form of economic engagement¶ in the present is a prominent feature of this event and its community. This ideal form was always¶ capitalist and entrepreneurial, with most of the speakers discussing how they had set up profitmaking¶ businesses to address the problems they saw. Companies included a solar farm in Wales¶ (selling into the British National Grid), a Californian venture capital fund investing in ecoenterprises¶ (and generating healthy returns on investment), a natural sea salt manufacturer (who¶ supply Walkers’ crisps), a green supply chain consultant (working for Tesco), and a company¶ providing cheaper loans than payday companies to the sub-prime poor of East London. In each¶ case the business was presented as an ethical solution to the problems of social and¶ environmental justice. There was never any suggestion that a profitable, capitalist business model¶ might be incompatible with these goals. Indeed, it was generally seen as the best way to ‘Do’¶ something and make a difference. Engagement with capitalism was presented as a way to do¶ good as well as make money. In this we might see the Do Lectures as encapsulating an ‘even¶ newer’ spirit of capitalism, in which the three dimensions of Boltanski and Chiapello’s (2005b,¶ 164) model are combined

**Link — Free Trade**

**Free trade is premised upon a biased ideology that forcibly integrates the world into the global economy – this causes wage differentials and stratifies the world along a global rich and poor divide.**

**De Angelis** **2k** (Massimo, Trade, political science pro, available: <https://libcom.org/files/NewComm.pdf>, “Trade, the global factory and the struggles for new commons, accessed: 7/16/2016)

Let us be clear from the outset. **There is no such as thing as "faire" trade liberalisation. To the billion of people in the global economy, trade liberalisation is part of the project to impose upon them the discipline of the global factory**. This discipline is the competing game itself. Whether is Pakistan’s textiles that replaces Italian’ textile workers or a British telecommunication firm that make Thailand's telecom workers redundant, it is the game itself that sucks. Whatever gains some group of workers obtain due to their competitive advantage, some other group of workers loses out, until they themselves are forced to take notice of a new competitive force which came to displace them. And if we patently follow the economists’ advice to wait for the long-term positive effect of trade, we are left to wonder: isn’t it now the long term of 200 hundreds yeas ago, of 100 years ago, of 50, 40 years ago, of twenty years ago? **The people who died** as result of the new enclosures accompanying trade liberalisation in all these years, **the people who suffered** war as result of the disintegration of the social fabric brought about by structural adjustment and associated export promotion, the people of any country of the North has to run in the competing rat race no less, but even more than in the past, just to acquire what is on average necessary to live with dignity**, the average people struggling to overcome an imposed condition of scarcity when in fact we live in plenty, can we say these people have benefited of the long term advantage of trade?** Nonsense, nobody can make these sorts of judgements. Without a proper assessment of human, social and environmental costs of modern trade, one cannot even to start talking about long term or short term advantages of trade. **Without taking into consideration the voice of those without voice the rhetoric of trade benefits is a bias rhetoric.** If there is no way anybody can argue whether trade has brought advantages or disadvantages, the only thing we can say with certainty is that because of current patterns of trade the context in which our lives and struggles of today are located is different than the context of our lives and struggles of yesterday and, if trade liberalisation continues, of tomorrow. However, the recomposing factors of various movement in Seattle last November, can be summarised by the slogan “no new round, WTO turnaround.” With this slogan the movement sets against the boundlessness of capital’s accumulation, but there is more. “No new round,” all movements agree. "WTO turnaround,” here is the problem, because people start to ask and debate “where to?” The problem for us is to identify, in the context of the large movement emerged in Seattle and that has set a temporary limit to trade liberalisation, whether it is possible to start to promote a debate towards an independent position of planetary civil society, one that does not bow to the easy traps of the free trade ideology. To do so, **we must open a debate on the contradictory nature of trade in this phase of capitalist accumulation,** its meaning and implications for a diverse organisation of human and natural resources of the planet. To gain an independent position of planetary civil society, we must start to think about proposals of transformation of current society within a conceptual grid that is independent from the main current dogmas that sustain capital's discourse: competition and, especially, the meaning of growth. Behind these unqualified concepts, there lies the project of today’s capital’s strategies.

#### Trade regulations and trade agreement highlight the hybridization of neoliberal governmentality, inequitable markets and disposability of social groups.

**Dardot & Leval 13** (Pierre Dardot, philosopher and specialist in Hegel and Marx. Christian, Professor of Sociology at the Université de Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense. “The New Way of the World: On Neoliberal Society. 2009; Pg. 489-497. iBooks)

The financial crisis thus dramatically highlighted the dangers inherent in neo-liberal governmentality, when this leads to entrusting part of prudential supervision at the very heart of the capitalist economic system to the ‘actors’ themselves, on the grounds that they directly experience the constraints of global competition and know how to govern themselves by pursuing their own interests. It was precisely these **logics of hybridization that lulled vigilance and led to extremely destabilizing conduct.** Among the private actors who played the most pernicious roles, we find, in particular, the small number of ratings agencies responsible for evaluating banking establishments. Charged with monitoring – a highly strategic role – these actors escape any monitoring themselves and are shot through with acute problems of conflicts of interest, in so far as the evaluations are requested and remunerated by the enterprises being rated. **The flaws in the supervisory apparatus were obviously very diverse.** But **the rules themselves were the decisive factor**. In addition to being drafted and implemented by the ‘supervisees’, they only concerned establishments taken individually, which immediately rendered them ineffective in the case of a systemic crisis. What is therefore at stake is the capacity of private actors to discipline themselves by taking into account the interests not only of their own establishment, but also of the system itself.17 We find the same logic of indirect, **hybrid regulation in all the procedures of technical specification necessary to world trade,** which are left to negotiation between the professionals of each sector. This development obviously takes us back to economic and financial changes themselves. Competition **has intensified to such an extent that it prompts various responses** in production and marketing – for example, the accentuation of ‘product differentiation’ by enterprises as the main mode of their competition with one another. Oligopolistic c**ompetition between large global groups has encouraged them to make alliances for** ‘research and development’ (**R&D), in order to pool resources and risks**. In this set-up**, states have no more than a subordinate or subsidiary role; and they internalize this role to the extent that they are no longer in a position to define social, environmental or science policies without the at least tacit agreement of the oligopolies**. **The state is not retreating**.18 **It is conforming to new conditions that it has helped to create**. The political construction of global finance affords the best proof of this.19 It is with state resources, and in accordance with an often very traditional rhetoric (the ‘national interest’, the ‘security’ of the country, the ‘good of the people’, etc.), that **governments, in the name of a competition they have themselves constructed, pursue policies favourable to enterprises and disadvantageous to the wage-earners of their own countries**. When reference is made to the growing influence of international or inter-governmental bodies, such as the IMF, the WTO, the OECD or the European Commission, it is forgotten that governments which feign passive submission to the audits, reports, injunctions and directives of these bodies, are actively involved in them. It is as if neo-liberal discipline, which imposes social regression for much of the population and organizes a transfer of income to the best-off, presupposes a ‘game of masks’ that makes it possible to shift onto other bodies responsibility for dismantling the social and educational state by laying down competitive rules in all areas of existence. The major **international institution**s created after the Second World War (IMF, World Bank, GATT) **have been the main vectors for imposing the new neo-liberal norm**. **They have taken over from the United States** and Britain without encountering major resistance. For this, the Bretton Woods institutions have had both to redefine their role and to make space for new nongovernmental institutions and agencies. The rise to power of the World Trade Organization (WTO) is a major sign of this. It would be erroneous to view the latter as the mere tool of universal market rules, free of state and oligopolistic pressures and interests; and, even more so perhaps, to regard it as the main defender of the countries of the South by virtue of the shift in the content of trade negotiations to priorities linked to development. The logic of oligopolistic interests is most openly expressed in the area of technological innovation. In the framework of WTO negotiations, the countries of the North are more inclined to serve the interests of oligopolies in sectors with high R&D expenditure, by enabling them to achieve an extension of intellectual property rights. Through international organizations, the pressure groups of knowledge oligopolies organize the protection of innovation rents in order to recover the fruits of private R&D expenditure and help to confine developing countries to under-development. Another inflection in government action is even more directly bound up with the norm of global competition. It relates to the refocusing of state intervention on factors of production. The state now has an important responsibility for logistical and infrastructural support for oligopolies, as for attracting these big oligopolies to the national territory it administers. This affects a great variety of areas: research, universities, transport, tax incentives, cultural environment and urbanization, guarantee of outlets (public markets open to small and medium-sized enterprises in the US). In other words, government intervention takes the form of a policy of production and economic environment factors. **The competitive state is not the state as arbitrator between interests, but the state as partner of oligopolistic interests in the global economic war**. **This is clear in the area of trade policy**. Free trade changes its meaning. As a result of the fragmentation of productive processes, the products exported by a country contain an increasingly large proportion of imported components. States are therefore led to replace tariff protectionism by strategic protectionism, protection of products by a logic of subsidizing factors of production. The norm of generalized competition impels states, or other public bodies, to create the optimal local conditions for capital valorization – what, paradoxically, might be called the ‘common goods of capital’. Such goods are the product of the investment in infrastructure and institutions required to attract capital and skilled workers in a regime of intensified competition. Research structures, taxation, universities, roads, banking networks, residential zones and leisure areas for managers – these are some of the goods necessary for capitalist activity. This tends to show that the precondition of capital mobility is the creation of fixed, immobile infrastructure by the state. **The state is no longer so much directed to** ensuring the integration of the different levels of collective existence as to **aligning societies with the constraints of global competition and finance**. Population management changes in meaning and method. Whereas, in the Fordist period, the predominant idea was (in the established formula) ‘harmony between economic efficiency and social progress’ in the framework of a national capitalism, this same population is now perceived merely as a ‘resource’ for enterprises, in a cost-benefit analysis. The logic of the policy still referred to as ‘social’ out of semantic inertia is no longer a distribution of productivity gains intended to maintain a sufficient level of demand for mass production outlets. It aims to maximize the population’s utility, by increasing ‘employability’ and productivity and reducing its cost through ‘social’ policies of a new kind, which consist in weakening the bargaining power of unions, downgrading labour law, reducing labour costs, and lowering the level of pensions and the quality of social protection in the name of ‘adapting to globalization’. The state is therefore not abandoning its role in managing the population, but its intervention no longer responds to the same imperatives or the same springs. In place of ‘welfare economics’, which emphasized the harmony between economic progress and the equitable distribution of the fruits of growth, the new logic views populations and individuals from the narrower angle of their contribution and cost in global competition. The conditions in which social groups come into conflict also change with entrepreneurial government.

### Link — TPP

**The TPP is *the* model free trade agreement for future mega-regional trade deals, locking in global capitalism by integrating East Asia into the ever-expanding ambit of the world’s bleak, U.S.-centered neoliberal future.**

**Starrs 15** (Sean, professor of international Relations, City University of Hong Kong, 5/13, “Making the World Safe for Big Business” Jacobin Magazine, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/05/trans-pacific-parternship-china-united-states-asia/)

Herein lies the uncertainty for the liberal economic order in East Asia, underpinned by American hegemony. **Chinese elites have benefitted massively from their integration with this order, but their continued legitimacy within China depends on an ethnocentric nationalist project that has the danger of becoming “too illiberal” in the eyes of the West**. Rapid Chinese military upgrading and rising territorial disputes in the East and South China Seas are aspects of this. **This is where the TPP comes in**. US Defense Secretary Ashton Carter understood this well when he stated that signing the TPP is more important than sending another aircraft carrier to East Asia. **One core factor behind the longevity of American power in the post–World War II era is its ability to permeate other economies in a way that structurally aligns the interests of their ruling classes with the interests of American hegemony. Japanese elites unwaveringly support American hegemony not because they are forced to, but because it is in their interests to do so.** **Chinese elites already depend on global capitalism, but to ensure they continue to do so into the foreseeable future, the US requires their further liberalization and integration with — and therefore dependence on — global capital** (especially American corporations), global finance (centered on Wall Street and the US Federal Reserve), and exports to Western consumers (especially American). Of course, it’s not all about China. The US has been pressuring Japan to liberalize its economy since the 1970s, and the TPP continues this quest by targeting Japanese farmers and carmakers. Malaysia, Mexico, and Vietnam are important export platforms that compete with China for foreign capital. Australia, Canada, and New Zealand are important American allies. Broadly speaking**, the more countries liberalize, the more open they become to American influence. But everyone, including the Chinese, knows the TPP is mostly about China, making it one of the most geopolitically-tinged trade deals ever.** **The TPP is about establishing the norms and rules of the future by locking the most dynamic region on Earth — East Asia, and especially China — into American-centered global capitalism**. If the US can forge common standards on IP protection and investor arbitration with Japan and Western Europe (through the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership), the West can continue to shape the rules of engagement for the rest of the world. **So if China wants to continue its integration with global capitalis**m(which it must, because a sharp decline in economic growth would undermine the authority of the CCP), **then China will be pressured to continue to liberalize and harmonize its rules and regulations with “international standards,” established by the West**. **Conforming to increasing liberalization will also reduce the salience of any coherent alternative model of “state capitalism” for others to follow.** **This is what some call “structural power”** — the ability to shape the rules and norms of the system so that others have little choice but to comply. Structural power is often more effective than “relational power,” or simply trying to force others to do something. **And it explains why China, despite expressing an interest in joining, is being excluded from the TPP negotiations — so they will not be able to alter the rules.** The architects of the TPP are structuring the agreement to serve their own interests: protection of intellectual property rights and investor arbitration facilitate the continued dominance of the world’s top corporations, which remain European, Japanese, and most of all American. Protection of IP rights ensures that advanced knowledge sectors, like the pharmaceuticals industry, maintain their healthy profit margins (and the poor continue to be denied life-saving drugs). US agribusiness will profit from the opening of Japan’s agricultural sector, and Nike will benefit from the further liberalization of Vietnam (where most of its shoes are manufactured). **To understand whose interests are being served, one simply has to note that US trade representatives are accompanied by over six hundred “corporate advisers” to the negotiations, which are shrouded in secrecy. Labor advisers? Zero.** **The TPP will also make it easier for transnational corporations to sue governments for labor, environmental, health, safety, and other regulations,** in order to gain taxpayer compensation for “loss of future returns” due to “expropriation.” Investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms — already in place in many existing international investment treaties — will be consolidated and strengthened in the TPP to ensure a single, more predictable, standard for the record-breaking number of new cases. One such case, in 2011, involved Philip Morris invoking the 1993 Hong Kong-Australia investment treaty to sue the Australian government for “expropriation” of its intellectual property. Australia passed some of the strictest cigarette packaging laws in the world, covering the cartons in grisly pictures of tumors and removed Philip Morris’s brand logo from the front. **The TPP will make it easier for corporations to challenge public health and other policies in supra-national courts, circumventing domestic legal institutions**. The TPP is under pressure in the US, especially from big trade unions who argue that decades of trade and investment agreements have increased the power of capital over labor, leading to the offshoring of manufacturing jobs and skyrocketing levels of inequality. (Many in the EU are opposed to the even bigger Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, or TTIP, for similar reasons, but with more emphasis on investor-state arbitration). If approved, **the TPP** would be the most expansive trade and investment treaty in history, encompassing 40 percent of the world’s GDP, a third of its exports, and almost half of the world’s foreign direct investment stock. It would likely breathe renewed vigor into the TTIP negotiations, which have stalled due to mass protests, including a petition with over one million signatories. It **would pressure China to further liberalize and align with the interests of American capital, as the TPP becomes the model for future mega-regional trade and investment agreements. Most of all, it would further bolster the power of capital over labor in both the US and abroa**d**,** ensuring that corporate, labor, and environmental regulations remain lax. For these reasons, **it is obvious we should be against the TPP — not to mention any international agreement that enhances the power of capital. Instead of “free trade” agreements that protect investors and corporations, the Left should fight for international agreements that enhance labor and environmental standards** (enshrining enforceable measures beyond mere rhetoric), **protect and nurture the independent power of unions, and impose greater regulations and controls on capital,** including capital mobility. But this must happen in the context of shifting the balance of social forces against capital in each nation. **With** the former Second and Third Worlds (especially **China) now more deeply integrated into global capitalism than ever before, this struggle is particularly urgent in the center of global capitalism — the United States**.

**TPP lets loose finance capital.**

**Soong 16** [Kua Kia, Ph.D. Sociology from the University of Manchester, “Three vital reasons we oppose the TPPA,” *malaysiakini* https://www.malaysiakini.com/news/326725]

Under the agreement, pharmaceutical companies, which are among those enjoying access to negotiators as “advisers,” can challenge any attempt to make generic drugs more affordable by claiming that such measures undermine their new rights granted by the (TPPA) deal. **In the financial sector, the agreement will water down regulatory safeguards put in place after the 2008 financial crisis and block any ban placed on risky financial products, including those toxic derivatives that contributed to the crisis in the first place**. **Chapters 9, 10, 11 of the TPPA provide a free rein to the operations of international finance capital via the dismantling of capital controls, prohibition on financial taxation and by undoing the stabilising tools set up in certain economies to counter the 2008 financial meltdown**. Stiglitz has warned that the TPPA presents "grave risks" as it "serves the interests of the wealthiest”.

**TPP is another neoliberal policy that increases exploitation and control over China.**

**Bowie 6/24** [Nile, political analyst and photographer, 6/24/16), "Trans-Pacific partnership: Neoliberal arm of Obama’s Asia-pivot," RT International, <https://www.rt.com/op-edge/trans-pacific-partnership-obama-704/>]

Everything that the public knows about the TPP so far has come from various leaks, and if the final agreement looks anything like the negotiating text, the implications would be far reaching, affecting everything from the cost of medicines to internet freedoms by broadening international copyright and intellectual property rights legislation in line with US law. Make no mistake – **the TPP is a neoliberal wish list that would empower corporations to skirt national laws and courts, while directly challenging health, environmental and other public interest policies. What makes the TPP so alarming is that it aims to create judicial authorities higher than national governments, in the form of extra-judicial tribunals overseen by the World Bank and UN.** If multinationals feel that existing government policy has hindered their expected future profits, national governments would be obliged to dole out compensation with taxpayer dollars. If the TPP were to be passed into law**, it would: create incentives for corporations to offshore millions of jobs** & encourage bottom-of-the-barrel low wage conditions in participating countries, prohibit bans on risky financial instruments, speculation, and derivatives; **countries would be banned from enacting capital controls and banks would enjoy** significantly **less regulatory oversight, impose** strict **intellectual property legislation that would undermine access to the internet** and digital file-sharing, **as well as stymie the product of generic medicines that** may **violate US patents,** lower food safety regulations and flood markets with those products, empowering corporations to **decrease environmental and health safeguards, and make signatory countries accountable to international tribunals, giving corporations the ability to demand compensation for any** expected future **profits that are hindered by** existing national **laws.** Like NAFTA, which dismantled the US manufacturing base and led to thousands of job losses, the TPP promotes offshoring through incentives for corporations, leading to wages being driven down and heightened inequality. Pharmaceutical giants would be allowed to increase drug prices and limit consumers’ access to cheaper generic drugs, which is bad news for many of the developing countries taking part. On the digital front, ISPs could be required to scrutinize user activity, while the creation and sharing of user-generated content would be stifled by drastic extensions of copyright protection. In the financial department**, the TPP imposes extreme deregulation policies that have contributed to the global economic crisis,** while prohibiting countries from enacting capital controls, an essential policy tool to counter destabilizing speculative cash flows. While Chuck Hagel and the gang over at the Pentagon are busy repositioning US military muscle to the Asia-Pacific, the Obama administration realizes that it must offer Pacific nations – who would otherwise have greater incentives in deepening economic ties with China – an attractive stake in the ailing US economy. The countries involved in the negotiations – Australia, Brunei, Chile, Canada, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, Vietnam, and now Japan – include major economic players in Southeast Asia. **The TPP is clearly the** economic **arm of the ‘pivot to Asia’ policy, roping** strategic **economies into a legally binding** corporate-governance **regime, lured in by the promise of** unfettered **access to US markets.** Many believe that the underlying purpose of Washington’s renewed interest in the Asia Pacific region is to counter the influence of China, which will soon overtake the US as the world’s largest economy. Examining the Beijing-aphobia conjecture of US foreign policy theoreticians like Robert Kagan can provide a clearer understanding of the TPP. An article penned by Kagan back in 1997, published with our friends at the Brookings Institute, articulates the China-containment narrative that undoubtedly strikes a chord with the policy architects of today. Kagan writes that the “present world order serves the needs of the United States and its allies, which constructed it,” and that **“Chinese leaders chafe at the constraints on them and worry that they must change the rules of the** international **system before the** international **system changes them**.” Kagan also references the literary classic, ‘Gulliver’s Travels’, where an explorer by the name of Lemuel Gulliver finds himself shipwrecked on an island, overtaken by a community of six-inch men called Lilliputians, who have tied him down with ropes and stakes, preventing him from moving. Kagan cites a conversation with Chinese military analysts, where he posits that Chinese leaders worry that they will "play Gulliver to Southeast Asia's Lilliputians, with the United States supplying the rope and stakes." The TPP is the most vivid policy directive that indicates that the US is hoping to deepen its footprint in Southeast Asia to counter the growing economic and military clout of China in the region.

## 2NC/1NR — Alternative Extensions

### Extend: “Rejection of Capitalism Solves”

#### The act of rejection creates the fissures necessary to resist global capitalism.

Holloway 5 (Ph.D. in Political Science at the University of Edinburgh, John, 8-16, Z Magazine, “Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?,” <http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616>)

On the question of fissures. We often feel helpless because capitalism weighs so heavily on us. But when we say No we start off with an appreciation of our own strength. When we rebel we are in fact tearing a little hole in capitalism. It is very contradictory. By rebelling we are already saying no to the command of capital. We are creating temporary spaces. Within that crack, that fissure, it is important that we fight for other social relations that don't point towards the state, but that they point towards the sort of society we want to create. At the core of these fissures is the drive to self-determination. And then it is a question of working out what does this mean, and how to be organised for self-determination. It means being against and beyond the society that exists. Of expanding the fissures, how to push these fissures forward structurally. The people who say we should take control of the state are also talking about cracks. There is no choice but to start with interstices. The question is how we think of them, because the state is not the whole world. There are 200 states. If you seize control of one, it is still only a crack in capitalism. It is a question of how we think about those cracks, those fissures. And if we start off from ourselves, why on earth should we adopt capitalist, bourgeois forms for developing our struggle? Why should we accept the template of the concept of the state?

#### Our alternative is to vote negative to refuse to participate in activities which support capitalism. We must hollow out capitalist structures by refusing to invest our energy in reforms and rescue operations.

Herod 4(James, Columbia University Graduate and Political Activist, Getting Free, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm>)

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for **destroying capitalism**. This strategy, at its most basic, **calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization** and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one **of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells.**¶This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want.¶ Thus **capitalist structures** (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) **are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support** (finance, condone) **the capitalist world** and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our **new democratic**, non-hierarchical**, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence.**¶This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. **Our new social world must grow** within the old, and **in opposition** to it, **until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations.** Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs.¶ But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). **Capitalism must be explicitly refused** and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly.¶ We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work.¶ It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods.¶ Another clarification is needed. **This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally**, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because **capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system.** We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system.¶ Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else.¶ Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it.¶ The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

### They Say: “Alternative Fails” (General)

#### The ‘no alternative’ claim wishes away real inequalities and renders us powerless to change things no matter how bad they get.

Meszaros 95 (Prof Emeritus of Philosophy @ U of Sussex, Istvan, Marxist.org, “Beyond Capital,” <http://www.marxists.org/archive/meszaros/works/beyond-capital/ch03-2.htm>)

The self-serving slogan of ‘there is no alternative’ is often coupled with an equally tendentious clause of self-justification which proclaims that ‘in the real world’ there can be no alternative to the advocated course of action (or inaction). This proposition is supposed to be a self-evident truth, automatically exempting all those who continue to assert it from inconveniencing themselves with the burden of proof. Yet, the moment we ask the question, what sort of ‘real world’ are they talking about, it becomes clear that it is an utterly fictitious one. For the structural defects and explosive antagonisms of the world in which we actually happen to live are apologetically denied or blindly disregarded by those who expect us to believe that in the ‘real world’ there is no alternative to the meek acceptance of the conditions necessary for the trouble-free functioning of the global capital system. In the name of reason, common sense, and ‘real politics’ we are invited to resign ourselves to the existing state of affairs, no matter how destructive its antagonisms. For within the parameters of the established order – eternalized as the rational framework of the fundamentally unalterable ‘real world’, with ‘human nature’ and its corresponding ideal reproductive instrumentality: the ‘market mechanism’, etc. – no solutions can be envisaged to the ubiquitous contradictions. Thus we are expected to pretend to ourselves that classes and class contradictions no longer exist or no longer matter. Accordingly, the only viable course of action in the thus postulated ‘real world’ is supposed to be to ignore, or to ‘explain away’ the evidence of structural instability provided by our own eyes, wishfully sweeping under an imaginary carpet the chronic problems and crisis symptoms of growing severity with which our social order confronts us every day. As things stand today, the ideologists of the established order do not believe any longer even in the earlier popularized notion of changing their order ‘little by little’. With the end of the ascending phase of capitalism no real change can be considered legitimate; neither by major structural intervention nor indeed ‘little by little’.

### They Say: “Don’t Know What Comes Next’

#### We don’t need blueprints for post-capitalism – what matters is that we begin a process of theorizing

Hudis 5 (phD candidate @ Loyola U for philosophy, Peter, 4/9/11, Journal of the Research Group on Socialism and Democracy, “Developing a Philosophically Grounded Alternative to Capitalism,” sdonline.org/38/developing-a-philosophically-grounded-alternative-to-capitalism)

The problem has only become more acute since the 1980s. It isn’t just that a concept of a non-capitalist society can assist today’s social movements. It has become vital for their very existence and forward motion. While spontaneous mass struggles often suggest the elements of a new society, the task of working out a comprehensive vision of non-capitalist social relations takes hard theoretical labor. Such labor requires more than spontaneous activity. It also requires more than the work of “enlightened” intellectuals who are isolated from mass struggles. What is needed today is not simply a general conception of socialism. We need more—Marx’s concept of a “revolution in permanence” that uproots the very basis of value production. Developing and projecting that concept requires a philosophic nucleus of activists and theoreticians who establish a dialogue with ongoing freedom struggles. To achieve this, we need to recognize that the form of organization, crucial as it is, does not exhaust the concept of organization. As Dunayevskaya stated in 1987: “The burning question of the day remains: What happens the day after? How can we continue Marx’s unchaining of the dialectic organizationally, with the principles he outlines in his Critique of the Gotha Program? The question of ‘what happens after?’ gains crucial importance because of what it signals in self-development and self-flowering—’revolution in permanence.’ No one knows what it is, or can touch it, or can decide upon it before it appears. It is not the task that can be fulfilled in just one generation…It has the future written all over it. The fact that we cannot give a blueprint does not absolve us from the task. It only makes it more difficult”(Dunayevskaya 1988, microfilm no. 10960). It was to focus the discussion of priorities for the Left in this direction that I began with a statement from Marx’s letter of 1881 to Domela Nieuwenhuis. That statement came directly after the following sentence: “A doctrinaire and of necessity fantastic anticipation of a future revolution’s program of action only serves to distract from the present struggle” (Marx 1986). Marxists have never stopped quoting this sentence, because it meant to them that they didn’t need to “speculate” about the future. But they usually didn’t quote what follows the sentence, where Marx speaks of the importance of “the dream of an imminent end,” because that wasn’t concrete to them. It has, however, become concrete to our age—far more so than Marx himself could ever have envisioned. This is no call to draw up “blueprints” for a new society, let alone regressing to “doctrinaire” anticipations of the future. Devising blueprints for the future is a form of Enlightenment reasoning that (to borrow a line from Hegel)4 “upsets the household arrangements by bringing in the goods and furnishings belonging to the world of the here and now.” But while we don’t need blueprints we do need a vision of the future. The future of the planet may well depend on it.

## 2NC/1NR — Impact Extensions

### Impact — Environment

#### Capitalism ensures environmental extinction that only the alt can solve.

Foster & Magdoff 10 [John Bellamy and Fred, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and professor emeritus at the University of Vermont, March, “What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism,” Monthly Review, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism/>]

**The** foregoing **analysis**, if correct, **points to the fact that the ecological crisis cannot be solved within the logic of the present system.** The various suggestions for doing so have no hope of success. **The system of world capitalism is clearly** unsustainable in: (1) its quest for never ending accumulation of capital leading to production that must continually expand to provide profits; (2) its agriculture and food system that pollutes the environment and still does not allow universal access to a sufficient quantity and quality of food; (3) its rampant destruction of the environment; (4) its continually recreating and enhancing of the stratification of wealth within and between countries; and (5) its search for technological magic bullets as a way of avoiding the growing social and ecological problems arising from its own operations**. The transition to a**n ecological—which we believe must also be a **socialist**—**economy will be a steep ascent and will not occur overnight.** This is not a question of “storming the Winter Palace.” Rather, **it is a dynamic, multifaceted struggle for a new cultural compact and a new productive system. The struggle is ultimately against the system of capital. It must begin, however, by opposing the logic of capital, endeavoring in the here and now to create in the interstices of the system a new social metabolism rooted in egalitarianism, community, and a sustainable relation to the earth.** The basis for the creation of sustainable human development must arise from within the system dominated by capital, without being part of it, just as the bourgeoisie itself arose in the “pores” of feudal society.54 Eventually, these initiatives can become powerful enough to constitute the basis of a revolutionary new movement and society.All over the world, such struggles in the interstices of capitalist society are now taking place, and are too numerous and too complex to be dealt with fully here. Indigenous peoples today, given a new basis as a result of the ongoing revolutionary struggle in Bolivia, are reinforcing a new ethic of responsibility to the earth. La Vía Campesina, a global peasant-farmer organization, is promoting new forms of ecological agriculture, as is Brazil’s MST (Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra), as are Cuba and Venezuela. Recently, Venezulean President Hugo Chávez stressed the social and environmental reasons to work to get rid of the oil-rentier model in Venezuela, a major oil exporter.55 **The climate justice movement is demanding egalitarian and anti-capitalist solutions to the climate crisis.** Everywhere radical, essentially anti-capitalist, strategies are emerging, based on other ethics and forms of organization, rather than the profit motive: ecovillages; the new urban environment promoted in Curitiba in Brazil and elsewhere; experiments in permaculture, and community-supported agriculture, farming and industrial cooperatives in Venezuela, etc. The World Social Forum has given voice to many of these aspirations. As leading U.S. environmentalist James Gustave Speth has stated: “The international social movement for change—which refers to itself as ‘the irresistible rise of global anti-capitalism’—is stronger than many may imagine and will grow stronger.”56 **The reason that the opposition to the logic of capitalism—ultimately seeking to displace the system altogether—will grow more imposing is that** there is no alternative, if the earth as we know it, and humanity itself, are to survive. Here, the aims of ecology and socialism will necessarily meet. It will become increasingly clear that the distribution of land as well as food, health care, housing, etc. should be based on fulfilling human needs and not market forces. This is, of course, easier said than done. But it means making economic decisions through democratic processes occurring at local, regional, and multiregional levels. We must face such issues as: (1) How can we supply everyone with basic human needs of food, water, shelter, clothing, health care, educational and cultural opportunities? (2) How much of the economic production should be consumed and how much invested? and (3) How should the investments be directed? In the process, people must find the best ways to carry on these activities with positive interactions with nature—to improve the ecosystem. New forms of democracy will be needed, with emphasis on our responsibilities to each other, to one’s own community as well as to communities around the world. Accomplishing this will, of course, require social planning at every level: local, regional, national, and international—which can only be successful to the extent that it is of and by, and not just ostensibly for, the people.57 **The very purpose of the new sustainable system**, which is the necessary outcome of these innumerable struggles (necessary in terms of survival and the fulfillment of human potential), **must be to satisfy the basic material and non-material needs of all the people, while protecting the global environment as well as local and regional ecosystems. The environment is not something “external” to the human economy, as our present ideology tells us; it constitutes the essential life support systems for all living creatures.** To heal the “metabolic rift” between the economy and the environment means new ways of living, manufacturing, growing food, transportation and so forth.60 Such a society must be sustainable; and sustainability requires substantive equality, rooted in an egalitarian mode of production and consumption. **Today we must strive to construct a genuine socialist system; one in which bureaucracy is kept in check, and power over production and politics truly resides with the people. Just as new challenges that confront us are changing in our time, so are the possibilities for the development of freedom and sustainability.**

### Impact — Inequality

#### Resisting the systemic violence of capitalism is the ultimate ethical responsibility – the current social order guarantees social exclusion on a global scale.

Zizek & Daly 4 (Slavoj, senior researcher at the Institute for Sociology and Philosophy at the University of Ljubljana, Global Distinguished Professor of German at New York University, and international director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities of the University of London, and Glyn, Conversations with Zizek page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of** today’s global **capitalism and its obscene naturalization / anonymization of the millions** who are **subjugated by it** throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette – Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it break with these types of positions 7 and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedeviled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffee, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a universal global system **the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system.** What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that **the gentrification of global liberal capitalism** is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally **reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s populations.** In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and,** in consequence, **social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that **this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect** (or misdirect) **social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.** Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this **Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion** on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

### Impact — Value to Life

#### No value to life under capitalism.

Dillon 99 (University of Lancaster, Michael, April, “Another Justice,” Political Theory, Vol. 27, 164-5)

Otherness is born(e) within the self as an integral part of itself and in such a way that it always remains an inherent stranger to itself." It derives from the lack, absence, or ineradicable incompleteness which comes from having no security of tenure within or over that of which the self is a particular hermeneutical manifestation; namely, being itself. The point about the human, betrayed by this absence, is precisely that it is not sovereignly self-possessed and complete, enjoying undisputed tenure in and of itself. Modes of justice therefore reliant upon such a subject lack the very foundations in the self that they most violently insist upon seeing inscribed there. This does not, however, mean that the dissolution of the subject also entails the dissolution of Justice. Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ultimately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economies of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. **The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism**. They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. **Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability**. Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. **Once rendered calculable**, however, **units of account are necessarily submissible** not only to valuation but also, of course, **to devaluation. Devaluation**, logically**, can extend to the point of counting as nothing**. Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. **There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of holocaust. However liberating and emancipating systems of value-rights-may claim to be, for example, they run the risk of counting out the invaluable.** Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life. Herewith, then, the necessity of championing the invaluable itself. For we must never forget that, "we are dealing always with whatever exceeds measure. But how does that necessity present itself? Another Justice answers: as the surplus of the duty to answer to the claim of Justice over rights. That duty, as with the advent of another Justice, is integral to the lack constitutive of the human way of being.