### 2NC OV

#### We must have a historical material understanding of the world to effectively allow ourselves to transition away from exploitation of labor – that’s Tumino 1. The root of this exploitation comes from capitalism’s growth imperative, which is now expanding to the point of ecological catastrophe – that’s Foster 5.

Only historical materialism can explain violence against non-humans. Both the aff and neg agree – there exists a split between humans and non-humans. However, the aff’s claim is merely discriptive of the fact that there is a split. They can’t explain why one group (non-humans) would necessarily be viewed as lesser even if they are viewed as difference. Only historical materialism explains this. It’s because profit in capitalism comes from the devaluation of resources and labor. This creates the possibility of violence against non-humans as they are rendered calculable and exploited to produce a profit.

### A2 Perm

#### The perm is worse than the plan – it validates the ability of capitalism to fix its own problems which short circuits any attempt at a more radical form of politics

Meszaros 95 [Istavan, Prof. Emeritus at Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition] p. 930

THE difficulty is that the ‘moment’ of radical politics is strictly limited by the nature of the crises in question and the temporal determinations of their unfolding. The breach opened up at times of crisis cannot be left open forever and the measures adopted to fill it, from the earliest steps onwards, have their own logic and cumulative impact on subsequent interventions. Furthermore, both the existing socioeconomic structures and their corresponding framework of political institutions tend to act against radical initiatives by their very inertia as soon as the worst moment of the crisis is over and thus it becomes possible to contemplate again ‘the line of least resistance’. And no one can consider ‘radical restructuring’ the line of least resistance, since by its very nature it necessarily involves upheaval and the disconcerting prospect of the unknown. No immediate economic achievement can offer a way out of this dilemma so as to prolong the life-span of revolutionary politics, since such limited economic achievements made within the confines of the old premises — act in the opposite direction by relieving the most pressing crisis symptoms and, as a result, reinforcing the old reproductive mechanism shaken by the crisis. As history amply testifies, at the first sign of ‘recovery’, politics is pushed back Into its traditional role of helping to sustain and enforce the given socio-economic determinations. The claimed ‘recovery’ itself reached on the basis of the ‘well tried economic motivations’, acts as the self-evident ideological justification for reverting to the subservient, routine role of politics, in harmony with the dominant institutional framework. Thus, radical politics can only accelerate its own demise (and thereby shorten, instead of extending as it should, the favourable ‘moment’ of major political intervention) if it consents to define its own scope in terms of limited economic targets which are in fact necessarily dictated by the established socioeconomic structure in crisis

#### The permutation is severance – it severs out of the methodology of capitalism rooted in the 1AC. This a voting issue because it creates a moving target that steals neg ground a makes it impossible to debate.

#### You cannot permute a method – it strips out all of the conceptual theory that allows us both understand the world and to create a praxis to end oppression

Tumino 1 [Stephen, Prof English at Pitt, ““What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online]

Orthodox Marxism has become a test-case of the "radical" today. Yet, what passes for orthodoxy on the left—whether like Smith and Zizek they claim to support it, or, like Butler and Rorty they want to "achieve our country" by excluding it from "U.S. Intellectual life" ("On Left Conservatism"), is a parody of orthodoxy which hybridizes its central concepts and renders them into flexodox simulations. Yet, even in its very textuality, however, the orthodox is a resistance to the flexodox. Contrary to the common-sensical view of "orthodox" as "traditional" or "conformist" "opinions," is its other meaning: ortho-doxy not as flexodox "hybridity," but as "original" "ideas." "Original," not in the sense of epistemic "event," "authorial" originality and so forth, but, as in chemistry, in its opposition to "para," "meta," "post" and other ludic hybridities: thus "ortho" as resistance to the annotations that mystify the original ideas of Marxism and hybridize it for the "special interests" of various groups. The "original" ideas of Marxism are inseparable from their effect as "demystification" of ideology—for example the deployment of "class" that allows a demystification of daily life from the haze of consumption. Class is thus an "original idea" of Marxism in the sense that it cuts through the hype of cultural agency under capitalism and reveals how culture and consumption are tied to labor, the everyday determined by the workday: how the amount of time workers spend engaging in surplus-labor determines the amount of time they get for reproducing and cultivating their needs. Without changing this division of labor social change is impossible. Orthodoxy is a rejection of the ideological annotations: hence, on the one hand, the resistance to orthodoxy as "rigid" and "dogmatic" "determinism," and, on the other, its hybridization by the flexodox as the result of which it has become almost impossible today to read the original ideas of Marxism, such as "exploitation"; "surplus-value"; "class"; "class antagonism"; "class struggle"; "revolution"; "science" (i.e., objective knowledge); "ideology" (as "false consciousness"). Yet, it is these ideas alone that clarify the elemental truths through which theory ceases to be a gray activism of tropes, desire and affect, and becomes, instead, a red, revolutionary guide to praxis for a new society freed from exploitation and injustice. Marx's original scientific discovery was his labor theory of value. Marx's labor theory of value is an elemental truth of Orthodox Marxism that is rejected by the flexodox left as the central dogmatism of a "totalitarian" Marxism. It is only Marx's labor theory of value, however, that exposes the mystification of the wages system that disguises exploitation as a "fair exchange" between capital and labor and reveals the truth about this relation as one of exploitation. Only Orthodox Marxism explains how what the workers sell to the capitalist is not labor, a commodity like any other whose price is determined by fluctuations in supply and demand, but their labor-power—their ability to labor in a system which has systematically "freed" them from the means of production so they are forced to work or starve—whose value is determined by the amount of time socially necessary to reproduce it daily. The value of labor-power is equivalent to the value of wages workers consume daily in the form of commodities that keep them alive to be exploited tomorrow. Given the technical composition of production today this amount of time is a slight fraction of the workday the majority of which workers spend producing surplus-value over and above their needs. The surplus-value is what is pocketed by the capitalists in the form of profit when the commodities are sold. Class is the antagonistic division thus established between the exploited and their exploiters. Without Marx's labor theory of value one could only contest the after effects of this outright theft of social labor-power rather than its cause lying in the private ownership of production. The flexodox rejection of the labor theory of value as the "dogmatic" core of a totalitarian Marxism therefore is a not so subtle rejection of the principled defense of the (scientific) knowledge workers need for their emancipation from exploitation because only the labor theory of value exposes the opportunism of knowledges (ideology) that occult this exploitation. Without the labor theory of value socialism would only be a moral dogma that appeals to the sentiments of "fairness" and "equality" for a "just" distribution of the social wealth that does the work of capital by naturalizing the exploitation of labor under capitalism giving it an acceptable "human face."

#### The plan is only a defensive move to restabilize capital – the system will marginalize any gains later – only a total negation can work

Meszaros 95 [Istavan, Prof. Emeritus at Sussex, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition]

WHEN the historical phase of defensive gains is exhausted, labour as the structural antagonist of capital can only advance its cause — even minimally — if it goes on the offensive, envisaging as its strategic target the radical negation and the positive transformation of the mode of social metabolic reproduction also when fighting for the realization of more limited objectives. For only through the adoption of a viable overall strategy can the partial steps become cumulative, in sharp contrast to all known forms of labour reformism which disappeared without a trace like a few drops of water in the desert sand. Defensive gains in the past were always closely tied to expansionary phases of the capital system.They were carved out from the margin of concessions which the system could not only afford but also positively turn to its advantage. Even under the most favourable circumstances they could not bring the promised ‘gradual’ realization of socialism one inch nearer. For by their very nature they could be only conjunctural concessions, affordable under conditions favourable to capital itself and only by ‘reflected glory’ helpful also to labour. Once, however, the historical phase of capital’s expansionary concessions is left behind, the total capitulation of reformist labour we witnessed in the last few decades accompanies it. This is because under such conditions not only further defensive gains by labour are out of the question, but even many of the past concessions must be clawed back, subject only to the potential destabilizing impact on capital’s continued self-reproduction if too much is taken back within a short space of time. This is what moderates the tendency for the equalization of the differential rate of exploitation in the capitalistically advanced countries for as long as the total social capital of the countries concerned can compensate for it through its neo-colonial domination of areas of the planet which provide for metropolitan capital’, thanks to a higher rate of practicable exploitation, a much higher rate of profit. Nevertheless, even such currently alleviating factors are bound to be temporary and displaced with the unfolding of capital’s structural crisis.

### A2 Reform Capatalism

#### We cannot reform capitalism - total rejection is key

Herod 4 (James Herod author of several books on capitalism and social activist since 1968 Getting Free 2004 <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm>)

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.

### A2 Work Within the System

#### Bad idea – when we attempt to work within the system – we only entrench the capitalist system by assimilating the individuals in it but we allow it to create a flexible empire that goes on create more destuction – and that merely magnifies the destruction-driven nature of capitalism

#### You cannot solve within the system. Only a complete rejection of capitalism can stop the suicide economy. Vote negative to explore new ways of being and join a critical web of energy that can challenge capital.

Korten 2 [David Korten, President of the People-Centered Development Forum, in 2002 (BEYOND THE GLOBAL SUICIDE ECONOMY, June 22, 2002, p. <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/pcdf/2002/Gobal6Billion.htm>.)]

The first step is to get clear that transformational change is not going to come from within the institutions of the suicide economy. The suicide economy is what organizational consultant Margaret Wheatley calls an “emergent system.” No one planned it. Those responsible for corporate interests grew it into being in their day-to-day effort to increase profits and market share. Step-by-step over a period spanning hundreds of years they reshaped the politics, the legal system, and the culture of humanity to create the interlocking system of interests, laws, and mutual obligations that make the suicide economy virtually impossible to transform from within. Those who promote serious reforms with the suicide economy are almost invariably marginalized or expelled. To change an emergent system that no longer serves you must displace it by growing a more powerful emergent system. According to Wheatley: “This means that the work of change is to start over, to organize new local efforts, connect them to each other, and know that their values and practices can emerge as something even stronger.” The key to transformational change is to create cultural, economic, political, and even spiritual spaces in which to explore new ways of being with one another toward the emergence of new cultures and institutions. This is why the existence of millions of living enterprises is so important. Presently most exist at the fringes of and dependent on the institutions of the suicide economy. The possibility remains, however, for them to gradually walk away from the institutions of the suicide economy and begin to growing webs of relationships among themselves to bring into being newly emerging living economies. The greater the number of members and links in the web the greater the life energy that participating enterprises may potentially attract and recycle within the living economy, thus increasing the strength and viability of both the web and its individual members. Community members can be encouraged to give preference to local living enterprises in their shopping choices, and eventually in their employment and investment choices.

### Impacts

#### 1. The prioritization link – that’s the 1NC Darder and Torres evidence. Only the prioritization of class as the basis for political struggle can tackle the systemic causes of oppression. Using race as the central category of analysis perpetuates the idea that the political and economic are separate spheres of society which can function independently—a view that sustains prevailing class relations of power in society.

#### 2. The divide and conquer link – Capitalism racializes subjects to divide social groups - a race and experience based epistemology and theory of oppression breaks down the concept of class as an all encompassing theory of exploitation that is the only way to enable the unification of the proleteriat

Zavarzadeh 3 (Mas’ud, “The Pedagogy of Totality” p.11-13, in “JAC: A Journal of Rhetoric, Culture, and Politics”, Volume 23.1, http://www.jaconlinejournal.com/archives/vol23.1.html)

The pedagogy of appearance focuses on cultural representation and the role of representation in constructing the represented. By centering teaching in the machinery of "representation,"it obliterates the objective. Reducing pedagogy to lessons in cultural semiotics, it makes "experi- ence" of the pleasures of "depthless" surfaces the measure of reality and thus obscures the social relations of production that are the material conditions of that experience. However, "This 'lived' experience is not a given, given by a pure 'reality,' but the spontaneous 'lived experience' of ideology in its peculiar relationship to the real" (Althusser 223). The ideological value of the concept of "experience" in de-concep-ualizing pedagogy will perhaps become more clear in examining the way bourgeois radical pedagogues, such as Giroux, deploy experience as an instance of spontaneity to eviscerate class as an explanatory concept by which the social relations ofproperty are critiqued. In his Impure A cts- a book devoted to marginalizing explanatory concepts and popularizing "hybrids" and that, in effect, justifies political opportunism in peda- gogy- Giroux repeats the claims of such other cultural phenomenologists as Stuart Hall, Judith Butler, and Robin Kelley that "class" is "lived through race" (28). Class, in other words, is an affect. He represents this affective view ofclass as epistemological resistance against class which, he claims, is a universal category that takes the "difference" ofrace out of class. As I have already argued, epistemology is used in mainstream pedagogy as a cover for a reactionary class politics that does several things, as Giroux demonstrates. First, it segregates the "black" proletariat from the "white" proletariat and isolates both :from other "racial" prole- tariats. In doing so, Giroux's pedagogy carries out the political agenda of capital - to pit one segment ofthe proletariat against the other and to tum the unity of the working class into contesting (race) "differences." Second, it rewrites the system of wage labor itself into a hybrid. Giroux's experience-ism obscures the systematicity of wage labor and argues that there is no capitalism operating with a single logic of exploitation. Instead, there are many, aleatory, ad hoc, local arrangements between employees and employers depending on the color of the worker not the laws ofmotion ofcapital. Third, it converts capitalism from an economic system based on the"exploitation"of humans by humans(wagelabor)- through the ownership ofthe means ofproduction-into an institution of cultural "oppression" based on "power." Fourth, since class is lived through race, it is not an objective fact (the relation of the worker to ownership ofthe means ofproduction) but a subjective experience. The experience of ("living") class through race, like all experiences, is contingent, aleatory, and indeterminate. Class (lived through the experi- ence of race) is thus reconstituted as contingent - an accident not a necessity of wage labor. Fifth, since capitalism is not a system but a series of ad hoc arrangements of exchange with various workers of diverse colors, it does not produce an objective binary class system but only cultural differences. One cannot, therefore, obtain objective knowledge of capitalism. There are, in short, no laws ofmotion ofcapital; there are only "experiences" ofwork influenced by one's color. Consequently, to say-as I have said-that capitalism is a regime ofexploitation is simply a totalitarian closure. We cannot know what capitalism is because, according to Giroux's logic, it is fraught with differences (ofrace) not the singularity of"surplus labor." In Giroux's pedagogy, there is no capital- ism ("totality"), only cultural effects of capitals without capitalism ("differences"). Giroux represents his gutting of class as a radical and groundbreaking notion that will lead to liberation ofthe oppressed. However, he never completes the logic of his argument because in the end it will de-ground his position and turn it into epistemological nonsense and political pantomime. Ifclass is a universal category that obliterates the difference of race, there is (on the basis of such a claim) no reason not to say that race is also a universal category because it obliterates the difference of sexuality (and other differences), which is, by the same logic, itself a universal category since it obliterates the difference of age (and other differences), which is itselfa universal category because it obliterates the difference of (dis)ability (and other differences), which is itselfa univer- sal category because it obliterates the difference of class (and other differences). In short, the social, in Giroux's pedagogy is a circle of oppressions, none of whose components can explain any structural relations; each simply absorbs the other ("class is actually lived through race," paraphrasing Giroux) and thus points back to itself as a local knowledge ofthe affective, difference, and contingency. Class explains race; it does not absorb it as an experience (see Butler, "Merely"), nor does i t reduce it to the contingencies o f ethnicities (Hall, "New") or urban performativities (Kelley, Yo '). To put it differently, since in this pluralism of oppressions each element cancels out the explanatory capacity of all others, the existing social relations are reaffirmed in a pragmatic balancing of differences. Nothing changes, everything is resignified. The classroom of experience reduces all concepts (which it marks as "grand narratives") to affects ("little stories") and, instead of explaining the social in order to change it, only "interprets" it as a profusion of differences. Teaching becomes an affirmation of the singular-as-is; its lessons "save the honor of the name" (see Lyotard, Postmodern 82). Giroux's program is a mimesis ofthe logic of the ruling ideology: as in all pedagogies of affect, it redescribes the relation of the subject of knowledge with the world but leaves the world itselfintact byreifying the signs of"difference" (see Rorty, Contingency 53, 73). The subject, as I will discuss later in my analysis ofCary Nelson's radical pedagogy, feels differently about itself in a world that remains what it was. Giroux is putting forth a class-cleansing pedagogy: he erases class from teaching in the name ofepistemology ("totalization"). But as I have already argued, epistemology is not an issue for Giroux; it is an alibi for hollowing out from class its economic explanatory power. Epistemology in bourgeois pedagogy is class politics represented as "theory"-whose aim is to tum class into a cultural aleatory experience. In Giroux's phenomenological experientialism, lived experience is an excuse for advancing the cause of capital in a populist logic (respect for the ineluctable "experience" of the student) so that the student, the future worker, is trained as one who understands the world only through the sense-able - his own "unique" experience as black, white, or brown; man or woman; gay or straight - but never as a proletariat: a person who, regardless of race, sexuality, gender, age, or (dis)ability has to sell his or her labor power to capital in order to obtain subsistence wages in exchange. Experience, in Giroux's pedagogy, becomes a self-protecting "inside" that resists world-historical knowledge as an intrusion from "outside"; it thus valorizes ignorance as a mark of the authenticity and sovereignty ofthe subject-as independence and free choice.

#### Expansion of solar and wind energies cannot escape the capitalist hegemonic framework.

Harris 10 (Jerry, Network for Critical Studies of Global Capitalism, Oct-Dec, Going Green to Stay in the Black: Transnational Capitalism and Renewable Energy, Race & Class, Vol. 52 #2, http://netglobalcapitalism.wordpress.com/articles/going-green-to-stay-in-the-black-transnational-capitalism-and-renewable-energy/)

Conclusion The global pattern in solar energy is similar to that of wind, characterized by transnational corporations who have foreign direct investments and assembly lines wherever a significant market exist. In both solar and wind there is a combination of some of the most powerful and well established TNCs and new corporations more exclusively focused on renewables. While government support is important there is no nationally exclusive policy, tax breaks and stimulus are offered to all active TNCs regardless of origin. The only exception is China, but as these corporations build a solid economic base they too have started to expand abroad. It should be no surprise that a pattern of global accumulation has emerged so early. Transnational capital is hegemonic worldwide so any new industry and significant technology will develop within this framework. This brings forth a number of questions about the viability of green capitalism and alternative paths of development.

### A2: Alt → Transition Wars

#### 1. The collapse of capitalism is inevitable – the aff just delays it which makes any transition war comparatively worse

**Mészáros 1** (István, Hungarian Marxist philosopher, and Professor Emeritus at the University of Sussex. He held the Chair of Philosophy at Sussex for fifteen years and was earlier Professor of Philosophy and Social Science for four years at York University. “Socialism or Barbarism.” New York : The Monthly Review Press, 2001. Pgs 9-10) JM

We have just left the twentieth century, described by capital's most vocal apologists as "the American century." This view is voiced as if the October Revolution of 1917, or the Chinese and Cuban Revolutions and the colonial liberation struggles in the following decades had never taken place, not to mention the humiliating defeat directly suffered by the mighty United States in Vietnam. Indeed, the uncritical defenders of the established order confidently anticipate that not only the coming century but the whole of the next millennium is destined to conform to' the unchallengeable rules of Pax Americana. Yet, no matter how much the relation of forces has been realigned in capital's favor in the last decade, the deep-seated causes beneath the major social earthquakes of the twentieth century mentioned above-to which one could add quite a few more, positive and negative alike, including two world wars-have not been resolved by subsequent developments. On the contrary, with every new phase of forced postponement the capital system's contradictions can only be aggravated, bringing with them ever greater danger for the very survival of humanity. The insolubility of our social antagonisms, coupled with capital's uncontrollability, may well continue to generate for some time the atmosphere of triumphalism as well as the disorienting illufuns of permanency, as they did in the recent past. But in due course the accumulating and destructively intensifying problems must be confronted. For if the next century is really going to be capital’s triumphant "American century," there will be no more centuries for humans afterwards, let alone a full millennium. Saying this has nothing to do with "anti-Americanism." In 1992 I expressed my conviction that, “The future of socialism will be decided in the United States, however pessimistic this may sound. I try to hint at this in the last section of The Power of Ideology where I discuss the problem of universality. J Socialism either can assert itself universally and in such a way that it embraces all areas, including the most developed capitalist areas of the world, or it won't succeed.”2

#### 2. The alternative is try or die – we’ll win that capitalism ends in extinction and outweighs their impacts, means that the only hope for the survival of humanity is the alternative

#### 3. Elites won’t block change – if aware of impending doom, fear of extinction will spur a mindset change

Kassiola 3 ( Dean at San Francisco State, Joel Jay, “Questions to Ponder in Understanding the Modern Predicament”, Explorations in Environmental Political Theory, ed. Kassiola, M.E. Sharpe)

As we reflect upon the causes of the potentially lethal modern predicament, we face the central question of how modern societal trans­formation will occur. This raises the concomitant, apparently insur­mountable, obstacle of the current elite’s opposition to such change in values and social institutions: How will the rich accept the lower material levels necessitated by environmental limits, and create a more just world order through a redistribution of wealth and power? The unhappy experience and knowledge of increasing environmental degradation with threats to all planetary life should move the industrial rich to recognize the self-defeating and unsatisfactory nature of modern values and social practices. They may come to accept the necessity of a new, postmodern social order, one not so characterized by the ideolo­gies of capitalism, industrialism, and Hobbesianism. In this new order citizens—including the rich—can have more leisure time to experience and contemplate the nonmaterial and more fulfilling aspects of the hu­man condition, like nature. Nature’s value to humans, as Goodin tells us, lies in directing humans to something “outside themselves,” some­thing “larger than themselves,” that “locates the self.”Of course, extensive social learning will have to occur if such a radical change is to occur, but it is precisely such a type of change that is needed to realize sustainability and justice. The crucial role of such social learn­ing to societal transformation is emphasized by both Milbrath’s and Pirages’s contributions. An urgent question remains: What specific agent can transform mod­ern society to an environmentally consistent, moral, and satisfying so­cial order? Several contributors note the role of disappointment, or tragedy (in Oscar Wilde’s sense of “emptiness after success”) on the recognition of mistaken goals. We experience alienation as we work harder and longer “getting and spending” yet increase our anguish and dissatisfaction with life. Some of our authors have remarked about the Wildean tragedy, or irony, of the most materially successful society in world history having success be its downfall. However, just as Zimmer­man admonishes us to preserve what is positive about modernity (for example, freedom from the shackles of feudalism and increased pro­ductivity to meet human biological needs), I feel compelled to re­mind the reader of Paehlke’s discussion of globalization, especially as it pertains to the global industrial elites and the effective spread of their ideology of growthmania and endless consumption. These elites control the global mass media of communications and direct the expanding reach of increasingly large and powerful transnational corporations. The dy­namics of how the current hegemonic rule of the industrial corporate behemoths will be undermined has yet to be written, posing a signifi­cant challenge to all environmental political theorists, environmental researchers and activists (similar to Zimmerman’s unforseen “caterpillar into a butterfly” transformation analogy). As Paehlke fears, we merely may be moving forward between cars on a train as it moves backward without changing its direction! But even the most destination-minded train engineer will stop, change direction, and reassess her/his stated objective when they run out of fuel, see disastrous circumstances ahead, and realize the train’s projected destination does not exist! [p. 185-187]

#### 4. Our impacts outweigh – the structural violence committed by capitalism kills more people every 15 years than an ongoing thermonuclear genocide

**Gilligan 96** (James, professor of Psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School, Director of the Center for the Study of Violence, and a member of the Academic Advisory Council of the National Campaign Against Youth Violence, 1996, “Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes,” p. 196)

The finding that structural violence causes far more deaths than behavioral violence does is not limited to this country. Kohler and Alcock attempted to arrive at the number of excess deaths caused by socioeconomic inequities on a worldwide basis. Sweden was their model of the nation that had come closes to eliminating structural violence. It had the least inequity in income and living standards, and the lowest discrepancies in death rates and life expectancy; and the highest overall life expectancy in the world. When they compared the life expectancies of those living in the other socioeconomic systems against Sweden, they found that 18 million deaths a year could be attributed to the “structural violence” to which the citizens of all the other nations were being subjected. During the past decade, the discrepancies between the rich and poor nations have increased dramatically and alarmingly. The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those by genocide—or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000) deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.