# Round 5 vs. Fullerton PR (Aff)

## 1AC

#### Same thing as other rounds with terrorism and resource wars removed from the 1AC.

## 2AC

### Solvency

#### They say plan doesn’t solve waste – 100% of waste can be reused via new technologies. Also, we remove the heat carrying isotopes eliminating any need for large repositories. That’s Bastin.

#### Reprocessing key to the effectiveness of waste storage – reduces the heat output and volume. Conclusion to your article.

Dennis, et al., ‘9

[Kate; Jason Rugolo; Lee Murray; and Justin Parrella, Graduate Students at Harvard, “The case for reprocessing”, Bulletin for Atomic Scientists, November/December 2009, RSR]

For long-term geologic storage, reductions in waste volume are important. But it is not just the space that the waste would physically take up that is vital, the heat output of the waste also must be taken into consideration, as does the space between waste packages necessary to prevent overheating in the repository. While it is true that high-level waste from reprocessing is hotter than non-reprocessed spent fuel, this does not completely nullify the decrease in waste volume achieved by reprocessing. The heat emitted from post-reprocessing waste decreases by approximately 70 percent during its first 30 years. In other words, such waste initially can be stored either aboveground in well-ventilated storage buildings (as Areva does), or it can be stored in geologic repositories with space between packages left empty and then filled over the years as heat output decreases. In contrast, spent fuel rods that are directly disposed in repositories cool more slowly and require larger geologic repositories. One estimate, which appears in the book Megawatts and Megatons by Richard Garwin and Georges Charpak, suggests that even with the increased heat output of high-level wastes from reprocessing, the amount of space required for a geologic repository can be reduced by one-half if the waste is reprocessed. Overall, Garwin and Charpak argue against reprocessing but acknowledge several benefits that we believe outweigh the economic burdens, the most important being that reprocessing can effectively double the capacity of a Yucca Mountain-sized permanent repository.

#### They say tax incentives fail – investment tax investment of 20% would provide an increase in energy of 4 mills/kWh. That’s Lagus. Also, tax incentives mitigate the long timeframe and inherent market risks. That’s the IAEA evidence. Also, this mitigates the cost of the government regulatory regime. That’s Selyukh.

#### They say reprocessing leads to radiation – cross apply Bastin analysis from above. US can use all the leftovers to be put in medical applications and other alternative uses.

#### No risk and their impact is academically disproven.

NEI, ‘12

[Nuclear Energy Institute, “Myths & Facts About Nuclear Energy”, June, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/reliableandaffordableenergy/factsheet/myths--facts-about-nuclear-energy-january-2012/]

Fact: If this claim were true, it would be dangerous to breathe air or eat food. Every human being is continuously exposed to different forms of radiation every moment of their life. In fact, the use of radiation in medicine, electricity generation and many other common applications has improved, extended and saved the lives of millions of Americans. Studies by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, the National Research Council’s BEIR VII study group and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements all show that the risk associated with low-dose radiation from natural and man-made sources, including nuclear power plants, is extremely small. Researchers with the U.S. Department of Energy’s Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, through a combination of state-of-the-art time-lapse live imaging and mathematical modeling of a special line of human breast cells, found evidence that for low-dose levels of ionizing radiation, cancer risks may not be directly proportional to dose. The data show that at lower doses of ionizing radiation, DNA repair mechanisms work much better than at higher doses. This contradicts the standard model for predicting biological damage from ionizing radiation—the linear-no-threshold hypothesis or LNT—which holds that risk is directly proportional to dose at all levels of irradiation. Dr. James Conca addressed LNT in a recent Forbes article. Conca is an international expert on the environmental effects of radiological and chemical contamination and the 9 determination of risk at low doses of radiation. Radiation is strictly controlled and monitored at all nuclear power plants to minimize plant emissions and worker exposure. Less than one-tenth of a percent of all radiation exposure is from nuclear facilities as confirmed by widespread radiation monitoring programs that ensure the safety of plant workers and neighbors. For more information about radiation, visit www.radiationanswers.org. Nuclear plants emit dangerous amounts of radiation. Fact: Nuclear power plants have controlled and monitored emissions of radiation, but the amount is extremely small and poses no threat to the public or the environment. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission reports that people living close to a nuclear power plant receive, at most, an additional one millirem of radiation exposure a year. To put this in perspective, one millirem is one thousandth of the radiation exposure from a single whole-body CAT scan. The average American is exposed to 620 millirem of radiation every year. Three hundred millirem comes from natural sources, such as cosmic rays, uranium in the Earth’s crust and radon gas in the atmosphere. Most of the rest comes from medical procedures such as CAT scans and consumer products. The radiation exposure from living near a nuclear power plant is insignificant and is no threat to the health of the public. After more than 3,600 reactor years of operation, there is no scientific or medical evidence that shows anyone has been harmed by the radiation from any of America’s commercial nuclear energy facilities, including the accident at Three Mile Island 32 years ago. The radiation from nuclear plants causes cancer and other harmful effects. Fact: After more than a half-century of radiological monitoring and medical research, there is no evidence linking U.S. nuclear energy plants to negative effects on the health of the public or workers. Claims that radioactivity from nuclear plants has caused negative health effects have been refuted by the United Nations Scientific Committee of the Effects of Atomic Radiation, National Research Council’s BEIR VII study group, the National Cancer Institute, the American Cancer Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, numerous state departments of health and other independent studies.

### Peak Oil

#### They say no peak oil – newest data says you’re wrong. Oil prices could soon reach $100 a barrel as data from the top 50 oil companies show costs increasing. That’s Worstall. All their claims are empirically denied.

#### Their evidence is about running about oil – our argument is about price shocks caused by oil dependence. Even if we don’t run out of oil, it will become more costly to get more and more money. This is already killing the economy. That’s Zakaria. 40 year study proves the effect on the economy. That’s Li.

### Cap K

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus a competitive policy option or the status quo.

#### This is key to ground and predictability – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Abandoning politics causes war, slavery, and authoritarianism

Boggs 2k (CAROL BOGGS, PF POLITICAL SCIENCE – SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, 00, THE END OF POLITICS, 250-1)

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

#### **Case outweighs. Waste is there packed on-site right now and its going to blow up. It’s also vulnerable to prolif and terrorist attacks that culminate extinction. Also, they can’t solve Yucca long term which also blows up. Rejecting capitalism doesn’t address the underlying problems of waste storage.**

#### **Perm: do both—the plan’s approach to the current energy crisis presents a unique opportunity to reform capitalism**

Peters 12 (Michael A Peters 2012, [Michael A. Peters is professor of education at the University of Waikato in New Zealand and professor emeritus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. ]10 June 2012, “Greening the Knowledge Economy: A Critique of Neoliberalism,” Truthout, http://truth-out.org/news/item/9642-greening-the-knowledge-economy-a-critique-of-neoliberalism)

Ecopolitics must come to terms with the scramble for resources that increasingly dominates the competitive motivations and long-range resource planning of the major industrial world powers. There are a myriad of new threats to the environment that have been successfully spelled out by eco-philosophers and that have already begun to impact upon the world in all their facets. First, there is the depletion of non-renewable resources - in particular, oil, gas, timber and minerals. Second, and in related fashion, is the crisis of energy itself, upon which the rapidly industrializing countries and the developed world depend. Third, the rise of China and India, with their prodigious appetites, which will match the United States within a few decades in rapacious demand for more of everything that triggers resource scrambles and the heavy investment in resource-rich regions such as Africa. Fourth, global climate change will have the greatest impact upon the world's poorest countries, multiplying the risk of conflict and resource wars. With these trends and possible scenarios, only a better understanding of the environment can save us and the planet. A better understanding of the earth's environmental system is essential if scientists **working in concert with communities, ecology** groups **across the board, green politicians, policymakers and business leaders** are to promote green exchange and to ascertain whether green capitalism strategies that aim at long-term sustainability are possible. The energy crisis may be a blessing in disguise for the United States. Jeremy Rifkin (2002) envisions a new economy powered by hydrogen that will fundamentally change the nature of our market, political and social institutions as we approach the end of the fossil-fuel era, with inescapable consequences for industrial society. New hydrogen fuel-cells are now being pioneered - which, together with the design principles of smart information technologies, can provide new distributed forms of energy use. While Thomas Friedman (2008) has also argued the crisis can lead to reinvestment in infrastructure and alternative energy sources in the cause of nation-building, his work and intentions have been called into question.[2] Education has a fundamental role to play in the new energy economy, both in terms of changing worldviews and the promotion of a green economy, and also in terms of research and development's contribution to energy efficiency, battery storage and new forms of renewable energy

#### Rejecting capitalism will spark transition wars, re-entrenching cycles of exploitation

Gubrud 97 [Mark Avrum (Center for Superconductivity Research); “Nanotechnology and International Security”; Foresight Nanotechnology Institute; <http://www.foresight.org/Conferences/MNT05/Papers/Gubrud/>

With molecular manufacturing, international trade in both raw materials and finished goods can be replaced by decentralized production for local consumption, using locally available materials. The decline of international trade will undermine a powerful source of common interest. Further, artificial intelligence will displace skilled as well as unskilled labor. A world system based on wage labor, transnational capitalism and global markets will necessarily give way. We imagine that a golden age is possible, but we don't know how to organize one. As global capitalism retreats, it will leave behind a world dominated by politics, and possibly feudal concentrations of wealth and power. Economic insecurity, and fears for the material and moral future of humankind may lead to the rise of demagogic and intemperate national leaders. With almost two hundred sovereign nations, each struggling to create a new economic and social order, perhaps the most predictable outcome is chaos: shifting alignments, displaced populations, power struggles, ethnic conflicts inflamed by demagogues, class conflicts, land disputes, etc. Small and underdeveloped nations will be more than ever dependent on the major powers for access to technology, and more than ever vulnerable to sophisticated forms of control or subversion, or to outright domination. Competition among the leading technological powers for the political loyalty of clients might imply reversion to some form of nationalistic imperialism.

#### The status quo is structurally improving.

Golanky, Policy Analyst for the Department of the Interior, ‘10

[Indur, PhD from MSU, “Population, Consumption, Carbon Emissions, and Human Well-Being in the Age of Industrialization (Part III — Have Higher US Population, Consumption, and Newer Technologies Reduced Well-Being?)”, April 24,

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/population-consumption-carbon-emissions-and-human-well-being-in-the-age-of-industrialization-part-iii-have-higher-us-population-consumption-and-newer-technologies-reduced-well-being/#more-9194>]

In my previous post I showed that, notwithstanding the Neo-Malthusian worldview, human well-being has advanced globally since the start of industrialization more than two centuries ago, despite massive increases in population, consumption, affluence, and carbon dioxide emissions. In this post, I will focus on long-term trends in the U.S. for these and other indicators. Figure 1 shows that despite several-fold increases in the use of metals and synthetic organic chemicals, and emissions of CO2 stoked by increasing populations and affluence, life expectancy, the single best measure of human well-being, increased from 1900 to 2006 for the US. Figure 1 reiterates this point with respect to materials use. These figures indicate that since 1900, U.S. population has quadrupled, affluence has septupled, their product (GDP) has increased 30-fold, synthetic organic chemical use has increased 85-fold, metals use 14-fold, material use 25-fold, and CO2 emissions 8-fold. Yet life expectancy advanced from 47 to 78 years. Figure 2 shows that during the same period, 1900–2006, emissions of air pollution, represented by sulfur dioxide, waxed and waned. Food and water got safer, as indicated by the virtual elimination of deaths from gastrointestinal (GI) diseases between 1900 and 1970. Cropland, a measure of habitat converted to human uses — the single most important pressure on species, ecosystems, and biodiversity — was more or less unchanged from 1910 onward despite the increase in food demand. For the most part, life expectancy grew more or less steadily for the U.S., except for a brief plunge at the end of the First World War accentuated by the 1918-20 Spanish flu epidemic. As in the rest of the world, today’s U.S. population not only lives longer, it is also healthier. The disability rate for seniors declined 28 percent between 1982 and 2004/2005 and, despite quantum improvements in diagnostic tools, major diseases (e.g., cancer, and heart and respiratory diseases) now occur 8–11 years later than a century ago. Consistent with this, data for New York City indicate that — despite a population increase from 80,000 in 1800 to 3.4 million in 1900 and 8.0 million in 2000 and any associated increases in economic product, and chemical, fossil fuel and material use that, no doubt, occurred —crude mortality rates have declined more or less steadily since the 1860s (again except for the flu epidemic). Figures 3 and 4 show, once again, that whatever health-related problems accompanied economic development, technological change, material, chemical and fossil fuel consumption, and population growth, they were overwhelmed by the health-related benefits associated with industrialization and modern economic growth. This does not mean that fossil fuel, chemical and material consumption have zero impact, but it means that overall benefits have markedly outweighed costs. The reductions in rates of deaths and diseases since at least 1900 in the US, despite increased population, energy, and material and chemical use, belie the Neo-Malthusian worldview. The improvements in the human condition can be ascribed to broad dissemination (through education, public health systems, trade and commerce) of numerous new and improved technologies in agriculture, health and medicine supplemented through various ingenious advances in communications, information technology and other energy powered technologies (see here for additional details). The continual increase in life expectancy accompanied by the decline in disease during this period (as shown by Figure 2) indicates that the new technologies reduced risks by a greater amount than any risks that they may have created or exacerbated due to pollutants associated with greater consumption of materials, chemicals and energy, And this is one reason why the Neo-Malthusian vision comes up short. It dwells on the increases in risk that new technologies may create or aggravate but overlooks the larger — and usually more certain — risks that they would also eliminate or reduce. In other words, it focuses on the pixels, but misses the larger picture, despite pretensions to a holistic worldview.

#### Capitalism solves war.

Gartzke, Associate Professor of Political Science and a member of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, ‘7

[Eric, “The Capitalist Peace”, American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 51, No. 1, January 2007, Pp. 166–191]

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

#### Capitalism the only way to save the environment from ecological disaster—technology drives efficiency

Taylor 12, Christopher. "Green Capitalism." *Breaking Washington DC News, Maryland News, Virginia News, US Politics News and Analysis*. N.p., 16 Mar. 2012. http://washingtonexaminer.com/article/141806.

James Watt, secretary of the Interior for Ronald Reagan is quoted as saying "After the last tree is felled, Christ will come back," as a reason for not worrying about the environment. Watt never said this, it was simply attributed to him by an author in Grist magazine, and later retracted. Still, many believe that conservatives and capitalists think that it’s okay to rape and destroy the planet in the name of riches and God. In reality, capitalism is one of the best hopes for our environment. The oil age did arguably save whales from extinction after all. Looking around the world, you can find a direct correlation between poverty and ecological disaster. Where people are poorest, the pollution and economic destruction are far worse than in more wealthy areas. Places where many poor people live in close quarters such as Calcutta, Beijing, and Mexico City are even worse. The main reason that poorer areas are such ecological disasters is because of the poverty. Economic stress causes people to stop being so fussy about how they find their next meal, or shelter, or clothing. When resources are limited, people begin choosing more critical needs over less, and picking up the trash stops being a priority, as does cleaning up waste, planting trees, and so on. It is also no coincidence that the poorer and less ecologically sound places in the world tend to be less capitalist. One of the most shocking things to academics and leftists when the Soviet Union collapsed is what an incredibly horrendous wasteland much of Russia had become under their rule. One infamous example is Lake Karachay, which the Soviet government used as a dumping ground for radioactive materials from their nuclear power plants. There is a company which specializes in finding radioactive materials scattered around the nation, including inside Moscow. China is the world’s leading producer of carbon dioxide and general pollution. Instead of resulting in better care for the environment, countries under totalitarian rule tend to have significantly worse care. The more collectivist the government, the worse their environmental care tends to be, for a few simple reasons. A significant reason is economic. Capitalism gives incentive to taking care of your environment because it is costly and less attractive to customers and investors. If your company is destroying the land around it, that tends to annoy and upset customers. Further, capitalism provides not just opportunity, but pressure for poor to get out of poverty and thus away from the desperation that creates environmental stress. Capitalism helps people achieve more and opens the way for anyone to become whatever they have the ability and will to become. Other, collectivist systems such as socialism and communism stifle and discourage this economic growth. However, the main reason is technological; capitalism tends to encourage and benefit people who innovate, invent, and create. Other systems with top-down control tend to stifle this, encouraging the status quo and simply obeying the rules to get a check. There’s no incentive to try harder, invent, or find a new way because you get paid the same either way. Technology results in less damage to the environment for better results. In the 1960’s Paul Ehrlich believed farming and food production techniques could not and would not get any better, so we’d become overpopulated and starve. In reality, food technology exploded in the end of the 20th century, resulting in massive increases in production while using fewer resources. Similarly, technology, driven by free-market capitalism, has resulted in a more energy-efficient world. Air conditioners and heaters are far more efficient today than they were even ten years ago. Computers, televisions, and other entertainment media use far less energy, often through simple innovations such as flat-screen LCD technology. These innovations come about because of the freedom and rewards which a free market affords, providing the tools for a cleaner planet. Companies realize that it’s cheaper in the long run to pollute less (and clean up less in the future) and they can advertise themselves as being good for the environment, which is popular with buyers. Capitalism can be destructive to the environment, but the free market inevitably over time provides counters and solutions to that, with advances to technology and pressures in the market. Collectivist systems tend to suppress both, resulting in stagnation and less benefit to the environment.

#### They read a Foster impact of ecological collapse with a Zizek alternative of doing nothing. There’s no reason why a psychoanalytic approach to capitalism is compatible with harms purported by Marxists.

#### Alt Fails: Four reasons Zizek’s politics are a terrible idea and the plan is net-beneficial 1) His politics are authoritarian and despotic; 2) The alt trades off with previous advances by the left; 3) Prevents coalition-building against capitalism; 4) Pragmatic action best overcomes the ‘impossibility’ of capitalism

Andrew Robinson, Postgraduate student, School of Politics, University of Nottingham, and Simon Tormey, Senior Lecturer in Politics and Critical Theory, University of Nottingham, 2003, online: http://homepage.ntlworld.com/simon.tormey/articles/Zizeknotradical.pdf, accessed October 22, 2004

Zizek’s politics are not merely impossible, but potentially despotic, and also (between support for a Master, acceptance of pain and alienation, militarism and the restoration of order) tendentially conservative. They serve only to discredit the left and further alienate those it seeks to mobilise. Instead, a transformative politics should be a process of transformation, an alinear, rhizomatic, multiform plurality of resistances, initiatives, and, indeed, acts, which are sometimes spectacular and carnivalesque, sometimes prefigurative, sometimes subterranean, sometimes rooted in institutional change and reform, sometimes directly revolutionary. Zizek’s model of the pledged group, bound together by the One who Acts, is entirely irrelevant to the contemporary world and would be a step backwards from the decentred character of current left/radical politics. Nor need this decentring be seen as a weakness as Zizek insists. It can be a strength, protecting radical politics from self-appointed elites, transformism, infiltration, defeat through the ‘neutralisation’ of leaders, and the threat of a repeat of the Stalinist betrayal. In contrast with Zizek’s stress on subordination, exclusivity, hierarchy and violence, the tendency of anti-capitalists and others to adopt anti-authoritarian, heterogeneous, inclusive and multiform types of activity offer a better chance of effectively overcoming the homogenising logic of capitalism and of winning support among wider circles of those dissatisfied with it. Similarly, the emphasis on direct action - which can include ludic, carnivalesque and non-violent actions as well as more overtly confrontational ones - generates the possibility of empowerment through involvement in and support for the myriad causes which make up the anti-capitalist resistance. This resistance stands in stark contrast to the desert of ‘heroic’ isolation advocated by Zizek, which, as Laclau puts it, is ‘a prescription for political quietism and sterility’.154 Zizek is right that we should aim to overcome the ‘impossibilities’ of capitalism, but this overcoming should involve the active prefiguration and construction in actuality of alternative social forms, not a simple (and actually impossible) break with everything which exists of the kind imagined by Zizek. It is important that radicals invoke ‘utopias’, but in an active way, in the forms of organisation, ‘disorganisation’, and activity we adopt, in the spaces we create for resistance, and in the prefiguration of alternative economic, political and social forms. Utopian imaginaries express what is at stake in left radicalism: that what exists does not exist of necessity, and that the contingency of social institutions and practices makes possible the overthrow of existing institutions and the construction or creation of different practices, social relations, and conceptions of the world. The most Zizek allows to radicals is the ability to ‘glimpse’ utopia while enacting the reconstruction of oppression. Radicals should go further, and bring this imagined ‘other place’ into actual existence. Through enacting utopia, we have the ability to bring the ‘no-where’ into the ‘now-here’.

#### The system’s resilient DESPITE income inequality and the alt fails.

Rose, Editor of Foregin Affairs, ‘12

[Gideon, Foreign Affairs, January/February 2012, “Making Modernity Work”]

The central question of modernity has been how to reconcile capitalism and mass democracy, and since the postwar order came up with a good answer, it has managed to weather all subsequent challenges. The upheavals of the late 1960s seemed poised to disrupt it. But despite what activists at the time thought, they had little to offer in terms of politics or economics, and so their lasting impact was on social life instead. This had the ironic effect of stabilizing the system rather than overturning it, helping it live up to its full potential by bringing previously subordinated or disenfranchised groups inside the castle walls. The neoliberal revolutionaries of the 1980s also had little luck, never managing to turn the clock back all that far. All potential alternatives in the developing world, meanwhile, have proved to be either dead ends or temporary detours from the beaten path. The much-ballyhooed "rise of the rest" has involved not the discrediting of the postwar order of Western political economy but its reinforcement: the countries that have risen have done so by embracing global capitalism while keeping some of its destabilizing attributes in check, and have liberalized their polities and societies along the way (and will founder unless they continue to do so). Although the structure still stands, however, it has seen better days. Poor management of public spending and fiscal policy has resulted in unsustainable levels of debt across the advanced industrial world, even as mature economies have found it difficult to generate dynamic growth and full employment in an ever more globalized environment. Lax regulation and oversight allowed reckless and predatory financial practices to drive leading economies to the brink of collapse. Economic inequality has increased as social mobility has declined. And a loss of broad-based social solidarity on both sides of the Atlantic has eroded public support for the active remedies needed to address these and other problems. Renovating the structure will be a slow and difficult project, the cost and duration of which remain unclear, as do the contractors involved. Still, at root, this is not an ideological issue. The question is not what to do but how to do it--how, under twenty-first-century conditions, to rise to the challenge Laski described, making the modern political economy provide enough solid benefit to the mass of men that they see its continuation as a matter of urgency to themselves. The old and new articles that follow trace this story from the totalitarian challenge of the interwar years, through the crisis of liberalism and the emergence of the postwar order, to that order's present difficulties and future prospects. Some of our authors are distinctly gloomy, and one need only glance at a newspaper to see why. But remembering the far greater obstacles that have been overcome in the past, optimism would seem the better long-term bet.

#### The alt fails – just pointing out the flaws doesn’t work.

Kliman, professor of economics at Pace University, ‘4

[Andrew, “Alternatives to Capitalism: What Happens After the Revolution?” http://akliman.squarespace.com/writings/]

I. Concretizing the Vision of a New Human Society We live at a moment in which it is harder than ever to articulate a liberatory alternative to capitalism. As we all know, the collapse of state-capitalist regimes that called themselves “Communist,” as well as the widespread failures of social democracy to remake society, have given rise to a widespread acceptance of Margaret Thatcher’s TINA – the belief that “there is no alternative.” Yet the difficulty in articulating a liberatory alternative is not mostly the product of these events. It is an inheritance from the past. To what extent has such an alternative ever been articulated? There has been a lot of progress – in theory and especially in practice – on the problem of forms of organization – but new organizational forms by themselves are not yet an alternative. A great many leftists, even revolutionaries, did of course regard nationalized property and the State Plan, under the control of the “vanguard” Party, as socialism, or at least as the basis for a transition to socialism. But even before events refuted this notion, it represented, at best, an evasion of the problem. It was largely a matter of leftists with authoritarian personalities subordinating themselves and others to institutions and power with a blind faith that substituted for thought. How such institutions and such power would result in human liberation was never made clear. Vague references to “transition” were used to wave the problem away. Yet as Marxist-Humanism has stressed for more than a decade, the anti-Stalinist left is also partly responsible for the crisis in thought. It, too, failed to articulate a liberatory alternative, offering in place of privateand state-capitalism little more than what Hegel (Science of Logic, Miller trans., pp. 841-42) called “the empty negative … a presumed absolute”: The impatience that insists merely on getting beyond the determinate … and finding itself immediately in the absolute, has before it as cognition nothing but the empty negative, the abstract infinite; in other words, a presumed absolute, that is presumed because it is not posited, not grasped; grasped it can only be through the mediation of cognition … . The question that confronts us nowadays is whether we can do better. Is it possible to make the vision of a new human society more concrete and determinate than it now is, through the mediation of cognition? According to a long-standing view in the movement, it is not possible. The character of the new society can only be concretized by practice alone, in the course of trying to remake society. Yet if this is true, we are faced with a vicious circle from which there seems to be no escape, because acceptance of TINA is creating barriers in practice. In the perceived absence of an alternative, practical struggles have proven to be self-limiting at best. They stop short of even trying to remake society totally – and for good reason. As Bertell Ollman has noted (Introduction to Market Socialism: The Debate among Socialists, Routledge, 1998, p. 1), “People who believe [that there is no alternative] will put up with almost any degree of suffering. Why bother to struggle for a change that cannot be? … people [need to] have a good reason for choosing one path into the future rather than another.” Thus the reason of the masses is posing a new challenge to the movement from theory. When masses of people require reasons before they act, a new human society surely cannot arise through spontaneous action alone. And exposing the ills of existing society does not provide sufficient reason for action when what is at issue is the very possibility of an alternative. If the movement from theory is to respond adequately to the challenge arising from below, it is necessary to abandon the presupposition – and it seems to me to be no more than a presupposition – that the vision of the new society cannot be concretized through the mediation of cognition. We need to take seriously Raya Dunayevskaya’s (Power of Negativity [PON], p. 184) claim in her Hegel Society of America paper that “There is no trap in thought. Though it is finite, it breaks through the barriers of the given, reaches out, if not to infinity, surely beyond the historic moment” (RD, PON, p. 184). This, too, is a presupposition that can be “proved” or “disproved” only in the light of the results it yields. In the meantime, the challenges from below require us to proceed on its basis.

#### Capitalism is ethical.

Bhagwati, University Professor and Senior Fellow in International Economics at Columbia, ‘9

[Jagdish, “Feeble Critiques: Capitalism's Petty Detractors”, World Affairs

<http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/articles/2009-Fall/full-Bhagwati-Fall-2009.html>, RSR]

Inevitably, the crisis on Wall Street has revived the never-ending notion that markets undermine morality. Oliver Stone, ever restless to recapture the days of former glory, has begun production on a sequel to the 1987 movie Wall Street, which immortalized Gordon Gekko as the symbol of markets and greed. But the debate on how markets affect morality has not always been a slam dunk for capitalism’s naysayers. Matthew Arnold, especially in his influential 1868 book, Culture and Anarchy, might have been spectacularly critical, but Voltaire’s passionate defense of markets, most eloquently stated in his 1734 Philosophical Letters, made him the most influential hero of the new bourgeois age. He proposed quite reasonably that peace and social harmony, as opposed to the religious strife common until then, would flow from the secular religion of the marketplace. After two and a half centuries of this fascinating debate, I have to say that my own sympathies lie with those who have found markets, on balance, to be on the side of the angels. But I should also add that I find the specific notion that markets corrupt our morals, and determine our ethical destiny, to be a vulgar quasi-Marxist notion about as convincing as that other vulgar notion that ownership of the means of production is critical to our economic destiny. The idea that working with and within markets fuels our pursuit of self-interest, greed, avarice, and self-love, in ascending orders of moral turpitude, is surely at variance with what we know about ourselves. Yes, markets will influence values. But, far more important, the values we develop will affect in several ways how we behave in the marketplace. Consider just the fact that different cultures exhibit different forms of capitalism. The Dutch burghers Simon Schama wrote about in The Embarrassment of Riches used their wealth to address the embarrassment of poverty. They, the Jains of Gujerat (from whom Mahatma Gandhi surely drew inspiration), and the followers of John Calvin were all taking values from religion and culture to bring morality to the market. Many economists, perhaps most noticeably André Sapir of Brussels, have used their study of the diverse forms of capitalism that flourish in the world to deny the claim that markets determine what we value. The Scandinavians, for example, have an egalitarian approach to their capitalism, which differs from what we find in the United States, where equality of access, rather than of success, is the norm. So, where do we get our values? They come from our families, communities, schools, churches, and indeed from our religion and literature. My own exposure to the conflicts of absolute values came initially from reading Dostoevsky’s Crime and Punishment, wherein Sofya Semyonovna Marmeladov turns to prostitution to support her family. My love of the environment came from reading Yasunari Kawabata’s famous novel, The Old Capital, which purports a harmony between man and nature, rather than the traditional Christian belief that nature must serve man. How does one react then to a phenomenon like Bernie Madoff? Does it not represent the corrosion of moral values in the marketplace? Not quite. The payoffs from corner-cutting, indeed outright theft, have been so huge in the financial sector that those who are crooked are naturally drawn to such scheming. The financial markets did not produce Madoff’s crookedness; Madoff was almost certainly depraved to begin with. The financial sector corrupts morality in the same sense that the existence of an escort service corrupted Eliot Spitzer. Should we blame the governor’s transgressions on the call girls rather than on his own flaws?

#### And not the root cause

Aberdeen, Author & Philanthropist, ‘3

[Richard, Uncommon Sense, Ch. 80, p. google]

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed.  This is a rather unfortunate and historically myopic view, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon **resorted to violence** as a means to achieve rather questionable ends.  And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem.  Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors.  These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed.  For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors.  Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation.  More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation.  The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹  does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see for more details).  So-called “classes” of people,unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation.  Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest.  War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this. Junior Bush and the neo-conservative genocidal maniacs of modern-day America could not have recently effectively gone to war against Iraq without the individual support of individual troops and a certain percentage of individual citizens within the U.S. population, each lending support for their own personal motives, whatever they individually may have been.  While it is true that corrupt leaders often provoke war, using all manner of religious, social and political means to justify, often as not, entirely ludicrous ends, very rare indeed is a battle only engaged in by these same unscrupulous miscreants of power.  And though a few iniquitous elitist powerbrokers may initiate nefarious policies of global genocidal oppression, it takes a very great many individuals operating from individual personal motivations of survival, desire and greed to develop these policies into a multi-national exploitive reality. No economic or political organization and no political or social cause exists unto itself but rather, individual members power a collective agenda.  A workers’ strike has no hope of succeeding if individual workers do not perceive a personal benefit.  And similarly, a corporation will not exploit workers if doing so is not believed to be in the economic best interest of those who run the corporation and who in turn, must answer (at least theoretically) to individuals who collectively through purchase or other allotment of shares, own the corporation.  Companies have often been known to appear benevolent, offering both higher wages and improved benefits, if doing so is perceived to be in the overall economic best interest of the immediate company and/or larger corporate entity. Non-unionized business enterprises frequently offer ‘carrots’ of appeasement to workers in order to discourage them from organizing and historically in the United States, concessions such as the forty-hour workweek, minimum wage, workers compensation and proscribed holidays have been grudgingly capitulated to by greedy capitalist masters as necessary concessions to avoid profit-crippling strikes and outright revolution. It is important to understand that so-called workers ‘rights’ and benefits were not volunteered by American capitalists or their political stooges (including several U.S. presidents) without extreme and often violent worker coercive persuasion over a great many years of prolonged strikes and similar worker revolts.  Modern supply-side Adam Smith inspired economic pipe dreams of unencumbered markets freely moving toward the common good are clearly and fundamentally, based on outright lies and not very well-masked, deliberate capitalist deception (again, see [Gallo Brothers](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/gallobrothers.html) for more information.  Those who proclaim the twisted gospel of modern supply-side economic theory are generally those who have a lot to gain from its acceptance, both economically and politically. Large political and other problems are historically created gradually stemming from negative individual leading to negative group motivation, in turn leading to negative individual and group action.  The correct root solution to humanity’s problems becomes, by historical default, changing individual negative motivation towards positive motivation.  This is not at all a new theory, as it was first stated over two thousand years ago by Jesus, historically the founder of Human and Civil Rights and not at all, the founder of Christianity or of any other religious movement; virtually everything Jesus said and did goes directly to human motivation, is community oriented, has little to do with modern conceptions of religion and is the antithesis of modern Christianity (see [Revolution](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/revolution.html) for more information).  Contrary to many current views painted of him, Jesus was extremely political, the correct political (and other) solution from true perspective being to center on and change individual motivation.  That is, if we wish to constructively change the extensive political and social problem plaguing our planet today, the root cause of negative individual human motivation leading to negative action must be addressed at the fundamental individual level. This correct political theory is seen as successfully initiated by early followers of Jesus, who practiced extreme communism, having no law “but to love one another”, sharing all things in common, allotting to each according to their need and giving the excess to the poor (which since they were mostly very poor, was a true sacrifice). ²   This was a way of life foreign to their culture, was viewed as a severe threat to the established religious and political order and thus, they were thrown to the lions accordingly.  The arising extended movement, called “The Way” by those who joined (it was not called “Christianity” by them, nor did these early followers view themselves as founders of a religion ), ³  represents extreme far-left radicalism even by modern liberal activist cooperative standards.  It has thus been historically demonstrated that if people practice the Human Rights foundation axiom set down by Jesus to treat other people as we ourselves wish to be treated, established ways of living will change, including non-violent elimination of the entire idea of capitalist oppression based on individual gain and private property ownership.  In practicing The Way, economic oppression is dealt with from the root cause up and thus, is overcome with love and peaceful unselfish collective co-existence. It is important to note that claiming to be a follower of Jesus and actually practicing “The Way” are today usually two entirely different realities; the modern 21st Century world has plenty of examples of the former and virtually no examples of the latter. Lenin and the Communist party overthrew a very oppressive capitalist Czarist system.  It did not take long for one corrupt system to be replaced by another, where even without capitalism and free enterprise to aggravate the Human Rights problem, people of power within the Communist political structure began, similar to their counterparts of capitalistic excess in Europe and America, exploiting the mass population for their own individual benefit, comfort and excess.  Thus the root problem is exposed as going deeper than simply changing an oppressive capitalist or other system.  Quite obviously, changing a corrupt system does not by itself, change the corrupt people who invented and supported it, neither does it change negative individual motivation leading to group oppression based on irrational disparagement of others regarding sex, color, intelligence or other perceived difference and neither does it prevent waste, laziness, murder, theft and rape by individuals within a perceived economic “class”.