### methodology comes first

#### Methodology is the foremost point of departure to any political query. you should evaluate the epistemology of their method prior to weighing the so called risk of solvency because method overdetermines political exigency.

Smith ‘96

[Steve, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, “Positivism and Beyond,” International theory: Positivism and beyond, New York: Cambridge University Press, 12-1 3//

But the stakes are also high because of the links between theory and practice. International theory underpins and informs international practice, even if there is a lengthy lag between the high- point of theories and their gradual absorption into political debate. Once established as common sense, theories become incredibly powerful since they delineate not simply what can be known but also what it is sensible to talk about or suggest. Those who swim outside these safe waters risk more than simply the judgement that their theories are wrong; their entire ethical or moral stance may be ridiculed or seen as dangerous iust because their theoretical assumptions are deemed as unrealistic. Defining common sense is therefore the ultimate act of political power. In this sense what is at stake in debates about epistemology is very significant for political practice. Theories do not simply explain or predict, they tell us what possibilities exist for human action and intervention they define not merely our explanatory possibilities but also our ethical and practical horizons. In this Kantian light epistemology matters, and the stakes are far more considerable than at first sight seem to be the case.

### A2: Permutation

#### Perm fails - Our alternative cannot succeed without radically reorienting social organization —the system will re-articulate any gains to protect profit accumulation, preventing future revolutionary potential. Zero-sum risk of the extinction DA.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P47-48,

Thus, within the framework of the existing socioeconomic system a multiplicity of potentially dialectical interconnections are reproduced in the form of perverse practical dualisms, dichotomies, and antinomies, reducing human beings to a reified condition (whereby they are brought to a common denominator with, and become replaceable by, "locomotives" and other machines) and to the ignominious status of "time's carcase." And since the possibility of practically manifesting and realizing the inherent worth and human specificity of the individuals through their essential productive activity is blocked off as a result of this process of alienating reduction (which makes "one man during an hour worth just as much as another man"), value as such becomes an extremely problematical concept. For, in the interest of capitalist profit- ability, not only can there be no room left for the actualization of the individuals' specific worth but, worse still, counter-value must unceremoniously prevail over value and assert its absolute domination as the one and only admissible practical value-relation. The alternative socialist accountancy cannot prevail unless it succeeds in radically reorienting the process of societal reproduction in its entirety by breaking the tyranny of capital's dehumanizing time imperative. The fundamental categories of the social reproduction process, as inherent in the vital first-order mediations of a sustainable dialectical interaction between humanity and nature on an indefinite historical timescale, have been subverted in the course of development, especially in the last three centuries under the fetishistic imperatives of capital's social metabolic control. Thus the all-important achievement of humanity in the form of potentially emancipatory free time, embodied in society's productively expanding surplus-labor\_ which happens to be both the precondition as well as the promising storehouse of all future advancement, once extricated from its alienating capitalist integument-has been forced into the ultimately suffocating straitjacket of surplus-value under the corollary imperative of reducing necessary labor-time to the minimum, so as to be managed by the system's not only dehumanizing but also in historical terms increasingly more anachronistic time accountancy

#### Perm fails - Capitalist epistemology is inherently contradictory, collapse is inevitable —the alternative is the only way to make the transition sustainable.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.275-276,

In order to create an economically viable and also, on a long-term basis, historically sustainable social reproductive order it is necessary to radically alter the self-contradictory inner determinations of the established one which impose the ruthless submission of human need and use to the alienating necessity of capital expansion. This means that the absurd precondition of the ruling productive system-where- by use-values, by preordained and totally iniquitous determinations of ownership, must be divorced from, and opposed to, those who create them, so as to bring about and circularly/arbitrarily legitimate capital's enlarged self-realization-has to be permanently relegated to the past. Otherwise, the only viable meaning of economy as rational economizing with the available, necessarily finite, resources cannot be instituted and respected as a vital orienting principle. Instead, irresponsible wastefulness dominates in capital's socioeconomic-and corresponding political-order which invariably reasserts itself as institutionalized irresponsibility, notwithstanding its self-mythology of absolutely insuperable "efficiency?' (To be sure, the kind of "efficiency" glorified in this way is in fact capital's ultimately self-undermining efficiency for blindly driving forward the adversarial and conflictual parts at the expense of the whole.) Understandably, therefore, the government's well-promoted fantasies of "market socialism" had to fizzle out in the form of a humiliating collapse, due to the acceptance of such presuppositions and capitalistically insuperable structural determinations.

#### Perm impossible - The limit of capitalist growth proves the need for total critique from outside the structure

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P.282-283

**There can be not even partial correctives introduced into capital's operational framework if they are genuinely quality-oriented.** For the only qualities relevant in this respect are not some abstract physical characteristics but the humanly meaningful qualities inseparable from need. It is true, of course, as stressed before, that such qualities are always specific, corresponding to clearly identifiable particular human needs both of the individuals themselves and of their historically given and changing social relations. Accordingly, in their many sided specificity they constitute a coherent and well-defined set of inviolable systemic determinations, with their own systemic limits. It is precisely the existence of such-very far from abstract-systemic limits which makes impossible to transfer any meaningful operating determinations and orienting principles from the envisaged alternative social metabolic order into the capital system. The two systems are radically exclusive of each other. For the specific qualities corresponding to human need, in the alternative order, carry the indelible marks of their overall systemic determinations, as integral parts of a humanly valid social reproductive system of control. In the capital system, on the contrary, the overall determinations must be inalterably abstract, because capital's value relation must reduce all qualities (corresponding to need and use) to measurable generic quantities, in order to assert its alienating historical dominance over everything, in the interest of capital expansion, irrespective of the consequences. The incompatibilities of the two systems become amply clear when we consider their relationship to the question of limit itself The only sustainable growth positively promoted under the alternative social metabolic control is based on the conscious acceptance of the limits whose violation would imperil the realization of the chosen-and humanly valid-reproductive objectives. Hence, wastefulness and destructiveness (as clearly identified limiting concepts) are absolutely excluded by the consciously accepted systemic determinations them- selves, adopted by social individuals as their vital orienting principles. By contrast, the capital system is characterized, and fatefully driven, by he-conscious or unconscious-rejection of all limits, including its own systemic limits. Even the latter are arbitrarily and dangerously treated as if they were nothing more than separable contingent obstacles. Hence, anything goes in this social reproductive system, including the possibility-and by the time we have reached our own historical epoch also the overwhelming grave probability-of total destruction. Naturally, this mutually exclusive relationship to the question of limits prevails also the other way round. Thus, there can be no "partial correctives" borrowed from the capital system when creating and strengthening the alternative social metabolic order. The partial-not to mention general-incompatibilities of the two systems arise from the radical incompatibility of their value dimension. As mentioned above, this is why the particular value determinations and relations of the alternative order could not be transferred into capital's social metabolic framework for the purpose of improving it, as postulated by some utterly unreal reformist design, wedded to the vacuous methodology of "little by little." For even the smallest relations of the alternative system are deeply embedded in the general value determinations of an overall framework of human needs whose inviolable elementary axiom is the radical exclusion of waste and destruction, in accord with its innermost nature.

### A2: Permutation - Extinction DA

#### A total negation of capital from outside its epistemological structure is key to solve. Relying on the system’s spatial fixes to its own problems causes extinction.

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” 2008 P 251-252,

Past history testifies to many instances of not only noble efforts dedicated to introducing significant social changes in order to overcome some major contradictions but also to some partial successes in the originally envisaged direction. All too often, however) the successes have been sooner or later rolled back by the subsequent restoration of the dependency relations of the earlier status quo. The primary reason for such developments was the fateful inertia of structural inequality reproduced in one form or another throughout history, despite some change in personnel from time to time at the apex of society. For structural inequality acted as an anchor, with shorter or longer chains attached to it, invariably dragging the ship back to a position from which there seemed to be no possibility of further progress in the journey, no matter how well intentioned might have been some of the personnel of the ship during a major historical tempest. And to make things worse, this historically determinate and humanly alterable predicament of the people dominated by the existing order was on a regular basis conceptualized and ideologically rationalized as a fatality of nature, even when it had to be conceded that the prevailing structural inequality was very far from being an all-round beneficial one. The necessary corollary of this kind of rationalization-and justification of the unjustifiable-was that social iniquity as an allegedly unalterable determination of nature (said to be well in tune with "human nature") is permanent and tenable. But what if the notion of permanence as such is put into question by evidence of a clearly identifiable and menacing historical change? For as soon as it must be admitted that human historical time is not measurable in terms of the permanence of nature) not to mention the fact that the lasting temporality of nature itself on our planet is being catastrophically undermined by the ongoing destructive intervention in nature by perverse socioeconomic forces, the whole reasoning of anti-historical justification collapses. At that point, it becomes imperative to orient our- selves well within the potentialities and limitations of real historical time, with a view to radically overcoming the perilous social antagonisms that point in the direction of putting an end to human history. At that point in time, exactly where we stand today, the elaboration of the required remedies in the form of a sustainable alternative social order, together with appropriate safeguards to make that order irreversible, becomes an unavoidable historical challenge. For without successfully meeting that challenge, given the urgency of a unique historical time when the survival of humanity is at stake-under the shadow of both the apparently uncontrollable accumulation and deployment of the "real" and not cynically and self-servingly fictionalized weapons of mass destruction, and of capital's devastating encroachment on nature, humankind cannot risk relapsing into an ever more destructive social order, as if we had the infinity of time at our disposal before we have to undertake some corrective action.

### 2NC ETHICS IMAPCT

#### CAPITALISM MAKES ETHICAL RELATIONS IMPOSSIBLE.

Morgareidge ’98 (Clayton Morgareidge, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College. August 22, 1998http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html)

To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism**, Marx writes, **everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money.** For those who manage and live from capital**, nothing has value of its own.** Mountain streams, clean air, **human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit**.[1] **If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products**. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, **if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced.** **Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care,** to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people**. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital**, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. Therefore **ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable.** People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. **Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.¶**

### 2nc At: capitalism inevitable

**Their inevitability claims are false - growing materialist dialectical knowledge production is key to organize growing discontent.**

Rosenberg and Villarejo 12 (Jordana Rosenberg, MA and PhD from Cornell University, and a BA from Wesleyan University. She is the recipient of an Ahmanson-Getty Fellowship from the Center for Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Studies at UCLA (2009- 2010), as well as a Marion and Jasper Whiting Foundation Award, the Catherine Macaulay Prize, and a William Andrews Clark Memorial Library Joint Fellowship Award. Professor Rosenberg's fields of research and teaching include eighteenth-century transatlantic literature and poetry, moral philosophy, political theory, early modern materialism, Marxism, and secularization; Amy Villarejo, Associate Professor in Film and Feminist, Gender, & Sexuality Studies Program. She received her B.A. in English from Bryn Mawr College in 1985, an M.A. in English from the University of Pittsburgh in 1991, and a Ph.D. in Critical and Cultural Studies (in the Film Studies Program) from the University of Pittsburgh in 1997, when she came to Cornell GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 18, Number 1,2012, Published by Duke University Press, “Introduction: Queerness, Norms, Utopia”)

**For even as neoliberal capitalism conscripts subjects to wage slavery, encloses commons, seizes resources, and consigns populations to death and dispossession, movements for resistance and liberation form and flourish in opposition to these depredations**. And, informed by such activist interventions, t**here has been in recent years a wealth of work documenting, defying, and exposing the specificities of neoliberal capitalism and its various poisonous strategies.** The dimensions of neoliberalism as an ideology, a politics, and an economic tactic have been eloquently and passionately analyzed in articles and in book-length **studies** both inside and outside queer studies. Lisa Duggan, David Eng, Jodi Melamed, Jasbir Puar, and Nikhil Pal Singh **have shown how “neoliberal multiculturalism” masks capitalism’s structural reliance on racism and imperialism in its seemingly endless quest to create and sustain profits**.5 Heterodox economists, historians, and critical geographers such as Gopal Balakrishnan, David Harvey, Anwar M. Shaikh and E. Ahmed Tonak, Gerard Dumenil and Dominique Levy, Chris Harman, and Giovanni Arrighi have charted how financialization, the permanent arms economy, falling profits, stagnant real wages, and the debt economy have convulsed the globe for decades. And, constellating the concerns of American studies, ethnic studies, and queer studies, critics like Roderick Ferguson, Kevin Floyd, Miranda Joseph, and José Muñoz have interrogated the historical lapses of political economy and Marxism in thinking gender, race, and sexuality.6 Such work has initiated critical rapprochements between Marxism and queer studies, through readings of cultural texts marked by neoliberalism’s inception and rise. Thus burdened with the miseries of neoliberal capitalism — and buoyed by the uprisings, liberation movements, and thriving critical approaches that interrogate and resist neoliberalism’s spoliations and havoc — “Queer Studies and the Crises of Capitalism” translates these contradictory castings into a robust engagement with the capitalism in “neoliberal capitalism.” We take to heart Melamed’s acute rendering of the forces of neoliberal multiculturalism, which, in “suturing liberal antiracism to U.S. nationalism,” “depoliticizes capitalism by collapsing it with Americanism” (6). This special issue works to resist such depoliticization by specifying, along with Melamed, that neoliberalism is a qualifier for the more precise analytic and historical category of neoliberal capitalism. For, as Nikhil Pal Singh has argued, “liberalism insists on divorcing universal questions of individual rights from a historical context of unequal property relations and . . . primitive capital accumulation” (28). This is a divorce we must not repeat in our own work. **Liberal ideology longs to veil the violence of capitalism from view, leaving only fantasies about nationalism and the naturalized fiction of a free market in its place**. **Our analytic response to such veilings must be to push capitalism always to the foreground as not simply an object of analysis but as the ground and condition of such analysis as well.** To this end, “Queer Studies and the Crises of Capitalism” invokes quite specifically the Marxist, anticapitalist, and left lineages of thinking neoliberalism. **Neoliberalism, that is, is always neoliberal capitalism.**