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### Social Movements 1NC

#### Mass consciousness is high now but the aff causes it to be co-opted. A living wage quells protests for racial justice

Moore 15 [(Ty Moore, 15 Now Organizing Director) “UNITING FIGHT FOR $15 WITH FERGUSON FURY” Jan 3, 2015] AT

Unfortunately, the union leaders’ ties to the Democratic Party at the national and local level – where Democratic mayors oversee racist police policies in most major cities – undermine their ability to win the trust of youthful protesters. These same Democratic Party leaders have played a generally conservative role in the fight for $15. They sometimes offer solidarity in words to fast food workers protesting McDonalds, but fail to champion $15 where they have the power to act at the city, state, and federal level. During the Ferguson protests especially, the Governor and other Democratic Party politicians who intervened did so mainly to quell the protests, either through supporting police repression or demanding protesters clear the streets to restore “peace.” So it is understandable that many youthful #BlackLivesMatter protesters are afraid that partnering with politicians and union leaders risks co-optation. Some will remember that during the Occupy movement in 2011, SEIU’s president Mary Kay Henry orchestrated a joint national day of action with Occupy Wall Street leaders, only to use the event to offer SEIU’s high profile early endorsement of Obama, calling him the “President of the 99%” to the outrage of most Occupy activists. There is mass popular anger at income inequality, racism, sexism, environmental destruction, and the corporate corruption of both major political parties. Polls show half of all young people have a negative view of capitalism, and anti-capitalist consciousness is highest in Black communities. The same youthful, combative, and radical mood expressed in the Occupy Wall Street protests of 2011 are present today in the #BlackLivesMatter movement, with the crucial difference that today’s movement is bringing a more oppressed, working class section of youth to the forefront. However, like Occupy before, the new movement against police racism will quickly face tough decisions. Endless protests and highway takeovers, if not connected to a clearly understood strategy to win tangible victories, will eventually exhaust the movement. A section of activists will be co-opted into the well funded non-profits and Democratic Party aligned efforts pushing for small-scale reforms. Limiting our demands to band-aid reforms like police cameras or slowing the flow of military weaponry to local police, while positive, won’t be enough to inspire the kind of mass movement needed. There is a burning desire to see fundamental changes. Yet many liberal leaders make the mistake of limiting demands to what they believe the current system, the current government, can “realistically” deliver. This so-called “realistic” approach fails in two ways. It fails because, as Malcolm X famously explained, “you can’t have capitalism without racism,” which means there is no way to meet the expectations of the movement for fundamental change without challenging the whole rotten system. The liberal approach of limiting our demands to small-scale reforms also fails because it undermines our strength to even win those small reforms! Mass movements are the only power that can win meaningful reforms for working people, but to inspire the level of energy and self-sacrifice needed to sustain mass struggle, activists need confidence that fundamental changes are within reach. How can this confidence be built when our fighting demands remain limited to what this rotten capitalist system and deeply corrupted two-party political system is prepared to deliver? Historically, all the most significant reforms within capitalism have been won when the ruling class is threatened with widening revolutionary consciousness. In contrast to liberal leaders, socialists urge movements to link up demands around immediate small-scale reforms with bigger transformative demands that offer a vision of fundamental change. The young people demanding justice for Mike Brown and Eric Garner have made clear they want to live in a society free from racist police policies, free from poverty, from unequal jobs, unequal housing, unequal education, etc.

#### These protests are key to force policymakers to improve racial justice and end the criminalization of black people

Cadore 14 [“If We Don’t Kick Racism Out of Criminal Justice Now, Then When?” Pacific Standard Magazine DEC 31, 2014] AT

The failure of the United States criminal justice system to protect non-white people is at an all-time high. The opportunity to correct course is now. The recent killings of Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Trayvon Martin, Rekia Boyd, Renisha McBride, and other black men and women—most at the hands of the police—together with the ongoing nationwide protests under the banner “Black Lives Matter” can be a great awakening of the American conscience about our criminalization of nonwhite people. We must reform the justice system so that every black boy and girl is free to walk unafraid in his or her own neighborhood without being stopped, questioned, frisked, and arrested at the will of the police. Otherwise, the murders of Garner, Brown, and others will have been in vain, and today’s protests and outrage at the non-indictment of the police who killed them will be recorded as mere political theater. America’s war on drugs has played a major role in criminalizing our nation’s non-white people. Black people, especially young black men, experience discrimination at every stage of the judicial system. They are more likely to be stopped, searched, arrested, convicted, harshly sentenced, and saddled with a lifelong criminal record. This is despite the fact that blacks comprise 13 percent of the U.S. population and use drugs at similar rates to people of other races. There are 2.2 million Americans in prisons or jails. It was not changes in crime rates but misguided and biased laws and policies that led to this drastic increase. In 2012 alone, there were more than 1.5 million drug arrests in the U.S. The vast majority—more than 80 percent—were only for possession. About 500,000 Americans are behind bars on any given night for a drug law violation—a population that has grown tenfold since 1980. My work for the Drug Policy Alliance to end America's war on drugs forces me to confront a criminal justice system based on laws and policies that only appear to be equal, just, and race-neutral, but that have an overtly racist impact on non-white communities. A defining moment was my realization that the people who enforce this system—a white ruling elite—seems to believe that the non-white “others” in this country do not deserve equal justice. Policymakers have used drug war policies and criminal justice laws to undermine the values they were elected to protect. In the name of winning a war on drugs and “keeping communities safe,” 2.7 million children are growing up in U.S. households in which one or more parents are incarcerated for non-violent offenses, primarily drug offenses. One in nine black children has an incarcerated parent, compared to one in 28 Latino children and one in 57 white children. More than half (54 percent) of incarcerated people, including more than 120,000 mothers, and 1.1 million fathers are parents of children under age 18. To begin any serious national discussion on radically transforming our criminal justice system, we must first confront our deepest beliefs about what truly makes each of us human and deserving. I have come to believe that the popularization of the image of a white God has had not only theological but political implications for how we treat non-white people in this country. Last spring, I was invited to Chicago to participate in a two-day summit, “The Intersection of Criminalization and Race.” A highlight was a presentation titled “The Color of Christ” by Edward J. Blum, a professor of race and religion at San Diego State University and co-author of The Color of Christ: Son of God and The Saga of Race in America. His presentation forced me to question the origin of black dehumanization in America: Could the fabricated misconception of a white savior be the pillar on which white supremacy and black subjugation is built? Is the notion of whiteness as good, pure, and divine and blackness as bad, sinful, and undeserving the bedrock on which our criminal justice system is built? Can this help explain a 40-year war on drugs that has incarcerated tens of millions of predominantly black and brown men and women? Poor and black communities are the battleground on which America’s war on drugs is fought. Each day, I grapple with the unsettling fact that thousands of mostly black men and women disappear from neighborhoods across this country and there is only a whisper. We’ve used language and color association to give meaning to socioeconomic and public health problems: We created the “predator” to criminalize young black men, we embraced the term “crack babies” to demonize black mothers and pathologize black children. We see people living in black communities as dangerous and we allow our perception of blackness to justify their devaluation as undeserving of our care, advocacy, and compassion. Why are we not outraged that millions of Americans are locked up? Why are we complacent about billions of our tax dollars being siphoned away from education and health care and into policing and prisons? Is it because the war on drugs is wreaking havoc on predominantly non-white communities? Right now in America there is a rare opportunity to demand answers to these questions before protests against racism and outrage at the murder of young black men by police die down. It may be that our policymakers don’t care about those they perceive to be inherently deviant, innately criminal, and historically licentious. But they have a responsibility to fix this system—and as voters, we must hold them accountable. Our policymakers have an important role in changing public perception and in promoting policy changes rooted in evidence. It may be that they don’t care about those they perceive to be inherently deviant, innately criminal, and historically licentious. But they have a responsibility to fix this system and, as voters, we must hold them accountable. We must make a commitment that never again will we allow policies and laws to be made in our name that promote and placate racism and injustice. It behooves us to be bold in our demands. We can no longer accept incarceration as good social policy. We must demand policies that strengthen communities. Police officers cannot be allowed to wage war on the communities they are paid to protect and serve, and police departments must be representative of the communities in which they are located. Additionally, we must advocate for policies such as Racial Impact Statements. Policymakers should be required to demonstrate that the laws they are making will not unfairly burden any one racial group. We must end mandatory minimum drug sentences; sending any American to prison for decades for non-violent drug offenses is un-American. Lastly, similar to the Senate Intelligence Committee report on CIA torture, we must have a congressional investigation of our drug and sentencing laws and of police practice. We cannot afford to lose another generation of black Americans to drug war violence, over-criminalization and mass incarceration. We can do this. Today, with tens of thousands of Americans taking to the streets nationwide to demonstrate that “Black Lives Matter,” we have the power to gently shove our elected officials to rebuild our justice system. But it’s equally about addressing the deep misconceptions we hold as a society. In this way we can begin to redeem that deaths of Renisha, Rekia, Trayvon, Eric, and Mike and millions more who were wronged by a system that distributed justice based not on their offense but on the color of their skins.

### Egypt Proves

#### Egypt proves

Xinhua 14 [“News Analysis: Egypt mulls minimum wage to appease protesters” China.org January 22, 2014] AT

Egypt's interim government plans to implement minimum wage regulations in an attempt to quell protesters who demand social justice and better living conditions, demands that led to the famous Jan. 25 upheaval, but some analysts said this move could harm the country's deteriorating economy. The interim government announced it would raise public sector minimum wages from 700 to 1,200 Egyptian pounds (around 172 U.S. dollars) as of January 2014. Many activists and economists said the figure will satisfy large segments of Egyptian workers despite still being relatively low compared to recent price hikes. Other experts said the changes will add more pressure on the economy hammered by three years of recession. "The minimum wage is successful politically, but a failure economically," said Mohamed Salem, an economics professor at Cairo University. He describes the decision as "catastrophic," arguing it will have a negative impact on the investments, business sector companies and the state budget.

### Mass Incarc 🡪 Crime

#### Mass incarceration increases crime

Defina 12 [(Lance Hannon, Professor of Sociology at Villanova University; Robert Defina, Professor and Chairperson Department of Sociology and Criminology at Villanova Univ) “Sowing the Seeds: How Adult Incarceration Promotes Juvenile Delinquency” Crime, Law and Social Change Volume 57, Issue 5 , pp 475-491] AT

Concentrated Imprisonment’s Impact on Families and Child Development Perhaps the easiest way to think about the potential for mass incarceration [has] to produce delinquency is to consider the collateral consequences for the partners and children of inmates. Surveys of men in prison reveal that while such men are less likely to be married than men on the outside, they are just as likely to have children (Western 2006; Wildeman and Western 2010). According to some recent estimates, over twenty-five percent of African American children born in 1990 had a parent imprisoned (Wildeman 2009). For White children, that figure is closer to four percent (2009). Across the U.S., such estimates suggest that millions of children have experienced the loss of a parent due to mass incarceration. 6 These children, and the single parents that raise them, experience a significant disadvantage in terms of lost family income (Oliver et al., 2007; Western and Beckett, 1999; DeFina and Hannon 2010a). Research reveals that most prisoners were working in legitimate occupations at the time of their arrest and were major contributors to their families’ earnings before imprisonment(Mumola, 2000). Moreover, even after an offender’s time is served an incarceration experience can severely limit the earnings capacity of parental breadwinners via the erosion of marketable skills, the loss of social networks, prison socialization into destructive attitudes and, perhaps most importantly, the scarlet letter of an incarceration record and what it means to potential employers (Western, Kling and Weiman, 2001; Pager, 2003). The loss of family income is not limited to the foregone wages of the prisoner or ex-prisoner, however. The loss of one parent also affects the earning capacity of the remaining parent. Most obviously, childcare needs can significantly decrease the time and flexibility needed to find and keep a job. In addition, precious time and money will be spent visiting or calling the prison (Braman, 2002). Often times, the remaining parent changes residence to get closer to the prison or to avoid neighborhood stigma (Braman 2002). Sometimes, the remaining parent starts a new relationship (Braman 2002). The introduction of such disruptions and resource disadvantages to already fragile families could promote delinquency through a variety of mechanisms, such as sporadic parental monitoring. Furthermore, beyond material considerations, parental incarceration has been shown to be associated with significant negative emotional and developmental outcomes for children (Johnson, 1995 and Sack, 1977). Some recent research suggests that a parent’s incarceration is linked to temper tantrums in children as young as three (Geller et al. 2009). Other recent studies suggest that parental incarceration is associated with anxiety and depression in older boys (Murray and Farrington 2008), as well as physical aggression (Wildeman 2010). Additionally, a new study suggests that much of the disparity between African American and White children in behavioral and mental health problems can be explained by racial differences in parental imprisonment (Wakefield and Wildeman 2011).From the perspective of the intergenerational transmission of crime, childhood mental and behavioral problems can be precursors to serious delinquency and ultimately, adult crime (Clear 1996; Hagan and Dinovitzer 1999; Foster and Hagan 2007; Travis and Waul 2003). One estimate suggests that between thirteen and twenty-nine percent of all serious juvenile delinquency may be an indirect product of parental incarceration’s effect on the material and emotional wellbeing of children (Pritikin 2008). This estimate is arguably conservative in that it is derived from general data on the impact of family disruption and does not take into account the unique ways that parental incarceration is more psychologically damaging to children than other reasons for parental absence. On a more macro level, the massive scale of the incarceration boom could affect youths’ normative expectations about transitions to adulthood (Massoglia and Uggen 2010) as well as their fear of going to prison (Clear 1996). Arguing that the deterrent effect of prison is based on the mystery of how horrible the experience 8 could be, Todd Clear (1996) has argued that rather than having a “scared straight” effect, hyper-incarceration has normalized the prison experience, particularly among economically marginalized minority populations. Clear (1996:8-9) notes: The real-life experience of each prisoner grounds an understanding of the prison for each parent, child, and loved-one known to that prisoner…The children, mothers, brothers, and sisters of prisoners in these neighborhoods are some of the nation's most well-informed consumers of the "scared straight" prison lecture…They know that the people in prison include some brutal and repulsive types as well as people like their father or brother. Instead of a dark fear of prison, they have a grounded image of what day-today life there entails. This is almost certainly not a pleasant image, but it is reality-based…If nearly everyone has a brother, father, or uncle who has gone to prison, the mortification one feels at the experience is less powerful. Thus, at the level of youth culture, mass incarceration may further the likelihood of delinquency by undermining the criminal justice system’s potential for general deterrence. Concentrated Imprisonment’s Impact on the Collective Efficacy of Communities Similarly, a burgeoning research literature suggests that the large scale and geographic concentration of incarceration has implications for beliefs and actions concerning the maintenance of community order (Clear et al. 2003; Clear 2007; Rose and Clear 1998; Rose and Clear 2004; Lynch and Sabol 2004; Sampson and Loeffler 2010). This literature builds on a long tradition in criminology proposing a link between population turnover and crime rates. The traditional social disorganization perspective, exemplified by Shaw and McKay’s (1942) classic work, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas, suggests that communities constantly in flux lack the ability to police themselves. Such a capacity for informal social control is generally derived from longer-term relationships with neighbors and knowledge of 9 established community norms and routines. Residents in socially disorganized communities do not watch out for one another, and importantly, one another’s children. It is often said that it takes a village to raise a child; the social disorganization perspective might add that it takes a village where people know and trust one another to do it right. In traditional social disorganization theory the source of population instability typically has been thought to stem from economic considerations such as job prospects, affordable housing, and the quality of neighborhood schools. However, given the dramatic increase in incarceration rates over the last few decades, contemporary theorists argue that hyper-incarceration’s “coercive mobility” needs to be recognized as a major source of population turnover (Clear 2007; Clear et al. 2001; Roberts 2004). Like the residential mobility of a more voluntary nature, the widespread removal and sporadic reentry of offenders negatively affects the ability of lawabiding community members to mobilize to achieve collective goals, such as keeping gangs of juveniles in check. Noting that the disorganizing “population churning” associated with mass imprisonment is most pronounced in areas already suffering from high levels of criminogenic disadvantage, Todd Clear (2007:84) argues that the “normative consensus and interpersonal connectedness that are the foundation of collective efficacy are undermined by high levels of concentrated incarceration and reentry.” Citing research by Jeffrey Fagan and Tom Tyler (2005), Clear (2007) further notes that legal cynicism flourishes in high incarceration neighborhoods, and this cynicism is not limited to only those who have directly experienced 10 incarceration. This widespread lessened legitimacy of law can ultimately lead to higher rates of juvenile delinquency through a variety of mechanisms, including, for example, reluctance to workwith the police in enforcing curfews. Finally, hyper-incarceration can harm the legitimate economy of a community as the effects of lost income for offenders/ex-offenders and their families ultimately impact community institutions. A feedback loop develops where the decreased spending caused by lost income due to incarceration results in fewer businesses that are able to remain solvent, which in turn leads to unemployment and further economic woes. Additionally, crucial non-profit institutions, such as community churches, can be negatively impacted by the snowballing economic contraction. Because such institutions frequently [which] provide goods and services that help keep youth out of trouble, their weakening can intensify[ing] the collateral consequences of mass imprisonment.

#### Empirics prove

Defina 12 [(Lance Hannon, Professor of Sociology at Villanova University; Robert Defina, Professor and Chairperson Department of Sociology and Criminology at Villanova Univ) “Sowing the Seeds: How Adult Incarceration Promotes Juvenile Delinquency” Crime, Law and Social Change Volume 57, Issue 5 , pp 475-491] AT

The empirical estimates provide general support for the hypotheses of Clear (1996), Rose and Clear (1998) and Clear, et al. (2003) that mass incarceration disrupts families, communities, and illegitimate markets leading to negative outcomes such as higher juvenile arrest rates. In all of the models considered, the squared incarceration rate was positive and significant, suggesting that higher levels of incarceration rates have increasingly deleterious impacts that result in increasingly higher juvenile arrest rates. Because places with high incarceration rates also tend to have a high proportion of minority residents, the results imply that the delinquency-promoting effect will be more pronounced in minority areas. The estimated impact of incarceration was found holding constant other indicators of social disorganization. Thus, incarceration appears to be a unique avenue through which disorganization occurs and harms communities. Similarly, because the models controlled for adult arrest rates, the impact of incarceration can be interpreted as leading to the juvenilization of crime. That is, juvenile arrests are increasing relative to adult arrests.

#### And it causes recidivism

Cullen et al 11 [“Prisons Do Not Reduce Recidivism : The High Cost of Ignoring Science” Francis T. Cullen, Cheryl Lero Jonson and Daniel S. Nagin The Prison Journal 2011 91: 48S originally published online 19 July 2011] AT

Second, Cassia Spohn and David Holleran (2002) examined 1993 data from offenders convicted of felonies in Jackson County, Missouri (which contains Kansas City). Following subjects for 48 months, they compared the recidivism rates of 776 offenders placed on probation versus 301 offenders sent to prison. Their message was straightforward: “We find no evidence that impris- onment reduces the likelihood of recidivism” (p. 329). Indeed, they found that being sent to prison was associated with increased recidivism and that those incarcerated reoffended more quickly than those placed on probation. Furthermore, they discovered that the criminogenic effect of prison was especially high for drug offenders, who were 5 to 6 times more likely to recidivate than those placed on probation.

## Capitalism DA

### Inequality Good DA

#### High income inequality makes revolution against the super-rich inevitable.

Hanauer 14 writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

But let’s speak frankly to each other. I’m not the smartest guy you’ve ever met, or the hardest-working. I was a mediocre student. I’m not technical at all—I can’t write a word of code. What sets me apart, I think, is a tolerance for risk and an intuition about what will happen in the future. Seeing where things are headed is the essence of entrepreneurship. And what do I see in our future now? I see pitchforks. At the same time that people like you and me are thriving beyond the dreams of any plutocrats in history, the rest of the country—the 99.99 percent—is lagging far behind. The divide between the haves and have-nots is getting worse really, really fast. In 1980, the top 1 percent controlled about 8 percent of U.S. national income. The bottom 50 percent shared about 18 percent. Today the top 1 percent share about 20 percent; the bottom 50 percent, just 12 percent. But the problem isn’t that we have inequality. Some inequality is intrinsic to any high-functioning capitalist economy. The problem is that inequality is at historically high levels and getting worse every day. Our country is rapidly becoming less a capitalist society and more a feudal society. Unless our policies change dramatically, the middle class will disappear, and we will be back to late 18th-century France. Before the revolution. And so I have a message for my fellow filthy rich, for all of us who live in our gated bubble worlds: Wake up, people. It won’t last. If we don’t do something to fix the glaring inequities in this economy, the pitchforks are going to come for us. No society can sustain this kind of rising inequality. In fact, there is no example in human history where wealth accumulated like this and the pitchforks didn’t eventually come out. You show me a highly unequal society, and I will show you a police state. Or an uprising. There are no counterexamples. None. It’s not if, it’s when. Many of us think we’re special because “this is America.” We think we’re immune to the same forces that started the Arab Spring—or the French and Russian revolutions, for that matter. I know you fellow .01%ers tend to dismiss this kind of argument; I’ve had many of you tell me to my face I’m completely bonkers. And yes, I know there are many of you who are convinced that because you saw a poor kid with an iPhone that one time, inequality is a fiction. Here’s what I say to you: You’re living in a dream world. What everyone wants to believe is that when things reach a tipping point and go from being merely crappy for the masses to dangerous and socially destabilizing, that we’re somehow going to know about that shift ahead of time. Any student of history knows that’s not the way it happens. Revolutions, like bankruptcies, come gradually, and then suddenly. One day, somebody sets himself on fire, then thousands of people are in the streets, and before you know it, the country is burning. And then there’s no time for us to get to the airport and jump on our Gulfstream Vs and fly to New Zealand. That’s the way it always happens. If inequality keeps rising as it has been, eventually it will happen. We will not be able to predict when, and it will be terrible—for everybody. But especially for us.

#### The revolution will challenge capitalism itself. Minimum wage increases stabilize capitalism and shut down anti-capitalist social movements

Hanauer 14 writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

One thing we can agree on—I’m sure of this—is that the change isn’t going to start in Washington. Thinking is stale, arguments even more so. On both sides. But the way I see it, that’s all right. Most major social movements have seen their earliest victories at the state and municipal levels. The fight over the eight-hour workday, which ended in Washington, D.C., in 1938, began in places like Illinois and Massachusetts in the late 1800s. The movement for social security began in California in the 1930s. Even the Affordable Health Care Act—Obamacare—would have been hard to imagine without Mitt Romney’s model in Massachusetts to lead the way. Sadly, no Republicans and few Democrats get this. President Obama doesn’t seem to either, though his heart is in the right place. In his State of the Union speech this year, he mentioned the need for a higher minimum wage but failed to make the case that less inequality and a renewed middle class would promote faster economic growth. Instead, the arguments we hear from most Democrats are the same old social-justice claims. The only reason to help workers is because we feel sorry for them. These fairness arguments feed right into every stereotype of Obama and the Democrats as bleeding hearts. Republicans say growth. Democrats say fairness—and lose every time. But just because the two parties in Washington haven’t figured it out yet doesn’t mean we rich folks can just keep going. The conversation is already changing, even if the billionaires aren’t onto it. I know what you think: You think that Occupy Wall Street and all the other capitalism-is-the-problem protesters disappeared without a trace. But that’s not true. Of course, it’s hard to get people to sleep in a park in the cause of social justice. But the protests we had in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis really did help to change the debate in this country from death panels and debt ceilings to inequality. It’s just that so many of you plutocrats didn’t get the message. Dear 1%ers, many of our fellow citizens are starting to believe that capitalism itself is the problem. I disagree, and I’m sure you do too. Capitalism, when well managed, is the greatest social technology ever invented to create prosperity in human societies. But capitalism left unchecked tends toward concentration and collapse. It can be managed either to benefit the few in the near term or the many in the long term. The work of democracies is to bend it to the latter. That is why investments in the middle class work. And tax breaks for rich people like us don’t. Balancing the power of workers and billionaires by raising the minimum wage isn’t bad for capitalism. It’s an indispensable tool smart capitalists use to make capitalism stable and sustainable. And no one has a bigger stake in that than zillionaires like us. The oldest and most important conflict in human societies is the battle over the concentration of wealth and power. The folks like us at the top have always told those at the bottom that our respective positions are righteous and good for all. Historically, we called that divine right. Today we have trickle-down economics. What nonsense this is. Am I really such a superior person? Do I belong at the center of the moral as well as economic universe? Do you? My family, the Hanauers, started in Germany selling feathers and pillows. They got chased out of Germany by Hitler and ended up in Seattle owning another pillow company. Three generations later, I benefited from that. Then I got as lucky as a person could possibly get in the Internet age by having a buddy in Seattle named Bezos. I look at the average Joe on the street, and I say, “There but for the grace of Jeff go I.” Even the best of us, in the worst of circumstances, are barefoot, standing by a dirt road, selling fruit. We should never forget that, or forget that the United States of America and its middle class made us, rather than the other way around. Or we could sit back, do nothing, enjoy our yachts. And wait for the pitchforks.

### Capitalism DA – Contradictions

#### Capitalism is collapsing now – its internal contradictions accelerate and state action is unable to solve, resulting in collapse – however, collapse isn’t inevitable – it’s now or never, we should let cap collapse before states resolve its contradictions

Panitch 13 [(Leo, Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science at York University and editor of the Socialist Register ; and Sam Gindin) “The Making of Global Capitalism” Conclusion. Jan 31, 2013] AT

Although the institutions of the European Union have more constitutional authority than other international organizations, their inability to intervene so as to resolve the debt crisis of their smaller member states is largely due to the internal political dynamics within other member states, above all Germany. The eurozone crisis also confirms a basic fact about the nature of both globalization and informal empire: state sovereignty is not effaced within it. This can be seen in the difficulties the American state has continually had to confront in getting the German state, from the time of the Herstaat banking crisis in the 1970s to the Mexican crisis in the 1990s to the crisis of the Euro today, to overcome its obsession with inflation and ‘moral hazard’ and to take its share of responsibility for containing crises. Yet this cannot be understood in terms of states, least of all Germany, retreating from free trade and free capital flows in favour of economic nationalism. After decades of economic integration, there are no national bourgeoisies like those that supported the fascist turn in Germany or Italy in the interwar period. When the term ‘empire’ was openly embraced to characterize the American state at the time of the Bush administration’s response to 9/11 (including by some of its advisors), the stress was placed, in Niall Ferguson’s words, on the ‘potential advantages of a self-conscious American imperialism’ as against ‘the grave perils of being an “empire in denial”’. The anxieties of a Kansas farmer that ‘we are trying to run the world too much… like the Romans used to’ were taken as exemplifying not just the difficulties of mediating the American state’s international and domestic roles, but the loss of imperial vigour and discipline, the main measure of which, allegedly, was that the bill for Social Security in the US was larger than the bill for national security. Notably, it was not a new world of rival imperial states that occupied the minds of such analysts of US empire. The eyes cast askance at Germany and France over the tensions which the invasion of Iraq initially produced were largely overcome once these states introduced the motion at the UN to have it endorse the occupation a year later; while the US integration with China was such that Ferguson himself dubbed it ‘Chimerica’. With the typically absurd hyperbole that was so common in the years after 9/11, he rather claimed it was now only ‘non-state actors’ like criminal organizations and terrorist cells ‘who truly wield global power’. The real problems of the US empire today appear in a very different light. As the global economic crisis triggered by the American financial crisis of 2007-8 persists, these problems have more to do with the difficulties of implementing adequate measures for ‘failure containment’, let alone ‘failure prevention’. Yet unlike the 1930s this has not been due to a breakdown of cooperation among capitalist states. As the G20 Toronto Summit communiqué of June 2010 proclaimed: ‘While the global economic crisis led to the sharpest decline of trade in more than seventy years, G20 countries chose to keep markets open to the opportunities that trade and investment offer. It was the right choice.’ The leaders renewed their ‘commitment to refrain from raising barriers or imposing new barriers to investment or trade in goods and services… [and] minimize any negative impact on trade and investment of our domestic policy actions, including fiscal policy and action to support the financial sector.’ But capitalist solidarity itself could not resolve the crisis of a finance-led global economy, where the orthodoxy of insisting on austerity - both to ensure that states pay their bond holders and to maintain vigilance against inflation - reinforces the stagnationist tendencies of under-consumption that comes with the diminished consumer credit available to sustain effective demand. The liberalization and expansion of finance, as this book has shown, was essential to the making of global capitalism, yet it came with a degree of volatility that threatened economic stability. Reviving capitalist health today requires strengthening the confidence of bankers that their activities will be appreciated and their assets protected. The unresolved dilemma for all capitalist states today is how to both stimulate the economy and regulate financial markets so as to limit increasingly dangerous volatility without undermining the ability of finance to play its essential role in capitalism. For most states, any attempt at fiscal stimulus aggravates the fears of bond holders that they won’t be repaid, and the increased rate of interest on the bonds necessary to fund fiscal and trade deficits requires restructuring state expenditure to prioritize interest payments over social expenditures, infrastructure development and public employment - thereby negating the very attempt at stimulus. This is the less the case for the US itself due to the ‘safe haven’ Treasury bonds represent, the appreciation of which is inseparable from the role of the American state as the ultimate guarantor of global capitalist interests. But the US faces its own policy dilemmas in terms of economic stimulus. The one immediate measure the US administration could take on its own to quickly revive effective demand, instructing the US housing agencies it directly controls to write off mortgage debt above the current value of existing homes, has been ruled out because it would reduce the banks’ mandated capital adequacy just as they are being required to raise it, and lower their revenues as homeowners made smaller monthly payments. This once again reveals the structural relationship between Wall Street and Washington: what makes such a move impossible is not that the votes in Congress are not there, but that it would threaten the solvency of some of the very large banks who are more than ever ‘too big to fail’ because their failure would trigger the failures of other financial institutions, not only in the US but around the world. To be sure, the conflict between Congress and the administration, reflecting the internal contradiction which the American state faces between acting as both the state of the United States, and as the ‘indispensable’ state of global capitalism, has certainly worried leading capitalists and officials. The CEO of Caterpillar, the world’s largest manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, called Washington’s debt ceiling saga in the summer of 2011 not only ‘ugly’ but also ‘a red herring’ which got in the way of Congress’s ratification of outstanding free trade agreements, as well as much-needed domestic infrastructure programs. The Fed’s Ben Bernanke, noting that Congress had ‘disrupted financial markets’, warned that ‘similar events in the future could, over time, seriously jeopardize the willingness of investors around the world to hold U.S. financial assets or to make direct investments in job-creating U.S. businesses.’ Yet although it was precisely on these grounds that the credit rating agency Standard & Poor’s downgraded US Treasury bonds, what was especially remarkable was that the appetite for these bonds, even at record low interest rates, far from abating, increased. Ruminations about an alternative reserve currency went nowhere, especially as the smouldering crisis in Europe’s interbank markets burst into flames, sending the widespread earlier expectations that the Euro would challenge the dollar up in smoke. Much like Germany in the crisis of the 1970s, even China today explicitly speaks in terms of the US’s unique responsibilities for ‘the world’s economic soundness’ given its status as ‘the world’s largest economy and the issuer of the dominant international reserve currency’. American political leaders were reminded that ‘political brinkmanship in Washington is dangerously irresponsible… It risks, among other consequences, strangling the still fragile economic recovery of not only the United States but also the world as a whole.’ Similarly, the concerns of capitalists in developing capitalist states were that the US might now abandon them. The extent to which they continued to look to the American state to help them restructure their own states was seen when Obama visited India in November 2010, accompanied by the largest ever entourage of US businessmen on such a trip, and told an assembly of Mumbai capitalists: ‘We don’t simply welcome your rise, we ardently support it. We want to invest in it.’ The importance of this to Indian capitalists was made very clear by the co-founder of India’s National Association of Software and Service Companies, who recalled that the US ‘was the one who said to us… “Go for free trade and open markets.”’ This was crucial to his industry’s success in ‘pushing our government to open our markets for American imports, 100 percent foreign ownership of companies and tough copyright laws when it wasn’t fashionable.’ Stressing the continuing importance of the US in overcoming ‘the socialist/protectionists among India’s bureaucrats’, he emphasized that ‘We don’t want America to lose self-confidence… there is nobody else to take that leadership. Do we want China as the world’s moral leader? No. We desperately want America to succeed.’ There were deep structural factors at work here, reflecting not only the extensive networks that link the world’s capitalists to US MNCs, but to US financial, legal and business services more generally. The enormous demand for US Treasury bonds showed the extent to which the world remained on the dollar standard and the American state continued to be regarded as the main underwriter of value. The US Treasury and Fed’s central role in global crisis management – from currency swaps to provide other states with much needed dollars, to overseeing policy cooperation among the G20 as well as G7 central banks and finance ministries – was also confirmed. It was the formerly highly-touted supranational system of European governance – exposed in the crisis for its lack of central authority over taxation, bond issuance and budget approval – which now appeared most dysfunctional for the management of global capitalism.

#### Minimum wage solves poverty – real world experience and academic consensus

Konczal 14 [Mike Konczal (Mike Konczal is a fellow at the Roosevelt Institute. His work has appeared in The Nation, Slate, and The American Prospect). “7 Bipartisan Reasons to Raise the Minimum Wage.” Boston Review. March 3, 2014] AJ

Some minimum wage advocates don’t care much about income inequality per se. Instead, they are focused on alleviating poverty. Poverty has significant consequences for human flourishing, with especially pronounced effects on children. A major mistake of the War on Poverty was its assumption that the economy would be capable of employing all people at generous wages as long as they had the right skills and as long as discriminatory obstacles were surmounted. Thus job training was a priority. However, during the ’70s, ’80s, and 2000s, wages at the bottom part of the income distribution fell, especially for men, even as the low-wage workforce became more educated. Education and technological advances alone could not solve poverty. Recent research strongly indicates that raising the minimum wage reduces poverty. Dube finds that a 10 percent hike in the minimum wage would reduce the number of people living in poverty by a modest but significant 2.4 percent. It also shrinks the poverty gap—how far people are below the poverty line—by 3.2 percent. And it reduces the poverty-squared gap, a measure of extreme poverty, by 9.6 percent. So it provides meaningful benefits for the poorest individuals. Larger increases would offer even more impressive gains. Raising the minimum wage to $10.10 would lift 4.6 million people out of poverty. It would also boost the incomes of those at the 10th percentile of the income distribution by $1,700 annually. That is a significant benefit for workers who have seen declining wages during the past forty years. In a review of the literature since the 1990s, Dube finds fifty-four estimates of the relationship between poverty and the minimum wage. Forty-eight of them show that a minimum wage reduces poverty. This reflects a remarkable consensus among economists. The effect of an increased minimum wage on poverty is real, and it would be positive.

#### Decreasing inequality solves US economic strength

Harkinson 11 [Josh Harkinson (staff reporter). “Study: Income Inequality Kills Economic Growth.” Mother Jones. October 4th, 2011] AJ

Corporate chieftains often claim that fixing the US economy requires signing new free trade deals, lowering government debt, and attracting lots of foreign investment. But a major new study has found that those things matter less than an economic driver that CEOs hate talking about: equality.

"Countries where income was more equally distributed tended to have longer growth spells," says economist Andrew Berg, whose study appears in the current issue of Finance & Development, the quarterly magazine of the International Monetary Fund. Comparing six major economic variables across the world's economies, Berg found that equality of incomes was the most important factor in preventing a major downturn. (See top chart.) In their study, Berg and coauthor Jonathan Ostry were less interested in looking at how to spark economic growth than how to sustain it. "Getting growth going is not that difficult; it's keeping it going that is hard," Berg explains. For example, the bailouts and stimulus pulled the US economy out of recession but haven't been enough to fuel a steady recovery. Berg's research suggests that sky-high income inequality in the United States could be partly to blame. So how important is equality? According to the study, making an economy's income distribution 10 percent more equitable prolongs its typical growth spell by 50 percent. In one case study, Berg looked at Latin America, which is historically much more economically stratified than emerging Asia and also has shorter periods of growth. He found that closing half of the inequality gap between Latin America and Asia would more than double the expected length of Latin America's growth spells. Increasing income inequality has the opposite effect: "We find that more inequality lowers growth," Berg says. (See bottom chart.) Berg and Ostry aren't the first economists to suggest that income inequality can torpedo the economy. Marriner Eccles, the Depression-era chairman of the Federal Reserve (and an architect of the New Deal), blamed the Great Crash on the nation's wealth gap. "A giant suction pump had by 1929-1930 drawn into a few hands an increasing portion of currently produced wealth," Eccles recalled in his memoirs. "In consequence, as in a poker game where the chips were concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, the other fellows could stay in the game only by borrowing. When the credit ran out, the game stopped." Many economists believe a similar process has unfolded over the past decade. Median wages grew too little over the past 30 years to drive the kind of spending necessary to sustain the consumer economy. Instead, increasingly exotic forms of credit filled the gap, as the wealthy offered the middle class alluring credit card deals and variable-interest subprime loans. This allowed rich investors to keep making money and everyone else to feel like they were keeping up—until the whole system imploded. Income inequality has other economic downsides. Research suggests that unequal societies have a harder time getting their citizens to support government spending because they believe that it will only benefit elites. A population where many lack access to health care, education, and bank loans can't contribute as much to the economy. And, of course, income inequality goes hand-in-hand with crippling political instability, as we've seen during the Arab Spring in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. History shows that "sustainable reforms are only possible when the benefits are widely shared," Berg says. "We hope that we don't have to relearn that the hard way."

#### That staves off collapse – US economic strength GUARANTEES capitalism will survive the crisis

Panitch 13 [(Leo, Distinguished Research Professor of Political Science at York University and editor of the Socialist Register ; and Sam Gindin) “The Making of Global Capitalism” Conclusion. Jan 31, 2013] AT

Although Marx discerned in the middle of the 19th century that a new class of capitalists was creating ‘a world after its own image’, it actually took until the beginning of the 21st century before ‘a constantly expanding market’ could be said to have fully spread capitalist social relations ‘over the entire surface of the globe’. Moreover, it was not a generic ‘bourgeoisie’ driven by competition to ‘nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere’ that alone made global capitalism after its own image. It took an empire of a new kind, founded on US capitalism’s great economic strength and centred on the capacities of the American state, to make global capitalism a reality. Yet no sooner did the task look to be more or less complete when the fourth great crisis of global capitalism (after those of the 1870s, the 1930s and the 1970s) spread rapidly across the world. Marx’s observation 150 years earlier, that the making of capitalism on a global scale was ‘paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises’ while at the same time ‘diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented’, seemed all too fully confirmed. And it was now the American empire that seemed to resemble ‘the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells’. Given the severity and duration of the latest crisis in a global capitalist economy that the American state had been so central to constructing, it was hardly surprising to see a resurgence of pronouncements that US hegemony was coming to an end. As pundits of every persuasion once again blur the lines between a capitalist crisis and the decline of the US empire, it is especially important to recognize the central role which the American state continues to play in reproducing global capitalism. To be sure, the current crisis has amply demonstrated the many challenges and contradictions it faces in doing this, but it has also demonstrated that while the American empire is certainly not always able to control the spirits it has called up from the deep, it nevertheless remains critical to the system’s survival. The new crisis has confirmed more generally the continuing significance of states in global capitalism.

### 2NR Overview

#### Capitalist states are struggling to resolve the internal contradictions of capitalism now – there is an inherent tension where financialization is now necessary for capitalism to survive, but it also ensures massive instability that threatens the system of capitalism itself. This means capitalism will inevitably collapse in the status quo as these contradictions play out, absent efforts to save it – that’s Panitch

#### This allows capitalism to thrive – it’s premised on American power, which allows the US to spread capitalism global and guard it from contradiction. This sustains global capitalism and allows states to prevent crisis from toppling capitalism- that’s Panitch

1. Nick Hanauer (American entrepreneur and venture capitalist living in Shoreline, Washington). “The Pitchforks Are Coming...For Us Plutocrats.” Politico. July/August 2014. Page 1. http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/06/the-pitchforks-are-coming-for-us-plutocrats-108014.html#.VKA3oV4AKA [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Nick Hanauer (American entrepreneur and venture capitalist living in Shoreline, Washington). “The Pitchforks Are Coming...For Us Plutocrats.” Politico. July/August 2014. Page 4. http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/06/the-pitchforks-are-coming-for-us-plutocrats-108014.html#.VKA3oV4AKA [↑](#footnote-ref-2)