**Prefigurative politics explanation: Prefigurative Politics: the deliberate experimental implementation of desired future social relations and practices in the here-and-now (Raekstad & Gradin, 2019 https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/paul-raekstad-and-eivind-dahl-prefigurative-politics)**

## **1NC**

KRITIK FW: The lense from which we should view this round is prefigurative politics. Within the round we are given an opportunity to reimagine the future. We can have the future now through prefigurative politics.

**The capitalist economy enforces abuse against women by failing to address the patriarchy rooted in the economy.**

**Mazurana and McKay, 2001 -** Research Director of Gender, Youth, and Community at Tufts Univ. and

contributor to The Irish Times [Dyan and Susan “Women, Girls, and Structural Violence: A Global Analysis”, (<http://u.osu.edu/christie/files/2014/10/Chapter-11-Women-Girls-Structural-Violence-Mazurana-McKay-xu91z1.pdf>**). -BS**

**The male bias inherent in (patriarchal) democracy has led to forms of patriarchal structural violence** that relegate “women’s issues” to the “private” realm where they become “private matters” that the state does not address. This bias is perhaps nowhere clearer than **in the issue of domestic violence, where male bias** greatly **impairs** the ability of police, judges, and **lawmakers from recognizing the violent behavior** in the family. “The view that ‘as a family matter’ battery is less important, is based on men’s, not women’s perceptions” (Murray & O’Regan, 1991, p. 45). The multiple forms of domestic violence that **women suffer** have profound (Herman, 1992; Kelly, 1993), prompting international calls for domestic violence

to be recognized**physical and psychological effects** as a form of torture (Copelon, 1994). Governmental support of patriarchal structural violence through its inattention to “private” matters is apparent throughout the world. Until 1991, the murder of a wife in Brazil was legal—it was considered an honor killing and was done to preserve the family’s honor because of a woman’s transgression. In many areas of the world, men are free to rape their wives with no threat of legal repercussions (Mertus, 1995). Other examples of government-sponsored patriarchal structural violence include laws and systems that condone particular forms of violence against women, deny women control over their bodies, provide no assistance with child care and maternity leave, make no attempt to remedy child support defaults, and fail to provide unemployment protection to women who work within the “private” realm in domestic service or farm work (Waring, 1988; Murray & O’Regan, 1991).

Because **governments rarely address patriarchal structural violence** or fight for women’s rights, **progress for women is largely made by women** working for the recognition and enforcement of women’s rights. As a result, in countries such as Australia, Brazil, Britain, Columbia, India, Sri Lanka, and the United States, violence against women in the home has been identified and some forms of it criminalized (Fineman & Mykitiuk, 1994)

**The reliance of welfare distribution on the nuclear family enforces patriarchal dominance**

**Mckay and Vanevery, 2002 – prof of economics at Glascow Univ. and Independent Writer** [Ailsa and Jo “Social Politics, Gender, Gender, Family, and Income Maintenance: A Feminist Case for Citizens Basic Income,” Summer <https://academic.oup.com/sp/article-abstract/7/2/266/1608558> TA]

**In liberal democracies a woman's relationship to the state is mediated by her husband,** who is seen to contribute directly to society through his paid work.

Despite recognition at the level of discourse of **women's "vital unpaid service" to the nation,** this service **is** still **treated as if it were but a personal one to her husband**. A new

model of citizenship needs to explicitly recognize the importance of the "sexual contract." In addition, it must recognize the social changes in personal relationships and intimate/sexual lives. Janet Finch (1989) points out that historical evidence shows that when **the state's notion of family obligation is out of line with individual ideas of appropriateness**, policies can have the opposite effect to that intended. Both Finch (1989) and Weston (1991) emphasize that individuals tend to see family as a last resort for assistance. This is in direct contrast to

the state's assumptions, enshrined in social security policies, that the (nuclear) family should be a first resort. Several authors have proposed concepts that attempt

to account for this. Julia O'Connor's insistence on the importance of personal autonomy, as "insulation from personal and public dependence," seems to us a promising direction (O'Connor 1993, 515). Lister's concept of "defamilialization" performs a similar role (1994; see also the discussion in Lister 1995, 29-30). In our opinion, welfare policies need to be disengaged from a particular model of the family— worker-citizen + wife-mother + children—if women are to achieve personal autonomy and a direct relationship to the state. The implications of family change and sexual citizenship for policy are that policies should be based on personal autonomy and enable a variety of supportive relationships. This involves a radical rethinking of the relationship between family and citizenship, a relationship with significant implications for the construction of gender. In an apparently paradoxical fashion, the best way to support families may be to treat people as individuals in social security policies. The **privilege of marriage** (even if broadened to include cohabiting heterosexual couples and even lesbian or gay couples) is **part and parcel of constituting women as "second-class" citizens.** Equal citizenship

rights involve recognizing the dependence of the "social contract" on the "sexual contract" and devising new ways of organizing the various types of work that need to be done. As Judith Stacey has argued: "The family" is not "here to stay." Nor should we wish it were. On the contrary, I believe that all democratic people, whatever their kinship preferences, should work to hasten its demise. An ideological concept that imposes**The**

**patriarchy that dominated the economy stemmed from the layout of the nuclear family in which men treated their wives like their employees. The intrinsic and structural inequities seen in modern day economy between men and women are not just evident in the failure for the USFG to pass policy recognizing women as equal to their coworkers but rather can be indemnified throughout many different aspects of women’s lives. The only way to restructure the systems that capitalize and exploit the bodies and work of women is to disengage from the system all together.**

**Thus capitalism and the patriarchy are inseparable, therefore a vote for the plan is therefore a vote for patriarchal oppression**

**Allan 21** Ellie Allan is a gender columnist at the Gazelle”Capitalism And Patriarchy Are Inseparable,” Published by the Gazelle on 03/20/21 Available here: (<https://www.thegazelle.org/issue/199/capitalism-patriarchy-inseperable>) WH

**The purpose of human existence, as set by capitalism, is to maximize profit**. In essence, the everyday person is to make money to yield financial gains and ultimately make the rich richer. Using this framework, it is important to understand that **what society considers “normal” are tools of oppression**. We see how **essential items** — housing, food, electricity and water — **are commodified**. There are also other human needs that are exploited. Female identity is a money-making machine. In particular, **the construction of women’s gender expression has been manufactured for profit and is upheld by capitalism’s patriarchal logic. The patriarchy seeks to uphold male supremacy socially and economically, and within the private and public spheres. The patriarchy is a foundational tool of capitalism.** Therefore it is essential to analyze how capitalism perceives gender and responds to it to understand it as a tool of exploitation. One defining reason that the patriarchy is related to capitalism is that **the subordination of women benefits the male worker.** Under **capitalism**, a person's worth **is** attributed to what they can contribute economically to society through labor. Under **the patriarchy**, a woman’s role is to serve her male counterparts and submit to their desires. The intersection of

**these two systems means that women have the job of providing free labor for the man — cooking, house care, childcare — while also producing offspring who eventually become part of the workforce**, and hence contribute to generating profit. The woman is considered the vessel of “culture,” a word used synonymously with “traditional values.” In this sense, **women must be controlled to ensure the comfort and ease of male supremacy**. Historically, European colonization has accelerated this trend as the colonizers violently reacted to countries that differed from the values of European Christian culture. Both state feminists and **liberal feminists often** ignore the complex intertwined history of capitalism, patriarchy and colonization, and **suggest that women can be empowered through economic participation**. A common joke from these feminisms is **the** term “**Girl Boss**,” which portrays women as liberated as long as they have the same opportunities as men. But this **narrative is misguided**. By encouraging participation of women economically, **the capitalist system makes workers believe they can obtain power and influence**. **The everyday woman**, with the same opportunities as men, **now thinks that she has free will and a choice in society**. But giving women the same opportunities as men alone will not allow for liberation. **An oppressed group cannot work within the system that is oppressing them and obtain autonomy** when this system fundamentally oppresses these groups to ensure its own success. These systems — **capitalism and the patriarchy — must be**

**entirely dismantled for any progress to occur, and for women to be truly liberated** By delegating gender roles, capitalism ensures that society is regulated and controlled. **This structure creates a strict binary for gender and gender expression, mandating how we are treated**.

This translates into our internal understanding of how we relate to our body in society. Anyone who refutes the binary will be systematically and

systemically violated. Capitalism’s description of gender trickles down to the everyday person, where anyone who is not cisgender and heterosexual is perceived as an alien who needs to be abolished. The gendered market is one capitalist tool that benefits men and oppresses women. This

market creates an impossible standard of female beauty and a threat of violence if it is not achieved. This is where **the social discrimination**

**against women meets the economic oppression of women**. As a result, **women are constantly chasing and changing to fulfill a visual aesthetic that changes frequently to create demand and ultimately profit the rich**. These standards are defined by men and tailored to their sexual and aesthetic benefits and desires. **Capitalism is so successful in its exploitation and control of gender that the majority are not aware that their bodies are being used as a political tool to gain capital and increase profits for the one percent**. The way this works is through the market “empowerment” tactic where individuals believe that they have autonomy over their bodies and choices. Capitalism presses the narrative that if you work hard, you deserve to buy nice things. **Consumerism is a prime example of this veil, encouraging women to dress and consume products that make them feel good about their body. This is pressed by the patriarchy, which**

**demands that women are visually objects to be consumed by men.** In this manner, a woman’s worth is associated with how attractive she is, by the standards of men; therefore, her gender expression is constantly scrutinized. The male gaze influences the way women “choose” to create their appearance. Women are told they can be liberated by expressing themselves

through what they adorn their body with. But **consumerism thrives as these products become more**

**trendy and more in demand for women to convey their sexuality, personality and gender**. The rich get richer and the poor are further exploited as consumerism thrives. **The factories in which these lavish and beautiful items are being produced are directly abusing women who are laboring to make these items in what would be “developing nations”**

**from the standard of Western supremacy**. The women in these factories work in order to survive, under the threat of violence. The responsibility is shifted from the exploiters to the masses as these women are hurt by imperialism and globalization.

**We cannot think about liberating marginalized bodies without dismantling the systems that oppress them. These systems, the patriarchy and capitalism, work hand-in-hand to benefit each other and profit from the women they control.**

**There is no possible way to actively oppose these systems while contributing to them — the body in its participatory form is inherently political.**

**Capitalism values women on their re/productive capacity, ie. sexual value, not their merit as humans, mirroring the patriarchy**

**Roberts 14** (Adrienne Roberts is a senior lecture at the University of Manchester for the department of politics and specializes in feminist international political economy that focused on gendered relations of finance) “Gender, Financial Deepening and the Production of Embodied Finance: Towards a Critical Feminist Annalist <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13600826.2014.975189>. DOA 7/10/23/RANA third theoretical entry point is opened up by several recent theoretical analyses of the differential production of bodies. From a historical materialist perspective, **the** key point here is that insofar as “part of what the creative **history of capitalism has been about is discovering new ways** (and potentialities) in **which the human body can be put to use as** the bearer of the capacity to **labor”,** bodies nonetheless bear markers of difference that differentiate the value of their labor. As David Harvey explains, **the differentiation of bodies** takes place as they are “**marked by different physical productive capacities** and

qualities according to history, geography, culture, and tradition”, reducing the markers of race, ethnicity, age and gender to perceptions of what particular kind of labor people are able to do. To view this through a feminist lens, however, again draws attention to the specific ways in which the socially and **historically constructed valuation of one's reproductive capacities also produces differences along these lines.** This is precisely the point made by feminist geographers, who have convincingly argued that the globalizing tendencies of capitalism have not led to a simple convergence of experiences but rather to the creation of various continuities and disjunctures, including in the production of gender subjectivities and bodies. Finance plays an important role here, as documented by Katherine Rankin's comparison of the differential production of the “financial subjectivities” of racialised subprime borrowers in the US and feminized microfinance borrowers in the Global South. She shows that while both the subprime and the microcredit markets aim to serve ostensibly poor and underserved borrowers, the former constructs the borrower as “poor, implicitly racialised and incapable of self-care”. In contrast, the “operative subjectivity” of the latter is that of “rational economic woman” who invests wisely, manages debt responsibly and is ultimately capable of ensuring the reproduction of “poverty finance”. While Rankin's work emphasizes the production of subjectivities rather than embodied subjects, the two are clearly interlinked. Applying this lens to the TBF agendas brings to light an interesting tension between processes of equalization and differentiation. That is, the forms of commodification and financial deepening that are promoted by TBF have an equalizing effect as more and more women and aspects of production/social reproduction are integrated into the global market and its tendencies towards abstraction. However, on the other hand, they also entail active processes of *differentiation*. This occurs, for instance, as certain groups of women are ascribed the operative subjectivity of Rankin's “rational economic woman” and “empowered” to engage in various forms of entrepreneurial labor (with all of its attendant embodied effects). However, these same TBF projects, particularly the “womenomics' ' projects that will be outlined below,

mobilize a discourse that erases bodies, as bearers of markers and symbols, from the operation of financial markets. The move towards standardized credit rating and risk assessment models is particularly indicative of the analytical erasure of bodies, as bearers of markers and symbols, from financial decision-making. This move, then, reproduces embodied forms of difference as the androcentrism of these models blinds them to the different conditions under which different groups of people engage in productive/reproductive labor, generally to the detriment of women, to certain racial and ethnic groups, and especially to racialized women.

**Seizing the means of (Re)Production to dismantle the system of capital that doubly oppresses women is the only way to end the disparities of capitalism Callaci 18** Emily Callaci is an assistant professor of history at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. “Seizing the Means of

Reproduction.” Published by Dissent Magazine in the Summer of 2018. Available here: (<https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/seizing-means-reproduction-laura-briggs-reproductive-politics-review/>) WH

In the 1970s, **feminists demand**ed that **their government pay them** wages **for housework**. Beginning with the International Feminist Collective in Italy in 1972, the Wages for Housework movement spread across the globe. Their demands for compensation issued from a larger political ambition: to abolish gender inequality by eliminating the distinction between work done in the home and work done in the marketplace. “**Wages for housework for all women**,” the New York Wages for Housework Committee argued, “**means the power to refuse the double shift of a second job, which is now our only alternative to working for nothing**.” At the core of the Wages for Housework movement was the concept of reproductive labor. Simply put, reproductive labor is the work required to sustain human life and raise future generations. The concept comes from **Marx**, who **distinguished the** productive labor of the factory from the **unpaid work that reproduces labor power**. For capitalism to survive, workers must be nourished from one workday to the next, and future generations of workers must be born and raised. Cooking or preparing food, cleaning and maintaining the home, caring for the elderly or the sick, and raising and looking after children are all forms of labor that make possible the flow of generations. **Historically, that work has been performed by women**. **Reproductive labor** is like electricity, invisible yet everywhere, and it **powers everything**. Much of the negotiation of daily life involves deciding either to give your time and energy to performing reproductive labor, or outsourcing it to someone else. It is unrecognized, uncelebrated, often unpaid, and yet utterly necessary. It is not currently a part of our everyday political lexicon, but look closely into any major political issue today, and you will likely

find a struggle over reproductive labor. This is the provocation of Laura Briggs’s book, How All Politics Became Reproductive Politics. It is a

history of neoliberalism, told from the vantage point of the family. The chronology is a familiar one: in the late 1970s the U.S. government moved to address inflation by tightening the money supply, dismantling the social safety net, and weakening the bargaining power of unions. Confronted with the double blow of stagnating real wages and fewer sources of public support for reproductive labor, most households could not sustain themselves on a single income. Meanwhile, conservatives justified the shrinking of public programs by denigrating black families and fulminating against “welfare queens.” (In reality, white women and children were the biggest beneficiaries of welfare.) All of this has shifted responsibility for reproductive labor from the public sphere onto the shoulders of private individuals and families. The dual-income nuclear family has become the site of all dependency. Those who don’t fit into that family model are deemed immoral; those who do face ever increasing burdens of reproductive labor. This turn in reproductive politics has led to what Briggs calls “offshoring reproduction.” **Families under increased financial pressure must pay others to do reproductive labor.** The work of **social reproduction is pushed further and further down the social hierarchy—onto employed women taking up a “second shift” at home, and then onto nannies and house cleaners.** Many of these domestic workers are immigrants made “available” as labor through the devastating effects of structural adjustment policies in their home countries, and middle-class American families can afford to hire them because their legal vulnerability keeps their wages low. The relationship stretches abroad, as those

traveling workers must then bear the expense of leaving their children with other caregivers at home, often in Central America or the Philippines. By labeling this process “offshoring reproduction,” Briggs makes visible the relationship between the wealthy, white, career woman and those who care for her nanny’s children. The conditions in which women become pregnant and give birth have also become more precarious. Briggs considers two kinds of infertility. The first is caused by economic demands—women in competitive, high-paying careers delay childbirth until they are professionally and financially secure, but less likely to become pregnant without assistance from expensive reproductive technologies with high failure rates, such as in vitro fertilization. The second kind of infertility is caused by structural racism—in the workplace, in the housing market and, crucially, in the medical establishment. Infertility is one outcome of a systemic assault on the reproductive lives of black women, the consequences of which are evident in the statistics: compared to white women, black women are more than twice as likely to have their infants die, more than three times as likely to die in childbirth, and twice as likely to struggle to become pregnant. Briggs does not claim that these two kinds of infertility are equivalent. As she points out, making IVF available to affluent white women while pathologizing and neglecting black pregnancy constitutes de facto eugenics. Her argument is that, in both cases, we should define infertility not as an individual medical problem, but as a condition with economic and social determinants. To address infertility, we must address sexism and racism. **It’s not a stretch to see child care, fertility, and maternal health as “reproductive politics**,” but the capacious political potential of the argument comes when Briggs looks further afield. She argues that the court decision legalizing gay marriage was based not on freedom or equality, but on the principle that responsibility for children, the sick, and the elderly should fall to private families, rather than the state. Expanding the legal definition of marriage perpetuates this economic arrangement. Mass incarceration has separated millions of children from their parents, causing immeasurable psychological damage as well as removing countless hours of care and reproductive labor from households. **A high proportion of those who had their homes foreclosed in the 2008 financial meltdown were single women, female heads of households, and women of color who had been targeted by predatory subprime loans**. In all these cases, **the state abdicates responsibility and individual families and communities must take on more work, more debt, and more risk**. “There is no outside reproductive politics,” Briggs argues. Perusing **mainstream news media outlets provides ample evidence in support of this claim**. A recent move by the Department of Education to deregulate the student loan debt collection industry comes at a time when parents increasingly bear the cost of educating their children, and young adults are saddled with debt at an age when they might consider starting their own families. Trump’s overturning of federal flood-risk management standards for housing construction makes families, rather than the state, responsible for the health and financial risks associated with rising sea levels. Marco Rubio’s proposal that women access maternity leave by drawing down their social security benefits relieves none of the financial costs of bearing children, entrenching a social arrangement in which individual women, rather than the public, are responsible for social reproduction. These struggles might all be framed as a battle over who should do, and pay for, the reproductive labor of caring for people at all life stages and raising future generations. One could go on and on through the headlines in **this** manner, and that is the point. By focusing on reproduction, Briggs shows that privatization and increasing wealth inequality are as much about gender as they are about class. What Briggs is offering **is not a comprehensive account of reproductive politics, but rather a framework for reinterpreting all politics**. Perhaps we can define all politics as reproductive politics. But should we? A basic political

platform along these lines might demand policies that offer material support for reproductive labor and **reject policies that shift those burdens onto private individuals and families**. One benefit of such a policy is that it is universal: **everybody either performs reproductive labor or relies on someone else’s**. Equally important, a politics defined in terms of **reproductive labor justifies a radical redistribution of resources that accounts not only for wealth inequality, but also for the material effects of racism and sexism**. As Briggs makes clear, those who historically have taken on the most unrecognized reproductive labor are the poor and especially women of color. **To call for a politics in which reproductive labor is more equitably performed and remunerated is to call for material**

**redistributions along lines of class, gender, and race**. To expand what counts as work is to radically reconfigure whose work is valued, and to begin to dismantle the perceived stalemate between class politics and identity politics. What about the rest of the world? Briggs keeps her analysis within U.S. borders, yet the United States is implicated in the

reproductive lives of individuals and families far beyond its borders. The Mexico City Policy, or the

global gag rule, is reinstated every time the American public votes a Republican president into office, curtailing the provision of lifesaving maternal and child-health services to women around the world. And the U.S. government is not the only American entity that gets an outsized say in global reproductive politics. Private American citizens and philanthropists increasingly have the power to direct health and educational resources around the world and set public agendas without being accountable to an electorate. Melinda Gates may help to save lives by making contraceptives available to women in developing nations, but her argument that birth control will lift individual women around the world out of poverty ignores the ways **American environmental and trade policies**, not to mention war-making, **shape the reproductive lives and wellbeing of women across the global South.**

Briggs knows all of this. She has examined reproductive politics on a global scale in her earlier work. Her decision to restrict her focus to the United States in this book reflects a choice to address these issues in the realm of electoral politics, with American citizens making demands of a government that is accountable to them. But if, as Briggs argues, racism is what motivated electoral support for neoliberal policies in the 1980s, what makes a progressive, inclusive, **redistributive reproductive politics** politically possible now? In a way, Briggs suggests an answer with the structure of her book. Each chapter **brings together constituencies differentiated along lines of class, race, immigration status, and sexual orientation by illuminating how they are connected by a more universal reproductive politics**. Will the more privileged members of these groups see it that way? I am reminded of a brilliant sign from the 2017 Women’s March that posed the challenge: “See all you nice white ladies at the next BLM march, right?” In a moment of optimism, the sign pithily conjured a history of exclusions within American feminist movements. As feminists of color have long observed, feminisms that have claimed to be universal have often presumed their subjects to be white, straight, healthy, safe, middle-class, politically enfranchised, and

able-bodied. The Women’s March was about a number of issues, reproductive freedom among them, and nothing could be more of an assault on reproduction than the threat of state-sanctioned violence against the children that black mothers bear and raise. Can we turn these connections into coalitions? No single book can answer that question. But Briggs has shown that we must ask it.

**The alt is therefore the acceptance of a radical anti-capitalist feminist prefigurative politics -- one that can meet the needs of the people as decided by the people and establishes a dual power structure, that empowers women over capital**

**Escalante, 19** [Alyson, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist, "Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach," Failing That, Invent,

[https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/02/15/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/]//Gavsie](https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/02/15/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/%5D//Gavsie)

I have previously argued that a crucial advantage to **dual power** strategy is that it **gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist institutions which can directly provide for material needs in times of capitalist crisis**. **Socialist** agricultural and food distribution **programs can take ground that the capitalist state cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist self-management and political institutions can function independently of capitalism**. This approach is not only capable of literally saving lives in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the possibility of a revolutionary project which seeks to destroy rather than reform capitalism. One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that we have 12 years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are inevitable, and we are now in a post-brink world, where damage control is the primary concern. The question is not whether we can escape a future of climate change, but whether we can survive it. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly. **In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market based reform**s. T**he Green New Deal, championed by Alexandria Ocasio Cortez and the left wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself, but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions** to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends. The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure, National Geographic reports that, “Fabricating [solar] panels requires caustic chemicals such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and the process uses water as well as electricity, the production of which emits greenhouse gases.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure only perpetuates environmental harm. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis. The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the United States can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant militarism from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, facilitates constant warfare as imperial states compete for spheres of influence in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the United States. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the United States military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change. Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even milquetoast capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever shrinking 12 year time frame. There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility. The pressing question we now face is: how are we going to save ourselves? Revolution and Dual Power If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America backed candidates cannot offer real

anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far

larger and far more well funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the United States, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within 12 years. While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the mean time? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the United States today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle.

Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a hard truth, but it is true. Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, we will accomplish nothing in the next 12 years. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these 12 years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development. Dual power is tooled towards this project best. The Marxist Center network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through tenants organizing and serve the people programs. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop mutual aid programs that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, mutual aid is not enough. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a broader revolutionary movement and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society. To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can abstract notions of mutual aid cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. **The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet the needs of its members and the communities in which it operates. Revolutionary institutions that can provide food, housing, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for building a base among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle.**

**The alt solves for climate and QOL/Worker Protections without reaffirming the patriarchy.**

**Socialist Appeal 92** Socialist Appeal is an online socialist organization that materially analyses the impacts of socialism. Published in 1992 on socialistl.net. “Climate Crisis” available at: (https://socialist.net/climate-crisis/)

Capitalism, with its insatiable pursuit of profit, is responsible for destroying the environment. We need to fight for socialism, in order to rationally plan production in the interests of people and the planet. Climate change is no longer a threat of the future. Already, hurricanes are becoming more powerful, forests are burning, and people are dying from heat waves, drought, floods, and famine. Such extreme weather events are quickly becoming the rule, not the exception. The oceans are polluted by plastic and chemical waste, killing off fish and other marine life. Underground water supplies are drained or polluted, leading to a widespread scarcity of this most essential of resources. Every year, species are becoming extinct through the senseless destruction of ecosystems. Immediate action is needed. A massive reduction in emissions and pollution levels is essential. But the solution does not lie in moralistic ‘lifestyle’ choices about ‘sustainable’ consumption. The capitalists and their political representatives are completely incapable of carrying out the radical changes that are required. The working class must seize the assets and wealth of the big conglomerates and monopolies (who are also the biggest polluters), and place their resources under democratic management. **Under a socialist society, we would be able to democratically and sustainably manage production, so we can improve the living conditions of working people in harmony with the planet. The fight against climate change and the fight for socialism are ultimately one and the same.**