### 1NC – New Affs Bad

#### Interp – the affirmative debater must disclose the affirmative 30 minutes prior to the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation – I’ve inserted a screenshot

#### Graphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generated

#### No neg reasonability claims – the fact that they typed in round proves they could’ve disclosed

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Neg Prep – 4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1NC or update generics – 30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1NC positions apply and cut and research their applications to the aff

#### 2] Academic Integrity – disclosing new affs is key to ensure that evidence isn’t miscut – 4 minutes of prep isn’t enough, especially since I need to save some for the 2NR and also construct a 1NC. This outweighs because if they can lie about their aff, everything else they could have said is a lie and should be disregarded. Key to education otherwise we wouldn’t learn what is true and what’s not.

#### Fairness because debate’s a game and education because it’s the only portable skill from debate.

#### Drop the debater – A] Their lack of disclosure makes substance irreparable because our entire argument is that we did not have a basis to engage the aff to begin with, B] Drop the arg means they lose since they lose their entire advocacy and cannot have offense. Competing interps – a) It fosters the best norms through encouraging the fairest rule b) Reasonability collapses by debating the brightline

#### No RVIs – a) Illogical – you shouldn’t win for proving that you’re fair or education because it’s a prima facie burden – logic outweighs because it determines what args count as valid b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI c) people will be scared to read theory against good theory debaters and will never be able to check abuse

### 1NC – Extra T

**Interpretation: the affirmative must only garner offense from the consequences of “a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**violation –**

**Standards –**

**1] Predictability – prepared to debate policy consequences – that's k2 pre round prep which is important for in round prep and clash – limits DA ground because they can add planks that solve**

**2] Limits – interp would allow "wto reduces ip and gives everyone 200 dollars" which takes us away from the core of the topic – that o/w on urgency + explodes the neg research burden bc we have to research issues completely unrelated to the topic**

#### Fairness because debate’s a game and education because it’s the only portable skill from debate. Drop the debater – a) Deters future abuse, b) Rectifies time loss, c) DTA encourages baiting – Debaters could fill their cases w/ abusive args, baiting theory and then just drop the argument in the next speech and go for undercovered substance

#### Competing interps – a) It fosters the best norms through encouraging the fairest rule b) Reasonability collapses by debating the brightline

#### No RVIs – a) Illogical – you shouldn’t win for proving that you’re fair or edication because it’s a prima facie burden – logic outweighs  because it determines what args count as valid b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI c) people will be scared to read theory against good theory debaters and will never be able to check abuse

### 1NC – Kant

#### The meta ethic is practical reason. Prefer –

#### 1] Is-ought gap – empiricism can only observe what is since that’s the only thing in our perception, not what ought to be, but it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises which requires a priori premises to form morality.

#### 2] Empirical uncertainty– evil demon could deceive us, dreaming, simulation, and inability to know other’s experiences makes empiricism an unreliable basis for universal ethics. Outweighs since it would be escapable since people could say they don’t experience the same.

#### 3] Infallibility – practical reason is the only unescapable authority because to ask why we should be reasoners is to concede authority to reason since the question itself uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary.

#### 4] Action Theory – every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, i.e. me moving my arm can be broken down to the infinite moments of every state my arm is in. Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason.

#### Reason requires that maxims we act upon must be universalizable – any reasoner would know that two plus two equals four because there is no a priori distinction between agents so norms must be universally valid. These things are temporally consistent – I know that adding two numbers now and taking the sum will not result in me adding the same two numbers in the future and getting a different sum.

#### And willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction – if I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too. If I die, I cannot exercise my freedom to kill someone else. Thus, willing a violation of freedom results in limitation of my own freedom.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom. Prefer additionally –

#### 1] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### 2] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### 3] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – prefer for Resource disparities- Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

#### Now negate –

#### 1] Strikes violate individual autonomy by exercising coercion.

Gourevitch 18 [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy recognizes that workers have a right to strike. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose serious problems for liberal societies. They involve violence and coercion, they often violate some basic liberal liberties, they appear to involve group rights having priority over individual ones, and they can threaten public order itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of disruptive collective protest in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ froze major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as statewide in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and Colorado; a strike by taxi drivers played a major role in debates and court decisions regarding immigration; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises far more issues than a single essay can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its relation to coercive strike tactics. I argue that strikes present a dilemma for liberal societies because for most workers to have a reasonable chance of success they need to use some coercive strike tactics. But these coercive strike tactics both violate the law and infringe upon what are widely held to be basic liberal rights. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know why workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of understanding the right to strike is as a right to resist the oppression that workers face in the standard liberal capitalist economy. This way of understanding the right explains why the use of coercive strike tactics is not morally constrained by the requirement to respect the basic liberties nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 2] Means to an end: employees ignore their duty to help their patients in favor of higher wages which treats them as a means to an end.

#### 3] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

While strikes and protests build solidarity among their supporters, they are susceptible to collective action problems. This is because the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be enjoyed by both strikers and non-strikers. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of free-riding problems, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.

### 1NC – Police PIC

#### CP: A just government should recognize the unconditional right of non-police workers to strike, abolishing police unions.

#### The aff makes police collective bargaining worse and gives more power to police unions.

Andrew **Grim, 20** Ph.D. candidate in history at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, is at work on a dissertation on anti-police brutality activism in post-WWII Newark

- ("What is The Blue Flue and How Has It Increased Police Power," Washington Post, 7-1-2020, 11-2-2021https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/)//AW

This weekend, officers from the New York City Police Department are rumored to be planning a walkout to protest calls to defund the police. This builds on a similar tactic used by police in Atlanta less than a month ago. On June 16, Fulton County District Attorney, Paul L. Howard Jr. announced that Garrett Rolfe, the Atlanta police officer who fatally shot Rayshard Brooks, would face charges of felony murder and aggravated assault. That night, scores of Atlanta Police Department officers caught the “blue flu,” calling out sick en masse to protest the charges against Rolfe. Such walkouts constitute, in effect, illegal strikes — laws in all 50 states prohibit police strikes. Yet, there is nothing new about the blue flu. It is a strategy long employed by police unions and rank-and-file officers during contract negotiations, disputes over reforms and, like in Atlanta, in response to disciplinary action against individual officers. The intent is to dramatize police disputes with municipal government and rally the citizenry to their side. But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities.

#### Police unions use collective bargaining to reinforce systems of racism and violence. Clark ‘19

Paul F. Clark [School Director and Professor of Labor and Employment Relations, Penn State], 10-10-2019, "Why police unions are not part of the American labor movement," Conversation, [https://theconversation.com/why-police-unions-are-not-part-of-the-american-labor-movement-142538 //accessed 10/20/2021](https://theconversation.com/why-police-unions-are-not-part-of-the-american-labor-movement-142538%20//accessed%2010/20/2021) //marlborough jh

In the wake of George Floyd’s death at the hands of a Minneapolis police officer, news reports have suggested that [police unions bear some of the responsibility](https://www.salon.com/2020/06/27/police-unions-blamed-for-rise-in-fatal-shootings-even-as-crime-plummeted/) for the [violence perpetrated against African Americans](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html). **¶**Critics have assailed these unions for [protecting officers who have abused their authority](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/06/09/limits-when-police-can-use-force-is-better-solution-than-banning-police-unions/). Derek Chauvin, the former police officer facing [second-degree murder charges for Floyd’s death](https://www.npr.org/2020/06/03/868910542/chauvin-and-3-former-officers-face-new-charges-over-george-floyds-death), had nearly [20 complaints filed against him during his career](https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/05/30/minneapolis-officers-work-personal-background-detailed-2/) but only received two letters of reprimand. ¶Many people who support labor unions in principle, who view them as a countervailing force against the power of employers, have only recently [come to view police unions as problematic](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2020-06-15/police-unions-george-floyd-reform) – as entities that [perpetuate a culture of racism and violence](https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses). But this sentiment reverberates through the history of the U.S. labor movement. As a [labor scholar](https://ler.la.psu.edu/people/pfc2) who has [written about unions](https://theconversation.com/essential-us-workers-often-lack-sick-leave-and-health-care-benefits-taken-for-granted-in-most-other-countries-136802) for [decades](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bjir.12526), I think this viewpoint can be explained by the fact that police unions differ fundamentally from almost all trade unions in America. Foot soldiers for the status quo For many veterans of the labor movement, [police have been on the wrong side](https://plsonline.eku.edu/insidelook/history-policing-united-states-part-3) of the centuries-old struggle between workers and employers. [Rather than side with other members of the working class](https://www.businessinsider.com/mayhem-in-madison-police-remove-protesters-lockdown-capitol-2011-3), police have used their legal authority to protect businesses and private property, enforcing laws viewed by many as anti-union. The strain between law enforcement and labor goes back to the origins of [American unions in the mid 19th century](https://plsonline.eku.edu/insidelook/history-policing-united-states-part-3). Workers formed unions to fight for wage increases, reduced working hours and humane working conditions. For employers, this was an attack on the existing societal power structure. They enlisted the government as the defender of capital and property rights, and [police officers were the foot soldiers](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/12/22/police-unions-havealwaysbeenalabormovementapart.html) who defended the status quo. ¶When workers managed to form unions, companies called on local police to disperse union gatherings, marches and picket lines, using [violence and mass arrests to break the will of strikers](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-1897-massacre-pennsylvania-coal-miners-morphed-galvanizing-crisis-forgotten-history-180971695/). A narrow focus Police work is a fundamentally conservative act. And police officers tend to be politically conservative and Republican. A poll of police [conducted in September 2016 by POLICE Magazine](https://www.policemag.com/342098/the-2016-police-presidential-poll) found that 84% of officers intended to vote for Donald Trump that November. And law enforcement unions like the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Union of Police Associations and the National Border Patrol Council [all endorsed Trump’s candidacy in 2016](https://theintercept.com/2016/10/09/police-unions-reject-charges-of-bias-find-a-hero-in-donald-trump/). This contrasts sharply with the 39% share of all [union voters who voted for Trump](https://www.wsj.com/articles/democrats-labor-to-stem-flow-of-union-voters-to-trump-11567422002) and the fact that every other union which made an [endorsement supported Hillary Clinton](https://justfacts.votesmart.org/candidate/evaluations/55463/hillary-clinton). Exclusively protecting the interests of their members, without consideration for other workers, also sets police unions apart from other labor groups. Yes, the first priority of any union is to fight for their members, but most other unions see that fight in the context of a [larger movement that fights for all workers](https://aflcio.org/what-unions-do/social-economic-justice). Police unions do not see themselves as [part of this movement](https://www.teenvogue.com/story/what-to-know-police-unions-labor-movement). With one exception – the [International Union of Police Associations](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/11/police-unions-american-labor-movement-protest), which represents just [2.7% of American police](https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ftelea9716.pdf) – law enforcement unions are not affiliated with the AFL-CIO, the U.S. labor body that unites all unions. Alternative justice system A central concern with police unions is that they use collective bargaining to negotiate contracts that reduce police transparency and accountability**.** T

### 1NC – Hedge

#### No 1AR theory – a) 1ar theory means it’s game over for the 2nr because of the 2ar collapse – the negative will inevitably undercover something, b) I can respond to 1ar only once which both kills resolvability and kills reciprocity since they can respond to 1nc shells twice.

#### Reasonability on 1ar theory – 7 minutes of the 1nc means they will always find there’s something abusive we did – reasonability’s key to incentivizing in-depth discussion rather than a 2ar collapse on theory.

#### Drop the arg on 1ar theory – 1ar theory is incentivized to restart the debate and avoid the 1n. Drop the arg solves because if one position the 1nc was abusive, then ignoring it in the 2ar allows evaluation of substance.

#### RVIs on 1ar theory – anything thing else puts me in a double bind because I’ll either overcover substance and undercover theory or vice versa which makes negating impossible – RVIs solve by creating another route to the ballot to compensate.

#### Can’t weigh case against the theory shells – a) Preclusion – can’t leverage pre-fiat offense against an argument that questions whether that should be read in the first place, b) Illogical – can’t cross apply offense from case to theory – i.e., whenever u read a china aff you don’t weigh extinction against strat skew

### Case

#### The ROJ is to be a fair arbiter in an intellectual competition – anything else is self-serving, arbitrary, and necessarily excludes certain arguments. We should be able to test the aff’s methodology without them excluding the basis for our arguments which kills clash.

#### No spillover – this is one debate round – people don’t really care if a 16 year old says “cap bad” and this 1 rounds isn’t going to change the norms of debate

#### Even if I lose TT, you should default to the ROB to vote for the better debater – anything else is self serving and arbitrary – this ballot isn’t key and their model of debate kills education.

Lbl their cards

#### Reject their deterministic framework – understanding particular real-world process is key

Kirsten Bell, Department of Anthropology, University of British Columbia, and Judith Green Faculty of Public Health & Policy, Department of Health Services Research & Policy, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, 2016, On the perils of invoking neoliberalism in public health critique, Critical Public Health, 26:3, 239-243

First, we need far more clarity on how the term is being used, rather than taking its meaning for granted. With the over-extension of ‘neoliberal’ to describe everything from welfare cuts to wearable health monitors, scholars need to unpack more carefully the particular processes to which they are referring. Rather than assume a deterministic role for those processes, the nature of the links between, say, welfare change and the impact on subjectivities needs to be explicated. As Meershoek and Hortsman (2016) note in this issue, merely reporting how health promotion reflects or contributes to neoliberalism does little to untangle the ‘material, technical and practical dimensions’ of how what kinds of health, and whose, are prioritized. Taking the commodification of workplace health promotion technologies as their case, they unpack how policies emphasizing employee health become legitimated within networks that include knowledge institutes and private companies, but not the workers themselves. Importantly, this focus on the process itself enables their analysis to point to not only the potential negative effects for public health of such commodification, but also ways forward, in political mobilization through workers’ organizations to incorporate different frameworks of well-being.

Second, we need more nuance and specificity in accounts. The question is not so much ‘what forms do public health outputs or technologies take in neoliberal times?’ but ‘how, where and in what forms do the various processes of neoliberalism impact public health?’ Two papers in this issue illustrate the value of more specificity. Hervik and Thurston (2016), in their account of how Norwegian men discuss their responsibilities for health, note that the specificities of the welfare state in Norway configure assumptions embedded in talk about ‘responsibility’. Rather than simply reading off the espousal of ‘personal responsibility for health’ as another reflection of neoliberal hegemony, Hervik and Thurston note that in this context, responsibility for health is rooted in a participatory model of the welfare state, in which principles of egalitarianism and social democracy may have very different implications for public health than in welfare states where the focus is on individual choice and self-sufficiency. Similarly, Nourpanah and Martin (2016) delineate both parallels and divergences between the discursive framings of health promotion described in Western states and those they document in Iran, where there is an absence of focus on consumption, despite similar orientations towards individual choice.

In general, rather than reifying neoliberalism as a monolithic entity, it may be more productive to speak of ‘neoliberalization’ as an always partial and incomplete process (Ward & England, 2007). This raises potentially fruitful questions around when, where, and in what ways the economic, political and cultural intersect with health. We need also to be reflexive about claims to neoliberalism, in that of course our critique is inevitably embroiled in the very processes it seeks to analyze. Indeed, it may be productive to think of neoliberalism as a discourse as much as a reality (Springer, 2012). In sum, we are not calling for the abandonment of the concept – paraphrasing Clifford (1988) on yet another troubled notion (‘culture’), neoliberalism seems to be a deeply compromised idea we cannot yet do without. Thus, being more careful and mindful of how we use it seems a good place to start.

#### The world is complex, and you should reject totalizing theories of liberalism and capitalism --- it’s possible to condemn the failures of capitalism while recognizing benefits that should be preserved

**Gopnik, 19 -** American [writer](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Writer) and [essayist](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Essayist) best known as a staff writer for [The New Yorker](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_Yorker)—to which he has contributed non-fiction, fiction, memoir and criticism

Adam Gopnik, “A Thousand Small Sanities: The Moral Adventure of Liberalism,” Basic Books New York, 2019

And to this add the truth that in the real world it will be impossible to separate government preferences from entrepreneurial energies, self-organizing market forces. The Internet grew up with enormous help from the U.S. Defense Department, and almost all of the American free market is shaped by, and for, big businesses through government intervention. We can be in favor of humanizing work by putting workers on company boards without being in favor of command economies and five-year plans.

It’s a muddle. Liberals like muddles. Liberalism ought to be agnostic about these modes, investing no religious significance in any one. To deny that capitalism left to its own devices produces bubbles, busts, and brutal human inequalities is to deny the achingly obvious truth of modern history; to deny that free-market economies have produced prosperity unparalleled in human history—and continue to lift more people out of poverty than any other model known to man—is to deny the thunderously plain. Two things can often be true at once. Two things are always true at once. Indeed, if you know only two true things “about a social phenomenon, you’re not looking, or counting, closely enough.

#### Neoliberalism is inevitable --- crises cause elites to double down on austerity measures and structural adjustment that hasten privatization --- 2008 proves

Peck and Theodore, 19

Jamie Peck is Canada Research Chair in Urban & Regional Political Economy and Professor of Geography at the University of British Columbia, Canada. He is the Managing Editor of Environment and Planning A and the convenor of the Summer Institute in Economic Geography. Nik Theodore is a Professor, Urban Planning and Policy, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research, CUPPA. “Still Neoliberalism?” The South Atlantic Quarterly, 118, April 2019

Neoliberal, Neoliberalism, Neoliberalization: What’s in a Name?

That neoliberalism remains a circulating if contestable term, after decades of fitful and fickle usage, might be considered an achievement of sorts. Repeatedly disowned, denigrated, and dismissed, it nevertheless refuses to go away— at least circumstantial evidence, perhaps, that there is indeed “some there there.” This is not the place to revisit the extended genealogy of this troubled signifier and its contested historical geography (see Peck 2010; Cahill et al. 2018), except to observe that its turbulent fortunes, perhaps especially in the period since the Wall Street crash of 2008, have been revealing, while at the same time adding new layers of mystification and puzzlement to what has been a never-less-than-checkered history. What was to be a particularly heavyhanded reboot of this history began in the thick of that last crisis, a little over a decade ago. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Wall Street crash was at the time widely interpreted as both a comprehensive repudiation and a system failure of neoliberalism by key figures on the left, from Eric Hobsbawm to Naomi Klein, who read the moment as terminal for the rolling project of financial deregulation and for the small-state consensus more generally, a view that was echoed by center-left economists such as Joseph Stiglitz and, although not in so many words, by the likes of Paul Krugman. Rather more surprisingly, there were also some mainstream politicians on the right and left flanks of the center ground, from France’s Nicolas Sarkozy to Australia’s Kevin Rudd, who in this uniquely disorientating context were moved to utter the hitherto unspeakable term, albeit only to declare its graceless exit (see Erlanger 2008; Rudd 2009). A common refrain across much of the commentary at the time, when real economies around the world and the credibility of those charged with their stewardship were both in freefall, was that the much-maligned state would be (had to be) making a comeback—in its own way echoing the arch-neoliberal conceits of governmental withdrawal and free-market governance, as if the state had ever really gone away. Projects of neoliberalization, it has been fairly clear all along to those willing to see, have never been synonymous with a simple diminution, or withdrawal, of the state, but instead have been variously concerned with its capture and reuse, albeit in the context of a generalized assault on social-welfarist or leftarm functions, coupled with an expansion of right-arm roles and capacities in areas like policing and surveillance, incarceration and social control, and the military. Nevertheless, this kind of state project was widely believed to have met its end a decade ago in the Wall Street meltdown.

What followed certainly did not align with the script of a terminal, once-and-for-all collapse of neoliberalism represented (again, somewhat misleadingly) as a bracketable “era” of free-market governance. As if to affirm Thatcher’s premature dismissal that there was “no alternative” to market rule, what followed in the wake of the financial crisis was, far from a retreat of neoliberalism, more like an audacious exercise in doubling down. Longterm austerity measures were (re)imposed in nations rich and poor, including those countries once regarded as the tutelary “heartlands” of the project, and its proving grounds, the United States and the United Kingdom. A new generation of structural adjustment

#### Capitalism is self-correcting– war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts.

Kaletsky ’11 (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21)

Democratic capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets.