## 1

#### Ethics must be derived from practical reason:

#### [1] To question why one should reason concedes its authority since it is an act of reasoning itself which proves it’s binding and inescapable

#### [2] Is/Ought Gap – experience just describes how the world is but doesn’t indicate how it ought to be which means there must be an a priori conception of good

#### [3] Agents can shift between different identities but doing so requires reason - it unifies the subject and is the only enterprise agents cannot escape

#### Ferrero 09 (Luca Ferrero, [Luca Ferrero is a Philosophy professor at University of California, Riverside. His areas of interest are Agency Theory, including Intentionality and Personal identity; Practical Reasoning; and Meta-Ethics], “Constitutivism and the Inescapability of Agency”. Oxford Studies in Metaethics, vol. IV, Jan 12, 2009. <https://philarchive.org/archive/FERCATv1> BHHS AK recut

Agency is special in two respects. First, agency is the enterprise with the largest jurisdiction.¹² All ordinary enterprises fall under it. To engage in any ordinary enterprise is ipso facto to engage in the enterprise of agency. In addition, there are instances of behavior that fall under no other enterprise but agency. First, intentional transitions in and out of particular enterprises might not count as moves within those enterprises, but they are still instances of intentional agency, of bare intentional agency, so to say. Second, agency is the locus where we adjudicate the merits and demerits of participating in any ordinary enterprise. Reasoning whether to participate in a particular enterprise is often conducted outside of that enterprise, even while one is otherwise engaged in it. Practical reflection is a manifestation of full-fledged intentional agency but it does not necessarily belong to any other specific enterprise. Once again, it might be an instance of bare intentional agency. In the limiting case, agency is the only enterprise that would still keep a subject busy if she were to attempt a ‘radical re-evaluation’ of all of her engagements and at least temporarily suspend her participation in all ordinary enterprises.

#### That justifies universalizability - insofar as there is no a priori distinction between reasoners, a reason for one agent must also be a reason for another; if all agents cannot set and pursue an end, it is not constitutive of agency. Willing a maxim that violates freedom is a contradiction in conception – you cannot violate someone’s freedom without having your own freedom to do so.

#### Thus, the countermethodolgy and ROB is to debate in accordance with a system of equal and outer freedoms.

#### 1] Performativity – arguing against my framework presupposes freedom because without freedom to reason you would not be able to make arguments and try to win – this means that contesting any of my arguments proves my framework true.

#### 

#### 2] Induction fails – 1. saying that induction works in the past uses induction, which means it’s circular and unjustified 2. It assumes specific causes of past consequences which can’t be verified as the actual cause

#### 3] Resolvability: Clarity of weighing under interpretation of Kantianism: perfect duties above imperfect duties. Duties in right. Explicit categories that supersede other categories. All other FWs are consequentialist that use unquantifiable prob, mag, or prob x mag. Resolvability is an independent voter cuz otherwise the judge can’t make a decision which means it’s a constraint on any rotb because otherwise the round is impossible

#### Negate:

#### [1] Categorical imperative – Not debating the topic would cause a contradiction in conception, because if we universalized all debaters not debating the topic, then the concept of a topic would be incoherent and not exist as nobody debated it, causing us to not be able to take the original action to begin with.

#### [2] The aff has a deontological obligation to be topical. Nebel 15

Jake Nebel,"The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel," Briefly, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/>

A second strategy denies that such pragmatic benefits are relevant. This strategy is more deontological. One version of this strategy appeals to the importance of consent or agreement. Suppose that you give your opponents prior notice that you’ll be affirming the September/October 2012 resolution instead of the current one. There is a sense in which your affirmation of that resolution is now predictable: your opponents know, or are in a position to know, what you will be defending. And suppose that the older resolution is conducive to better (i.e., more fair and more educational) debate. Still, it’s unfair of you to expect your opponents to follow suit. Why? Because they didn’t agree to debate that topic. They registered for a tournament whose invitation specified the current resolution, not the Sept/Oct 2012 resolution or a free-for-all. The “social contract” argument for topicality holds that accepting a tournament invitation constitutes implicit consent to debate the specified topic. This claim might be contested, depending on what constitutes implicit consent. What is less contestable is this: given that *some* proposition must be debated in each round and that the tournament has specified a resolution, no one can reasonably reject a principle that requires everyone to debate the announced resolution as worded. This appeals to Scanlon’s contractualism. Someone who wishes to debate only the announced resolution has a strong claim against changing the topic, and no one has a stronger claim against debating the announced resolution (ignoring, for now, some possible exceptions to be discussed in the next subsection). So it is unfair to expect your opponent to debate anything other than the announced resolution. This unfairness is a constraint on the pursuit of education or other goods: it wrongs and is unjustifiable to your opponent.

#### [3] Reducing IPP is a form of the government coercing medicine companies into giving away rights to their products – that’s is a contradiction in conception and this also takes out aff offense because companies can’t be coerced into doing something even if it might be a good under the framework – for example, you can’t coerce someone into donating to charity

## Case

**Capitalism is sustainable and self-correcting---they can’t solve**

Seabra 12 (Leo, has a background in Communication and Broadcasting and a broad experience which includes activities in Marketing, Advertising, Sales and Public Relations, 2/27, “Capitalism can drive Sustainability and also innovation,” http://seabraaffairs.wordpress.com/2012/02/27/capitalism-can-drive-sustainability-and-also-innovation/)

There are those who say that if the world does not change their habits, even the end of economic growth, and assuming alternative ways of living, will be a catastrophe. “Our lifestyles are unsustainable. Our expectations of consumption are predatory.Either we change this, or will be chaos”. Others say that the pursuit of unbridled economic growth and the inclusion of more people in consumption is killing the Earth. We have to create alternative because economic growth is pointing to the global collapse. “What will happen when billions of Chinese decide to adopt the lifestyle of Americans?” I’ll disagree if you don’t mind… **They might be** wrong. **Completely wrong** .. Even very intelligent people wrongly interpret the implications of what they observe when they lose the perspective of time. In the vast scale of time (today, decades, not centuries) it is the opposite of what expected, because they start from a false assumption: the future is the extrapolation of this. But not necessarily be. How do I know? Looking at history. What story? The history of innovation, this thing generates increases in productivity, wealth, quality of life in an unimaginable level. It is innovation that will defeat pessimism as it always did. It was innovation that made life today is incomparably better than at any other time in human history. And will further improve. Einstein, who was not a stupid person, believed that capitalism would generate crisis, instability, and growing impoverishment. He said: “The economic anarchy of capitalist society as it exists today is, in my opinion, the true source of evil.” The only way to eliminate this evil, he thought, was to establish socialism, with the means of production are owned by the company. A centrally controlled economy would adjust the production of goods and services the needs of people, and would distribute the work that needed to be done among those in a position to do so. This would guarantee a livelihood to every man, women and children. Each according to his possibilities. To each according to their needs. And guess what? What happened was the opposite of what Einstein predicted. Who tried the model he suggested, impoverished, screwed up. Peter Drucker says that almost of all thinking people of the late nineteenth century thought that Marx was right: there would be increased exploitation of workers by employers. They would become poorer, until one day, the thing would explode. Capitalist society was considered inherently unsustainable. It is more or less the same chat today. **Bullshit. Capitalism, with all appropriate regulations, self-**corrects. It is **an adaptive system that learns and changes by design. The design is just for the system to learn and change.** There was the opposite of what Einstein predicted, and held the opposite of what many predict, but the logic that “unlike” only becomes evident over time. It wasn’t obvious that the workers are those whom would profit from the productivity gains that the management science has begun to generate by organizing innovations like the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone .. to increase the scale of production and cheapen things. The living conditions of workers today are infinitely better than they were in 1900. They got richer, not poorer .. You do not need to work harder to produce more (as everyone thought), you can work less and produce more through a mechanism that is only now becoming apparent, and that brilliant people like Caetano Veloso still ignores. The output is pursuing growth through innovation, growth is not giving up. More of the same will become unsustainable to the planet, but most of it is not what will happen, will happen more different, than we do not know what is right. More innovative. Experts, such as Lester Brown, insist on statements like this: if the Chinese also want to have three cars for every four inhabitants, as in the U.S. today, there will be 1.1 billion cars there in 2030, and there is no way to build roads unless ends with the whole area used for agriculture. You will need 98 million barrels of oil per day, but the world only produces about 90 million today, and probably never produce much more. The mistake is to extrapolate today’s solutions for the future. We can continue living here for 20 years by exploiting the same resources that we explore today? Of course not. But the other question is: how can we encourage the stream of innovations that will enable the Chinese, Indians, Brazilians, Africans .. to live so as prosperous as Americans live today? Hey, wake up … what can not stop the engine of innovation is that the free market engenders. This system is self correcting, that is its beauty. We do not need to do nothing but ensure the conditions for it to work without distortion. The rest he does himself. It regulates itself.

#### Cap solves food

Bandler 17 (Aaron, staff writer for The Daily Wire, 3/18/17, “This AMAZING Chart Shows Just How Capitalism Has Alleviated Global Hunger”, https://www.dailywire.com/news/16621/amazing-chart-shows-just-how-capitalism-has-aaron-bandler, AZG)

A truly remarkable chart has surfaced that reveals that capitalism has sharply curtailed the scourge of global hunger. The chart, provided by Human Progress, shows that the number of undernourished persons sharply declined from nearly 960 million to under 700 million: There is clearly still work that needs to be done to ameliorate global hunger — as a little under 700 million malnourished people is still too high — but a decline of over 260 million malnourished people in a span of over 20 years is nevertheless amazing. This Human Progress chart actually disproves two leftist myths: capitalism is causing hunger, and overpopulation threatens essential resources. For instance, businessman Drew Hanson argued in a February 2016 Forbes piece that "capitalism will starve humanity by 2050," citing misleading statistics and claiming that capitalism would dry up the world's resources as the population continues to increase. "How do we expect to feed that many people while we exhaust the resources that remain?" Hanson wrote. Another leftist who claimed something similar is environmentalist fear-mongerer Paul Ehrlich, as he actually argued in favor of population control. But economist Julian Simon believed that a rising population would result in more resources, not less, and Simon was proven right: Simon and Ehrlich made a bet in 1980: if Ehrlich was correct, then commodities price would drastically increase with population growth, as a dearth of resources would naturally lead to less supply. However, as population has increased from 2 billion to 7 billion over the past 100 years, the commodities prices have actually decreased, according to The Federalist. This is because, as economist Phillip Verlerger once said, "Technology moves so quickly today that any looming resource constraint will be nothing more than a blip. We adjust." Indeed, the beauty of capitalism is that its respect for individual liberty and private property allows a free and prosperous people to produce goods that balances their skill set with market demand, creating a system that while imperfect, has created wealth that vastly improved society and made it easier to lift the poor and the hungry out of poverty. Even as Western societies have started to embrace the welfare state, capitalism has still managed to touch the globe through free trade and globalization, allowing those who have never tasted freedom to have a chance at improving their living situations. Despite what the Left would have you believe, capitalism is the most humane system on the face of the Earth and is the true answer to alleviating global hunger and poverty, as the Human Progress graph illustrates.

#### Food shortages cause war

FDI 12, Future Directions International, a Research institute providing strategic analysis of Australia’s global interests; citing Lindsay Falvery, PhD in Agricultural Science and former Professor at the University of Melbourne’s Institute of Land and Environment, “Food and Water Insecurity: International Conflict Triggers & Potential Conflict Points,” <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/workshop-papers/537-international-conflict-triggers-and-potential-conflict-points-resulting-from-food-and-water-insecurity.html>

There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources.¶ Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world.¶ In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. .¶ He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.”¶ “Hunger feeds anarchy.”¶ This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” ¶ He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.”¶ As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves.¶ Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry.¶ A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon.¶ The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

#### Green capitalism solves environmental impacts – business practice, tech innovation, and biomimicry. The only reason we have renewables is because market incentives like green cap.

**Scales 17** (Ivan R., Sir Harvey McGrath lecturer in Geography and Fellow, St Catharine's College, "Green capitalism", The International Encyclopedia of Geography, 2017, DOA: 7-26-2017) //Snowball

Although the various ideas underpinning green capitalism have a long history, it is only since the emergence of the concept of sustainable development in the 1980s that they have become mainstream. This represents a significant shift away from the “limits to growth” and “zero growth” environmentalism of the 1960s and 1970s, which argued for radical political, economic, and cultural changes to drastically cut production and consumption. Green capitalism also fits well with neoliberal economic thinking, which places an emphasis on individual liberty, minimal involvement of the state, and free markets as the most efficient way to coordinate the diverse needs of people.∂ Emerging forms of green capitalism∂ Accounting for nature and paying for ecosystem services There have been growing efforts to include the value of natural capital into business activities and government policy. These depend on (i) being able to calculate the value of various ecosystem services and (ii) creating mechanisms whereby those who benefit from ecosystem services pay those who maintain those services. Calculating the economic value of ecosystem services remains technically challenging. With regard to creating financial flows to pay for natural capital, the most advanced attempts to establish such schemes have been under the banner of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES). These are defined as voluntary transactions that involve the purchase of a well-defined ecosystem service from a service provider, who is paid if (and only if) the provision of that ecosystem service is secured (Wunder 2005). From a green capitalist perspective the advantage of PES is that they conform to Coase’s view that environmental issues are best left to negotiations between individuals or groups with clear ownership rights over natural resources.∂ A green industrial revolution: harnessing the competitive and innovative aspects of market forces to improve manufacturing processes∂ Internalizing the value of natural capital into the operation of markets is the first step toward green capitalism. Once pollution has a cost and natural capital has financial value it is expected that the logic of capitalism will drive innovation and efficiency to reduce costs and maximize income. In the same way that the first industrial revolution harnessed machinery and new forms of fossil fuel energy to dramatically increase productivity, a green industrial revolution would harness technology to deliver radical improvements in efficiency.∂ Hawken, Lovins, and Lovins (1999) propose a range of ways that a green industrial revolution might occur. First, radical improvements in productivity and efficiency could allow societies to produce more from fewer resources. Looking at the automobile industry, for example, ultra-light “hypercars” with fuel-efficient engines could dramatically reduce fuel consumption. In order to generate radical leaps in productivity, Hawken, Lovins, and Lovins (1999) advocate biomimicry, a design principle that imitates biological processes and structures in order to improve manufacturing and create new materials. For example, the physical properties of spider silk could be mimicked to make ultra-strong and ultra-light materials.

#### Capitalism solves war—capitalist peace theory

Harrison 11 (Mark, Department of Economics, University of Warwick, Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Birmingham, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, “Capitalism at War”, Oct 19 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/academic/harrison/papers/capitalism.pdf)

Capitalism’s Wars America is the world’s preeminent capitalist power. According to a poll of more than 21,000 citizens of 21 countries in the second half of 2008, people tend on average to evaluate U.S. foreign policy as inferior to that of their own country in the moral dimension. 4 While this survey does not disaggregate respondents by educational status, many apparently knowledgeable people also seem to believe that, in the modern world, most wars are caused by America; this impression is based on my experience of presenting work on the frequency of wars to academic seminars in several European countries. **According to the evidence, however, these beliefs are mistaken**. We are all aware of America’s wars, but they make only a small contribution to the total. Counting all bilateral conflicts involving at least the show of force from 1870 to 2001, it turns out that the countries that originated them come from all parts of the global income distribution (Harrison and Wolf 2011). Countries that are richer, measured by GDP per head, **such as America do not tend to start more conflicts**, although there is a tendency for countries with larger GDPs to do so. Ranking countries by the numbers of conflicts they initiated, the United States, with the largest economy, comes only in second place; third place belongs to China. In first place is Russia (the USSR between 1917 and 1991). What do capitalist institutions contribute to the empirical patterns in the data? Erik Gartzke (2007) has re-examined the hypothesis of the “democratic peace” based on the possibility that, **since capitalism and democracy are highly correlated across countries and time, both democracy and peace might be products of the same underlying cause, the spread of capitalist institutions**. It is a problem that our historical datasets have measured the spread of capitalist property rights and economic freedoms over shorter time spans or on fewer dimensions than political variables. For the period from 1950 to 1992, Gartzke uses a measure of external financial and trade liberalization as most likely to signal robust markets and a laissez faire policy. **Countries that share this attribute of capitalism above a certain level, he finds, do not fight each other, so there is capitalist peace as well as democratic peace**. Second, economic liberalization (of the less liberalized of the pair of countries) is a more powerful predictor of bilateral peace than democratization, controlling for the level of economic development and measures of political affinity.