# Offs

## 1 – T/combo

#### Interp – affirmatives may not spec a non-state actor – they’re jettisoning the entire topic to run a neg K on the aff

#### A] The indefinite singular subject “a just government” means the topic is not about one or even a majority of governments but the principles inherent to a just government as a concept.

Leslie et al. 9

Sarah-Jane Leslie (Department of Philosophy, Princeton University), Sangeet Khemlani (Department of Psychology, Princeton University), Sandeep Prasada (Department of Psychology, Hunter College), and Sam Glucksberg (Department of Psychology, Princeton University). “Conceptual and linguistic distinctions between singular and plural generics.” Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society. Volume 31. 2009. JDN. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/CogSci2009-singulars.pdf> -recut CAT

We are currently conducting a series of experiments to test these predictions, and we report the first two experiments of the series here. These two experiments are concerned with the distribution of acceptability of Leslie’s categories across different syntactic forms. Generics in English come in three distinct syntactic forms. (1)-(3) below exemplify these three forms: (1) Tigers are striped (2) A tiger is striped (3) The tiger is striped These three different forms of generics are known as bare plural (BP) generics, indefinite singular (IS) generics, and definite singular (DS) generics respectively. Bare plural generics have received the most attention, and are also the main focus of Prasada’s and Leslie’s work. Linguists and philosophers have noted that some statements that are perfectly acceptable in bare plural form seem a little odd in definite or indefinite singular form (Lawler, 1973; Burton-Roberts, 1977; Carlson, 1977; Krifka et al 1995). The three sentences in the triple (1)–(3) above all sound perfectly natural to our ears, but this is not so for the triples (4)–(6) and (7)-(9) on their generic interpretations: (4) Barns are red (5) ?A barn is red (6) ?The barn is red (7) Sharks attack bathers (8) ?A shark attacks bathers (9) ?The shark attacks bathers While the BP generics (4) and (7) sound perfectly natural, the IS and DS versions seem somewhat unnatural. One is tempted to interpret them as saying something about a particular barn or a particular shark, rather than saying something about barns and sharks in general. Prasada and Dillingham (2009) found that people generally did not like statistical items in IS form and Prasada and Dillingham (2006) report an unpublished experiment that found this to be the case for the DS form. The IS form is of the most theoretical interest to us, because it is generally agreed among linguists and philosophers of language that the IS is felicitous only when the relation between the subject and the predicate is in some sense “necessary”, “essential” or “inherent” (Lawler, 1973). We believe that the correct way to cash out this intuition in psychological terms is to understand the IS form as ‘selecting’ only those generalized properties that are characteristic of the kind – that is, only those connections that are principled (Prasada, in press; Leslie, in preparation). Thus it is of significant theoretical interest to learn whether people accept minority characteristics in IS form, since this would suggest that the connection between kinds and these less prevalent properties should nonetheless be counted as principled. The DS form is, unfortunately, poorly understood, so it is difficult to draw strong theoretical conclusions from a study of it. We hope, though, that the data we present here concerning the DS will contribute to a better future understanding of this elusive form. We predicted that we would confirm Prasada and Dillingham’s finding that principled/non-minority characteristic generics fare well in IS and DS forms, and that statistical/majority generics would do less well. We further predicted that Leslie’s minority characteristic generics would be judged to be acceptable in both IS and DS forms, while the striking property generics would not. Since previous work (Khemlani, Leslie, Glucksberg, & Rubio-Fernandez, 2007; Leslie, Khemlani, & Glucksberg, submitted) has found that people agree to striking and majority BP generics less often than they agree to characteristic generics, our studies were designed to compare people’s rating of BP generics to their ratings of IS generics (Experiment 1) and DS generics (Experiment 2), so as to control for the possibility of globally lower ratings for striking and majority generics. Experiment 1: Bare plural vs. indefinite singulars We asked a sample of 25 volunteers on the Internet to judge how natural it was for bare plural and indefinite singular statements to be understood as generic assertions. Method Design. We presented the four different types of predicates, as described above, one statement at a time. We also presented statements that were unequivocally incompatible with generic interpretations, e.g., ‘A kangaroo was hopping in my backyard,’ but instead tended to receive a specific interpretation. Statements appeared in either bare plural form (‘Xs are Ys’) or indefinite singular form (‘An X is a Y’), generating a 5 (predicate-type: characteristic, majority, principled, striking, and specific) x 2 (statement-type: bare plural vs. indefinite singular) repeated measures design. Participants. 25 volunteers participated in the study over the Internet through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk system for human interface tasks. All spoke English as their first language and none had participated in experiments concerning generics before. Procedure and Materials. Participants were asked to judge how natural it was to use each of the ten different types of assertions to generally characterize the kind they referred to. For a given assertion such as ‘A lion roars’, participants were given the prompt: ‘How natural would it be to use this sentence to characterize lions in general?’ They took the study over the Internet using an experiment interface written in Ajax, and registered their response by selecting from a 7- point Likert scale (+3 = very natural, 0 = neutral, -3 = very unnatural). They received 10 items of each type of predication; half were presented in bare plural form and half in indefinite singular form. They also received 5 practice trials to familiarize themselves with the scale. Each participant received the items in a different random order. Results and Discussion As a manipulation check, we included statements that were intuitively not natural ways to express genericity such as ‘squirrels are in my backyard’ (bare plural form) or ‘a squirrel is in my backyard’ (indefinite singular form). Participants responded as expected, and rated specific statements as natural on only 20% of trials (see Table 1). The forms of the sentences did not yield differential responses; participants judged bare plural specific statements as naturally expressing a generic only 21% of the time and indefinite singular statements as doing so 20% of the time (Wilcoxon test, z = .45, p = .66). In general, bare plurals received higher naturalness ratings than did indefinite singulars. Principled generics were rated higher than were characteristic generics, with majority and striking predicate types rated even lower. These differences were assessed via a 5 x 2 within-subjects ANOVA, which yielded a significant main effect of predication type, F(4, 100) = 87.17, p < .0001, a significant main effect of statement type, F(1, 24) = 6.77, p < .05, and a significant interaction, F(4, 100) = 4.25, p < .005. Mean ratings of generic naturalness express a continuous measure that does not take into consideration the semantic values of the points on the scale, i.e., naturalness, neutrality, and unnaturalness. Table 1: Mean ratings of generic naturalness as a function of statement and predicate type in Experiment 1. Statement type Predicate type Bare plural Indefinite singular Principled 2.46 2.14 Characteristic 1.93 1.72 Majority 0.58 -0.22 Striking 0.28 -0.24 Specific -1.38 -1.15 That is, it may be meaningful that participants yield more natural than neutral responses for certain predications. To examine such patterns, we analyzed participants’ responses categorically. Points on the Likert scale were collapsed such that -3 to -1 denoted responses in which participants believed the assertion was not naturally used to characterize the category in general; point 0 on the scale denoted the case in which the participants could not tell whether the assertion was naturally a generic or not; and points +1 to +3 on the scale denoted the case in which participants believed that Figure 1. The distribution of responses in Experiment 1 as a function of predicate type and statement type. the assertion could take on a generic interpretation. The distributions of the categorical responses as a function of statement and predication types are shown in Figure 1. We then made comparisons across pairs of responses to determine whether a certain statement and predicate type yielded a different pattern of responses than another by comparing the differences between naturalness responses and unnaturalness responses for pairs of interest. Principled and characteristic predications. Participants judged principled (e.g., ‘tigers have stripes’) and characteristic (e.g., ‘ducks lay eggs’) statements as naturally expressing a generic on 94% and 87% of trials, respectively (Wilcoxon test, z = 2.27, p < .05). Principled statements were judged marginally more natural as generics when they were in bare plural form than when they were in indefinite singular form (97% vs. 91%, Wilcoxon test, z = 1.80, p = .07). Characteristic statements were not reliably judged more natural in bare plural form than in indefinite singular form (88% vs. 83%, Wilcoxon test, z = 1.58, p = .11). Naturalness judgments on principled and characteristic statements were not reliably sensitive to sentential form, and these statements were judged as natural on the preponderance of trials. Majority and striking predications. Majority and striking predications were judged as naturally expressing a generic on 47% and 46% of trials respectively (Wilcoxon test, z = .47, p = .64). Majority statements were judged as more natural in bare plural form than in indefinite singular form (59% vs. 34%, Wilcoxon test, z = 3.25, p < .005). Likewise, striking statements yielded a similar pattern of responses; they were judged more natural in bare plural form, but the difference between the two sentential forms was marginal (51% vs. 41%, Wilcoxon test, z = 1.81, p = .07). As Figure 1 shows, participants tended to rate majority and striking statements as naturally expressing a generic on most trials when the statements appeared as bare plurals (59% and 51% respectively), but did not do so when the statements appeared as indefinite singulars (34% and 41% respectively). These data suggest that principled and characteristic generic assertions tend to be rated as naturally expressing generalizations irrespective of statement type, i.e., as bare plurals or as indefinite singulars. In contrast, majority predications tended to be rated as less natural, but with the bare plural form rated as significantly more natural than the indefinite singular. Finally, striking predications were also rated as less natural than principled and characteristic predications in general, with a marginal preference for the BP form over the IS form. These findings support our predictions, including our hypothesis that the difference between how the striking items were rated in BP vs. IS form would be less than the difference for the majority items perhaps because striking generics are accepted only if the corresponding disposition is characteristic of the kind (Leslie, 2007, 2008; Prasada, in press).

#### B] “Recognize” means the agent of action must be a government – THEIR author

1AC Crepon, RE-CUT, CATONSVILLE READS GREEN

Marc Crépon & Micol Bez 19; Marc Crépon is a French philosopher and academic who writes on the subject of languages and communities in the French and German philosophies and contemporary political and moral philosophy. Micol Bez @ CPES (Cycle Pluridisciplinaire d’Études Supérieures) at the University of Paris Sciences and Letters. The Right to Strike and Legal War in Walter Benjamin's “Toward the Critique of Violence”. Critical Times 1 August 2019; 2 (2): 252–260. <https://read.dukeupress.edu/critical-times/article/2/2/252/141479/The-Right-to-Strike-and-Legal-War-in-Walter> brett -recut CAT

In other words, nothing would endanger the law more than the possibility of its authority being contested by a violence over which it has no control. The function of the law would therefore be, first and foremost, to contain violence within its own boundaries. It is in this context that, to demonstrate this surprising hypothesis, Benjamin invokes two examples: the right to strike guaranteed by the state and the law of war. Let us return to the place that the right to strike occupies within class struggle. To begin with, the very idea of such a struggle implies certain forms of violence. The strike could then be understood as one of the recognizable forms that this violence can take. However, this analytical framework is undermined as soon as this form of violence becomes regulated by a “right to strike,” such as the one recognized by law in France in 1864. What this recognition engages is, in fact, the will of the state to control the possible “violence” of the strike. Thus, the “right” of the right to strike appears as the best, if not the only, way for the state to circumscribe within (and via) the law the relative violence of class struggles. We might consider this to be the perfect illustration of the aforementioned hypothesis. Yet, there are two lines of questioning that destabilize this hypothesis that we would do well to consider First, is it legitimate to present the strike as a form of violence? Who has a vested interest in such a representation? In other words, how can we trace a clear and unequivocal demarcation between violence and nonviolence? Are we not always bound to find residues of violence, even in those actions that we would be tempted to consider nonviolent? The second line of questioning is just as important and is rooted in the distinction established by Georges Sorel, in his Reflections on Violence, between the “political strike” and the “proletarian general strike,” to which Benjamin dedicates a set of complementary analyses in §13 of his essay. Here, again, we are faced with a question of limits. What is at stake is the possibility for a certain type of strike (the proletarian general strike) to exceed the limits of the right to strike— turning, in other words, the right to strike against the law itself. The phenomenon is that of an autoimmune process, in which the right to strike that is meant to protect the law against the possible violence of class struggles is transformed into a means for the destruction of the law. The difference between the two types of strikes is nevertheless introduced with a condition: “The validity of this statement, however, is not unrestricted because it is not unconditional,” notes Benjamin in §7. We would be mistaken in believing that the right to strike is granted and guaranteed unconditionally. Rather, it is structurally subjected to a conflict of interpretations, those of the workers, on the one hand, and of the state on the other. From the point of view of the state, the partial strike cannot under any circumstance be understood as a right to exercise violence, but rather as the right to extract oneself from a preexisting (and verifiable) violence: that of the employer. In this sense, the partial strike should be considered a nonviolent action, what Benjamin named a “pure means.” The interpretations diverge on two main points. The first clearly depends on the alleged “violence of the employer,” a predicate that begs the question: Who might have the authority to recognize such violence? Evidently it is not the employer. The danger is that the state would similarly lack the incentive to make such a judgment call. It is nearly impossible, in fact, to find a single instance of a strike in which this recognition of violence was not subject to considerable controversy. The political game is thus the following: the state legislated the right to strike in order to contain class struggles, with the condition that workers must have “good reason” to strike. However, it is unlikely that a state systematically allied with (and accomplice to) employers will ever recognize reasons as good, and, as a consequence, it will deem any invocation of the right to strike as illegitimate. Workers will therefore be seen as abusing a right granted by the state, and in so doing transforming it into a violent means. On this point, Benjamin’s analyses remain extremely pertinent and profoundly contemporary. They unveil the enduring strategy of governments confronted with a strike (in education, transportation, or healthcare, for example) who, after claiming to understand the reasons for the protest and the grievances of the workers, deny that the arguments constitute sufficient reason for a strike that will likely paralyze this or that sector of the economy. They deny, in other words, that the conditions denounced by the workers display an intrinsic violence that justifies the strike. Let us note here a point that Benjamin does not mention, but that is part of Sorel’s reflections: this denial inevitably contaminates the (socialist) left once it gains power. What might previously have seemed a good reason to strike when it was the opposition is deemed an insufficient one once it is the ruling party. In the face of popular protest, it always invokes a lack of sufficient rationale, allowing it to avoid recognizing the intrinsic violence of a given social or economic situation, or of a new policy. And it is because it refuses to see this violence and to take responsibility for it that the left regularly loses workers’ support. The second conflict of interpretation concerns what is at stake in the strike. For the state, the strike implies a withdrawal or act of defiance vis-à-vis the employer, while for the workers it is a means of pressuring, if not of blackmail or even of “hostage taking.” The diference is thus between an act of suspension (which can be considered nonviolent) and one of extortion (which includes violence). Does this mean that “pure means” are not free of ambiguity, and that there can be no nonviolent action that does not include a residue of violence? It is not clear that Benjamin’s text allows us to go this far. Nevertheless, the problem of pure means, approached through the notion of the right to strike, raises the following question: Could it be that the text “Zur Kritik der Gewalt,” which we are accustomed to reading as a text on violence, deals in fact with the possibility and ambiguity of nonviolence? The opposition between the aforementioned conflicts of interpretation manifests itself in Benjamin’s excursus on the revolutionary strike, and specifically in the opposition between the political strike and the proletarian general strike, and in the meaning we should attribute to the latter. As previously discussed, the state will never admit that the right to strike is a right to violence. Its interpretative strategy consists in denying, as much as possible, the effective exercise of the right that it theoretically grants. Under these conditions, the function of the revolutionary strike is to return the strike to its true meaning; in other words, to return it to its own violence. In this context, the imperative is to move beyond idle words: a call to strike is a call to violence. This is the reason why such a call is regularly met with a violent reaction from the state, because trade unions force the state to recognize what it is trying to ignore, what it pretends to have solved by recognizing the right to strike: the irreducible violence of class struggles. This means that the previously discussed alternative between “suspension” and “extortion” is valid only for the political strike—in other words, for a strike whose primary vocation is not, contrary to that of the proletarian general strike, to revolt against the law itself. Essentially, the idea of a proletarian general strike, its myth (to borrow Sorel’s words), is to escape from this dichotomous alternative that inevitably reproduces and perpetuates the violence of domination.

#### C] “Resolved” implies a general principle – specifics can’t prove generics – that means even if it’s a good idea for tactical leaders to recognize an unconditional right to strike it doesn’t justify voting Aff

Coburn-Palo and Luong 96

Nicholas Coburn-Palo (Assistant Debate Coach and Instructor in the Department of Communication at Weber State University, formerly a fulltime speech instructor and Director of Debate at The Pinewood College Preparatory School, and formerly an active member of the National Tournament of Champions Advisory Committee) and Minh Luong (Assistant Professor in the Ethics, Politics, & Economics Program at Yale University and International Affairs Fellow at the Yale Center for International and Area Studies), “Resolutional focus in policy argumentation: theory and application.” NFL Rostrum, January, 1996. JDN. <https://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/cxluong0196.pdf> -recut CAT

Another reason why it would be logically correct to consider the resolution as the focus of the debate is the presence of alternative phrasing possibilities.9 The term "resolved" has appeared in all contemporary policy debate resolutions and a review of the literature indicates that the term implies a firmness or determination in reference to the claim which is being upheld.10 This interpretation would seem to render atypical examples irrelevant because no firmness or determination could be demonstrated in reference to the statement to which "resolved" applies. At an absolute minimum, there is no linguistic reason to believe that the resolution is meant as a boundary from which the affirmative is free to pick any example. Indeed, the authority of the topic selection committee to phrase the topic any way it wishes would seem to indicate that they at least have the option to permit the possibility of resolutionally-focused debate. The committee could have phrased the resolution as: Resolved: That a plan of the affirmative's choosing should be adopted by the United States government which would substantially change its foreign policy toward the People's Republic of China.

#### Violation – they spec “tactical leaders” – that’s the 1AC Hardt and Negri

#### Vote neg-

#### 1] Precision - the neg interp is the one with the best explanatory power for why the topic has precisely the wording that it does. Precision is a ceiling, not a floor. You should vote for the most intuitive and straightforward reading, not just any one that is minimally plausible, because the function of the topic is to coordinate research expectations, and that breaks down if each person has their own pet interp they think is most pragmatic - they’ll say they’re good enough but there’s no brightline

#### 2] Limits. they can spec any group within any country which explodes limits. That solves PICs.

#### a] any subset of workers will be with in the Aff lit, so there’s no prep or unfair surprise and

#### b] any tiny PIC like Kazakhstani mail carriers will lose to “perm do the CP” because it affirms on balance

#### 3] Resolvability—it’s more resolvable to compare semantics because you’re just comparing two definitions, but pragmatics involves weighing between different impacts and how well they connect to voters, which is less resolvable because pragmatics is way more subjective. Resolvability matters because otherwise the judge must intervene to determine a winner which is the worst form of abuse since the debaters can’t control it.

#### 4] SSD – THEIR AUTHORS

1AC Greene and Hicks ‘6, RE-CUT, CATONSVILLE READS GREEN

[Ronald Greene, former Chair of the Critical and Cultural Studies Division of the National Communication Association, and Darrin Hicks, communication studies at the University of Denver. 2006. “Lost convictions: Debating both sides and the ethical self-fashioning of liberal citizens,” <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09502380500040928>] bracketed for gender- pat // sosa

In the hands of Dennis Day, the goal of debate was to reassign the convictions of students to the process of debate as a democratic form of decision-making. In this way debate training was no longer simply a mechanism for developing critical thinking or advocacy skills, but instead, debate was now a performance technique that made possible the self-fashioning of a new form of liberal citizen. The citizen’s commitments were to be redirected to the process of debate. This redirection entails a procedural notion of liberal citizenship that asks the student to invest in debate as a method of deliberation. Our argument here rests on Day’s attempt to ethically defend debating both sides by linking the pedagogical rationale of debate to a public ethic, in this case, full and free expression. We are not claiming that debate actually creates a situation in which students who participate in the activity abandon their convictions and commitments on the issues of the day nor are we claiming that debate asks students to embrace an ungrounded relativism. For us, what is important here is that when faced with an ethical criticism of debating both sides, Day sets out a deliberative-oriented vision of democracy whereby the liberal citizen materializes by divorcing [their] his/her speech from the sincerity principle. To embody one’s commitment to the democratic norm of free and full expression required students to argumentatively perform positions they might personally oppose in order to instantiate the circulation of free and full expression and to secure a commitment toward debate as a democratic form of decision-making. Thus, the debate over debate was a struggle over the ethical attributes required for liberal citizenship.

#### a] you want to read a NEG interp on the Aff – Crepon fundamentally says the state can’t be the agent to recognize the right to strike if we’re going to bring down capitalism

#### b] shiftiness – your definition of “tactical leaders” is jello – it “includes” student groups, church groups, community groups – that’s 1AC Hardt and Negri – that means you can de-link from literally any Neg offense by arguing those aren’t the leaders we’re looking for

#### 5] TVA double-bind—Get a real solvency advocate and argue that the right to strike is the thin edge of the wedge to bring down capitalism – that’s trivially easy to find, here you go

Smith 11

[Sharon, author of Subterranean Fire: A History of Working-Class Radicalism in the United States (Haymarket, 2006) and Women and Socialism: Class, Race, and Capital (revised and updated, Haymarket, 2015). July 2011. “Marxism, unions, and class struggle: The future in the present,” <https://isreview.org/issue/78/marxism-unions-and-class-struggle/index.html>] pat -recut CAT

Shifting the balance of class forces is, of course, of immediate urgency for the U.S. labor movement. But for Marxists, a new era of class struggle also provides a path to working-class revolution—by preparing workers not only to overthrow the system but also to rule society collectively. Marx stated clearly in the German Ideology, “[T]he revolution is necessary therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because the class overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew.” Marx and Engels regarded class struggle as the means through which the working class advances from a class “in itself” to a class “for itself,” as a necessary precondition for their own self-emancipation. As Marx wrote in The Poverty of Philosophy, “Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers.… The mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and continues itself as a class for itself. The interests it defends become class interests.” The tremendous class solidarity expressed in Madison in February and March marked a leap forward in establishing a working class “for itself”—including union and non-union workers from the public and private sector, students and supporters from all over the U.S. committed to defending public sector unions in Wisconsin. Engels argued that unions, and the strike weapon in particular, are “schools of war” that train workers in class struggle, as a necessary precondition to their own self-emancipation: These strikes, at first skirmishes, sometimes result in weighty struggles; they decide nothing, it is true, but they are the strongest proof that the decisive battle between bourgeoisie and proletariat is approaching. They are the military school of the workingmen in which they prepare themselves for the great struggle which cannot be avoided.… And as schools of war, the Unions are unexcelled. Draper added to this formulation, “The trade-union movement is a school or training ground of the proletariat in a less warlike sense too, including that of preparing cadres of workers capable of administering society. Engels pointed out that ‘the working people, in the management of their colossal Trade Societies’ also prove themselves ‘fit for administrative and political work.’” Thus, while unions exist to negotiate better terms for workers under capitalism, the additional goal for revolutionaries is always to strengthen the fighting capacity of the working class, with the aim of expanding and deepening revolutionary leadership among rank-and-file workers. As such, each phase of struggle—whether a victory or a defeat—marks a particular moment in the revolutionary process. This is not a wooden formula, but involves shifting strategies and tactics appropriate for every stage of the class struggle, which will be discussed further below. Negotiating the terms of exploitation At their best, unions are indispensible vehicles for the class struggle. But since their essential function under capitalism is to negotiate the terms of exploitation on behalf of their members, their preservation depends on the continuation of capitalist class relations. As Tony Cliff and Donny Gluckstein argue, “The improvement of workers’ conditions within capitalism—not the overthrow of capitalism—is the common guideline of trade union activity in normal times. In reality unions tacitly accept the framework set by the system and tend either to exclude political issues from discussion or to support reformist political parties that do not challenge the present order of society.” At various points in Marx and Engels’ lifetimes, unions led the class struggle far forward; at others, they restrained the movement. In times of union retreat, Marx and Engels complained bitterly about the state of the trade unions. As Engels wrote in 1871, “The trade union movement, among all the big, strong and rich trade unions, has become more an obstacle to the general movement than an instrument of its progress.” The Russian revolutionary V.I. Lenin echoed Marx and Engels’ changing attitudes toward trade unions. But he too was reacting to the historic role of the unions themselves, reflecting their vacillation. In 1899, Lenin wrote, “Every strike brings thoughts of socialism very forcibly to the worker’s mind, thoughts of the struggle of the entire working class for emancipation from the oppression of capital.… This is the reason that socialists call strikes ‘a school of war,” a school in which the workers learn to make war on their enemies for the liberation of the whole people.” Just three years later, Lenin’s polemic What Is to Be Done? described the politics of trade unionism in singularly negative terms: “There is much talk of spontaneity. But the spontaneous development of the working-class movement leads to its subordination to bourgeois ideology...for the spontaneous working-class movement is trade-unionism…and trade unionism means the ideological enslavement of the workers by the bourgeoisie.” Yet three years after that, during the 1905 revolution, Lenin returned to his earlier argument, commenting that “the working class is instinctively, spontaneously Social-Democratic [socialist].”

#### Drop the debater on T—

#### a] the damage was done and I can’t regive the 1NC after a 1AR shift

#### b] severance

#### c] 7-6 timeskew

#### d] 2-1 speech skew

#### Use competing interps—

#### a] leads to a race to the top where we find the best norms

#### b] reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### c] reasonability collapses—you use offense/defense on the paradigm debate.

#### No RVIs—

#### a] logic – you don’t win for being fair

#### b] means you bait theory and go for the RVI

#### Fairness is a voter and comes first—every argument implicitly concedes to the validity of fairness, meaning if they win fairness bad vote neg because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

#### T > K – that’s Colburn-Palo and Luong

## 2 – Cap K

#### The **first link is localism – The 1AC’s decentralization and reliance upon individual “tactical leaders” doesn’t defend the real consequences of any effort to change conditions - this cannot confront neoliberalism - we must move beyond feel-good horizontalism.**

Williams 13

Alex PhD student at the University of East London working on a thesis entitled Complexity and Hegemony. "Escape Velocities." e-flux journal 46 (2013). <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/46/60063/escape-velocities/> -CAT  
Such a future is only going to be possible with significant transformations in the radical Left. The Euro-American Left’s current obsessions with localism, direct action, and deliberative democracy are ill-matched when confronted with the acephalous monstrosity that is global capital today. What is therefore necessary is the constitution of a Left comfortable with globality, complexity, mediation, quantification, and technology, rather than sentimentalized modes of action and organization more suited to generating an affective sensation of feeling good in pious defeat, rather than efficacious action. The fetishization of localized horizons of direct democracy must be replaced by a more substantive conception of collective self-mastery, wherein the more we are able to harness our knowledge of the social and technical world, the better we will be able to effectively rule ourselves. This Promethean politics of maximal mastery over society and its environment will necessarily be highly experimental in nature. The older forms of mastery more traditionally associated with Enlightenment thinking stressed a Laplacian absolute knowledge, fit for a clockwork Newtonian universe. Today, our knowledge of non-trivial complex systems means that any attempts at mastering our world entail developing a mode of action which is more capable of metabolizing contingency, able to use the technical tools at its disposal to model the range of possible outcomes to any interventions.

#### The second link is poetics—the 1AC re-imagines culturally conservative institutions like schools and churches as revolutionaries – that kind of literary play-acting becomes a cover for economic exploitation at the level of subjectivity – their so-called “leaders” will hold rhetorical but not real power

Gräbner and Wood 10

(Cornelia – Lecturer of European Languages and Cultures at Lancester University, and David – Researcher at the Institute for Aesthetic Research of the National Autonomous University of Mexico, “Poetics of Resistance: Introduction,” Cosmos & History 6(2):2-19, accessed 2-5-15 //Bosley) -CAT

The title of this special issue, poetics of Resistance, is also the name of a network of scholars and cultural producers. The network was founded in 2007 with the purpose of developing new analytical approaches for an understanding of the relationship between creativity, culture, and political resistance, in the context of neoliberal globalization, and from a perspective of committed scholarship. The founding members of the network felt that global neoliberal politics had created a situation in which the relationship between these three categories—creativity, the impact of neoliberalism, a committed position—became increasingly difficult to translate into practices of committed research and cultural production. This difficulty seemed to derive from a variety of reasons. one was that the term ‘cultural resistance’ seemed to hold rhetorical rather than analytical or descriptive power. In his introduction to the Cultural Resistance Reader, Stephen Duncombe unravels some of the diverse meanings that the term can take on. he suggests that we think of cultural resistance in terms of ‘scales of resistance’, which he equates with ‘political engagement’. Duncombe suggests the existence of three scale measures: political self-consciousness, the social unit engaged in cultural resistance, and the results of cultural resistance.2 While Duncombe’s model of scales can be a productive approach if one wishes to analyse a great variety of practices in light of their resistant function(s), it does raise the question of which cultural practices are not at least potentially acts of political resistance, and what descriptive power the term ‘resistance’ still holds if it can be equally applied to shopping and to anti-consumerist culture jamming, for example. as Duncombe himself points out, the concept ‘culture’ is partially the source of such an excess of meaning:3 here i’m referring to culture as a thing, there as a set of norms, behaviors and ways to make sense of the world, and in still other places, i’m describing culture as a process. … The term ‘cultural resistance’ is no firmer. in the following pages i use it to describe culture that is used, consciously or unconsciously, effectively or not, to resist and/or change the dominant political, economic and/or social structure. but cultural resistance, too, can mean many things and take on many forms. Combining ‘resistance’ with ‘poetics’ limits the scope of the practices under discussion. ‘poetics’—as distinct from ‘culture’—encourages a focus on individual creativity rather than on the wider category of cultural practices. Those are still discussed; however, in the contexts discussed here this is usually done in relation to poetic practices. The register of individuality and subjectivity that is linked with the term poetics, and the evocation of collectivity and community through the term resistance, places the practices and works under discussion in a tension between these categories. it encourages an analytical approach that considers the relationship between the work of art, the subjectivities of its creator(s) and of its recipients, and the social movements or political ideologies with which it is linked. The place of the work of art in the tension field between the subjective and the collective, and the relationality that the existence of this tension field necessarily entails, has emerged as one of the most important foci of the work of members of the network. The term ‘resistance’, in the way it is used by the network, needs further explanation. We use it with specific reference to neoliberalism, as one recent form of capitalism, while also maintaining an interest in practices of creative resistance to pre-neoliberal regimes of capital. This focus was chosen to facilitate the response to a very particular situation which is characterized by the implementation of a specific set of ideologically based policies while, at the same time, the existence of the ideological dimension is disavowed by policy makers. as eagleton points out, proponents of conservatism (we may apply this more concretely to neoliberalism) are wary of acknowledging its own ideological status, since ‘to dub their own beliefs ideological would be to risk turning them into objects of contestation’.4 neoliberalism thus pretends to be pragmatic rather than ideological; interested in policy rather than ideology. This pretence is made easier by neoliberalism having originally emerged as an economic theory. David harvey writes:5 neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. … but beyond these tasks the state should not venture. This ‘theory of political economic practices’ does, however, have ideological underpinnings which are crucially important to an understanding of neoliberalism’s impact on the arts, and also on scholarship. Those ideological underpinnings have become ever more obvious as the economic theory proves to be flawed, inadequate, and destructive. since the crisis of 2008, it has become ever more necessary for neoliberalism’s proponents to maintain the appearance of its overall coherence and effectiveness. ideology is indispensable for this. Other actors—not politicians—have to step in and provide the justification for the continuity of neoliberal politics. This justification draws on the previous ‘construction of consent’, as harvey calls it, and this draws increasingly on the pretension that ‘there is no alternative’. Culture in the widest sense plays a part in translating the ideological points outlined by harvey into more generalized assumptions, discursive figures, and commonly held beliefs. Thus, neoliberalism creates imaginaries that can then inform the creative imagination or that, conversely, are projected through works of art without this necessarily being the intention of the artist. The potentially complicit functions of art and scholarship and their co-optation, are important areas of interest of the members of the network. at the same time—and this interest is more prominently represented in the articles collected in this issue—the members of the network explore how works of art can effectively resist the imposition of neoliberal ideology and the absorption of art by neoliberal politics, either by creating alternative imaginaries or by contributing to and interacting with political projects that stand in opposition to the neoliberal model. This sometimes implies seeking spaces of artistic praxis ‘outside’ neoliberalism, but frequently involves entering into discursive, and sometimes financial, negotiation with neoliberally-informed social, cultural and educational structures. For those of us working in higher education, as we will see below, such negotiation is an everyday reality. ConCepTualizinG ResisTanCe The decision to focus specifically on neoliberalism, and on poetics rather than culture, requires a re-conceptualization of resistance and, with reference to scholarship, a re- thinking of the critical approaches to the relationship between creativity and resistance. a brief discussion of influential theoretical works on poetry as a practice of resistance highlights why it is difficult to use these approaches to understand the work of art in times of neoliberalism. John beverley and Marc zimmerman’s analysis of poetry in the Central american revolutions was able to draw on a revolutionary and ideological practice that informed literature; barbara harlow in Resistance Literature establishes a connection between resistance in literature and anti-colonial liberation struggles; and Carolyn forché in Against Forgetting argues that the act of witnessing as an act of resistance against enforced oblivion translates into an act of political resistance. however, the insidious and gradual insertion of a supposedly non-ideological neoliberal imaginary into cultural imaginaries is not as easily identifiable as an act of oppression or persecution. The neoliberal imaginary does not explicitly endorse or justify violence, and therefore is more complex to resist or to contest. hardt and negri’s concepts of the global state of war and the global state of exception capture this elastic presence of violence and oppression. 6 The conceptualization of resistance is tied in with two further complexities: the place of the work of art in relation to resistance struggles, and the effectiveness of resistant works of art. both points are addressed in most essays in this issue, though authors come to different resolutions. The bearers of resistance struggles in the political sphere are some governments—for instance, those that form part of the bolivarian alternative for the americas (alba)—and a great variety of social movements. The emergence of new social movements as bearers of resistance struggles has opened up the question about the place of art and culture in relation to these movements. hardt and negri’s approach has been influential in this respect, and it is also exemplary of an approach with which members of the network struggle. in Empire, hardt and negri argue for an approach to culture that emphasizes its economic power:7 The various analyses of ‘new social movements’ have done a great service in insisting on the political importance of cultural movements against narrowly economic perspectives that minimize their significance. These analyses, however, are extremely limited themselves because … they perpetuate narrow understandings of the economic and the cultural. Most important, they fail to recognize the profound economic power of the cultural movements, or really the increasing indistinguishability of economic and cultural phenomena. on the one hand, capitalist relations were expanding to subsume all aspects of social production and reproduction, the entire realm of life; and on the other hand, cultural relations were redefining the production processes and economic structures of value. A regime of production, and above all a regime of the production of subjectivity, was being destroyed and another invented by the enormous accumulation of struggles.

#### The alternative: embrace an anti-captialist praxis that decouples both the means of survival and inherent human dignity from labor; rigorous intellectual analysis can lead us to a world without work.

Livingston 16
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So the question is not how to put us all back to work for a minimum wage — fuck that — it’s how to detach income from time spent on the job**.** But look, we’ve already done that, too. Wall Street bankers don’t do much of anything except peddle bad paper, but they get paid millions of dollars. Teachers, professors, novelists, journalists, carpenters, musicians, and janitors do everything we say we value — they educate, entertain, they build things, and they clean up after us — but they get paid almost nothing. Meanwhile the so-called welfare state has also decoupled income from work, but not so that you’d notice unless you, like Paul Ryan and Jeb Bush, think “entitlements” are a danger to the moral fiber of the nation. Remember, 20 percent of all household income now arrives in the form of a transfer payment from government, and every Walmart “associate” is a ward of the state, someone collecting food stamps or using the emergency room for routine health care, because he or she can’t make it on the wages alone. So it’s not as if we don’t know how to do what needs to be done, which is detach income from work; it’s that we refuse to face the fact that it’s now simply necessary to complete what we’ve already begun — which is the transition to a postcapitalist society, where wage labor neither determines nor disfigures daily life. How, then, do we face the fact? I don’t doubt the moral and political significance of a movement for a higher minimum wage, $15 an hour. But as I’ve said, forty hours a week at this pay grade just puts you at the poverty line (and you know Coda 97 you’re not getting forty hours, because that would require real benefits from your employer). What is the point of a higher minimum wage, then, except to prove that you have a work ethic? Excuse me, that’s another rhetorical question. There’s no good reason to increase wages by legislative fiat if the labor market is broken. But there’s a good reason to replace that market. So what is to be done, for now, is intellectual work. Our question is, how to imagine a moral universe that isn’t anchored to or limited by socially necessary labor — how we learn to accept income that can’t be accounted for by reference to time on the job. To hell with full employment. How about full enjoyment? Fuck work. II Love and work — the two things we all want, according to Freud and every other student of human nature — have pretty much the same function in our lives. Like good teachers, they take us out of ourselves, into the world. Love and work commit us to purposes that we didn’t invent, and so they teach us to devise and evaluate our own. When we’re in love, what we most want is that the person we love can become what he or she wants to be, partly because we know that this urgent desire includes us. When we’re at work, what we most want is to get the assigned task completed, because we know that this is what our coworkers need — we know that this 98 Coda completion will free us from the commands of the past, and so let us experience the present, enter the future. In love or at work, commitment is a condition, but also a boundary and a limit. It requires certain behaviors, and it precludes others. But commitment in either emotional venue doesn’t necessarily mean a cancellation of your own purposes, although of course it can. The thing about love and work is that you typically feel commitment as both the limitation and the liberation of your own volition — as the realization rather than the negation of your self, of your natural talents, past effort, and learned skills. Think about it as a musical proposition. You can’t play the blues without mastering the genre, which is pretty simple without memorizing the chords and the changes and the lyrics. But you can’t improvise, make it new, become yourself as a player or a singer, without that preparation, that commitment. “Piety is not only honorable,” as G. L. S. Shackle put it in explaining the Keynesian revolution, “it is indispensable. Innovation is helpless without tradition.” Love forces us to acknowledge antecedents — the physical actuality and the moral capacity of other people. You can have sex with anyone without this doubled acknowledgment, but you can’t love someone without it. Broaden that dictum and you find that poor old Immanuel Kant was right, after all, in rendering the Golden Rule as a philosophical principle. To love your neighbor as yourself, he must appear to you as an end in himself, not a means to your ends, whether they’re sexual, economic, or political. Coda 99 To love someone is to treat him or her as a person who must be different from you, and who must, by the same token, be your equal. Otherwise you could rightfully decide their purposes for them, which would mean treating their moral capacity as absent or insufficient. Everyone would then appear to you as a slave or a child in need of your tutelage. The obvious limits of this supervisory vantage, by the way, are arguments against the idea that parental love (or God’s love for all his children) is the paradigm of love as such. To love your neighbor, to be your brother’s keeper, is, then, to care for yourself, and vice versa. That is what we have yet to learn. “As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master.” That’s how Abraham Lincoln put it in an unpublished note to himself. Harry Frankfurt puts it differently, but no less usefully, in a book called The Reasons of Love: “There must be something else that a person loves — something that cannot reasonably, or even intelligibly, be identified as his ‘self’ — in order for there to be anything at all to which his self-love is actually devoted A person cannot love himself except insofar as he loves other things.”[1](#bookmark11) Work seems much different than love in such perspective. A TV series like The Office and movies like Office Space or Horrible Bosses exist and succeed precisely because the people in charge quite realistically violate this Kantian principle, the Golden Rule. But that is why the heroes of these fictions say, “No, I would prefer not to.” They’re Bartleby the Scrivener all over again because they don’t stand up to anybody, they don’t even leave the office, no, they subvert the system by hanging around or doing something stupid. 100 Coda But what these fools, our fools, keep demonstrating is their moral capacity, however bumbling it may seem to their bosses, and to us the audience — at first, anyway. They insist that they must be acknowledged as agents in their own right, as moral personalities who can steer this business, and their own lives, as well as anyone in charge. They reject what Hegel, also Nietzsche, called “slave morality,” the idea that self-mastery is an interior to which no exterior corresponds. (The fascination with manual labor on reality TV, as in Dirty Jobs or Ice Truckers, has the same political valence; it’s a way of saying that every man, every woman, can decide for himself or herself, without guidance from the well-groomed and the well-educated.) Finally, love and work similarly remind us that the material artifacts of this world, whether natural or man-made, can be indifferent, even resistant, to our efforts. Here the rules of love begin to look like the laws of science — you can’t make the be- loved do what he or she won’t, or can’t, not anymore than you can bend the earth to your will. And here again that knowledge is a form of self-consciousness, a way of learning the limits of what we can ask of others, of the world. It’s a way of asking ourselves, given this situation, what can I do about it? Still, what becomes of love when work disappears? III Love and work as we know them, as the choices we make that decide who we are as individuals — these are the essential Coda 101 ingredients of modern times. They date from the late eighteenth century, when the notion of individualism we take for granted, as an expression of unique qualities that sets each of us apart from all others, took hold because it could, because the idea that “all men are created equal” became first a revolutionary slogan and then a cultural commonplace. So the real question is, what happens to us when work must be love? This absurd question is what we must answer, because work is no longer our lot. Unlike every generation before us, we can do without it, and we’ll have to. We don’t need to work. But if we want to survive, we have to love each other, as ourselves — we have to be our brothers’ keepers. It’s not merely a moral imperative, as Kant would have it; this is a practical, economic necessity. There’s not enough work to go around. We can produce more every year, every month, with less and less labor time. We lost our race with the machine, and we know the robots are coming to take our jobs and steal our emotions. That means the principle of productivity — from each according to his or her input, to each according to his or her output — is outmoded, even ridiculous, and not just because the more we produce, the more we destroy. That principle of productivity has been more or less incongruent with reality for a hundred years; but then cultural revolutions typically take about a century. The relation between goods produced and income received has been totally unintelligible for that long, anyway, since the “human element” could be eliminated from the factories, and now from the banks and 102 Coda the stores and the warehouses, by electrification, automation, instrumentation, cybernation, computerization. So, what is to be done? The first thing we do is kill all the bankers. Just kidding; we need them to keep the books. No, the first thing is, we think through what it means to detach income from work. Then we invent practical means of doing so. We don’t have to start from scratch just because for the last fifty years, liberals, conservatives, and all those in between have been addressing the wrong issue, “full employment.” Instead, we start with Nixon’s Family Assistance Program, and see where it leads us. Eventually we’ll decide that, in the absence of jobs that pay a living wage, even at a minimum of $15 an hour, we have to provide everyone with a guaranteed annual income, regardless of the work they do. Then we get to ask the real questions.

#### Thus, the ROB - vote for the debater who has the better liberatory strategy to free us from neoliberalism – yes this K is so good it has a solvency advocate

Medea and Davies 21 (10/20/21)

[Medea Benjamin](https://www.commondreams.org/author/medea-benjamin), co-founder of [Global Exchange](http://www.globalexchange.org/) and [CODEPINK: Women for Peace](http://www.codepinkalert.org/), is the author of the 2018 book, "[Inside Iran: The Real History and Politics of the Islamic Republic of Iran](https://www.amazon.com/Inside-Iran-History-Politics-Republic/dp/1944869654)." Her previous books include: "[Kingdom of the Unjust: Behind the U.S.-Saudi Connection](https://www.amazon.com/Kingdom-Unjust-Behind-U-S-Saudi-Connection/dp/1944869026)" (2016); "[Drone Warfare: Killing by Remote Control](https://bookshop.org/a/16708/9781781680773)" (2013); "[Don’t Be Afraid Gringo: A Honduran Woman Speaks from the Heart](https://bookshop.org/a/16708/9780060972059)" (1989), and (with Jodie Evans) "[Stop the Next War Now (Inner Ocean Action Guide)](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/B004D4Y3A2?ie=UTF8&tag=commondreams-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=B004D4Y3A2)" (2005). [Nicolas J. S. Davies](https://www.commondreams.org/author/nicolas-js-davies) is an independent journalist, a researcher with CODEPINK and the author of [Blood On Our Hands: the American Invasion and Destruction of Iraq.](https://bookshop.org/a/16708/9781934840986) “Our Future vs. Neoliberalism” Common Dreams. October 20, 2021. <https://www.commondreams.org/views/2021/10/20/our-future-vs-neoliberalism?fbclid=IwAR3Wb3UHFCPxvh-QbPSXrPYct2qVNq5Va1WLfTpik1Eh6msAwLas1a1Ky1U> Accessed October 28, 2021 -CAT

In country after country around the world, people are rising up to challenge entrenched, failing [neoliberal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoliberalism) political and economic systems, with mixed but sometimes promising results. [Progressive leaders](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/09/progressive-democrats-congress-strength-infrastructure-reconciliation) in the U.S. Congress are refusing to back down on the Democrats' promises to American voters to reduce poverty, expand rights to healthcare, education, and clean energy, and repair a shredded social safety net. After decades of tax cuts for the rich, they are also committed to raising taxes on wealthy Americans and corporations to pay for this popular agenda. Americans should likewise demand that our government stop wasting trillions of dollars to militarize the world and destroy countries like Afghanistan and Iraq, and start solving our real problems, here and abroad. Germany has elected a [ruling coalition](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-58924480) of Social Democrats, Greens and Free Democrats that excludes the conservative Christian Democrats for the first time since 2000. The new government promises a $14 minimum wage, solar panels on all suitable roof space, 2% of land for wind farms and the closure of Germany's last coal-fired power plants by 2030. Iraqis voted in an election that was called in response to a popular [protest movement](https://www.juancole.com/2019/12/iraqis-against-corruption.html) launched in October 2019 to challenge the [endemic corruption](https://english.alaraby.co.uk/news/iraq-150bn-stolen-oil-cash-smuggled-out-2003) of the post-2003 political class and its subservience to U.S. and Iranian interests. The protest movement was split between taking part in the election and boycotting it, but its candidates still won about 35 seats and will [have a voice](https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/iraq-elections-how-change-political-landscape) in parliament. The party of long-time Iraqi nationalist leader Muqtada al-Sadr won 73 seats, the largest of any single party, while Iranian-backed parties whose armed militias killed hundreds of protesters in 2019 lost popular support and many of their seats. Chile's billionaire president, Sebastian Piñera, is being [impeached](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/13/chile-sebastian-pinera-impeachment-proceedings-pandora-papers) after the Pandora Papers revealed details of bribery and tax evasion in his sale of a mining company, and he could face up to 5 years in prison. Mass street protests in 2019 forced Piñera to agree to a new constitution to replace the one written under the Pinochet military dictatorship, and [a convention](https://publicseminar.org/essays/chile-tries-to-write-a-new-constitution/) that includes representatives of indigenous and other marginalized communities has been elected to draft the constitution. Progressive parties and candidates are expected to do well in the general election in November. Maybe the greatest success of people power has come in Bolivia. In 2020, only a year after a U.S.-backed right-wing [military coup](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/sep/18/silence-us-backed-coup-evo-morales-bolivia-american-states), a [mass mobilization](https://peoplesdispatch.org/2020/08/07/national-strike-continues-across-bolivia-demands-grow-for-anez-to-step-down/) of mostly indigenous working people forced a new election, and the socialist MAS Party of Evo Morales was returned to power. [Since then](https://portside.org/2021-10-16/bolivia-shows-us-what-possible) it has already introduced a new wealth tax and welfare payments to four million people to help eliminate hunger in Bolivia. The Ideological Context Since the 1970s, Western political and corporate leaders have peddled a quasi-religious belief in the power of "free" markets and unbridled capitalism to solve all the world's problems. This new ["neoliberal"](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoliberalism) orthodoxy is a thinly disguised reversion to the systematic injustice of 19th century laissez-faire capitalism, which led to gross inequality and poverty even in wealthy countries, famines that killed [tens of millions](https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/01/02/18/reviews/010218.18senlt.html) of people in India and China, and horrific exploitation of the poor and vulnerable worldwide. For most of the 20th century, Western countries gradually responded to the excesses and injustices of capitalism by using the power of government to redistribute wealth through [progressive taxation](https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-soi/02inpetr.pdf) and a growing public sector, and ensure broad access to public goods like education and healthcare. This led to a gradual expansion of broadly shared prosperity in the United States and Western Europe through a strong public sector that balanced the power of private corporations and their owners. The steadily growing shared prosperity of the post-WWII years in the West was derailed by a combination of factors, including the 1973 OPEC oil embargo, Nixon's freeze on prices and wages, runaway inflation caused by dropping the gold standard, and then a second oil crisis after the 1979 Iranian Revolution. Right-wing politicians led by Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in the U.K. blamed the power of organized labor and the public sector for the economic crisis. They launched a "neoliberal" counter-revolution to bust unions, shrink and privatize the public sector, cut taxes, deregulate industries and supposedly unleash "the magic of the market." Then they took credit for a return to economic growth that really owed more to the end of the [oil crises](https://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/10/ronald-reagans-legacy/). The United States and United Kingdom used their economic, military and media power to spread their neoliberal gospel across the world. [Chile's experiment](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/nov/13/why-is-inequality-booming-in-chile-blame-the-chicago-boys) in neoliberalism under Pinochet's military dictatorship became a model for U.S. efforts to roll back the "pink tide" in Latin America. When the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe opened to the West at the end of the Cold War, it was the extreme, neoliberal brand of capitalism that Western economists imposed as "[shock therapy](https://newint.org/features/2004/04/01/facts/)" to privatize state-owned enterprises and open countries to Western corporations. In the United States, the mass media shy away from the word "neoliberalism" to describe the changes in society since the 1980s. They describe its effects in less systemic terms, as globalization, privatization, deregulation, consumerism and so on, without calling attention to their common ideological roots. This allows them to treat its impacts as separate, unconnected problems: poverty and inequality, [mass incarceration](https://books.google.com/books?id=fFJh8wZlDIAC&pg=PA411#v=onepage&q&f=false), environmental degradation, ballooning debt, money in politics, disinvestment in public services, declines in public health, permanent war, and record military spending. After a generation of systematic neoliberal control, it is now obvious to people all over the world that neoliberalism has utterly failed to solve the world's problems. As many predicted all along, it has just enabled the rich to get [much, much richer](https://inequality.org/research/growing-apart-political-history-american-inequality/), while structural and even existential problems remain unsolved. Even once people have grasped the self-serving, predatory nature of this system that has overtaken their political and economic life, many still fall victim to the demoralization and powerlessness that are among its most insidious products, as they are brainwashed to see themselves only as individuals and consumers, instead of as active and collectively powerful citizens. In effect, confronting neoliberalism—whether as individuals, groups, communities or countries—requires a two-step process. First, we must understand the nature of the beast that has us and the world in its grip, whatever we choose to call it. Second, we must overcome our own demoralization and powerlessness, and rekindle our collective power as political and economic actors to build the better world we know is possible. We will see that collective power in the streets and the suites at COP26 in Glasgow, when the world's leaders will gather to confront the reality that neoliberalism has allowed corporate profits to trump a rational response to the devastating impact of fossil fuels on the Earth's climate. Extinction Rebellion and other groups will be [in the streets](https://rebellion.global/blog/2020/08/31/act-now-extinction-rebellion-demands/) in Glasgow, demanding the long-delayed action that is required to solve the problem, including an end to net carbon emissions by 2025. While scientists warned us for decades what the result would be, political and business leaders have peddled their [neoliberal snake oil](https://www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/environment/stefanik-market-solutions.html) to keep filling their coffers at the expense of the future of life on Earth. If we fail to stop them now, living conditions will keep deteriorating for people everywhere, as the natural world our lives depend on is washed out from under our feet, goes up in smoke and, species by species, dies and disappears forever. The Covid pandemic is another real world case study on the impact of neoliberalism. As the official death toll reaches [5 million](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/covid-cases.html) and many more deaths go unreported, rich countries are still [hoarding vaccines](https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/us-must-stop-hoarding-excess-covid-19-vaccine-doses), drug companies are reaping a [bonanza of profits](https://www.commondreams.org/newswire/2021/09/15/pharmaceutical-companies-reaping-immoral-profits-covid-vaccines-yet-paying-low) from vaccines and new drugs, and the lethal, devastating injustice of the entire neoliberal "market" system is laid bare for the whole world to see. Calls for a "[people's vaccine](https://www.citizen.org/article/a-plan-for-the-peoples-vaccine/)" and "vaccine justice" have been challenging what has now been termed "vaccine apartheid." Conclusion In the 1980s, U.K. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher often [told the world](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/There_is_no_alternative), "There is no alternative" to the neoliberal order she and President Reagan were unleashing. After only one or two generations, the self-serving insanity they prescribed and the crises it has caused have made it a question of survival for humanity to find alternatives. Around the world, ordinary people are rising up to demand real change. The people of Iraq, Chile and Bolivia have overcome the incredible traumas inflicted on them to take to the streets in the thousands and demand better government. Americans should likewise demand that our government stop wasting trillions of dollars to militarize the world and destroy countries like Afghanistan and Iraq, and start solving our real problems, here and abroad. People around the world understand the nature of the problems we face better than we did a generation or even a decade ago. Now we must overcome demoralization and powerlessness in order to act. It helps to understand that the demoralization and powerlessness we may feel are themselves products of this neoliberal system, and that simply overcoming them is a victory in itself. As we reject the inevitability of neoliberalism and Thatcher's lie that there is no alternative, we must also reject the lie that we are just passive, powerless consumers. As human beings, we have the same collective power that human beings have always had to build a better world for ourselves and our children—and now is the time to harness that power.

#### And, dismantling capitalism o/ws under under any framework -- it’s the greatest existential threat and the biggest affront to human rights and structural inequalities. The consensus of recent studies prove that transition is possible but that requires radical rejection of current neoliberal politics

Ahmed 20
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* The last paragraph shows that rapid peaceful transition is possible so put away that garbage Harris 02 transition wars card

The COVID19 pandemic has exposed a strange anomaly in the global economy. If it doesn’t keep growing endlessly, it just breaks. Grow, or die. But there’s a deeper problem. New scientific research confirms that capitalism’s structural obsession with endless growth is destroying the very conditions for human survival on planet Earth. A landmark study in the journal Nature Communications, “Scientists’ warning on affluence” — by scientists in Australia, Switzerland and the UK — concludes that the most fundamental driver of environmental destruction is the overconsumption of the super-rich. This factor lies over and above other factors like fossil fuel consumption, industrial agriculture and deforestation: because it is overconsumption by the super-rich which is the chief driver of these other factors breaching key planetary boundaries. The paper notes that the richest 10 percent of people are responsible for up to 43 percent of destructive global environmental impacts. In contrast, the poorest 10 percent in the world are responsible just around 5 percent of these environmental impacts: The new paper is authored by Thomas Wiedmann of UNSW Sydney’s School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Manfred Lenzen of the University of Sydney’s School of Physics, Lorenz T. Keysser of ETH Zürich’s Department of Environmental Systems Science, and Julia K. Steinberger of Leeds University’s School of Earth and Environment. It confirms that global structural inequalities in the distribution of wealth are intimately related to an escalating environmental crisis threatening the very existence of human societies. Synthesising knowledge from across the scientific community, the paper identifies capitalism as the main cause behind “alarming trends of environmental degradation” which now pose “existential threats to natural systems, economies and societies.” The paper concludes: “It is clear that prevailing capitalist, growth-driven economic systems have not only increased affluence since World War II, but have led to enormous increases in inequality, financial instability, resource consumption and environmental pressures on vital earth support systems.” Capitalism and the pandemic Thanks to the way capitalism works, the paper shows, the super-rich are incentivised to keep getting richer — at the expense of the health of our societies and the planet overall. The research provides an important scientific context for how we can understand many earlier scientific studies revealing that industrial expansion has hugely increased the risks of new disease outbreaks. Just last April, a paper in Landscape Ecology found that deforestation driven by increased demand for consumption of agricultural commodities or beef have increased the probability of ‘zoonotic’ diseases (exotic diseases circulating amongst animals) jumping to humans. This is because industrial expansion, driven by capitalist pressures, has intensified the encroachment of human activities on wildlife and natural ecosystems. Two years ago, another study in Frontiers of Microbiology concluded presciently that accelerating deforestation due to “demographic growth” and the associated expansion of “farming, logging, and hunting”, is dangerously transforming rural environments. More bat species carrying exotic viruses have ended up next to human dwellings, the study said. This is increasing “the risk of transmission of viruses through direct contact, domestic animal infection, or contamination by urine or faeces.” It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the COVID19 pandemic thus emerged directly from these rapidly growing impacts of human activities. As the new paper in Nature Communications confirms, these impacts have accelerated in the context of the fundamental operations of industrial capitalism. Eroding the ‘safe operating space’ The result is that capitalism is causing human societies to increasingly breach key planetary boundaries, such as land-use change, biosphere integrity and climate change. Remaining within these boundaries is essential to maintain what scientists describe as a “safe operating space” for human civilization. If those key ecosystems are disrupted, that “safe operating space” will begin to erode. The global impacts of the COVID19 pandemic are yet another clear indication that this process of erosion has already begun. “The evidence is clear,” write Weidmann and his co-authors. “Long-term and concurrent human and planetary wellbeing will not be achieved in the Anthropocene if affluent overconsumption continues, spurred by economic systems that exploit nature and humans. We find that, to a large extent, the affluent lifestyles of the world’s rich determine and drive global environmental and social impact. Moreover, international trade mechanisms allow the rich world to displace its impact to the global poor.” The new scientific research thus confirms that the normal functioning of capitalism is eroding the ‘safe space’ by which human civilisation is able to survive. The structures The paper also sets out how this is happening in some detail. The super-rich basically end up driving this destructive system forward in three key ways. Firstly, they are directly responsible for “biophysical resource use… through high consumption.” Secondly, they are “members of powerful factions of the capitalist class.” Thirdly, due to that positioning, they end up “driving consumption norms across the population.” But perhaps the most important insight of the paper is not that this is purely because the super-rich are especially evil or terrible compared to the rest of the population — but because of the systemic pressures produced by capitalist structures. The authors point out that: “Growth imperatives are active at multiple levels, making the pursuit of economic growth (net investment, i.e. investment above depreciation) a necessity for different actors and leading to social and economic instability in the absence of it.” At the core of capitalism, the paper observes, is a fundamental social relationship defining the way working people are systemically marginalised from access to the productive resources of the earth, along with the mechanisms used to extract these resources and produce goods and services. This means that to survive economically in this system, certain behavioural patterns become not just normalised, but seemingly entirely rational — at least from a limited perspective that ignores wider societal and environmental consequences. In the words of the authors: “In capitalism, workers are separated from the means of production, implying that they must compete in labour markets to sell their labour power to capitalists in order to earn a living.” Meanwhile, firms which own and control these means of production “need to compete in the market, leading to a necessity to reinvest profits into more efficient production processes to minimise costs (e.g. through replacing human labour power with machines and positive returns to scale), innovation of new products and/or advertising to convince consumers to buy more.” If a firm fails to remain competitive through such behaviours, “it either goes bankrupt or is taken over by a more successful business. Under normal economic conditions, this capitalist competition is expected to lead to aggregate growth dynamics.” The irony is that, as the paper also shows, the “affluence” accumulated by the super-rich isn’t correlated with happiness or well-being. Restructure The “hegemonic” dominance of global capitalism, then, is the principal obstacle to the systemic transformation needed to reduce overconsumption. So it’s not enough to simply try to “green” current consumption through technologies like renewable energy — we need to actually reduce our environmental impacts by changing our behaviours with a focus on cutting back our use of planetary resources: “Not only can a sufficient decoupling of environmental and detrimental social impacts from economic growth not be achieved by technological innovation alone, but also the profit-driven mechanism of prevailing economic systems prevents the necessary reduction of impacts and resource utilisation per se.” The good news is that it doesn’t have to be this way. The paper reviews a range of “bottom-up studies” showing that dramatic reductions in our material footprint are perfectly possible while still maintaining good material living standards. In India, Brazil and South Africa, “decent living standards” can be supported “with around 90 percent less per-capita energy use than currently consumed in affluent countries.” Similar possible reductions are feasible for modern industrial economies such as Australia and the US. By becoming aware of how the wider economic system incentivises behaviour that is destructive of human societies and planetary ecosystems critical for human survival, both ordinary workers and more wealthy sectors — including the super-rich — can work toward rewriting the global economic operating system. This can be done by restructuring ownership in firms, equalising relations with workers, and intentionally reorganising the way decisions are made about investment priorities. The paper points out that citizens and communities have a crucial role to play in getting organised, upgrading efforts for public education about these key issues, and experimenting with new ways to work together in bringing about “social tipping points” — points at which social action can catalyse mass change. While a sense of doom and apathy about the prospects for such change is understandable, mounting evidence based on systems science suggests that global capitalism as we know it is in a state of protracted crisis and collapse that began some decades ago. This research strongly supports the view that as industrial civilization reaches the last stages of its systemic life-cycle, there is unprecedented and increasing opportunity for small-scale actions and efforts to have large system-wide impacts. The new paper shows that the need for joined-up action is paramount: structural racism, environmental crisis, global inequalities are not really separate crises — but different facets of human civilization’s broken relationship with nature. Yet, of course, the biggest takeaway is that those who bear most responsibility for environmental destruction — those who hold the most wealth in our societies — urgently need to wake up to how their narrow models of life are, quite literally, destroying the foundations for human survival over the coming decades.