

1

Interp: Debaters must, on the page with their name and the school they attend, disclose all taglines, full citations, and the first and last three words of each evidence on the NDCA 2021-2022 wiki at least an hour before the round if they've read that case before.

Violation: My opponent hasn't posted any neg cites for Palm Classic

Rounds		Round Reports					
Tournament	Round	Opponent	Judge	Cites	Round Report	Open Source	Edit/Delete
Harvard Westlake Debates	1	Dougherty Valley KM	Zachary Siegel				
Harvard Westlake Debates	4	Penninsula AL	Jonathan Jeong				
Meadows	2	Interlake KK	KD Bond				
na	1	na	na				
na	1	na	na				
na	1	na	na				

Cites

Expand/Collapse All

Entry		Da	
▼ 0- Contact Info			1/1
▼ Covid Aff			10/

Standards:

1] Accessibility – Disclosure allows open-access for cites and small schools can recut evidence others come up with – voting issue to mitigate structural skews which precludes the ability to have a fair debate.

2] Clash – Disclosure allows debaters to substantively engage positions rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion – also allows depth since debaters see specific arguments instead of trying to link generics – forces us to defend our positions and voting issue for advocacy skills to engage real change

1 - Drop the debater since dropping the arg is the entire case that wasn't disclosed – voting for me sets a precedent and deters harmful positions – also no way to rectify abuse since forcing disclosure now won't fix educational deficits in this round

2 – Comes before 1AR theory – A – if we had to be abusive its because it was impossible to engage their aff, B – Neg abuse outweighs aff abuse because we control the depth of the debate if we can't engage depth is impossible

3 – Use competing interps on T – a) T is a yes/no question, you can't be half topical or mostly topical b) reasonabikity invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

4 – No RVI's, illogical, baiting, strat skew

2

Private extraction key to study of space samples—costs

OSI ND (Outer Space Institute, network of world-leading space experts united by their commitment to highly innovative, transdisciplinary research that addresses grand challenges facing the continued use and exploration of space. <http://outerspaceinstitute.ca/resources.html>. No date but is referencing asteroid probes from 2021.)DR 22

Public-private partnerships are fostering the development of ISRU technology. **NASA contracted four private companies to collect samples of regolith from the Moon's south pole.** Once collected, ownership of the samples will be transferred to NASA in-situ as a move to kick-start space commerce and incentivize further investment in the development of ISRU technology. Additionally, **NASA awarded SpaceX a \$2.9 billion contract to build a human landing system that will carry astronauts to the lunar surface.**

China has also made significant progress on the technological front with the success of their Chang'e 5 spacecraft, which extracted a four-pound sample of lunar regolith and returned it to Earth.

The sample-return **missions underway** by NASA and JAXA serve as technological demonstrations of the possibilities, challenges, and dangers when interacting with asteroids. **Other teams planning to do the same** in the near future, some of which **are commercial actors**, will learn greatly from these missions

Mining asteroids could also **become a very real prospect** decades from now. New sample and return technology, namely the **probes** deployed by JAXA and NASA, have **extracted material from** the **asteroids** Ryugu and Bennu, respectively, **and are returning it to Earth.** Meanwhile, commercial launch **companies** such as SpaceX, **are drastically lowering the cost** of launching equipment into space, **making it accessible to a wider range of actors.**

Despite the declining investment into asteroid mining start-ups, some ambitious companies remain waiting for a future date when it becomes economically feasible. In the meantime, they undertake other space activities, such as operating Earth imaging satellites, to maintain revenue streams.

Mining space resources, such as the Moon and asteroids, could greatly expand humanity's knowledge about the origins of the solar system, the Earth, the abundance of water, and the origin of life. Ice and water-bearing minerals could be used to produce rocket fuel; fuel that, being sourced in space, will not need to be lifted – at great expense – out of Earth's heavy gravity. **Studying material from asteroids may also prove to be vital in** humanity's **defence against** potential major **impactors.**

Specifically, SpaceX's Starship enables sample collection at an unprecedented rate.

Heldmann et al 21 "Accelerating Martian and Lunar Science through SpaceX Starship Missions" May 2021 Jennifer L. Heldmann [NASA Ames Research Center, Division of Space Sciences & Astrobiology, Planetary Systems Branch], other authors listed in the article

https://surveygizmoresponseuploads.s3.amazonaws.com/fileuploads/623127/5489366/111-381503be1c5764e533d2e1e923e21477_HeldmannJenniferL.pdf SM

Given the **Starship's** anticipated **low cost, high** payload **capacity**, and potential for high flight cadence, **the opportunities presented for planetary science missions have the potential to dramatically increase our progress towards NASA Planetary Science & Astrobiology goals and objectives.** Building upon the NASA CLPS paradigm (Bussey et al. 2019), **use of SpaceX Starships** will allow for increased flights for science experiments, technology demonstrations, and capability development to enable human spaceflight missions through NASA partnership and purchase of flight payload accommodation. High priority science objectives as outlined in the Decadal Survey and NASA Strategic Plan for the Moon and Mars can uniquely be achieved through flights to lunar/Martian orbit and/or to the surface of these planetary bodies. In addition, Starship has the ability to deploy orbiters on approach. This capability would provide the opportunity to deliver either relatively large orbital assets with sophisticated remote

sensing instrumentation and/or many smaller satellites that could serve a variety of purposes, including development of communications or meteorology networks.

Starship is designed to lift off from its planetary destination and return to Earth, thereby allowing not only the return of crew members but also the return of unprecedented quantities of lunar and Martian samples to Earth for scientific analysis. Because Starship can return tens of tons of payload from the surface of the Moon, the return sample mass of lunar samples from a single mission would dwarf the combined total returned mass of all lunar samples from all sample return missions to date. Many samples with greater sample variety will allow for more scientifically robust analytical studies in laboratories on Earth. Removing the need to severely high-grade and down-select samples on the Moon and Mars will also enable opportunistic science from returned samples to degrees previously not achievable. Never before has the science or exploration community had the potential to send such payload capacity to these destinations and return as much sample material as can be accommodated by Starship. The scientific progress achieved would be unprecedented.

Asteroid samples key to planetary defense

Grove and Powell 20 (Phil Groves, producer of the award-winning documentary *Asteroid Hunters*. Corey Powell, reporter for discover magazine “We’re Coming for the Asteroids. Are the Asteroids Coming for Us?” <https://www.discovermagazine.com/the-sciences/were-coming-for-the-asteroids-are-the-asteroids-also-coming-for-us> November 30, 2020)DR 22

Groves: The way I internalize that sort of thinking is an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. You have a house. You buy a fire extinguisher, and the expense of that fire extinguisher relative to the overall cost of the house is pretty small. The amount of money that you would have to spend to send up a space telescope to look for asteroids so that we can find it before they find us, is pretty small compared to the overall economy of the world. When you go to sleep at night, you lock your front door. The chances of someone invading your house in the middle of the night is pretty minuscule as well, but you do it. This is the same thing, just on a grander scale.

And it doesn't even cost that much! NASA's budget for finding asteroids is probably less than what it costs to make one Hollywood asteroid-disaster movie.

Groves: That might be generous, by the way. NASA's budget for planetary defense in this past year is about 150 million bucks. Just about every Marvel movie made out there cost more than that. And this is the only natural disaster you can actually prevent from happening. You can't cork a volcano. You can't throw a net over a hurricane. You can't glue shut a fault line to stop earthquakes. But this we can stop.

What do you find most scientifically exciting about asteroids?

Groves: The coolest fact that I learned along the way [making *Asteroid Hunters*] is that the asteroid belt is a planet that never came to be because of this big gravitational bully called Jupiter. It jealously prevented a planet from ever taking shape because of its gravitational influences on planetesimals, which is what asteroids are. They're the leftover materials of construction of the planets of the solar system. The big gap between Mars and Jupiter is because of Jupiter's huge influence. It was the first planet to form, and it's the biggest. It kept things stirred up, gravitationally speaking, in that area, so the asteroids were never given a chance to come together and form a planet.

Then over the four-and-a-half billion years, most of the asteroids have either been sent packing outside of the solar system or sent inward, where they become impactors of the Moon and the Earth, not to mention Venus, Mercury, and Mars. Some also fall into the Sun. The asteroid belt today is maybe 1 percent of what it used to be. All of this stuff, it's a big ammo belt, just being flung outward and inward over the course of the eons.

It's an exciting time in asteroid exploration, with Hayabusa2 and OSIRIS-REx bringing asteroid samples back to Earth. Any thoughts on these missions?

Groves: They'll help us get an understanding of **the construction** of our solar system and maybe even the formation of life itself. A lot of these asteroids carry with them organic compounds. You want to know: Did they bring water to Earth and Mars and perhaps other planets?

What's also interesting about OSIRIS-REx is the asteroid it's investigating, Benu, is one of these potentially hazardous asteroids I was referencing earlier. It's going to pass close to Earth in 2035. It's not going to hit then, but Earth's gravity could have some influence on its orbit around the Sun. After that, Benu may become a real risk to our planet, and it's a pretty big asteroid. It's about 500 meters across, more than 1,500 feet.

The images of Benu are amazing. It's a diamond-shaped hunk of gravel.

Groves: It's a rubble pile, and knowing that is an important aspect of planetary defense. How you would mitigate the threat could depend on your understanding of the asteroid structure. Is it mostly metallic, like a big cannon ball? Or is it a rubble pile, where if you whack it too hard, it'll break apart? Then you'd have a pile of buckshot, which could be just as bad.

Core to deflection—poorly planned deflection makes collision more likely

Andrews 21 (Robin George Andrews is a volcanologist and science writer based in London. His upcoming book *Super Volcanoes: What They Reveal about Earth and the Worlds Beyond* will be released in November 2021. "NASA's DART Mission Could Help Cancel an Asteroid Apocalypse" <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/nasas-dart-mission-could-help-cancel-an-asteroid-apocalypse/> November 18, 2021)DR 22

Mission planners are reasonably confident that DART's hushed demise will successfully convey a billiardlike kick to Dimorphos, which seems hefty enough to be sufficiently squeezed by gravity's clutches. But in the case of a slightly less substantial object, a kinetic impactor could just shoot right through, like a bullet through a cake, blowing it into small but still dangerous chunks. A successful deflection for such threats could require multiple, more gentle impacts rather than a one-and-done wallop.

Another huge unknown is Dimorphos's appearance. It could be shaped like a potato, a dog bone, a rubber duck, two bowling balls stuck together, or something else entirely. A colleague recently gifted Adams a donut-shaped fridge magnet, a wink to how often asteroids surprise scientists once unveiled up close by some deep-space robotic emissary. A near-spherical or even potatolike shape would be optimal for a clean hit, whereas the uneven distribution of mass from more complex morphologies would raise the chance of a glancing blow, one that could just "spin up the moonlet and not actually change its orbit," says Olivier de Weck, a systems engineering researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In the specific and benign case of Dimorphos, all these uncertainties are mostly academic. But in the event of a deflection attempt for a true city-killer, they could prove critical. We could, for instance, successfully deflect a potentially hazardous asteroid only to inadvertently put it on a new orbit that makes it more likely to hit Earth in the long run. There are points in space around our planet known as gravitational keyholes, wherein Earth's pull on the asteroid sets the errant space rock on an assuredly destructive journey. "Once you go through a keyhole, the probability of hitting the Earth is virtually 100 percent," says de Weck. This, to put it mildly, constitutes a major hurdle for any preemptive strikes against nascent impact threats.

The emerging calculus is formidable indeed: Protecting ourselves from the most numerous and tricky (and thus most dangerous) space rocks requires more than making shots in the dark, especially when each “shot” is a multimillion-dollar deflection attempt. Ensuring success requires first scouting out the threat to learn any given space rock’s exact mass and ability to absorb a weighty impact.

Some of that work can be done from Earth, but as Dimorphos is deviously demonstrating, tiny objects are hard targets for remote studies. It is far better—albeit more difficult—to get up close and personal with any adversarial asteroid before trying to hit it at all. This was, in fact, ESA’s original plan, before schedule slips ensured that its reconnaissance spacecraft would arrive only after DART’s dramatic impact. In the future, miniaturized kinetic impactors could even be sent alongside scientific scouting missions, meant to merely nudge target asteroids to estimate how they would respond to more powerful deflective blows. “We have to go and characterize them better before we rest humanity’s fate in that one golden shot,” de Weck says.

Case

AT Penny

- Not all private ventures to space for monopolies, for purpose of research
- XA scientific study DA, for purpose of global benefit, NASA cant do this

AT Kaminska

- Ev outdated, from 2014

Cap is good and sustainable – cycles of innovation and massive improvements in QoL prove

Cooper 16 – (2016, Mark, PhD from Yale, former Fullbright Fellow, Senior Research Fellow for the Institute for Energy and the Environment, Vermont Law School “Energy Justice in Theory and Practice: Building a Pragmatic, Progressive Road Map,” T. Van de Graaf et al. (eds.), The Palgrave Handbook of the International

Political Economy of Energy, pp. 687-92)

The Immense Leap in Material Well-Being Global Energy Justice provides important data on several key energy-intensive activities that deeply affect daily life (heat, light, power and transportation). In Fig. 28.1, I augment that data with measures on population, income and total energy consumption, as well as technological change and developments in the state. Figure 28.1 identifies rates of growth in key activities that define the material conditions in which people live. I use a 100-year view to calculate the rate of improvement, which is consistent with efforts to analyze distributive justice. ** Fig. 28.1 Indicators of progress in human material conditions (Sources : Based on data from: Benjamin, K. and Michael H. Dworkin, *Global Energy Justice* (Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 48, 312), heat, light transportation, power; Douglas North, *Understanding the Process of Economic Change* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2005), p. 89 US Bureau of the Census, https://www.census.gov/population/international/data/worldpop/table_history.php , UN 1999 where available, average of lower and upper summary elsewhere. Wikipedia for 2000, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_population_estimates ; J. Bradford De Long, *Estimates of World GDP, One Million BC–Present, Standard Chartered, Technology: Reshaping the Global Economy, January 19, 2015, p. 11, technologies. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Westphalian_sovereignty) Lighting, heating, power and transportation are energy-intensive activities that receive a great deal of attention in the discussion of energy poverty and justice. Light, heat and power are central to defining the standard of living and, hence, the energy justice analysis. The direct link between energy consumption and income is also central to that discussion. Starting with the emergence of capitalism and accelerating in the industrial era, these four services exhibited a dramatic decline in cost, which made them affordable for an ever increasing number of people. I include three measures of the overall outcome of the economic development process—population growth, output per capita and energy consumption per capita. North (2005 , p. 89) points to population for an obvious reason: Statistical data ... can get us part way in describing the magnitude of changes in the landscape. They provide dramatic evidence of the revolutionary changes in the human condition. Man’s subjugation of the uncertainties related to the physical environment is most clearly manifested in the explosive increases in population since the beginning of the modern age in the eighteenth century [T]his dramatic change along with major development in knowledge, technological progress, and scientific breakthroughs that contributed to this explosive development. The close correlation between GDP per capita and population is clear. GDP per capita and its growth have been the primary focal point of the analysis of economic growth and development for quite some time. The close correlation between GDP per capita and energy consumption per capita has also been a focal point of analysis. 12 The graph also identifies several technologies that are widely seen as ushering in fundamental shifts in economic activity. An important and obvious point to be made is that these involve power and transportation technologies. Three of the recent examples involve energy—steam, internal combustion engine and electricity. Substituting mechanical power for human and animal power constitutes a major leap. The shift to electricity, considered a General Purpose Technology (Jovanovic and Rousseau 2005) , 13 was one of the key factors in the second industrial revolution. Finally, at the bottom, the graph shows key developments in the structure of policy making. The nation-state was a*

key development that enabled the process of economic growth to gain traction (Acemoglu and Robinson 2012, Figure 5). The Westphalian state was a key development. Efforts to organize relations between states were the subject of a stream of treaties, but the graph shows the major efforts to organize multilateral relations in the twentieth century. It is important to keep in mind that the graph is truncated. Prior to the year 1400, the rate of growth in the factors that affect material well-being was virtually nil. The data underscore the immense progress made in the material condition of society in the past three centuries. The dramatic change in the rates of progress is coincident with the emergence of capitalism and, in particular, the industrial revolution. The key message for the purpose of this analysis is strikingly clear. If we accept the proposition that human civilization dates back about 12 millennia, then the capitalist era is about 4% of human history. The industrial era covers the second half of that period. Measured by population, per capita income, heat, power, transportation, lighting, about 90 % of human progress has taken place in the most recent 2 % of human history, the very short period of capitalist industrialization. 14 The Virtuous Cycle of Progress and the Potential for Justice The progressive capitalist frame for a theory of justice launches from this dramatic change in the human condition. Obviously, it postdates much of the thinking of the ancient philosophers and early modern (preindustrial) political theorists who naturally make up a large part of the intellectual and cultural heritage of the Western concept of justice, as discussed at length in Global Energy Justice. There has been a dramatic transformation of the terrain of justice in three ways. • The capitalist industrial revolution has not only produced a dramatic improvement in the human condition, it has also created the possibility/ hope/expectation that there will be a massive and continuing improvement in the material well-being of people. Mankind has been freed from endless poverty and expects continuous economic growth and improvement in material conditions. • The improvement in material well-being comes with (and is in part dependent on) an increasing interdependence of economic activity (a refined division of labor and globalization). • Increasing wealth and improvements in communications (which are made possible by changes in energy technology, i.e. electrification) have allowed more and more people to engage and participate more directly and forcefully in self-governance. In the capitalist industrial era we no longer have to treat human history as a kind of zero-sum, depleting resource story. The current generation should not be chastised for overconsuming scarce resources as long as it produces the means to maintain and improve the prospects of future generations. For the past quarter of a millennium, the groundwork for a much higher standard of living has been laid by each successive generation. Perez (2002) argues that capitalist development needs to be progressive in the sense I use the term. Technology is the fuel of the capitalist engine (Perez 2002, p. 155). The potential for production and productivity grows this considerable. What is needed for its realization is a new space for the unhindered expansion of markets, favoring economics of scale and fostering a new wave of investment. This essentially means that adequate regulation ... has to be established and an institutional framework favoring the real economy over the paper economy needs to be put in place ... So the rhythm of potential growth is modulated by the qualitative dynamics of effective demand (Perez 2002, pp. 114–116). Since market saturation is one of the main limits encountered in deploying the growth potential of a technology revolution, ensuring consistent extension of markets is the way to facilitate the pursuit of those goals. Consequently, it is progressive distribution and worldwide advances in development that can best guarantee a continued expansion of demand (Perez 2002, p. 124). The impact of progressive capitalism on the terrain of justice involves more than simple progress. It also reflects the structure and process by which capitalism creates progress. Two key processes are involved. A discussion of these broad issues is beyond the scope of this chapter and has been offered elsewhere (Cooper 2015). Here I emphasize two points that are central to the discussion of energy justice. • First, the explanation asserts that capitalism has given birth to recursive feedback loops, virtuous circles and cycles, of creative destruction and construction that creates a spiral of progress. • Second, the division of labor advances relentlessly, which ultimately increases human capital and promotes democratic equality. The stark contrast between the twenty-first-century digital mode of production that is emerging and the twentieth-century mode of production described by Perez (2004, 2009) underscores this process in several ways. First, the mass market production of the twentieth century was very much driven by fossil fuel consumption. The digital mode of production is much more dependent on electricity. Second, technologies are emerging to power more and more activity with electricity. Third, the heterogeneity of products creates niche markets. Fourth, the new division of labor is much more global and complex, shifting a great deal of activity and autonomy to the edge of the networks. The virtuous cycles of economic progress are interconnected in the sense that they tend to produce the key ingredients to solve the next great challenge that faces the economic system. Perez builds this into her model of capitalism by linking Schumpeter's concept of creative destruction to the equally powerful process of creative construction. The result is a spiral of development. While analysis of this process is also beyond the scope of this chapter, one aspect of the current phase of development is critical to the discussion of energy justice. Industrial revolutions produce the ingredients necessary to solve the challenges that

they faced. This is certainly true of the third industrial revolution in the energy sector, the electricity sector in particular. **Dynamic technological development has produced the tools for the transformation of the energy sector that can solve the problem of climate change, while dealing with the challenge of energy justice.** The central station model of base-load facilities combined with high cost peaking power and massive amounts of pollution, including greenhouse gas emissions, has been undercut by dramatically declining cost for distributed renewables and storage. The Information and Communications Technologies revolution has now made it possible to integrate and manage demand and supply rather than build central station, fossil-fuel-based powered facilities that passively follow load. Economic analyses of the cost of addressing energy justice that were offered as it became a topic of increasing attention a decade ago are obsolete as a result of dramatic innovation and competition (Cooper 2014b). An electricity sector centered on smaller scale, more flexible resources should facilitate and lower the cost of addressing both energy poverty and climate change. This technological revolution not only delivers affordable electricity, but it also does so in a manner that utilizes local resources and fosters local autonomy. As has always been the case, however, there is a struggle between the incumbent and the new entrant technologies over the speed and ultimate configuration of the new system and which values will be expressed by the system. In short, the energy sector, in general, and the electricity sector, in particular, are at the “turning point” (Perez 2002) or “critical juncture” (Robinson and Acemoglu 2012) of the “quarter-life crisis of the digital mode of production” (Cooper 2013b). Political economy is about driving the economy in the right direction with policy. **While the outcome is uncertain, the technological progress suggests that prospects are good for a successful deployment of the third industrial revolution.** 3 A Broad Frame for Justice Building on the intense discussion of energy justice presented in the two books noted in the introduction, the theory of distributive justice offered below is intended to provide a framework that makes the inclusion of progressive values and the policies that address energy poverty more compelling in the process of institutional recomposition that is taking place. Needless to say, this was the purpose of the Encyclical on climate change. The analysis makes several basic points that **lead to an important conclusion— distributive justice is not an afterthought to a dynamic economic system, it is an indispensable, core ingredient of success.** • **Markets have a critical role as the driver of progress.** • **The state plays an equally critical role with policies to guide the economy toward a stable growth trajectory** and in a progressive direction by placing constraints on property and the accumulation of power. • **Egalitarian relationships are consistent with the need to advance the division of labor.** • **Autonomy and choice for individuals plays a critical role** in promoting efficiency and democracy. • **The convergence and synergy between an inclusive market and an inclusive state is necessary for progress to continue.**

Capitalism solves war – it creates incentives for peace, and economic instability breeds extremism and conflict

Alan W. Dowd 14, senior fellow with the Fraser Institute, served as an adjunct professor at Butler University; was a founding member of the Sagamore Institute leadership team, where he continues to hold a senior fellow post; and was director of Hudson Institute’s corporate headquarters. He earned a B.A. with departmental high honors from Butler University and an M.A. from Indiana University, July 9, 2014, “Capitalizing on the Capitalist Peace”, <https://www.aei.org/publication/capitalizing-on-the-capitalist-peace/>

But a new Fraser Institute study helps quantify how building up free-market institutions and **promoting economic freedom can strengthen societies by increasing social trust and reducing the risk of war.**

Starting from the premise that “adequate finance is a key ingredient for organizing violence against a state,” Indra de Soysa and Krishna Chaitanya Vadlamannati argue that “**economic repression and market distortions create conditions that make armed conflict feasible.**” These factors “supply the means, motive and opportunity for groups to challenge states because economic distortions spawn underground economies that form the organizational bases of insurgency.” The expansion of free markets and free economic exchange, on the other hand, “marginalizes violence because it binds people meaningfully in a way suited to addressing the collective dilemmas stemming from violence.” “With economic freedom, people gain when they produce goods and services others desire in mutually beneficial exchange,” the report concludes. “People from other groups become customers, employees, employers, suppliers.” Together, they lay the building blocks for social trust and become essential ingredients in economic expansion — rather than enemies in a zero-sum struggle over scarce resources. **In other words,**

economic freedom raises the costs of violence — and helps remove the incentives and benefits of civil disorder.

Of course, others have pointed out the limitations of democracy in promoting stability and prosperity — and even the dangers of prematurely opening up a society to democratic governance. For instance, Robert Kaplan observed in his 2000 book *The Coming Anarchy* that “Democracies do not always make societies more civil — but they do always mercilessly expose the health of the societies in which they operate ... If a society is not in reasonable health, democracy can be not only risky but disastrous.” He wrote those words two years before America began its nation-building project in Afghanistan, four years before Iraq’s postwar war, and more than a decade before Egypt descended into its spiral of re-revolution. “Democracy,” Kaplan noted, “emerges only as a capstone to other social and economic achievements.” These include the rule of law, stable institutions, economic freedom, and a civil society that protects minority rights as much as it respects majority rule. There is also an application here for international relations. **Just as the spread of economic freedom creates incentives for cooperation within nation-states and disincentives for conflict between sub-state groups, it lessens the likelihood of war between nation-states** by raising the costs of war. As political scientist Erik Gartzke noted in 2005, “For six decades, developed nations have not fought each other.” This “capitalist peace” is historically unusual given that “powerful nations are the most war prone.” However, nations that embrace economic freedom — even those with different approaches to governance, politics, and religion — are learning to “capitalize on the capitalist peace ... through expanding markets, development, and a common sense of international purpose.”

AT O’Keefe

The affirmative functions as a “revolutionary reform” that pushes the limits of capitalism - genuine reforms only lead to market panic and backsliding - the aff’s politically feasible strategy creates cracks and fissures within the neoliberalism
Wray 14

(Ben Wray [researcher for the Reid Foundation and a member of the ISG based in Govanhill], 14/4/14, "The case for revolutionary reforms," International Socialist Group, internationalsocialist.org.uk/index.php/2014/04/the-case-for-revolutionary-reforms/)

We need revolutionary change. There’s no two ways about it – if the exploitation of labour by capital continues to be the central dynamic driving economic development, we are headed for human and environmental catastrophe. But as I’ve discussed in the previous five parts of this series, **getting from where we are to a revolutionary transformation that overthrows the dominant property relations of the capitalist economy** and replaces them with social relations based on democratic control of the world’s resources is not as simple as declaring our desire for it to be so. I saw a petition on change.org the other day proposing the overthrow of capitalism. If one million people signed that petition and one million people signed a further petition to introduce full collective bargaining rights for trade-unions in the UK, which one would move us closer to the overthrow of capitalism? I wager the latter. **Whilst having an end goal in sight is important,** most people don’t change their thinking about the world based on bold visions of what could be done at some point in the future: they change their ideas based on evidence from their material lives which points to the inadequacy or irrationality of the status quo. In other words, **we need to have ideas that build upon people’s lived experience of capitalism,** and since that it is **within the framework of a representative democracy system,** **we need ideas based around proposals for reforms.** At the same time those reforms have to help rather than hinder a move to more revolutionary transformation that challenges the very core of the capitalist system. The dialectic of reform and revolution **What we need,** therefore, **is a strategy of revolutionary reforms.** Such a notion would appear as a contradiction in terms to many who identify as reformists or revolutionaries and see the two as dichotomous, but there is no reason why this should be the case. Indeed, **history has shown that revolutionary transformations have always happened as a dialectical interaction between rapid, revolutionary movements and more institutional, reform-based challenges.** Even the revolutionary part of that dialectic has always been motivated by the immediate needs of the participants

involved – ‘land, bread and peace’ being the first half of the slogan of the Russian Revolution. What does a strategy of **‘revolutionary reforms’** entail? Ed Rooksby explains that it **‘is a political strategy that builds towards revolutionary change by using reforms to ‘push up against the limits’ of the ‘logic of capitalism’** in practice: “At first these **‘feasible objectives’** will be limited to reforms within capitalism—or at least to measures **‘which from** the standpoint of a more or less reformist **‘working class consciousness, appear to be** legitimate and **‘achievable within the system, but which may actually run counter to the logic of capitalism and start to push up against its limits.** As the working class engages in struggle, however, the anti-capitalist implications of its needs and aspirations are gradually revealed. At the same time, through its experience of struggle for reform, the working class learns about its capacity for **‘self-management, initiative and collective decision’** and can have a **‘foretaste of what emancipation means’**. In this way **‘struggle for reform helps prepare the class** psychologically, ideologically and materially for revolution.” The late Daniel Bensaid expressed this argument through the lens of the history of the socialist movement: “In reality all sides in the controversy agree on the fundamental points inspired by The Coming Catastrophe (Lenin’s pamphlet of the summer of 1917) and the Transitional Programme of the Fourth International (inspired by Trotsky in 1937): the need for transitional demands, the politics of alliances (the united front), the logic of hegemony and on the dialectic (not antinomy) between reform and revolution. We are therefore against the idea of separating an (‘anti-neoliberal’) minimum programme and an (anti-capitalist) ‘maximum’ programme. We remain convinced that **‘a consistent anti-neoliberalism leads to anti-capitalism and that the two are interlinked by the dynamic of struggle.’** So revolutionary reforms means a policy agenda that, as Alberto Toscano has put it, “at one and the same time make concrete gains within capitalism which permits further movement against capitalism”. The Italian marxist Antonio Gramsci described this approach as a ‘war of position’. The neoliberal context To understand what all of this means in practical terms for a left party in Scotland today we need to understand the economic and political context we live in. **The last forty years of neoliberal capitalism has seen a rolling back of the gains of the post-war era, as the rate of exploitation has increased enormously, the strength of trade-unions has decreased significantly, and major chunks of the welfare state and public-sector have been shrunk or sold-off.** The outcome is a massive redistribution of wealth and power to a narrowing capitalist elite, who increasingly use money to make money through financialisation, bypassing the productive aspects of the capitalist economy entirely. Britain is part of the vanguard of this neoliberal offensive. **The political consequence of this is that mainstream parties, whether they be centre-left or centre-right, are unwilling to challenge the supremacy of neoliberalism** in the British economy. **The economic crisis if anything has seen a further radicalisation of neoliberalism. Therefore a left party that challenges neoliberalism is also challenging capitalism.** What may have been a reform the capitalist system could easily have absorbed or even desired forty years ago is now a fatal threat to its order. Indeed, **‘the word ‘reforms’ today is used to justify all manner of counter-reforms** which further dismantle the safety-net of public services and the welfare state. Global capital is trying to go further than ever in stripping away the rights of states and judicial systems that don’t work in their favour. **One particularly terrifying example of this is the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership which is a single-market agreement between the EU and the US.** What is in the fine print is an “investor-state dispute settlement” mechanism whereby in the situation that a particular nation-state doesn’t want companies to, say, mine in particular areas or sell goods produced unethically, the decision can be overturned by a secret arbitration panel of corporate lawyers which has the power to bypass domestic courts and ignore the will of parliaments. **Given this context of hyper-capitalist authoritarianism, the reform-revolution dialectic is intensified today** compared to forty years ago. As the Canadian Marxist Leo Panitch puts it: “**Perhaps the greatest illusion of 20th-century social democrats was their belief that once reforms were won they would be won for good.** In fact, we can now see how far the old reforms were subject to erosion by expanding capitalist competition on a global scale. They have been so undermined by the logic of competitiveness that it now seems very difficult to see how state protections against markets could be secured in our time without additional measures that would be seen as revolutionary.” **Genuine reforms** such as democratic public control of the money supply, **would cause panic** amongst credit agencies and the ‘markets’, potentially **leading to a run on the banks of the nation-state** in which such a proposal was made. This is global capitalism’s way of threatening the state to tow the line, and **usually states and their political parties are responsive to its needs.**

The affirmative functions as a “revolutionary reform” that pushes the limits of capitalism - genuine reforms only lead to market panic and backsliding - the aff’s politically feasible strategy creates cracks and fissures within the neoliberalism

Wray 14

(Ben Wray [researcher for the Reid Foundation and a member of the ISG based in Govanhill], 14/4/14, "The case for revolutionary reforms," International Socialist Group, internationalsocialist.org.uk/index.php/2014/04/the-case-for-revolutionary-reforms/)

We need revolutionary change There’s no two ways about it – if the exploitation of labour by capital continues to be the central dynamic driving economic development, we are headed for human and environmental catastrophe. But as I’ve discussed in the previous five parts of this series, getting from where we are to a revolutionary transformation that overthrows the dominant property relations of the capitalist economy and replaces them with social relations based on democratic control of the world’s resources is not as simple as declaring our desire for it to be so. I saw a petition on change.org the other day proposing the overthrow of capitalism. If one million people signed that petition and one million people signed a further petition to introduce full collective bargaining rights for trade-unions in the UK, which one would move us closer to the overthrow of capitalism? I wager the latter. **Whilst having an end goal in sight is important**, most people don’t change their thinking about the world based on bold visions of what could be done at some point in the future: they change their ideas based on evidence from their material lives which points to the inadequacy or irrationality of the status quo. In other words, we need to have ideas that build upon people’s lived experience of capitalism, and since that it is within the framework of a representative democracy system, **we need ideas based around proposals for reforms**. At the same time those reforms have to help rather than hinder a move to more revolutionary transformation that challenges the very core of the capitalist system. The dialectic of reform and revolution What we need, therefore, is a strategy of revolutionary reforms. Such a notion would appear as a contradiction in terms to many who identify as reformists or revolutionaries and see the two as dichotomous, but there is no reason why this should be the case. Indeed, history has shown that revolutionary transformations have always happened as a dialectical interaction between rapid, revolutionary movements and more institutional, reform-based challenges. Even the revolutionary part of that dialectic has always been motivated by the immediate needs of the participants involved – ‘land, bread and peace’ being the first half of the slogan of the Russian Revolution. What does a strategy of **‘revolutionary reforms’** entail? Ed Rooksby explains that it **is a political strategy that builds towards revolutionary change by using reforms to ‘push up against the limits’ of the ‘logic of capitalism’** in practice: “At first these **‘feasible objectives’** will be limited to reforms within capitalism—or at least to measures **which from** the standpoint of a more or less reformist **working class consciousness, appear to be** legitimate and **achievable** within the system, but **which** may **actually run counter to the logic of capitalism and** start to **push up against its limits**. As the working class engages in struggle, however, the anti-capitalist implications of its needs and aspirations are gradually revealed. At the same time, through its experience of struggle for reform, the working class learns about its capacity for **‘self-management, initiative and collective decision’** and can have a **‘foretaste of what emancipation means’**. In this way struggle for reform helps prepare the class psychologically, ideologically and materially for revolution.” The late Daniel Bensaid expressed this argument through the lens of the history of the socialist movement: “In reality all sides in the controversy agree on the fundamental points inspired by The Coming Catastrophe (Lenin’s pamphlet of the summer of 1917) and the Transitional Programme of the Fourth International (inspired by Trotsky in 1937): the need for transitional demands, the politics of alliances (the united front), the logic of hegemony and on the dialectic (not antinomy) between reform and revolution. We are therefore against the idea of separating an (‘anti-neoliberal’) minimum programme and an (anti-capitalist) ‘maximum’ programme. We remain convinced that a consistent anti-neoliberalism leads to anti-capitalism and that the two are interlinked by the dynamic of struggle.” so revolutionary reforms means a policy agenda that, as Alberto Toscano has put it, “at one and the same time make concrete gains within capitalism which permits further movement against capitalism”. The Italian marxist Antonio Gramsci described this approach as a ‘war of position’. The neoliberal context To understand what all of this means in practical terms for a left party in Scotland today we need to understand the economic and political context we live in. The last forty years of neoliberal capitalism has seen a rolling back of the gains of the post-war era, as the rate of exploitation has increased enormously, the strength of trade-unions has decreased significantly, and

major chunks of the welfare state and public-sector have been shrunk or sold-off. The outcome is a massive redistribution of wealth and power to a narrowing capitalist elite, who increasingly use money to make money through financialisation, bypassing the productive aspects of the capitalist economy entirely. Britain is part of the vanguard of this neoliberal offensive. The political consequence of this is that mainstream parties, whether they be centre-left or centre-right, are unwilling to challenge the supremacy of neoliberalism in the British economy. The economic crisis if anything has seen a further radicalisation of neoliberalism. Therefore a left party that challenges neoliberalism is also challenging capitalism. What may have been a reform the capitalist system could easily have absorbed or even desired forty years ago is now a fatal threat to its order. Indeed, the word 'reforms' today is used to justify all manner of counter-reforms which further dismantle the safety-net of public services and the welfare state. Global capital is trying to go further than ever in stripping away the rights of states and judicial systems that don't work in their favour. One particularly terrifying example of this is the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership which is a single-market agreement between the EU and the US. What is in the fine print is an "investor-state dispute settlement" mechanism whereby in the situation that a particular nation-state doesn't want companies to, say, mine in particular areas or sell goods produced unethically, the decision can be overturned by a secret arbitration panel of corporate lawyers which has the power to bypass domestic courts and ignore the will of parliaments. Given this context of hyper-capitalist authoritarianism, the reform-revolution dialectic is intensified today compared to forty years ago. As the Canadian Marxist Leo Panitch puts it: "Perhaps the greatest illusion of 20th-century social democrats was their belief that once reforms were won they would be won for good. In fact, we can now see how far the old reforms were subject to erosion by expanding capitalist competition on a global scale. They have been so undermined by the logic of competitiveness that it now seems very difficult to see how state protections against markets could be secured in our time without additional measures that would be seen as revolutionary." Genuine reforms such as democratic public control of the money supply, would cause panic amongst credit agencies and the 'markets', potentially leading to a run on the banks of the nation-state in which such a proposal was made. This is global capitalism's way of threatening the state to tow the line, and usually states and their political parties are responsive to its needs.