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## 1---T

T Rez

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may only descriptively declare the appropriation of outer space as unjust – to clarify the affirmative may not specify a policy that [ends/regulates] appropriation of outer space.

#### “is” means –

Merriam Webster, [Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is>] Recut Sachin

is Definition of is (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense first-person and third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense plural of BE

#### “BE” is a linking verb---distinct from action---implementation is incoherent.

Grammar Monster, ["Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm>] Recut Sachin

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) A linking verb is used to re-identify or to describe its subject. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. Alan is a vampire. (Here, the subject is re-identified as a vampire.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)
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#### Unjust means –

Cambridge, [“Meaning of unjust in English” Cambridge Dictionary, [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust]](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust%5d) Recut Sachin

unjust adjective US /ʌnˈdʒʌst/ not morally right; not fair: New laws will protect employees against unjust dismissals. (Definition of unjust from the Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary © Cambridge University Press)

#### Resolved, in LD, refers to a statement of value---policymaking fails without an actor.

UPitt, [University Of Pittsburgh Communications Services Webteam, copyright 2015-21, "Basic Definitions," Department of Communication , <https://www.comm.pitt.edu/basic-definitions>] Recut Sachin

Affirmative/Pro. The side that “affirms” the resolution (is “pro” the issue). For example, the affirmative side in a debate using the resolution of policy, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens, would advocate for federal government implementation of a poverty reduction program. Argument. A statement, or claim, followed by a justification, or warrant. Justifications are responses to challenges, often linked by the word “because.” Example: The sun helps people, because the sun activates photosynthesis in plants, which produce oxygen so people can breathe. Constructive Speech. The first speeches in a debate, where the debaters “construct” their cases by presenting initial positions and arguments. Cross-examination. Question and answer sessions between debaters. Debate. A deliberative exercise characterized by formal procedures of argumentation, involving a set resolution to be debated, distinct times for debaters to speak, and a regulated order of speeches given. Evidence. Supporting materials for arguments. Standards for evidence are field-specific. Evidence can range from personal testimony, statistical evidence, research findings, to other published sources. Quotations drawn from journals, books, newspapers, and other audio-visuals sources are rather common. Negative/Con. The side that “negates” the resolution (is “con” the issue). For example, the negative side in a debate using the resolution of fact, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production, would argue that global warming does not threaten agricultural production. Preparation Time. Debates often necessitate time between speeches for students to gather their thoughts and consider their opponent's arguments. This preparation is generally a set period of time and can be used at any time by either side at the conclusion of a speech. Rebuttal Speech. The last speeches in a debate, where debaters summarize arguments and draw conclusions about the debate. Resolution. A specific statement or question up for debate. Resolutions usually appear as statements of policy, fact or value. Statement of policy. Involves an actor (local, national, or global) with power to decide a course of action. For example, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens. Statement of fact. Involves a dispute about empirical phenomenon. For example, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production. Statement of value. Involves conflicting moral dilemmas. For example, Resolved: The death penalty is a justified method of punishment. Topic. A general issue to debate. Topics could be “The Civil War,” “genetic engineering,” or “Great Books.”

#### Violation: They defend implementation, enforcement and stuff. Goehgrid says that’s states should implement a global commons. Doesn’t prove injustice in appropriation but rather proves justice in smth else.

#### Vote neg –

#### 1] Limits – Letting affs add anything to the aff explodes limits – truisms like "2+2=4” or "racism bad" suddenly become additional aff ground if you meet the floor of the rez – means even if we have ground, the aff will always win truth claims which outweigh on sheer probability. AND lets the affirmative contradict – adding “not” or replacing “unjust” with “just” suddenly becomes topical when we do away with the words in the rez.

#### 2] Ground – wrecks all neg arguments – smart affs under their interp will just add planks outside of the topic to solve DAs or wreck CP competition – planks about R&D funding solves innovation, random reforms could solve econ or warming – makes advantage CPs T. Meeting the floor of the rez is not sufficient if there is no ceiling to topical affirmatives. Allowing them to end all appropriation proves the violation to extra T---the rez is abt private appropriation not all of it.

#### 3] TVA – Just don’t implement and add words to the rez.

#### T is DTD and No RVIs – The whole aff violates and its their burden to be topical---must proactively prove the aff is good since the entire debate follows it. Means T comes first---our abuse was because of theirs and it affects the largest portion of the debate.

#### Use Competing Interps – Anything else lets the judge intervene and pick whatever def is best under their bs meter leading to a proliferation of abuse.

## 2---CP

### Advantage CP---1NC

Advantage CP

#### Text: Capitalism ought to be regulated as per the Budolfson card---that entails reigning in monopolies, investing in public goods, limiting externalities, redistributing wealth, and ensuring basic rights

#### Cap is great!---solves war, disease, inequality, human rights, and the environment---it’s historically supported, rejection is the worst option---solves advantage 2

Mark Budolfson 21. PhD in Philosophy. Assistant Professor in the Department of Environmental and Occupational Health and Justice at the Rutgers School of Public Health and Center for Population–Level Bioethics "Arguments for Well-Regulated Capitalism, and Implications for Global Ethics, Food, Environment, Climate Change, and Beyond". Cambridge Core. 5-7-2021. https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/core/journals/ethics-and-international-affairs/article/arguments-for-wellregulated-capitalism-and-implications-for-global-ethics-food-environment-climate-change-and-beyond/96F422D04E171EECDEF77312266AE9DD

Discourse on food ethics often advocates the anti-capitalist idea that we need less capitalism, less growth, and less globalization if we want to make the world a better and more equitable place, with arguments focused on applications to food, globalization, and a just society. For example, arguments for this anti-capitalist view are at the core of some chapters in nearly every handbook and edited volume in the rapidly expanding subdiscipline of food ethics. None of these volumes (or any article published in this subdiscipline broadly construed) focuses on a defense of globalized capitalism.1

More generally, discourse on global ethics, environment, and political theory in much of academia—and in society—increasingly features this anti-capitalist idea as well.2 The idea is especially prominent in discourse surrounding the environment, climate, and global poverty, where we face a nexus of problems of which capitalism is a key driver, including climate change, air and water pollution, the challenge of feeding the world, ensuring sustainable development for the world's poorest, and other interrelated challenges.

It is therefore important to ask whether this anti-capitalist idea is justified by reason and evidence that is as strong as the degree of confidence placed in it by activists and many commentators on food ethics, global ethics, and political theory, more generally.

In fact, many experts argue that this anti-capitalist idea is not supported by reason and argument and is actually wrong. The main contribution of this essay is to explain the structure of the leading arguments against the anti-capitalist idea, and in favor of the opposite conclusion. I begin by focusing on the general argument in favor of well-regulated globalized capitalism as the key to a just, flourishing, and environmentally healthy world. This is the most important of all of the arguments in terms of its consequences for health, wellbeing, and justice, and it is endorsed by experts in the empirically minded disciplines best placed to analyze the issue, including experts in long-run global development, human health, wellbeing, economics, law, public policy, and other related disciplines. On the basis of the arguments outlined below, well-regulated capitalism has been endorsed by recent Democratic presidents of the United States such as Barack Obama, and by progressive Nobel laureates who have devoted their lives to human development and more equitable societies, as well as by a wide range of experts in government and leading nongovernmental organizations.

The goal of this essay is to make the structure and importance of these arguments clear, and thereby highlight that discourse on global ethics and political theory should engage carefully with them. The goal is not to endorse them as necessarily sound and correct. The essay will begin by examining general arguments for and against capitalism, and then turn to implications for food, the environment, climate change, and beyond.

Arguments for and against Forms of Capitalism

The Argument against Capitalism

Capitalism is often argued to be a key driver of many of society's ills: inequalities, pollution, land use changes, and incentives that cause people to live differently than in their ideal dreams. Capitalism can sometimes deepen injustices. These negative consequences are easy to see—resting, as they do, at the center of many of society's greatest challenges.3

And at the same time, it is often difficult to see the positive consequences of capitalism.4 What are the positive consequences of allowing private interests to clear-cut forests and plant crops, especially if those private interests are rich multinational corporations and the forests are in poor, developing countries whose citizens do not receive the profits from deforestation? Why give private companies the right to exploit resources at all, since exploitation almost always has some negative consequences such as those listed above? These are the right questions to ask, and they highlight genuine challenges to capitalism. And in light of these challenges, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that perhaps a different economic system altogether would be more equitable and beneficial to the global population.

The Argument for Well-Regulated Capitalism

However, things are more complicated than the arguments above would suggest, and the benefits of capitalism, especially for the world's poorest and most vulnerable people, are in fact myriad and significant. In addition, as we will see in this section, many experts argue that capitalism is not the fundamental cause of the previously described problems but rather an essential component of the best solutions to them and of the best methods for promoting our goals of health, well-being, and justice.

To see where the defenders of capitalism are coming from, consider an analogy involving a response to a pandemic: if a country administered a rushed and untested vaccine to its population that ended up killing people, we would not say that vaccines were the problem. Instead, the problem would be the flawed and sloppy policies of vaccine implementation. Vaccines might easily remain absolutely essential to the correct response to such a pandemic and could also be essential to promoting health and flourishing, more generally.

The argument is similar with capitalism according to the leading mainstream arguments in favor of it: Capitalism is an essential part of the best society we could have, just like vaccines are an essential part of the best response to a pandemic such as COVID-19. But of course both capitalism and vaccines can be implemented poorly, and can even do harm, especially when combined with other incorrect policy decisions. But that does not mean that we should turn against them—quite the opposite. Instead, we should embrace them as essential to the best and most just outcomes for society, and educate ourselves and others on their importance and on how they must be properly designed and implemented with other policies in order to best help us all. In fact, the argument in favor of capitalism is even more dramatic because it claims that much more is at stake than even what is at stake in response to a global pandemic—what is at stake with capitalism is nothing less than whether the world's poorest and most vulnerable billion people will remain in conditions of poverty and oppression, or if they will instead finally gain access to what is minimally necessary for basic health and wellbeing and become increasingly affluent and empowered. The argument in favor of capitalism proceeds as follows:

Premise 1. Development and the past. Over the course of recorded human history, the majority of historical increases in health, wellbeing, and justice have occurred in the last two centuries, largely as a result of societies adopting or moving toward capitalism. Capitalism is a relevant cause of these improvements, in the sense that they could not have happened to such a degree if it were not for capitalism and would not have happened to the same degree under any alternative noncapitalist approach to structuring society. The argument in support of this premise relies on observed relationships across societies and centuries between indicators of degree of capitalism, wealth, investments in public goods, and outcomes for health, wellbeing, and justice, together with econometric analysis in support of the conclusion that the best explanation of these correlations and the underlying mechanism is that large increases in health, wellbeing, and justice are largely driven by increasing investments in public goods. The scale of increased wealth necessary to maximize these investments requires capitalism. Thus, as capitalist societies have become dramatically wealthier over the past hundred years (and wealthier than societies with alternative systems), this has allowed larger investments in public goods, which simply has not been possible in a sustained way in societies without the greater wealth that capitalism makes possible. Important investments in public goods include investments in basic medical knowledge, in health and nutrition programs, and in the institutional capacity and know-how to regulate society and capitalism itself. As a result, capitalism is a primary driver of positive outcomes in health and wellbeing (such as increased life expectancy, lowered child and maternal mortality, adequate calories per day, minimized infectious disease rates, a lower percentage and number of people in poverty, and more reported happiness);5 and in justice (such as reduced deaths from war and homicide; higher rankings in human rights indices; the reduced prevalence of racist, sexist, homophobic opinions in surveys; and higher literacy rates).6 These quantifiable positive consequences of global capitalism dramatically outweigh the negative consequences (such as deaths from pollution in the course of development), with the result that the net benefits from capitalism in terms of health, wellbeing, and justice have been greater than they would have been under any known noncapitalist approach to structuring society.7

Premise 2. Economics, ethics, and policy. Although capitalism has often been ill-regulated and therefore failed to maximize net benefits for health, wellbeing, and justice, it can become well-regulated so that it maximizes these societal goals, by including mechanisms identified by economists and other policy experts that do the following:

* optimally8 regulate negative effects such as pollution and monopoly power, and invest in public goods such as education, basic healthcare, and fundamental research including biomedical knowledge (more generally, policies that correct the failures of free markets that economists have long recognized will arise from “externalities” in the absence of regulation);9
* ensure equity and distributive justice (for example, via wealth redistribution);10
* ensure basic rights, justice, and the rule of law independent of the market (for example, by an independent judiciary, bill of rights, property rights, and redistribution and other legislation to correct historical injustices due to colonialism, racism, and correct current and historical distortions that have prevented markets from being fair);11 and
* ensure that there is no alternative way of structuring society that is more efficient or better promotes the equity, justice, and fairness goals outlined above (by allowing free exchange given the regulations mentioned).12

To summarize the implication of the first two premises, well-regulated capitalism is essential to best achieving our ethical goals—which is true even though capitalism has certainly not always been well regulated historically. Society can still do much better and remove the large deficits in terms of health, wellbeing, and justice that exist under the current inferior and imperfect versions of capitalism.

Premise 3. Development and the future. If the global spread of capitalism is allowed to continue, desperate poverty can be essentially eliminated in our lifetimes. Furthermore, this can be accomplished faster and in a more just way via well-regulated global capitalism than by any alternatives. If we instead opt for less capitalism, less growth, and less globalization, then desperate poverty will continue to exist for a significant portion of the world's population into the further future, and the world will be a worse and less equitable place than it would have been with more capitalism. For example, in a world with less capitalism, there would be more overpopulation, food insecurity, air pollution, ill health, injustice, and other problems. In part, this is because of the factors identified by premise 1, which connect a turn away from capitalism with a turn away from continuing improvements in health, wellbeing, and justice, especially for the developing world. In addition, fertility declines are also a consequence of increased wealth, and the size of the population is a primary determinant of food demand and other environmental stressors.13 Finally, as discussed at length in the next section of the essay, capitalism can be naturally combined with optimal environmental regulations.14 Even bracketing anything like optimal regulation, it remains true that sufficiently wealthy nations reduce environmental degradation as they become wealthier, whereas developing nations that are nearing peak degradation will remain stuck at the worst levels of degradation if we stall growth, rather than allowing them to transition to less and less degradation in the future via capitalism and economic growth.15 In contrast, well-regulated capitalism is a key part of the best way of coping with these problems, as well as a key part of dealing with climate change, global food production, and other specific challenges, as argued at length in the next section. Here it is important to stress that we should favor well-regulated capitalism that includes correct investments in public goods over other capitalist systems such as the neoliberalism of the recent past that promoted inadequately regulated capitalism with inadequate concern for externalities, equity, and background distortions and injustices.16

Conclusion. Therefore, we should be in favor of capitalism over noncapitalism, and we should especially favor well-regulated capitalism, which is the ethically optimal economic system and is essential to any just basic structure for society.

This argument is impressive because, as stated earlier in the essay, it is based on evidence that is so striking that it leads a bipartisan range of open-minded thinkers and activists to endorse well-regulated capitalism, including many of those who were not initially attracted to the view because of a reasonable concern for the societal ills with which we began. To better understand why such a range of thinkers could agree that well-regulated capitalism is best, it may help to clarify some things that are not assumed or implied by the argument for it, which could be invoked by other bad arguments for capitalism.

One thing the argument above does not assume is that health, wellbeing, or justice are the same thing as wealth, because, in fact, they are not. Instead, the argument above relies on well-accepted, measurable indicators of health and wellbeing, such as increased lifespan; decreased early childhood mortality; adequate nutrition; and other empirically measurable leading indicators of health, wellbeing, and justice.17 Similarly, the argument that capitalism promotes justice, peace, freedom, human rights, and tolerance relies on empirical metrics for each of these.18

Furthermore, the argument does not assume that because these indicators of health, wellbeing, and justice are highly correlated with high degrees of capitalism, that therefore capitalism is the direct cause of these good outcomes. Rather, the analyses suggest instead that something other than capitalism is the direct cause of societal improvements (such as improvements in knowledge and technology, public infrastructure, and good governance), and that capitalism is simply a necessary condition for these improvements to happen.19 In other words, the richer a society is, the more it is able to invest in all of these and other things that are the direct causes of health, wellbeing, and justice. But, to maximize investment in these things societies need well-regulated capitalism.

As part of these analyses, it is often stressed that current forms of capitalism around the world are highly defective and must be reformed in the direction of well-regulated capitalism because they lack investments in public goods, such as basic knowledge, healthcare, nutrition, other safety nets, and good governance.20 In this way, an argument for a particular kind of progressive reformism is an essential part of the analyses that lead many to endorse the more general argument for well-regulated capitalism.

Although these analyses are nuanced, and appropriately so, it remains the case that the things that directly lead to health, wellbeing, and justice require resources, and the best path toward generating those resources is well-regulated capitalism. And on the flip side, according to the analyses behind premise 1 described above, an anti-capitalist system would not produce the resources that are needed, and would thus be a disaster, especially for the poorest billion people who are most desperately in need of the resources that capitalism can create and direct, to escape from extreme poverty.21

#### Only internalizing the costs of the appropriation through a system of property rights and Pigouvian taxes---commoning drives profits to zero.

Akhil Rao 19. [B.S., University of California, 2012 M.A., University of Colorado, 2016] “The Economics of Orbit Use: Theory, Policy, and Measurement.” https://scholar.colorado.edu/concern/graduate\_thesis\_or\_dissertations/jh343s34j

Gravity wells of planetary bodies are congestible resources. Orbiting satellites face the risk of colliding with other satellites, and objects left in orbit can stay there for hundreds or thousands of years. The current legal environment on Earth precludes efficient allocation of orbital paths through property rights and markets, making Earth’s orbits into an open access commons. The orbital congestion problem is made worse by the possibility of Kessler Syndrome - a cascade of collisions between objects in orbit, each collision producing many fragments and increasing the likelihood of another collision.

Relatively little is known about how to manage and measure orbital congestion under open access. Economic theory suggests that open access to a commons will drive the expected profits of commons use to zero, and that congestion can be managed by a system of property rights over the congested resource or a Pigouvian tax levied on the source of the externality. But what do these principles mean for orbital resources, given their novel dynamics and constrained legal environment? Will expected profit maximization under open access prevent or exacerbate positive feedbacks in debris growth? What are the relevant margins for optimal policy design, and to what extent can technological advances limit inefficient orbit use? How should the marginal external cost of orbit use be measured, and what does it imply for the efficient rental rate of orbit use? How much better off would society be by switching to optimal orbital management? Each chapter of my dissertation addresses one of these questions and related issues in orbital management.

In Chapter 2, Giacomo Rondina and I study the economic dynamics of open access and socially optimal orbit use. We focus on answering, “How will orbits be managed under open access, and how should they be managed?” We develop formal results and economic intuition for the nature of equilibrium congestion in orbit, and consider the effects of different time-varying physical and economic processes on open access orbit use. We show that the equilibrium collision risk under open access will be determined by the excess return on a satellite and that the economic feedback from expected congestion cost to profits can short-circuit explosive debris growth. However, firms under open access will not internalize longer-term debris accumulation. Consequently they may cause Kessler Syndrome despite limiting launches in response to collision risk. Increasing the decay rate of debris (e.g. through deorbit guidelines) or decreasing the amount of launch debris generated (e.g. through technological advances) may exacerbate equilibrium congestion. The interaction between debris accumulation, collision risk, and profit maximization may also cause endogenous fluctuations in orbital stocks around the steady state. This chapter connects to the literatures on open access and common resource problems.

In Chapter 3, I derive economic principles governing the choice of space traffic control policies. I focus on answering, “How should regulators choose amongst management policies, and to what extent can debris removal technology reduce the scope of the externality?” I show that policies which target satellite ownership, such as satellite taxes or permits, achieve greater expected social welfare than policies which target satellite launches, such as launch taxes or permits. Price or quantity policies can achieve equal expected social welfare due to the symmetry of uncertainty between regulators and firms. I also show that active debris removal can reduce the risk of runaway debris growth no matter how it is financed, but can only reduce the risk of satellite-destroying collisions if satellite owners pay for it. Technical solutions to space traffic control tend to emphasize launch restrictions or public funding of debris removal technology development and use, but often ignore that current and prospective orbit users dissipate rents under open access. While satellite-focused policies can achieve first-best orbit use, attempts to control orbital debris growth and collision risk through launch fees or debris removal subsidies under open access may be ineffective or backfire. This chapter connects to the literatures on congestion control, commons resource problems.

In Chapter 4, Dan Kaffine, Matt Burgess, and I calibrate the model developed in the preceding chapters and use it to estimate the time paths of an optimal satellite tax or rental fee, and the improvement in satellite safety and long-run global welfare from moving to a globally-harmonized optimal orbital management regime. We estimate physical and economic parameters from historical data on satellite and debris counts and collision probabilities over 1957—2017 and aggregate satellite industry revenues and costs over 2006—2015. The estimation and simulation methods can be used to calculate optimal policy values and gains from optimal policy under alternate physical and economic modeling assumptions and given different starting points. To achieve the results of a counterfactual optimal satellite management regime beginning in 2006, an optimal satellite tax would be on the order of $37,500 per satellite in 2020. The optimal management regime would approximately halve the risk of satellite-destroying collisions in 2020 and more than double the net present value of global social welfare in 2020 from orbit use. This chapter connects to the literatures on congestion measurement, commons management, and integrated assessment modeling.

#### Condo advantage counterplans are good – key to test the intrinsicness of aff impacts – winning a straight turn doesn’t prove the aff is a good idea or better than the squo which is the aff’s burden, and no policymaker would implement a proposal just because it’s not the worst idea which also justifies judge kick because even if the 2AR proves the counterplan is bad it doesn’t prove the aff is good. Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

## 3---DA

### Transition DA---1NC

Transition DA

#### Capitalism is human nature.

James Pethokoukis 21. Senior Fellow @ AEI; Editor, AEIdeas Blog; and DeWitt Wallace Chair "The 21st-century degrowth movement makes the same mistake about human nature as 20th-century socialists". American Enterprise Institute - AEI. 6-28-2021. https://www.aei.org/economics/the-21st-century-degrowth-movement-makes-the-same-mistake-about-human-nature-as-20th-century-socialists/

After the collapse of the Soviet Empire, Harvard University history professor Richard Pipes wrote in the essay “Human Nature and the Fall of Communism” that “a government that monopolizes a nation’s wealth and prohibits its citizens from accumulating any property beyond mere personal effects ensures its own destruction — if not from social or political explosion, then from chronic apathy, the sociopolitical equivalent of pernicious anemia.”

In other words, the Marxist-Leninist socialist notion that humanity was a blank slate upon which the Communist Party would write and thus create a New Soviet Man was doomed to failure. It ignored both the reality of human nature and its resilience. Indeed, the result in Soviet Russia was an economy marked by apathy and stagnation, and a society marked by corruption and repression. Again, Pipes:

The Communists wanted their citizens to give up, along with private property, personal ambitions, and to dedicate themselves wholly to the collective good. This aspiration has proven very difficult to realize, even in small utopian communities composed of idealistic volunteers. It was utterly unattainable in a vast empire held together by force. Rather than devote themselves 100 percent to the good of all, the vast majority of Soviet citizens dedicated themselves 100 percent to their private welfare. To members of the elite, the regime was an inexhaustible cornucopia that they skimmed mercilessly. Ordinary citizens interpreted the nationalization of all assets to mean that they had no stake in the country, since it belonged to someone else: since “they” owned it, let “them” take care of it. As a Soviet joke had it, “They pretend to pay us; we pretend to work.” Such attitudes resulted in a progressive alienation of the citizenry from the body politic.

Another anti-capitalist movement also suffers from a misunderstanding of human nature: the degrowthers who decry economic growth as environmentally unsustainable and beneficial only to a sliver of humanity. Of course, this view ignores the billions of still quite impoverished humans who would like to live like those in OECD countries. And then there’s those of us who currently live in rich countries and also would like higher incomes to acquire new goods, services, experiences, and opportunities. But don’t we in rich countries already have enough? Wouldn’t we be fine with stagnation or even a bit less? Certainly anyone having lived through the slow post-financial crisis economy should know better than to even pose such questions. I would also point to this telling example from economist Branko Milanovic’s newsletter:

I think that it could be reasonably argued that no group of people in the history of the world has lived as pleasant lives as today’s Italians. The advantages are well-known: lots of wealth, peace, moderate working hours, strong family and friendship bonds, nice weather, beautiful historical and natural sights, excellent and healthy food. Who then needs to grow? And Italy did not. It has by now stagnated for a generation and while in 1999, its GDP per capita was 3.5 times the world average, it is today 2.5 times. One could say, “it does not matter if people are happy”. But the problem is that, while superficially people may be happy this Summer as they congregate on the beaches and drink aperol, there is a deep malaise induced precisely by the absence of growth. The young are not happy because of lack of opportunities, the middle-aged people are not happy by non-challenging jobs, the old are not happy because their pensions are stagnant. So even if you have achieved a stagnant Arcadia, you cannot be happy and stop running because others are overtaking you and the fundamental features of capitalism, in Italy and elsewhere, are as I have described them above.

Those excellent points are ones that advocates of universal basic income should keep in mind.

#### Pure commons alternatives reinforce existing inequalities.

James McCARTHY 5 Geography @ PSU [“Commons as counterhegemonic projects,” *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 16 (1) p. INFORMA]

Global commons can also be profoundly undemocratic and reinforce existing inequalities, however. To assert a commons at one scale is almost necessarily to deny claims at another. For example, to claim as the 'common heritage of mankind' something as aggregated and reified as 'biodiversity'41 is to stake a claim to resources in other sovereign territories and to override many national or indigenous claims, usually without consultation with or benefit to those most affected. Global 'commons' of this sort, even if redistributive in initial intent (as efforts to claim deep seabed mineral resources as the 'common heritage of mankind' were), have the potential to reinforce and perpetuate existing global inequalities, in part because they lack defining attributes of commons, such as genuine participation in decision-making by all or most members of the community in question and relative equity among the 'commoners.' So, new commons do not always mean greater democracy or sensitivity towards alternative property regimes. Such considerations highlight the importance of Klein's insistence on local diversity and autonomy: while she advocates a global reclaiming of commons, it is not at all clear that she advocates global commons in the end; rather, she seems convinced that the many local calls for commons she catalogues share a common political impulse and point the way towards a new kind of left politics. Finally, while she is explicitly anti-capitalist and certainly accords no deference to the market, her conviction that the local is necessarily more democratic and sustainable than the national seems to me based more on ideology than on evidence. I would argue that her vision of commons might benefit from a direct, robust engagement with arguments that the state, for all its flaws, remains the most democratic and democratizable of modern institutions.

#### Elites block transition---causes mass death---only capitalism enables a peaceful solution to poverty.

Rainer Zitelmann 21. German historian and author of “The Rich in Public Opinion.” "Violence Is History’s Great Economic Leveler." National Interest. 6-30-2021. https://nationalinterest.org/feature/violence-history%E2%80%99s-great-economic-leveler-188974

Another question that is all too rarely asked is: What would be the price of eliminating inequality? In 2017, the renowned Stanford historian and scholar of ancient history Walter Scheidel presented an impressive historical analysis of this question: The Great Leveler: Violence and the History of Inequality from the Stone Age to the Twenty-First Century. He concludes that societies that have been spared mass violence and catastrophes have never experienced substantial reductions in inequality.

Substantial reductions in inequality have only ever been achieved as the result of violent shocks, primarily consisting of war, revolution, state failure and systems collapse, and plague.

According to Scheidel, the greatest levelers of the twentieth century did not include peaceful social reforms, they were the two world wars and the communist revolutions. More than 100 million people died in each of the two world wars and in the communist social experiments.

Total War as a Great Leveler

World War II serves as Scheidel’s strongest example of “total war” leveling. Take Japan: In 1938, the wealthiest 1 percent of the population received 19.9 percent of all reported income before taxes and transfers. Within the next seven years, their share dropped by two-thirds, all the way down to 6.4 percent. More than half of this loss was incurred by the richest tenth of that top bracket: their income share collapsed from 9.2 percent to 1.9 percent in the same period, a decline by almost four-fifths. The declared real value of the income of the largest 1 percent of estates in Japan’s population fell by 90 percent between 1936 and 1945 and by almost 97 percent between 1936 to 1949. The top 0.1 percent of all estates lost even more during this period, 93 and 98 percent, respectively. During this period, the Japanese economic system was transformed as state intervention gradually created a planned economy that preserved only a facade of free-market capitalism. Executive bonuses were capped, rental income was fixed by the authorities, and between 1935 and 1943 the top income tax rate in Japan doubled.

Significant leveling also took place in other countries during wartime. According to Scheidel’s analysis, the two world wars were among the greatest levelers in history. The average percentage drop of top income shares in countries that actively fought in World War II as frontline states was 31 percent of the prewar level. This is a robust finding because the sample consists of a dozen countries. The only two countries in which inequality increased during this period were also those farthest from the major theaters of war (Argentina and South Africa).

Low savings rates and depressed asset prices, physical destruction and the loss of foreign assets, inflation and progressive taxation, rent and price controls, and nationalization all contributed in varying degrees to equalization. The wealth of the rich was dramatically reduced in the two world wars, whether countries lost or won, suffered occupation during or after the war, were democracies or run by autocratic regimes.

The economic consequences of the two world wars were, therefore, devastating for the rich—a fact that stands in direct opposition to the thesis that it was capitalists that instigated the wars in pursuit of their own economic interests. Contrary to the popular perception that the lower classes suffered most in the wars, in economic terms it was the capitalists who were the biggest losers.

Incidentally, the left-wing economist Thomas Piketty comes to a similar conclusion. In his book Capital in the Twenty-First Century, he argues that progressive taxation in the twentieth century was primarily a product of the two world wars and not of democracy.

Poverty is Eliminated Peacefully

The price of reducing inequality has thus usually involved violent shocks and catastrophes, whose victims have been not only the rich but millions and millions of people. Neither nonviolent land reforms nor economic crises nor democratization has had as great a leveling effect throughout recorded history as these violent upheavals. If the goal is to distribute income and wealth more equally, says historian Scheidel, then we simply cannot close our eyes to the violent ruptures that have so often proved necessary to achieve that goal. We must ask ourselves whether humanity has ever succeeded in equalizing the distribution of wealth without considerable violence. Analyzing thousands of years of human history, Scheidel’s answer is no. This may be a depressing finding for many adherents of egalitarian ideas.

However, if we shift perspective, and ask not “How do we reduce inequality?” but “How do we reduce poverty?” then we can provide an optimistic answer: Not violent ruptures of the kind that led to reductions of inequality, but very peaceful mechanisms, namely innovations and growth, brought about by the forces of capitalism, have led to the greatest declines in poverty. Or, to put it another way: The greatest “levelers” in history have been violent events such as wars, revolutions, state and systems collapses, and pandemics, but the greatest poverty reducer in history has been capitalism. Before capitalism came into being, most of the world’s population was living in extreme poverty—in 1820, the rate stood at 90 percent. Today, it’s down to less than 10 percent. And the most remarkable aspect of all this progress is that, in the recent decades since the end of communism in China and other countries, the decline in poverty has accelerated to a pace unmatched in any previous period of human history. In 1981, the rate was still 42.7 percent; by 2000, it had fallen to 27.8 percent, and in 2021 it was only 9.3 percent.