## 1

### T

#### Interp and Violation: The affirmative must defend a use of the WTO or its nation members

#### The WTO is a trade organization

**WTO No Date** (<https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm>) EE

What is the WTO?

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world’s trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to help producers of goods and services, exporters, and importers conduct their business.

#### Nation means a community with a defined territory and government

**Merriam Webster no date** (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nation>) EE

b: a community of people composed of one or more nationalities and possessing a more or less defined territory and government

Canada is a nation with a written constitution

— B. K. Sandwell

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Fairness – post facto topic adjustment and debates about scholarship breed reactionary generics and allow the aff to cement their infinite prep advantage. They can specialize in 1 area of literature for 4 years which gives them a huge edge over people switching topics every 2 months – this crushes clash because all neg prep is based on the rez as a stable stasis point and they create a structural disincentive to do research – we lose 90% of negative ground while the aff still gets the perm which makes being neg impossible.

#### 2] SSD is good – it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it.

#### 3] Small schools disad: under-resourced are most adversely effected by a massive, unpredictable caselist which worsens structural disparities. Inclusion is an independent voter – you can’t debate if you can’t participate which is a prerequisite to accessing their benefits and ensures everyone gains from the activity.

#### 4] TVA: Read an aff about how vaccine apartheid in South Africa is a function of histories of suboordination

#### Failure to integrate race and IP protections either creates shallow policy analysis or shallow theoretical analysis. The two are mutually constitutive in the context of the topic which makes a plan imperative.

**Sirleaf 21** (Matiangai Sirleaf is the Nathan Patz Professor of Law at the University of Maryland School of Law. Professor Sirleaf writes and teaches in the areas of global public health law, public international law, international human rights law, international criminal law, post-conflict and transitional justice and criminal law. Professor Sirleaf previously served as an associate professor of law at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law, as an assistant professor of law at the University of Baltimore School of Law and as a Sharswood Fellow at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. “DISPOSABLE LIVES: COVID-19, VACCINES, AND THE UPRISING”. JUNE 1, 2021.)

**Recalling** the concept of **medical neocolonialism** is instructive here, as **South Africa obtained** millions of **vaccine doses at a cost** of $5.25 per dose, which is more than **double the** $2.16 per dose that **E**uropean **U**nion **countries paid** to AstraZeneca.97 Moreover, since South Africans initially participated in clinical trials for the development of the drug, they should have had greater post-trial access and benefit-sharing based on fundamental principles of research referenced earlier.98 Instead, **South Africa had to pay more for a drug it ultimately will not be able to use.** The trial of the vaccine revealed comparatively low efficacy rates (under 25%) against mild and moderate cases of the disease in South Africa, a threshold that does not “meet minimal international standards for emergency use.”99 South Africa has discontinued its plans to use the AstraZeneca vaccine, given the vaccine’s ineffectualness against a newer variant of the virus that is prevalent in South Africa.100 At the time of writing, its national immunization drive is in flux. This is compounded by Moderna’s (manufacturer of one of the most expensive COVID-19 vaccines101) earlier indication that it did not plan to distribute its vaccine in South Africa.102 Significantly, a single dose of the Moderna vaccine costs approximately $32–$37 and has an efficacy of approximately 95%.103 While Moderna pledged not to enforce its patent during the COVID-19 pandemic,104 it does not own all the patents in its vaccine.105 Accordingly, Moderna cannot make credible commitments that bind other patentholders. **Conventional analyses would simply treat vaccine apartheid as driven by and fully accounted for by poverty. Such shallow analyses,** however, **tend to obscure the functioning of race and histories of subordination**, which is why the concept of medical neocolonialism is so useful. The South African example vividly illustrates how “the fruits of medical and scientific advances are stockpiled for some and denied for others.”106 By failing to take an intersectional approach, traditional analyses may not fully capture how multiple overlapping areas such as race, class, and geography may function to produce heightened subordination. The political economy explanation also does not consider how market **failures for pharmaceuticals** aimed at diseases that disproportionately impact people of color **are tied to long histories of exploitation, dispossession, and devaluation of** the lives of Black, Indigenous, and other **people of color.** **A thorough analysis of** COVID-19 **vaccine apartheid and disposability must also consider the role of the international intellectual property regime in** severely **compounding the challenges of equitable vaccine distribution**. Briefly, **the** international **i**ntellectual **p**roperty **regime provides a** twenty-year **monopoly for pharmaceuticals**.107 Until the creation of this regime, many countries did not even place patent protection on pharmaceuticals. Previously, states regarded patent rights as a national prerogative rather than a minimum international substantive regime with standards for what intellectual property rights protections countries should adopt. Recognizing this, the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (**TRIPS**) Agreement grants extra implementation time to developing countries and **delayed implementation for the least-developed countries.**108 Although the DOHA Declaration, which reaffirms the TRIPS Agreement, and some TRIPS provisions were meant to create better flexibilities for public health or incentivize research and development, they have had limited effect in facilitating access to medicines,109 given the larger incentive structure toward profit maximization.110 Indeed, the creation of the international intellectual property regime and the ratification of this regime in the Doha Declaration has functioned to expand and increase U.S.-style pharmaceutical patent protection globally.111 Further, the United States often threatens to close off its market to countries that run afoul of its interpretation of what the TRIPS regime requires for protecting pharmaceuticals.112 The United States and others also advance their structural power against states in the Global South through a mix of TRIPS-plus provisions placed in bilateral and regional free-trade agreements that have imposed much more stringent requirements on countries than required by TRIPS.113

#### B]

#### The impact is fairness—a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense

#### No rvis—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

## Case

#### The alt fails – material habits influence state action more than discourse – they can’t change top-level state behavior

**Hopf 10**

(Ted, Associate Professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University, “The logic of habit in International Relations”, European Journal of International Relations published online 16 June 2010, http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/06/08/1354066110363502)

The logics of habit and practice differ fundamentally from the logics of consequences and appropriateness by stressing that the actions of actors in the world are often not the product of deliberate calculation of any sort, instrumental or normative. The practice turn also has reminded constructivist IR scholars that intersubjective reality is not just spoken into existence, but is acted into existence, too (Neumann, 2002). **Constructivism has long ignored what states** and their agents **do, while concentrating on what they say**. Discourse has been reduced to texts, ignoring practices. If interaction creates intersubjective reality, theorists of practice pointed out, then we should be paying attention to these actions, not just exchanges of words. If ‘practice theory moves the level of sociological attention “down” from conscious ideas and values to the physical and the habitual’, then the practice turn has yet to fully appreciate what it means to be habitual (Swidler, 2001: 75). The logic of practice is more reflective and agential than the logic of habit and, consequently, expects far more change in the world. The logic of practice is dedicated to removing the human mind from the theorization of practice, while the logic of habit makes the automatic system in the brain a critical factor in explaining unreflective perceptions, attitudes, and practices. While the logic of practice treats unreflective practices as the taproot for all other logics of action, the logic of habit assumes, at least at this early stage of theorization, that all logics have their place in everyday life. The practice turn is still too agential, expecting agents to be able to effect change in prevailing social structures with far greater frequency than habit would permit. The practice turn underestimates the social, cognitive, even phsyiological, **power of habit to prevent change**. It ignores **the ‘psychological advantage of the status quo’** that the logic of habit foregrounds (Eidelman and Crandall, 2009: 85–106).

## Globalism Good

#### Embracing globalism is good and alt doesn’t solve

**Karlsson**, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Umeå University, **‘16**

(Rasmus, “The Environmental Risks of Incomplete Globalisation,” Globalizations, August)

While neither xenophobia nor militarism is by any means new in history, what is striking is the **lack of enthusiasm** among contemporary elites and leading academics for accelerating globalisation processes or actively planning for a future of shared prosperity. As climate change has emerged as the defining political issue of our time, the rise of the poor is increasingly treated as a problem rather than a transformative opportunity (Myers & Kent, 2003). What is worse, **cultural perfectionist ideas** about the perceived superficiality of “mass consumption” have been allowed to **blend with protectionist fears of foreign competition** into a **silent acceptance of chronic poverty** abroad, preferably **under the guise of “sustainable livelihoods”** powered by small-scale renewable energy, as a tolerable price for avoiding a climate emergency. According to Paul and Anne Ehrlich, avoiding a collapse of global civilisation will require “widely based cultural change” and dramatic reductions of both “population size and overconsumption” (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 2013:5). For those subscribing to such views, a delayed or incomplete globalisation is seen as a blessing of sorts as it takes away some of the urgency of climate mitigation.

The primary aim of this paper is to show that, far from offering a path to long-term climate stability, such a development may lead policy-makers to **grossly underestimate** the true scope of the climate/energy challenge (Arto et al., 2016) and pursue policies that continue to lock in non-scalable forms of low-carbon technologies. More generally, beyond the formidable human cost of maintaining a divided world, the possibility of incomplete globalisation is likely to make the transition to a “Good Anthropocene” (Ellis, 2014) more difficult, reduce overall resilience, and **divert resources** away from important social and environmental ends.

The paper is structured so that it proceeds from a general critique of traditional environmental ideas of intentional localisation through a more specific discussion on the effects of “climate nationalism” towards a normative argument in favour of deliberately, i.e. by political and democratic means, accelerating the transition to a fully integrated high-energy planet as a way of reducing global environmental risks. **None of this comes from facile cornucopian optimism** or any attempt to downplay the existential challenges that humanity is currently facing with regard to the natural environment. It is rather the very urgency of those risks that makes it important to **contest existing discourses** on the relationship between globalisation and the environment, both those discourses that reflect **Malthusian beliefs** (Christoff & Eckersley, 2013) and those who deny the very reality of global environmental problems such as climate change.

The transition fallacies of localism

One long-running theme in the literature on sustainability **has been the virtues of localism and decentralisation** (Dobson, 2007:95; Goodin, 1992:147). Local economies are thought to be (a) intrinsically more sustainable, (b) better equipped to cope with resources scarcities, and (c) less vulnerable to environmentally catastrophes. As a consequence, the “Transition Town” movement and others have come to see intentional localisation as an appropriate response to climate change and other Anthropocene risks (Barry & Quilley, 2009; North, 2010). While such arguments obviously form part of a much broader discussion on political economy and the future of capitalism, there are many reasons to be **sceptical of this localist discourse**.

Starting with the first claim and assuming a basic natural resource point of view, it is clear that different geographical locations have different endowments of everything from soil types to moisture variability. This naturally invites specialisation and **intensification** of production. If each locale were to produce the full range of goods necessary even for meeting **basic human needs**, then **efficiency would be much lower** and **land use much higher** than today. Inefficient modes of production would thus not only require higher inputs of labour, energy, and raw materials but also **leave less room for nature** (Desrochers & Shimizu, 2012). As agricultural production would be pushed into landscapes of increasingly lower productivity (e.g. poorer soils, less favourable climatic conditions, and steeper slopes) the result would be **lower yields yet again**. In a field such as metallurgy, even the most rudimentary processes require inputs that are geographically dispersed. To unthink trade is therefore essentially to unthink modern civilisation. While this may in fact be the explicit goal of some of the most radical voices (Zerzan, 2008) there is very little recognition in localist literature for how much of human welfare that actually depends on economies of scale, specialisation, and exchange. Yet, it simply suffice to consider how little most individuals in advanced economies know of farming, forestry or mining to realise what an enormous loss in productivity and knowledge that would follow if these tasks were to be more broadly shared within local communities. Similarly, the ecological toll that would follow if billions of people would go out in nature in search for food and fuel is clearly **unfathomable**. It is thus not surprising that most advocates of localism **fall short of endorsing autarky** or complete self-reliance. However by romanticising the local and discriminating in favour of it (Woodin & Lucas, 2004:30) these scholars show little appreciation for the enormous gains in welfare, not to mention the formidable progress in science and technology, which have been made possible over the last centuries precisely thanks to specialisation and the integration of markets.

Even if pre-modern human history was essentially defined by poverty, social domination, and violent conflict, **it is still common to blame the prevalence of such ills on modernity.** Yet, as many have rightly pointed out, what is difficult to explain is not underdevelopment but that development was at all possible. According to a progressive reading of history, the key driver behind the great acceleration of the last centuries has been the emergence of broad social investments (Lindert, 2004). While both Marxists and libertarians may think otherwise, equality is crucial for modern capitalism to function as it provides both consumers who can afford the goods of industrialism and producers who can create ever more sophisticated things of value to others. Whatever short-term gains that may be obtained through exploitation or other unequal forms of exchange, they are dwarfed by the long-term gains that come with greater measures of equality as clearly illustrated by the resounding economic success of welfare capitalism over the course of the 20th century (Berman, 2006). The same of course holds true in a globalised economy. Rich countries may benefit in the short run from low consumer prices of imported goods but, for every Bangladesh that becomes a South Korea, the value of rising global demand and new export markets is obviously much greater.

As for the second claim that localism promotes resilience, there is a strong intuitive argument that if consumption and production are taking place in close proximity, supply chain interruptions can be minimised. Yet, considering how deeply integrated global supply chains have already become, **the opposite may in fact be the case**. This is so because either discrimination in favour of local products (1) rem**ains the kind of boutique concern for environmental elites** that it is in the present and then it will not matter much in a situation of global trade disruption or (2) it forms part of a comprehensive protectionist regime and then it may be the very thing that **triggers the disruption of global trade in the first place**. As a consequence, the best way to mitigate situations of resource scarcity is therefore rather to ensure the existence of a robust world trade system (Deudney, 1990:470) since it not only allows communities to offset immediate local shortages but also gives them more time to come up with substitutes through technological innovation (the costs of which presumably can be shared among a large number of consumers worldwide). Moreover, judging from the history of the 20th century, the existence of an open world trade system is in itself crucial for driving overall growth and making eventual economic convergence possible (Williamson, 1996).

Finally, as to the third claim, that decentralised local communities would be better suited to cope with environmental disasters thanks to their **“organic” or “embedded” nature**, **the opposite again seems to be the case**. As the events following the 2004 Boxing Day tsunami clearly illustrate, the existence of cosmopolitan norms of solidarity abroad and the possibility to bring in resources from unaffected, far-away lands offered **much better help than any policy of national isolation**. Likewise, after the super typhoon Haiyan hit in 2013, remittances from people working overseas and the help from international NGOs have been essential for the rebuilding of the city of Tacloban in the Philippines. As these and many other similar cases illustrate, accelerated global integration appears **far more appropriate** in any real-world scenario of environmental catastrophe than traditional environmental visions of **self- sufficiency and communitarianism**.

### AT: Economic Structures

#### No structuring logic to the economy

**Latour**, professor at Sciences Po, Paris, **‘14**

(Bruno, “On some of the affects of capitalism,” Lecture given at the Royal Academy, Copenhagen, 26th of February)

Thesis 1: Economics and its associated retinue of skills and trades — accounting, marketing, design, merchandizing, business training, organization studies, management — do not make up a science that would be studying a material world, but a set of disciplines in charge of extracting from the social and natural world another world that would have remained transcendent **without this violent act of performation**.

Thesis 2: Economics, as a discipline, has helped format local forms of “market organizations” which are entirely mundane, makeshift affairs depending so much on culture, law, and geography that they should not, in any circumstances, be transformed into a “system” and especially not into a “natural” system. The word “law” in the “laws of economics” should be understood as in “civil laws”, that is **as a highly revisable affair in the hands of a polity**. **Not as a law of a transcendent world in the hands of an invisible deity.** Thesis 3: To be radical a “radical critique” of an unfair, destructive and unsustainable “system” should **abstain from falling into the trap of fighting a system**. It is because **it is not transcendent** and because it **obeys no superior laws** that any “market organization” may spread and it is for the same reasons that it may be **amended**, **modified**, **corrupted**, **reformed** or **reorganized**. To be radical a critique should follow the exact same pathsthrough which the extension of standards, templates or metrological chains occurs. As soon as it jumps to another superior level, it ceases to be radical — that is, close to the roots of the problem.

Thesis 4: If it is true that the word “economy” and the word “liberty” have been linked throughout history, then this liberty should be expanded — yes, radically expanded — to all the devices, experiments, instruments, voting mechanisms, shares and stocks that constitute the makeshift, artificial and constantly reengineered armamentarium of the economy. Liberalism means “not letting anything go, not letting anything pass”.

Thesis 5: To be radical, that is, to be liberal, an interpretation of the working of economics and its “market organizations” should be of this Earth. **No transcendent power, neither God nor Mammon, is at work in the economy.** If it is true that economics inherits from the old “oeconomia” of the Greek Fathers, that is,the “dispensatio” by God the Creator, then it should inherit also all the qualities of such a providential plan, namely the suspension of fate, of slavery and domination and receive all the promises of salvation. It is blasphemous to use Providence to mean that the inflexible power of fate has been once again imposed upon the human race after it has been delivered from poverty.

### AT: Markets = Unethical

#### Markets are effective and ethical methods of resolving climate change –

**Monast ’17** – C. Boyden Gray Distinguished Fellow and Assistant Professor, University of North Carolina School of Law

Jonas. “On Morals, Markets, and Climate Change: Exploring Pope Francis' Challenge” LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS Vol. 80. HeinOnline

A. Argument 1: The Policy Instrument Is Intrinsically Immoral

For some, opposition to emissions trading is rooted in the view that allowing entities to buy and sell emissions credits is equivalent to licensing the "right to pollute."" Under this view, the market for units of emissions is objectionable on three grounds.45 First, emissions markets establish allowances or credits equal to a unit of pollution-typically the equivalent of a ton of carbon dioxide in the carbon market context. This view argues that the act of creating a tradable good out of an environmental harm-commodifying the environment and undermining the norm of pollution as intrinsically wrong-is itself immoral.

A second line of argument suggests that emissions markets conflict with a shared duty not to cause environmental harm." Rather than imposing mandatory emission reduction requirements at each source, emissions markets explicitly embrace compliance flexibility.47 At the end of a compliance period, entities subject to the emissions cap must submit the number of allowances equal to the corresponding units of pollution emitted. Emissions from an individual facility may increase, decrease, or remain unchanged, provided that: (1) each individual entity submits enough allowances to cover its actual emissions (or pay a heavy penalty); and (2) the cumulative emissions from all covered entities do not exceed the cap for that compliance period. 48 Because some emitters may avoid reducing the environmental harm caused by their facilities by purchasing allowances or credits-that is, extra reductions in emissions-from other emitters who therefore emit less, detractors of carbon markets view this compliance flexibility as allowing some polluters to avoid responsibility for reducing their contribution to harming public health or the environmental commons.4 9 If there is a universal duty to avoid environmental harm, the critics say, allowing some facilities to evade this responsibility by purchasing emission credits is wrong.

A third argument underlying the "inherent immorality" viewpoint rests on the view that national and international laws and treaties call for a clean and safe environment for all people." On this view, even if those laws have not achieved uniform protections, together they create a societal norm that pollution is bad and those responsible for emitting the pollution have a responsibility to reduce their impacts. According to Sandel, for example, the permits-and-fines-based environmental policy embedded in environmental statutes in the 1970s carried a "moral message" that polluting the environmental commons was wrong. These fines required companies to pay penalties for violating their legal and moral obligations. In contrast, some argue, using public policy to establish a market for emission credits undermines the societal norm of shared sacrifice to protect the environment, replacing it with the view "that nature is a dumping ground for those who can afford it."52 Sandel argues that this line of reasoning distinguishes carbon taxes from carbon trading -that taxing environmental harm conveys themoral stigma, while allowing emissions trading legitimizes the environmental harm provided the polluter is willing and able to purchase the permission to cause the harm.53

While Pope Francis does not invoke the "licensing the right to pollute" language, the encyclical's criticism of free market ideologies, of carbon credits, and of prioritizing profit maximization over personal responsibility, all suggest sympathy for the arguments that carbon markets are inherently immoral.

These **arguments**, however, **are unpersuasive on several grounds**. First, all environmental policies license some amount of pollution, except those rare cases that require a total ban. Alternatives to market-based instruments, such as traditional regulation via prescriptive technology standards or performance standards, also license residual pollution-indeed, for free-whereas marketbased instruments force the polluter to pay for each residual unit of emissions through an allowance obligation. This is true even if traditional policies are backed by heavy penalties for noncompliance, because even a firm in full compliance (for example, achieved by installing a scrubber), is permitted to continue to release residual (unabated) emissions (despite full compliance) at no penalty. On the other hand, under market-based policies, even firms in full compliance still must pay the allowance obligation (or tax, if applicable) on their residual emissions, or forego the proceeds they could have earned by selling their remaining allowances." Thus, traditional regulation may represent granting the right to pollute even more than market-based policies. Market-based policies can force the polluter-pays principle to apply to every unit of emissions, whereas traditional regulation exempts residual emissions for free. Imposing a penalty only on emissions above some permitted amount expresses the message that the permitted amount is legitimate, whereas an emissions tax or cap-and-trade expresses the message that the polluter must pay for every unit of emissions."

Second, if what is immoral is licensing pollution, or, licensing increased environmental harm, then a **rejection of market-based approaches may itself be an immoral choice**. This is particularly true where **market-based instruments are more likely to address an environmental harm in a cost-effective manner**, generate more pollution-control for a given expenditure, stimulate greater dynamic innovation in new methods of pollution reduction, or enable society to buy more environmental protection. 6 In such cases, the act of **opposing** **market based instruments may actually license greater pollution, which would presumably be an immoral position** (according to the critics).57 Third, this point is even stronger if morality includes concern for non-human life and the environment. Other life on earth suffers from climate change impacts and benefits from improving environmental quality and preventing damaging climate change-but presumably does not care about humans' moral scruples and norms about how humans prevent climate change. **If** **market mechanisms** offer an opportunity to **achieve greater environmental benefits** and successfully prevent climate change damages, then **opposing** **market** mechanisms in order **to vindicate** asserted **human ethical scruples** **means** thereby **sacrificing** some **climate protection for the rest of life on earth**, and is therefore at odds with a moral stance that includes concern for non-human life and the environment.

### 1NC – AT: Racial Capitalism

#### Their totalizing depiction of racial capitalism as requiring suicide produces a heroic drive for total revolution that obscures “as existing” progress

Shulman, PhD, 17

(George, PoliSci@NYU, Critical Exchange Afro pessimism, Contemporary political theory)

For on the one hand, it seems to me that ‘‘social death’’ is totalized as the truth that must be faced without consolation, while on the other hand, the only valid response is depicted as revolutionary (perhaps violent) refusal. We are driven toward helplessness and despair by an annihilating structure that seems impossible to change, but also, if we ask, what can be done, we receive images of revolutionary suicide. The systematic character of critique offers a clarity that is appealing; we also may be tempted by the appearance of heroic radicalism – and by an unavowed solace we may derive from the form of ‘‘election’’ it offers. But we may be better served by questioning the either-or structure of exceptionality, which juxtaposes social death in/as the ordinary to metaphors of radical refusal. By that structure, Schmitt distinguished ordinary existence as deadening repetition, and miracle as the decision to take exception to it; for Wilderson and Sexton ‘‘life’’ thus seems to require the decisive, unequivocal ‘‘event’’ of overcoming an ordinary life ruled – indeed emptied out, negated, or literally killed – by inescapably gripping social death. But what kind of life or politics is this? Might the ‘‘fact’’ or ‘‘lived experience’’ of blackness as social death be metabolized, transfigured, resisted, or dramatized in other ways? Rather than radically juxtapose awful truth and demeaned consolation, could we rework the relationship of critique and repair? Or is the impossibility of repair in its usual senses – because only a revolution would be truly reparative – the necessary assumption for rightly seeing the conditions of black agency? Rather than respond to their critique by asking, what radical action could possibly suffice to change this world, could we ask instead, what is already being done?

#### Collapse makes their impacts worse

**Korowicz 14**—former ministerial appointment to the council of Comhar, director of Metis Risk, on the executive committee of Feasta, The Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability

(David, “How to be Trapped: An Interview with David Korowicz”, <http://www.resilience.org/stories/2014-03-19/how-to-be-trapped-an-interview-with-david-korowicz>, dml)

That said, a disorderly de-growth/collapse would bring us to a new era where we would end up with a much reduced capacity to access and use resources and dump waste. But we’d still have to respond to problems and that would generally require whatever energy and resources were at hand. For example, anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions would likely nose-dive, a good thing of course, although the effects of climate changes would continue to get worse because of lags in the climate system while our adaptive capacity compared to today would have been shattered. Thus the real cost of climate change would escalate beyond our ability to pay quite suddenly and much faster than conventional climate-economic models would suggest. The danger here is that in a state of poverty and forced localization our attempts to respond to such emergent stress and crises mean we start undermining our local environments and their on-going capacity to support us. So any form of steady-state economy in the foreseeable future is inherently problematic.