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## 1

#### I value morality, the standard is consistency with consequentialism.

#### 1] only it can explain degrees of wrongness- it is worse to kill thousands than to lie to a friend- either ethical theories cannot explain comparative badness, or it collapses

#### 2] debate requires prioritizing mitigating material violence- ideal theory or a focus on diagnosing the problem as opposed to generating discussions on how to solve concrete oppression allows academics and students to elide their responsibility towards reducing injustices- complexity of social problems, understandings of risk, and epistemic limitations means that moral theories must prioritize action and reject totalizing ideological frames- intuitions that oppression and death are bad must be prioritized in your ethical calculus since people instinctively want to avoid them and because they preclude the possibility of accessing other values- this means you should reject absolutism or moral purity- it’s just an excuse to remain complicit in suffering

#### 3] actor spec-

#### A] no act-omission or intent-foresight distinction- gov’ts must create permissions and prohibitions so inaction is functionally an action and policymakers have to take the global perspective since they are responsible for the public and lack the relevant features of individual agents like autonomy that justify such a distinction

#### B] gov’ts have to aggregate since all collective actions require trade-offs that benefit some and worsen others- side-constraints freeze action and render ethics inoperable- takes-out and turns calc indicts- consequentialism is hard but not impossible, it’s empirically false since we calculate all the time, and the alt is no action which is worse

#### C] only consequentialism treats agents equally since it values their well-being the same- public officials have special obligations by virtue of their role to benefit its people in an equal manner

#### 4] existential threats outweigh-

#### A] extinction o/ws under any framework- moral uncertainty and future gens

Pummer 15 — (Theron Pummer, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford, “Moral Agreement on Saving the World“, Practical Ethics University of Oxford, 5-18-2015, Available Online at http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/, accessed 7-2-2018, HKR-AM) \*\*we do not endorse ableist language=

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### B] prereq to their offense- it forecloses all future value and causes massive structural violence

## 2

#### Congress is inching towards a funding deal—but, it’s a deliberate dance to keep them focused on funding while avoiding political complications

Romm 2/2 [Tony Romm is the congressional economic policy reporter at The Washington Post, tracking infrastructure reform, government spending and the financial impacts of federal decision-making nationwide, "Democrats, GOP inch ahead toward potential deal to fund government, avert shutdown", 2/2/22, https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2022/02/02/democrats-republicans-spending-shutdown-covid/]

Top Democrats and Republicans inched forward Wednesday in pursuit of a deal that could fund the federal government for the remainder of the fiscal year, hoping to stave off a shutdown while potentially pumping new spending into health care, education, science and defense.

The continued negotiations marked the second consecutive day of developments on Capitol Hill, as lawmakers who oversee the federal purse increasingly have come to express a measure of confidence that they can act before an upcoming Feb. 18 deadline — and overcome months of prior political disputes and delays.

Since President Biden took office, the U.S. government has operated under short-term measures that sustain key federal agencies and programs largely at their existing spending levels. The stopgaps have kept the government running, but they have also delayed Democrats from delivering on some of the White House’s top priorities, from expanding affordable housing to confronting climate change.

Republicans appeared content to continue in that vein, essentially dealing a political blow to Biden’s agenda in the process. But the two sides have come to see mutual benefit in striking a longer-term resolution, putting aside their differences at a moment when the United States continues to confront the pandemic at home and faces new diplomatic challenges abroad. The omicron variant of the coronavirus has sparked fresh discussions about the need for another round of federal aid, while the intensifying standoff between Russia and Ukraine has emboldened a Republican-led push to spend more on defense.

Both spending priorities could be appended to any new government funding measure, provided the two sides can reach a deal in the first place. In a sign of progress, Republicans on Wednesday presented a counter-offer for federal spending over the rest of the 2022 fiscal year, which Democrats are reviewing. The GOP move had the effect of temporarily delaying a planned afternoon meeting of the House and Senate’s top appropriators, but it still reflected a new seriousness among negotiators who until now hadn’t traded such proposals.

Yet new political fault lines also emerged Wednesday. Taking to the chamber floor earlier in the day, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) foreshadowed what could be staunch GOP opposition to another round of pandemic relief, as he cited roughly $6 trillion in spending that has been approved since the start of the public health emergency in 2020.

“Let’s start the discussion by talking about repurposing the hundreds of billions already sitting in the pipeline,” McConnell said.

Lawmakers begin discussing government spending deal as Democrats eye virus aid, paid leave

The promises and platitudes nonetheless amounted to noteworthy progress on Capitol Hill, a place where partisan disagreements these days have come to transform all but the most basic debates into intractable conflicts.

Twice in recent months, the appropriations process has nearly brought federal agencies to a screeching halt, threatening to shut down the government and hamstring the country’s response to the pandemic. Republicans at the end of last year even held up a swift resolution to the funding fight to launch an ill-fated political campaign against Biden’s vaccination and testing mandates targeting businesses. The Supreme Court later struck down some of the administration’s policies.

This year, lawmakers from both parties have pledged to steer clear of the same brinkmanship that characterized negotiations in fights past. Instead they have aimed for a deal that covers spending through the fiscal year, which concludes at the end of September. But they already face a race against the clock to act by Feb. 18, the date by which lawmakers must adopt another short-term measure or broker the sort of compromise that has so far eluded them during Biden’s presidency.

With the clock ticking, Democrats huddled Tuesday morning to discuss their political strategy. Emerging from the gathering, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and Senate Majority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) each offered their public, formal blessings for the nascent talks around a longer-term spending deal. Schumer added that the party’s negotiators are “on the same page,” though he and Pelosi noted they had not yet received an official counteroffer from their GOP counterparts.

The leaders of the House and Senate’s top panels overseeing appropriations then gathered on their own late Tuesday to try to put pen to paper. One of the participants in the bipartisan session, Sen. Richard C. Shelby (R-Ala.), later told reporters that lawmakers are still seeking an “agreement on our principles, then the [spending] top line will follow.”

Shelby acknowledged at the time that a slew of policy gaps still separate the parties, including the balance between “social spending versus national security.” But he joined his Democratic counterparts in maintaining that “we all want to try to get to yes,” adding: “We’re not there yet.”

Democrats seek significant boosts in federal domestic spending, now that the country for the first time in a decade is not bound to strict budget caps. Writing to her caucus last month, Pelosi endorsed the need for a “strong omnibus” that would “address critical priorities for our country, including for our national security and for communities at home.”

Yet some of the Democrats’ proposed spending increases and policy tweaks have troubled Shelby and his fellow Republicans. Beginning last year, they pointed to a series of “poison pills” — from Democratic plans to enhance the IRS to the party’s effort to loosen a long-standing ban on federal funding for abortion services — that could sink any talks on a deal. GOP lawmakers also have called for parity in defense and nondefense spending, a move that historically has troubled some Democrats, who have sought greater cuts to the Pentagon than even Biden has proposed.

“We’re looking for parity. We live in a troubled world and a lot of us think national security is important for this country,” Shelby, who leads the GOP on the Senate’s appropriations panel, stressed on Tuesday.

Democrats and Republicans otherwise appeared to downplay any potential disagreements following their flurry of meetings. Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), the chairman of the chamber’s appropriations panel, described himself as “always optimistic.” Rep. Rosa L. DeLauro (D-Conn.), his counterpart in the House, declined to specify any timelines or expectations for the follow-up session set for Wednesday afternoon.

“The goal is to get an agreement,” DeLauro said.

But such a deal, known in congressional parlance as an omnibus, is likely to carry additional significance this year. The compromise could pave the way for billions of dollars to flow toward projects that would improve the nation’s roads, bridges, pipes, ports and Internet connections. Lawmakers approved the money as part of a bipartisan infrastructure law finalized in 2021, but the package requires them to complete the act of writing the check, so to speak, before the real work can begin.

The must-pass spending measure also could serve as a legislative vehicle for lawmakers to advance a slew of other critical priorities. That includes new disaster aid in response to recent hurricanes and the tornadoes in and around Kentucky last year, for example, along with billions of dollars to augment the country’s efforts to combat the coronavirus.

With cases still rampant from the omicron variant, Democrats in recent weeks have renewed their calls for more federal spending to boost testing, therapeutics and vaccine access, especially abroad. Others have sought to provide additional benefits to workers, including the revival of a program that offers limited, pandemic-related paid family and medical leave. And still other Democrats have joined with a small but growing crop of Republicans who hope to give the green light to new assistance targeting restaurants, gyms, stages and other small businesses.

Lawmakers begin talks on another round of coronavirus relief for businesses

Publicly, the White House has maintained in recent months that significant money remains as part of the roughly $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan that Biden signed into law last spring. White House officials, meanwhile, have quietly started preparing a supplemental request focused on outstanding public health needs.

But the Biden administration by Tuesday afternoon had not transmitted any official request to the Capitol, Democratic leaders said. “We’re waiting for the administration to send us something. They haven’t sent us anything yet,” Schumer told reporters.

Some party aides acknowledged it had become a deliberate, delicate dance, reflecting an attempt to keep Congress focused on solidifying government funding levels without adding any other political complications.

#### Space policy causes immense partisan backlash that wrecks the delicate balance

Dreier 16 [Casey Dreier, Chief Advocate & Senior Space Policy Adviser for The Planetary Society, April 13, 2016. “Does Presidential Intervention Undermine Consensus for NASA?” https://www.planetary.org/blogs/casey-dreier/2016/0413-does-a-strong-president-help-or-hurt-consensus-on-NASA.html]

To see how this happens, I recommend reading the book “[Beyond Ideology](http://smile.amazon.com/Beyond-Ideology-Politics-Principles-Partisanship/dp/0226470768/ref=smi_www_rco2_go_smi_g2243582042?_encoding=UTF8&*Version*=1&*entries*=0&ie=UTF8)” by Frances Lee. The author’s larger premise is that issues having no intrinsic relation to stated party ideology have become increasingly polarized in recent years. This is a function of the two party nature of our political system. If your party coalition wins, the other one loses. It’s [It is] zero-sum. Your party can win in one of two ways: you can make a better pitch to voters by demonstrating the superiority of your agenda; or you can undermine and stymie the agenda of the opposition party, making them unpopular with voters, and pick up the seats that they lose. Since you’re the only other political party, you gain in either scenario. I’m not sure if you’ve noticed, but the “undermine and stymie” approach has been popular for quite some time now in the U.S. Congress. Given this situation, the President and their policies naturally become the symbolic target of the opposition party. Anything promoted by the President effectively induces opposition by association. Lee demonstrates the magnitude of this induced polarization on various types of issues. For highly polarized issues like the role of government in the economy, or social issues, the impact is minimal—the opposition has already been clearly defined and generally falls into clearly defined ideologies of the Republican and Democratic parties. But for issues that do not fit readily into a predefined political ideology—like space—the induced polarization by the President can be significant. In fact, Lee showed that space, science, and technology issues incur the greatest increase in partisanship based on their inclusion in the Presidential agenda. One need only look to at the responses by political operatives of the opposing party to the strong human spaceflight proposals by [Barack Obama in 2010](http://www.shelby.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/mobile/newsreleases?ID=25F3AD2E-802A-23AD-4960-F512B9E205D2), [George W. Bush in 2004](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/3950099/ns/technology_and_science-space/t/bush-sets-new-course-moon-beyond/#.Vw3UMRMrKHo), and [George H.W. Bush in 1989](http://www.nytimes.com/1989/07/21/us/president-calls-for-mars-mission-and-a-moon-base.html) to see this reflected in recent history. This isn’t to say that Presidents can’t have a significant impact on the space program. Clearly they can. But the broad consensus needed for stability after their departure from office may be undermined by the very priority they gave it during their tenure. It what amounts to a mixed blessing for NASA, the U.S. space program does have an unusually strong bipartisan group of politicians who support the program due to NASA centers in a variety of states throughout the union. Berger notes this throughout his article, and it does, in a way, act as force that is resistant to change for good and bad. This mitigates somewhat the pure polarization seen on other science and technology issues. But for a Journey to Mars—a major effort that would, at best, require stability and significant funding over many Presidential administrations—that may not be enough. Perhaps the solution is for the next President to maintain a light touch on space. Maybe they should speak softly through the budget process, and avoid the Kennedyesque speeches and declarations to Congress that induce the types of partisanship we so dearly need to avoid.

#### Bipart’s key—otherwise, yearlong CR ruins defense industrial base and military modernization

Gould 1/22 [Joe Gould is senior Pentagon reporter for Defense News, “Defense industry frets as funding talks crawl”, 1/21/2022, https://www.defensenews.com/congress/budget/2022/01/21/defense-industry-frets-as-funding-talks-crawl/]

Despite repeated warnings from uniformed Pentagon leaders and lawmakers of both parties that a full-year continuing resolution will hurt national security, some defense industry advocates are still worried about an impasse.

On Thursday, both chambers of Congress left town on recess until the week of Jan. 31, after making scant progress on a deal for an omnibus federal spending package. Amid partisan divisions over funding levels and policy provisions, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-N.Y., warned that a full-year CR would create a national security crisis ― in an effort to pressure Republicans.

“It is a national security issue of the highest priority, with the threats that exist out there. To go to a continuing resolution instead of a decision-making omnibus bill is to weaken our security and our stability,” Pelosi told reporters Thursday. “The Republicans should know that, so we hope we will be able to bring that legislation to the floor before [the current CR] expires.”

With fiscal 2022 spending bills four months overdue, lawmakers and the Pentagon have warned against a yearlong CR that would freeze defense spending at the level of 2021 appropriations. CRs continue funding at the previous year’s level, preventing the Pentagon from starting new acquisition programs and ramping up production quantities.

And without a 2022 spending deal to set a new baseline, the president’s budget submission is in limbo and expected to come months late, which is sowing uncertainty for the military and its vendors.

President Joe Biden signed a defense policy bill that boosts his $753 billion national defense budget request for FY22 to $778 billion, a 3% increase. But Republicans have said they want more for defense, less than the 16% increase proposed by Democrats and an agreement on some politically charged policy riders.

By the reckoning of National Defense Industrial Association Chairman Arnold Punaro, lawmakers could meet somewhere in the middle with 8% increases for both defense and nondefense, but that’s far from a certainty. Democrats have raised fears some Republicans see budget gridlock as an advantage heading into midterm elections and don’t want a deal at all.

“We’re still in budget chaos,” Punaro told Defense News this week. “China’s on the march, Russia’s on the move and North Korea’s on the advance, and yet Congress is sitting on their duff, not passing a spending bill. It’s disgraceful.”

The lack of a 2022 deal as a baseline for defense amid escalating inflation presents a huge challenge for Pentagon planners crafting the FY23 budget request, Punaro said. He worried the administration could make a flat budget request, potentially costing the Pentagon billions of dollars in buying power.

Meanwhile, a full-year CR would yield $11 billion of lost growth, while 7% inflation would mean another $50 billion in lost buying power, according to defense consultant Jim McAleese, the founder of McAleese & Associates.

Though the current CR runs out on Feb. 18., recent negotiations in Congress have sparked some optimism.

Lead appropriators in the Senate met Jan. 13 with Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell to set the guidelines for negotiations. From there, lead House and Senate appropriators met to kick off talks, and Pelosi has said she’s been in discussions with House Appropriations Committee Chairwoman Rosa DeLauro, D-Conn.

Asked Thursday whether it’s realistic to get an agreement by Feb. 18, as Congress was about to leave town Senate Appropriations Committee Vice Chairman Richard Shelby, R-Ala., said: “That’s a good question. It’d be hard to get it by the 18th, but if we can make huge progress, we can probably get done soon.”

It’s unclear whether looming international crises with Russia and Ukraine, China and Taiwan, and North Korean missile tests would add pressure to pass defense spending. When asked about Pelosi’s comments, Shelby seemed to dig in.

“She’s right on that, but to underfund defense as some people would like to do, that would be a bigger challenge,” he said.

At a House Appropriations Committee hearing Jan. 12 about the effects of a potential full-year CR, the top officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Space Force warned such a move would sabotage the military’s efforts to compete with China by stalling new weapons like hypersonic missiles.

“CRs effectively prevent modernization at speed,” said Marine Corps Commandant Gen. David Berger. “We actually stand to be outpaced by China — not because of their speed but because of our failure to comply with our own budgetary processes.”

The president and CEO of the Aerospace Industries Association, Eric Fanning, has warned that budget unpredictability is inefficient for the defense industry, which has to idle while the Pentagon waits for its projects to be funded. Amid the Capitol Hill activity, Fanning said he is “hopeful that the momentum continues.”

“The hearing painted a concerning picture of additional and unnecessary costs, as well risks to capabilities and to the industrial base in the short and long-terms. There was bipartisan agreement on how devastating a year-long CR could be,” Fanning said in a statement Thursday. “Over the last few days, there are positive signs that the message is getting through and the top appropriators from both parties are coming to the table.”

Lead Pentagon officials have talked for years about the need to harness the innovation of small tech firms. But CRs stifle those efforts, an executive at one of those firms, Anduril Industries, wrote in an essay this week.

#### Impact’s cyber and deterrence crash

Manchester ’19, [Josh, Founder of Champion Hill and General Partner at Foundation Capital, Venture-backed Startups Will Build the Defense Technology the Free World Needs Right Now, https://medium.com/@joshmanchester/venture-backed-startups-will-build-the-defense-technology-the-free-world-needs-right-now-d2cefa2b2196]

With U.S. defense spending exceeding $700 billion per year, how could the United States be on the brink of a national security emergency? Simply put, America’s national security competitors are outflanking an Industrial-Age U.S. military machine that, like a lumbering dinosaur, is not adapting fast enough to its changing environment. The Pentagon desperately needs rapid innovation. Yet the current defense industry structure is not compatible with U.S. venture capital and high-growth technology industries for several reasons: · The U.S. military’s industrial base is centered on a few huge oligopoly suppliers known within the Beltway as “the Primes” — Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Raytheon, General Dynamics, and Northrop Grumman. These companies, ancient by tech startup standards, have optimized themselves to sustain a 20th century Industrial Age World War II-style force structure which supports the political decision-makers across the country who appropriate the funding that industrial base receives. The Primes are great at building very large platforms that cost billions of dollars and take 15–30 years to field. The Primes are also historically heavy on hardware talent and much lighter on software talent. · The Primes receive the vast majority of defense spending. Defense budgets have historically not unlocked for startups. While a defense private equity industry exists to aggregate small companies and flip them downstream to the Primes, venture capital investors, who have a much higher return threshold, know that it’s hard to have venture outcomes (in other words, to make money) when a company can’t win large market share or survive as a stand-alone business. · Venture-backed tech industries have matured as an asset class in peacetime and most mainstream U.S. venture firms in existence today do not have institutional cultures or histories that include defense innovation, apart from cybersecurity. · Major tech companies, like the FAANGs (Facebook, Apple, Amazon, Netflix, Google and Microsoft too), are generally unwilling to work on defense related projects, and sometimes must deal with employee protests when they do. · Many observers perceive this as an indicator that software engineers generally don’t want to work on defense-related innovation. · Finally, in a bizarre set of twists, some of the organizations that comprise the Limited Partners of venture capital firms (the blue chip endowments and foundations of the U.S. Eastern establishment, often founded on the fortunes of great American industrialists from decades ago, along with public pension funds throughout the country) are [sometimes accidentally funding Chinese defense technology](https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanmac/us-money-funding-facial-recognition-sensetime-megvii) while often restricting their U.S. venture managers from making defense investments. Foundations and endowments in particular often have negotiated Limited Partnership Agreements with the venture firms they finance precluding them from investing in anything that could have military usage. The irony is that these same tax-exempt pools of capital are frequently investors in Chinese venture funds which provide software to make smarter and more deadly Chinese weapons and to the advanced surveillance systems that have turned China’s Xinjiang province into a virtual Uighur prison camp and a human rights disaster. No single individual or entity has caused this state of events to transpire; it is simply the accumulation of various cultural aspects of the capital formation process of the venture industry and its portfolio companies. Fortunately, we believe that almost all these characteristics will rapidly change over the next few years. But first let’s discuss some additional background. Venture capital has come of age in a time of unprecedented peace The U.S. venture capital industry is about 100 years old. Bessemer Ventures was formed in 1911 and originally had just the family fortune of Henry Phipps Jr., a co-founder of Carnegie Steel, as its sole limited partner. Despite these deep roots, the U.S. venture industry has only institutionalized as an asset class since the mid-1990s. Until then it was extremely clubby and very small. Sequoia Capital, KPCB, Charles River Ventures, and NEA were all founded in the 1970s and Accel Partners in the 1980s. But it has really only been since the mid-1990s (Benchmark Capital was founded in 1995, as was my own former firm, Foundation Capital) that the industry has institutionalized and grown substantially, first in the desktop computing and internet boom, and second during the combination of platform shifts over the last ten years that have given us mobile computing, social media, e-commerce, cloud computing, software-as-a-service and all of their associated new business models. For a quarter of a century, the institutional, mainstream venture investing ecosystem, at the startup, venture firm and limited partner levels, developed business processes, mental models, networks, and expertise in certain technical areas and heuristics — in aggregate, an industry culture — that have created one of the most dynamic parts of the U.S. economy. The U.S. tech industry is also one of the most unique aspects of American life — and a powerful, difficult-to-replicate form of “soft power,” featuring an inclusivity for aspirational immigrant founders — a feature perhaps unequalled in human history. From a long-term U.S. historical viewpoint, it is striking that the venture industry’s maturation has occurred during a unique period in American history when the United States had no major great power competitor, either ideologically or technologically. The Cold War ended in 1991, the Soviet Union dissolved, and Russia was in disarray for the next 15 years. This period of peace was not without its own unique trials, but the security challenges associated with terrorism, counterinsurgency, and lower-intensity military activity have not required the sort of Herculean societal and political efforts that were drawn upon during the Cold War or World War II. We should all be grateful every day that this has been the reality of the last 25 years. A useful analogy might be made with gold. In 1933, President Roosevelt made it illegal for U.S. citizens to own gold. In 1934, Benjamin Graham published the first edition of Security Analysis. In January 1975 it became legal to own gold again. Graham died in 1976. It was therefore illegal to own gold during key years of the development of modern security analysis. From this gap came gold bugs — the weirdos who seemed to always talk about nothing else, and didn’t get invited to key social events. No analogies are perfect but this captures some of the similarities between venture and defense today. Cybersecurity investors understand the cybersecurity parts of U.S. defense. But most mainstream Silicon Valley venture firms do not spend time on other parts of defense due to the industry’s institutionalization during this recent period of relative peace and American dominance — which has also been a time when the lion’s share of defense spending has gone to the Primes, as discussed. Sadly, peace is ahistorical. Great power competitions are a feature of humanity, not a bug. Periods of time when a major power, or superpower, are not challenged in some profound fashion by one or more other powers, regardless of whether they are driven by fear, prestige, economic interest, or ideology — are, in short, rare when looking back on the sojourn of homo sapiens on planet earth. The period when the free world had a monopoly on power has now ended. The tech-defense status quo is inverting The only previously delineated area where we don’t expect much change is from the FAANGs. These massive companies are best viewed as small nation-states themselves with global stakeholders. For example, many of their employees are not U.S. citizens and may not want their employers engaged in U.S. defense work. We think everything else will invert. · We believe defense budgets will begin unlocking for young startups. Many key national security decision-makers in Washington are now seeking better, faster alternatives to the byzantine Pentagon acquisitions process. Thought leaders like Will Roper, in charge of the U.S. Air Force’s $40 billion annual research and acquisition budget, are [eagerly welcoming the contributions that smaller, nimble venture-capital funded entrepreneurs can make](https://federalnewsnetwork.com/dod-reporters-notebook-jared-serbu/2019/03/air-force-looks-to-build-big-idea-pipeline-to-expand-its-industrial-base/). Roper, and others in the Pentagon, are reforming their practices to make it easier for genuine innovators to compete against the legacy defense oligopoly. When recently asked at a conference what problem keeps him up at night, Roper replied, “The industrial base.” · Given the hardware roots of the Primes, they are ill-suited to provide solutions to many of the most pressing problems today. The Defense Department will increasingly allocate resources to startups solving software problems for which the Primes have no existing stock of machine learning engineers. · As this happens some venture firms will experience cultural shifts toward more defense investing. As venture capitalists see that startups are receiving large purchase orders from various Defense Department units, they will develop strategies to deploy capital toward defense innovation. A good example is [last week’s award by the Air Force of $121 million to Pivotal Software in San Francisco](https://dod.defense.gov/News/Contracts/Contract-View/Article/1861753/source/GovDelivery/). · Institutional limited partners as a group will likely slowly allocate away from any China-based manager who could be investing in Chinese military technologies. Some LPs with the freedom to do so may remove restrictions on defense investing from limited partnership agreements. · We believe it is a myth that software engineers do not want to work on defense. This is a classic case of preference falsification, the social phenomenon in which people do not speak their true minds about a given topic, though their actions often indicate otherwise. We believe that talented engineers are often very attracted to defense-related work because it often offers the hardest problems to solve. An enormous opportunity therefore exists for startups: to hire the engineers who don’t want to work for ancient and outdated Primes, and who aren’t very welcome at the FAANGS, but who wish to create the technologies that an increasingly eager democratic government needs to defend itself and its allies. Companies in our own portfolio, like [SpaceX](https://www.spacex.com/), [Rigetti Computing](https://www.rigetti.com/), [Anduril Industries](https://www.anduril.com/), and [Umbra Lab](https://umbralab.com/) are executing this strategy. The hardest technical problems today are defense-related How can data from satellites, drones, land-based radar, ships, and other sources be stitched together, in real time, to find long-range missiles on mobile transporters, hiding among the background in cities, forests, and mountains? How can friendly troops, who have separated into very small units in order to hide and survive, be connected to each other electronically, and be resupplied from historically long ranges? How and to what degree and in what conditions should an adversary’s sensor networks be spoofed? What type of false electronic picture can be painted? The aggregation of targeting data for an air wing takes 72 hours today and has a heavy human component. Can this complex optimization problem be solved autonomously, such that the targeting list for pilots is developed in 15 minutes? How does a deployed force of perhaps 50,000 personnel, with planes, ships, and land forces, continue to fight when satellite links have been knocked out, and “reachback” to the U.S., for data processing, is no longer possible? Can deep learning be used for crisis diplomacy? Put another way, since DeepMind’s AlphaZero can teach itself to move pieces forward on a board to win a game, can it learn to move them backwards, to de-escalate a crisis? These problems, and many others, are asking to be solved by entrepreneurs. Phase change There is a looming breakdown in deterrence. If the U.S. defense establishment is unable to adapt to the new great power competitive environment, then adversaries will be tempted to grab for a fait accompli, with war the result. This has been the pattern since Homer wrote The Iliad; there is no evidence to conclude human behavior is different in the 21st Century. We believe the prevention of this scenario involves rapid technical innovation. The defense environment is more favorable now for upstart firms than anytime in the past several decades. If you are a founder building technology to ensure the survival of government by consent, our firm would like to talk to you.

## Case

### Underview

#### We aren’t reading theory point 1 doesn’t apply to us

#### The util stuff:

#### Aggregation doesn’t fail – you can compare between being stabbed and hitting your toe

#### We can compare pain vs pleasure – that’s the way we know dying is worse than being mean

#### Approbation of outer space isn’t unique so many other things are causing this accelerationist such as developing tech

### Contention 1

#### No reason to reemphis on earth – expanding is good allows us to be introduced to new things

#### Capitalism has made the world substantially better

Iacono 16 — Corey Iacono, 1-16-2016, "How Capitalism and Globalization have made the world a better place", Quillette, http://quillette.com/2016/01/16/how-capitalism-and-globalization-have-made-the-world-a-better-place/

Throughout this week, the hashtag #ResistCapitalism was trending on Twitter. Using this hashtag, activists have aired their grievances against an economic system which they deem to be destructive, unfair, and immoral. In their view, the growth of global capitalism experienced over the last few decades has been only detrimental to human well-being. Indeed, since the early 1990s, global capitalism has lapsed into “its most savage form,” according to progressive populist Naomi Klein.

In fact, the expansion of capitalism and freer international trade has coincided with an era of slow economic growth, high unemployment, increased child labor, skyrocketing inequality, and grinding poverty.

Just kidding, that’s not what happened at all. In fact, as the world has become more capitalist and more globalized, the quality of life for the average person, and especially for the average poor person, has increased substantially. In 1990, 37% of the global population lived on less than $1.90 per day. By 2012, that number had been reduced to 12.8%, and in 2015 it was under 10%. The source of this progress isn’t a massive wealth redistribution program; it’s massive wealth creation — that is, economic growth.

Economists David Dollar and Aart Kraay found that, in a global sample of over 100 countries, changes in the income growth of the bottom 40% of the world’s income earners are highly correlated with economic growth rates. On the other hand, changes in inequality contributed relatively little to changes in social welfare of the poor over the last few decades.

There is good reason to believe that the expansion of free trade, facilitated by international organizations like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), have had a considerable impact in accelerating the economic development of developing countries.

In the 1990s GATT facilitated reforms which moved 125 countries towards freer trade by reducing the burden of government imposed trade barriers like tariffs. This was the first serious attempt at trade reform for most developing countries at the time, and arguably presents a unique natural experiment on the economic effects of trade reform.

In fact, a paper published by the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), specifically examined how trade reforms facilitated by GATT affected the economic development of the reforming countries. In the paper, the authors compared the trends in economic growth before and after trade reform in the reforming countries. Then they compared those results to trends in economic growth of a control group of countries which didn’t undergo trade reform.

What they found was very encouraging for proponents of free trade. Prior to reform, the economic development of reformers and non-reformers was practically identical, but after reform, the economic development of reforming countries accelerated while non-reforming countries saw their economies stagnate and decline. The results suggest that the reforms towards freer trade lead to an increase in income per capita of around 20% in the long-run, an effect so large that it almost certainly had a positive and non-trivial impact on poverty reduction.

Similarly, other research has shown that more free market trade policies result in lower rates of extreme poverty and child mortality in developing countries. There are other benefits as well. One study on trade reform in Indonesia found that reductions of import tariffs led to an increase in disposable income among poor households, which allowed them to pull their children out of the labor force, leading to “a strong decline” in the incidence of child labor.

Unfortunately, many activists have reflexively taken up the cause of opposing the expansion of global capitalism, for a number of reasons. Western anti-sweatshop activists, for example, will often argue in favor of government imposed barriers to trade with poor countries because their working conditions are terrible in comparison to those in developed Western nations. In their view, western consumers should not be promoting a cycle of capitalist exploitation by buying products made in Vietnamese sweat-shops.

But satisfactory working conditions aren’t the natural state of mankind; they are a consequence of decades of economic development. Erecting barriers to trade with poor countries is surely a large impediment to their development, in fact, research suggests that existing developed world tariffs depress economic growth rates in the developing world by 0.6 to 1.6 percent per person, a considerably large effect.

Moreover, the sweat-shops which produce clothing for Westerners are often much better than alternative forms of domestic employment. In poor countries like Bangladesh, China, and Vietnam, the apparel industry consistently pays more than most other domestic industries. According to research by economist Ben Powell, in poor countries “most sweatshop jobs provide an above average standard of living for their workers.”

Notably, a paper published in the Journal of Development Economics found that the expansion of the garments industry in Bangladesh lead to an increase in employment and income among young women, giving them the means to finance their own education. Remarkably the authors found that, “the demand for education generated through manufacturing growth appears to have a much larger effect on female educational attainment compared to a large-scale government conditional cash transfer program to encourage female schooling.”

Foreign investment is also more desirable than opponents of capitalism and globalization give it credit for. The conventional wisdom among activists in wealthy countries is that multinational corporations exploit poor workers in third world countries for cheap labor, profiting off people working in sweatshop conditions.

It should come as a surprise to the individuals who hold this view to learn that 85% of people in developing countries believe that foreign companies building factories in their countries is a good thing, according to Pew Research.

In fact, for all the talk of exploitative multinational corporations, research shows that, in general, these corporations provide higher wages and better working conditions than domestic employers in developing countries.

Additionally, when multinational corporations build factories in poor countries, it raises the demand for low-skilled workers, resulting in higher wages for local workers. Consistent with this fact, recent empirical evidence demonstrates that investment by foreign companies in developing countries reduces both poverty and income inequality by raising the incomes of low-skilled workers.

Foreign investment can also make people in relatively low-income countries better off by providing better or more inexpensive products. A recent analysis published by the NBER found that foreign retailers like Wal-Mart greatly reduce the cost of living for both the rich and poor in Mexico, making everyone along the income distribution better off.

Global capitalism is by no means a perfect phenomenon. Many businesses do have questionable labor practices that are worthy of contempt. And free market policies may in many instances lead to socially undesirable outcomes, sometimes on a large scale.

However, the one-dimensional, automatic denunciation of capitalism and the accompanying refusal to give it any credit for its successes — as social media activists have done — reflects an uncompromising, and quite frankly ignorant worldview. It is one in which capitalism is always bad, no matter what the evidence tells us.

#### Capitalism has made poverty better – has allowed for better living conditions, innovation, and health improvements

Steven Horwitz, 6-9-2016,( Steven Horwitz is the Charles A. Dana Professor of Economics at St. Lawrence University and the author of Hayek’s Modern Family: Classical Liberalism and the Evolution of Social Institutions. "Capitalism Is Good for the Poor," No Publication, <https://fee.org/articles/capitalism-is-good-for-the-poor/> , MRV)

Critics frequently accuse markets and capitalism of making life worse for the poor. This refrain is certainly common in the halls of left-leaning academia as well as in broader intellectual circles. But like so many other criticisms of capitalism, this one ignores the very real, and very available, facts of history. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets. Nothing has done more to lift humanity out of poverty than the market economy. This claim is true whether we are looking at a time span of decades or of centuries. The number of people worldwide living on less than about two dollars per day today is less than half of what it was in 1990. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets, such as China and India. If we look over the longer historical period, we can see that the trends today are just the continuation of capitalism’s victories in beating back poverty. For most of human history, we lived in a world of a few haves and lots of have-nots. That slowly began to change with the advent of capitalism and the Industrial Revolution. As economic growth took off and spread throughout the population, it created our own world in the West in which there are a whole bunch of haves and a few have-more-and-betters. For example, the percentage of American households below the poverty line who have basic appliances has grown steadily over the last few decades, with poor families in 2005 being more likely to own things like a clothes dryer, dishwasher, refrigerator, or air conditioner than the average household was in 1971. And consumer items that didn’t even exist back then, such as cell phones, were owned by half of poor households in 2005 and are owned by a substantial majority of them today. Capitalism has also made poor people’s lives far better by reducing infant and child mortality rates, not to mention maternal death rates during childbirth, and by extending life expectancies by decades. We spend a much smaller percentage of our lives working for pay, whether we’re rich or poor. Consider, too, the way capitalism’s engine of growth has enabled the planet to sustain almost 7 billion people, compared to 1 billion in 1800. As Deirdre McCloskey has noted, if you multiply the gains in consumption to the average human by the gain in life expectancy worldwide by 7 (for 7 billion as compared to 1 billion people), humanity as a whole is better off by a factor of around 120. That’s not 120 percent better off, but 120 times better off since 1800. The competitive market process has also made education, art, and culture available to more and more people. Even the poorest of Americans, not to mention many of the global poor, have access through the Internet and TV to concerts, books, and works of art that were exclusively the province of the wealthy for centuries. And in the wealthiest countries, the dynamics of capitalism have begun to change the very nature of work. Where once humans toiled for 14 hours per day at backbreaking outdoor labor, now an increasing number of us work inside in climate-controlled comfort. Our workday and workweek have shrunk thanks to the much higher value of labor that comes from working with productive capital. We spend a much smaller percentage of our lives working for pay, whether we’re rich or poor. And even with economic change, the incomes of the poor are much less variable, as they are not linked to the unpredictable changes in weather that are part and parcel of a predominantly agricultural economy long since disappeared. Think of it this way: the fabulously wealthy kings of old had servants attending to their every need, but an impacted tooth would likely kill them. The poor in largely capitalist countries have access to a quality of medical care and a variety and quality of food that the ancient kings could only dream of. Consider, too, that the working poor of London 100 years ago were, at best, able to split a pound of meat per week among all of their children, which were greater in number than the two or three of today. In addition, the whole family ate meat once a week on Sunday, the one day the man of the household was home for dinner. That was meat for a week. These changes are not about technology. Compare that to today, when we worry that poor Americans are too easily able to afford a meal with a quarter pound of meat in it every single day for less than an hour’s labor. Even if you think that capitalism has made poor people overweight, that’s a major accomplishment compared to the precapitalist norm of constant malnutrition and the struggle even 100 years ago for the working poor to get enough calories. The reality is that the rich have always lived well historically, as for centuries they could commandeer human labor to attend to their every need. In a precapitalist world, the poor had no hope of upward mobility or of relief from the endless physical drudgery that barely kept them alive. Today, the poor in capitalist countries live like kings, thanks mostly to the freeing of labor and the ability to accumulate capital that makes that labor more productive and enriches even the poorest. The falling cost of what were once luxuries and are now necessities, driven by the competitive market and its profit and loss signals, has brought labor-saving machines to the masses. When profit-seeking and innovation became acceptable behavior for the bourgeoisie, the horn of plenty brought forth its bounty, and even the poorest shared in that wealth. Once people no longer needed permission to innovate, and once the value of new inventions was judged by the improvements they made to the lives of the masses in the form of profit and loss, the poor began to live lives of comfort and dignity. These changes are not, as some would say, about technology. After all, the Soviets had great scientists but could not channel that knowledge into material comfort for their poor. And it’s not about natural resources, which is obvious today as resource-poor Hong Kong is among the richest countries in the world thanks to capitalism, while Venezuelan socialism has destroyed that resource-rich country. Wealth is not about natural resources. Inventions only become innovations when the right institutions exist to make them improve the lives of the masses. That is what capitalism did and continues to do every single day. And that’s why capitalism has been so good for the poor. Consider, finally, what happened when the Soviets decided to show the film version of The Grapes of Wrath as anticapitalist propaganda. In the novel and film, a poor American family is driven from their Depression-era home by the Dust Bowl. They get in their old car and make a horrifying journey in search of a better life in California. The Soviets had to stop showing the film after a short period because the Russian audiences were astonished that poor Americans were able to own a car. Even anticapitalist propaganda can’t help but provide evidence that contradicts its own argument. The historical truth is clear: nothing has done more for the poor than capitalism.

#### Capitalism is good for education—none of your arguments are supported by real evidence

Blanchard 15 - Kate Blanchard, has been teaching religious studies to undergraduates in central Michigan for over a decade. She is the author of 'The Protestant Ethic or the Spirit of Capitalism' (Cascade 2010), co-editor of 'Lady Parts: Biblical Women and the Vagina Monologues' (Wipf & Stock 2012), and co-author of 'An Introduction to Christian Environmentalism' (Baylor 2014). She has also written for Religion Dispatches, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and the Wabash Center, 15 ("Higher Ed and Capitalism: The Best of Frenemies," Huffington Post, 5-26-2015, Available Online at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kate-blanchard/higher-ed-and-capitalism-\_b\_7437098.html, Accessed on 7-6-2017 //JJ)

One particular statement from a UNC board member, though, is especially jarring to those of us who are still naïve enough to believe in higher education as a good in and of itself. “We’re capitalists,” said Steven Long, “and we have to look at what the demand is, and we have to respond to the demand.”

As the beneficiary of both public high school and private institutions, I do not wish to dismiss the importance of markets to education. Excellent public education depends upon a healthy tax base, which in turn depends on a strong economy. Markets, when well regulated, on the whole do a better job of creating strong economies than the two alternative systems - theft or gift, both of which quash incentives to productivity. (I hasten to add, however, that taxation and theft are not necessarily the same thing, since citizens expect to get something for their taxes.) Well-funded education tends to be much better than under-funded education, so anything that produces funds for education is welcome. Thus, capitalism can be a friend to education in so far as it helps pay for it.

What the business-minded people who now populate most college and university boards fail to understand, however, is that not-for-profit education - while it may potentially thrive under a capitalist system - is not inherently “capitalist” in that it is not defined by the pursuit of profits.

It is, rather, defined by the pursuit of human beings who are better than they would have been without education. Students, to speak capitalist language, could be called the products of a university rather than the customers; if there is any customer in the mix, it is society at large. But even to use the terms “product” and “customer” is already to have lost the argument. Capitalism is the enemy of education when it colonizes its logic, replacing the motivating values of genuine learning and personal growth with the values of radical individualism and material gain.

American higher education has been, indeed still is, globally admired for its excellence. That excellence was enabled both by healthy markets that provided a healthy tax base, and by civic-minded Americans who believed that their neighbors’ well-being (at least those neighbors who looked like them) would ultimately benefit their own. But somewhere along the way, a majority of American voters apparently decided, against all data to the contrary, that taxation was essentially stealing from the deserving rich to help the undeserving poor.

#### Capitalism is the only way to incentivize the innovation necessary to solve the environment

Franz 4/25 (Caleb, podcast director for *Outset* magazine. “Markets Work: Capitalism and Innovation Heal the Earth”, 4/25/17. <http://outsetmagazine.com/2017/04/25/capitalism-and-innovation-heal-the-earth/>, 7/7/17)//JM

When it comes to opposing factions, it seems as though no two factions could be more averse to each other than environmentalists and capitalists. We are taught to believe that those who care about economic growth cannot possibly care about environmental protection and vice versa. While this rhetoric is a good way to polarize those with opposing priorities, the truth is that they can co-exist. In fact, not only can capitalism and environmentalism co-exist, but only with free market capitalism can the environment ever hope to be clean. Even though critics of capitalism accuse the system of placing profits above people or the environment, the reality sets a different tone. The market demand for clean and renewable energy is growing every day. Companies and businesses are finding it profitable to keep the environment that their costumers live in clean. There is also an opportunity for those who care about the cause to take action like never before and to do so within the market. Technology and innovation are evolving at such a rate that dirty fuels and pollution will soon become a thing of the past. Elon Musk is the perfect example of this concept. Musk has created an entire empire based on clean and affordable energy; not because of government decree or regulation, but from private incentives to innovate and compete, which drives product quality up. Because Musk is allowed to profit and gain from the demand of the marketplace, his companies are on the cutting edge of innovation changing the world and the environment. Musk recently announced that he could produce roof solar panels at a cheaper rate than even conventional roofs. He is using Tesla Motors to revolutionize the automobile and clean energy industries. While Tesla cars are currently not as quite as profitable as I’m sure he would like, these innovations are setting the essential groundwork for years to come. On a smaller scale, new industries are finding innovative ways to help fight pollution and restore clean water to the planet. The only reason any company is even able to do this is capitalism. Competition is a powerful force, and people often forget that the market is what we make it. Going to government is not just a lazy way of trying to achieve sustainability, but it is also ineffective and does more harm than good. The market, so long as it is free and without crony assistance from the government, always hold businesses accountable. Sure, in a genuinely free market, a business might pollute, but the decision to pollute in excess will eventually prove counter to business interests. First, a company’s pollution would significantly affect the water that their employees drink or the air that they breathe, which would raise employment costs. Second, and more importantly, the company would also be polluting the water or air of their customers, who will be far less likely to continue doing business with the company after they have damaged the ecosystem of the community. Pollution would leave the company vulnerable to outside competition that recognizes these environmental concerns as well as the economic concerns. The business that pollutes the air and waters of the community it serves will quickly lose customers and suffer significant losses because the community, and not the government, will punish the business. Not only should we explore innovation with the market to protect the environment, but we must also act to curtail the world’s largest polluter: the U.S. Government. While environmentalist protest and rally against large corporations who pollute the air and water, the government remains the world’s largest overall polluter. Calls for government reform are silent. Not only are they the largest overall, but the federal government is also the fourth largest contributor to greenhouse gas pollution alone. Of course, we also cannot forget about the terrible EPA mine spill polluting the Colorado River in 2015. If environmentalists want to be serious about reducing pollution, they must focus on cutting the size of government. We should all strive for sustainability. Therefore, we should not view capitalism at odds with a clean Earth. Only through capitalism can we have a realistic expectation of a cleaner Earth. Government intervention only hinders economic progress and does little to protecting the environment. The path to a clean and sustainable planet cannot and should not go through the government but through competition and innovation. The government cannot mandate economic growth. The only thing it can and should do is get out of the way and remove all restrictions that slow innovation. Fossil fuels are already on their way out, and clean energy is the way of the future. But that fact does not, by itself make clean energy affordable. Only with the creative destruction that the market provides can we have a clean and sustainable future that coincides with our economic growth and prosperity. Capitalism leading the way to heal the planet is just one excellent example of how well markets work.

#### Improving capitalism is key to solve warming

Kellner 4-11 (Peter, founder and managing partner of Richmond Global Ventures L.L.C. and chairman and C.E.O. of the Richmond Global Compass Fund L.P., 4-11-2017, "To fight climate change, we need to improve capitalism, not get rid of it," America Magazine, <https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2017/04/11/fight-climate-change-we-need-improve-capitalism-not-get-rid-it>) kb

Pope Francis correctly points out the evil fruits of capitalism, including inequality. However, no other system has lifted billions of people out of poverty. It is an imperfect system, with many flavors, but it is our best form of imperfection. Now, more than ever, we must rely on—and change—its dynamics. We live in the Anthropocene, a period defined by the emergence of humans and our impact on the climate and environment. Before this period, there were five major mass extinctions: Ordovician, Devonian, Permian, Triassic and Cretaceous. Each time, a catastrophic event, or series of events, wiped out between 76 percent and 86 percent of all species. Should we be concerned about another mass extinction? The Industrial Revolution has dramatically affected the climate, causing the melting of the Arctic, rising sea levels and unbearable pollution in cities such as Beijing and Mumbai (and, at one time, Los Angeles). Yet the idea of climate change is still controversial. Is it hyperbole or undeniable reality? I contend it is the latter. We cannot ignore the signals from nature itself, akin to red alerts if one pays close attention. Scientists estimate that we are now losing species at 1,000 to 10,000 times the natural long-term rate. That means dozens of species are going extinct daily. In her book The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History, Elizabeth Kolbert reports that a third of all reef-building corals, a third of all freshwater mollusks, a third of sharks and rays, a quarter of all mammals, a fifth of all reptiles and a sixth of all birds are headed toward extinction. The answer to this scourge is capitalism, but in a new form and magnitude. For decades, there has been a largely philanthropy-driven effort to promote socially conscious investing and grant-making. There has also been a substantial growth in socially responsible for-profit businesses of various kinds. But only recently has a focus on social and environmental responsibility started to gain traction among for-profit investors and financial markets. It takes the form of a new approach called E.S.G. (for “environmental, social and governance”) investing, and it is increasingly being used by endowments, pensions and family-controlled investment groups. E.S.G. investing has been mainstreamed through “impact investment” firms that seek both financial and social returns, as well as through philanthropy. In total, these efforts account for the hundreds of.billions of dollars invested in private markets annually. Evidence from leading business schools and experts suggest that E.S.G. investing can increase financial and social returns by lowering the cost of capital, reducing volatility, increasing returns (or the risk premium), improving governance (a proxy for management) and mitigating a variety of regulatory and other risks. Once an outlier, E.S.G. is now seen by the U.S. Department of Labor as valid in helping to determine the value of an investment. Here is the challenge, and it is enormous: The hundreds of billions invested annually from impact investing and philanthropy is critical but only a first step in addressing worldwide environmental change. Compared with the scale of global capital markets overall, it is a drop in the bucket. We must focus on the approximately $180 trillion invested annually in public global financial assets. E.S.G. investing barely touches this sector, but it is only this quantum of capital that is truly capable of shifting our global trajectory, through investments in a cleaner environment, improved governance and healthy communities. We have not yet seized the opportunity to drive powerful change through the allocation of global public capital. Reasons for this include the short-termism of financial reporting, managerial priorities and differences between investors in different geographic areas (for example, Europe is much more E.S.G.-focused than the United States is). We are nearly out of time. Most environmental scientists warn that if temperatures rise another two to four degrees Celsius (as I am sure they will without action), we will face irreversible change, including crop failure, flooding, diseases, wildfires, rising waters, extreme heat, and social and economic instability at a global level. An alternate course is possible if our greatest investors, and the trillions in assets behind them, recognize the gold mine waiting to be prospected: $180 trillion annually! The time is now for a course correction in capitalism, and its rewards are abundant. Everyone should preach this gospel.

#### Capitalism is key to resolve climate change, alternatives take too long, the belief that squo governments can solve only feeds into right wing criticisms of climate change

Chait 15 (Jonathan, an American liberal commentator and writer for New York magazine, previously a senior editor at The New Republic and an assistant editor of The American Prospect, 10-23-2015, "Is Naomi Klein Right That We Must Choose Between Capitalism and the Climate?," Daily Intelligencer, <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/10/must-we-choose-between-capitalism-and-climate.html>) kb

It is not the right but the center-left that provides the main target of Klein’s polemic. Mainstream liberalism, in keeping with classic economic analysis, has always seen pollution as a straightforward market failure. If an individual or a business is dumping a harmful by-product into the commons, economic logic dictates they be forced to internalize the cost. Creating a price for carbon emissions, so that greenhouse gasses cannot be emitted for free, will give the marketplace the correct financial incentive to reduce its emissions to the necessary level. Klein insists, on the contrary, that liberal remedies that leave in place the underlying structure of the market economy do not, and cannot, work. Klein portrays the 2010 failure of a cap-and-trade bill as a victory for true environmentalism against the corporate neoliberal sellouts that promoted it. “The fact that the U.S. Senate failed to pass climate legislation in 2009 should not be seen, as it often is, as the climate movement’s greatest defeat,” she writes, “but as a narrowly-dodged bullet.” Klein attacks the cap-and-trade bill for compromising with energy producers in order to neutralize their opposition. At one point, she mocks the bill as a giveaway to Big Energy (“a huge amount of wealth being transferred to their companies”). Two pages later, she mocks the bill for being opposed and defeated by those energy companies (who “made it abundantly clear that they had never stopped being its enemies”). Cap-and-trade is damned by evidence of energy companies supporting it, and it is also damned by evidence of energy companies opposing it. If her logic does not make sense to you, that is because you fail to grasp Klein’s moral code, which considered corporations an irredeemably evil force tainting anything with which they come into contact. Consider a passage in which she dismisses the Environmental Defense Fund, a moderate green outfit. EDF, she writes, “prided itself as putting ‘results’ above ideology, but Krupp’s EDF was highly ideological.” Its neoliberal ideology led it to advocate a cap-and-trade system in the 1980s to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide, which caused acid rain. “The new approach worked and it was popular among foundations and private donors, particularly on Wall Street,” she reports. If you’re a neoliberal sellout, you probably think the important part of that sentence is the beginning, where Klein concedes that the cap-and-trade system proposed by EDF “worked.” The successful results would seem to disprove Klein’s accusation that EDF is hyperideological and merely pretends to be results-driven. Indeed, she might even pause to consider the possibility that this program’s success demonstrates that it is possible to reduce pollution through market mechanisms. (Numerous other examples can be found.) Instead, Klein just blows right past the fact that EDF’s program worked right into associating it with Wall Street, a fact that tells her everything she needs to know. This is not the only time Klein comes face-to-face with evidence that falsifies her thesis and ignores it. In one passage, she castigates the World Trade Organization, an old bête noire, for blocking a Canadian law designed to protect a domestic solar manufacturer. This episode, she tells her readers, shows how free trade prevents the transition to a clean economy. Yet, in a footnote, she complains that China “flooded the market with cheap panels in recent years, contributing to a global oversupply that has outpaced demand.” Klein presents this as more evidence of the WTO’s nefarious impact. But, from the standpoint of the climate, aren’t cheap solar panels good? \*\*\* The most fascinating thing about This Changes Everything is how much factual refutation of Klein’s thesis is contained within the book itself. She faithfully reports huge amounts of damning facts, but confines them to subordinate clauses and footnotes. Klein’s major thesis, remember, is that the triumph of anti-corporate economics is the only way to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. In another brief but damning passage, she concedes that a number of governments with sufficiently progressive economic character have taken power in recent years, citing Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, Venezuela, and Greece. Alas, she admits, “have so far been unable to come up with economic models that do not require extremely high levels of extraction of finite resources, often at tremendous ecological and human cost.” In other words, Klein’s proposed remedy of addressing climate change by electing a left-wing government has been tried repeatedly, and it has failed every single time. Even left-wing governments turn out to not be keen on shutting down their fossil-fuel industries and jacking up energy prices on their voters. Once again, though, Klein moves quickly past this deep record of unbroken failure. Her book and the documentary linger extensively on positive anecdotes she gathers from activists. “Large and growing social movements in all these countries,” she reports, “are pushing back against the idea that extraction-and-redistribution is the only route out of poverty and economic crisis.” Klein backs this up with lots of inspiring drum-circle footage. If Klein’s arguments do not pass any plausible evidentiary standard, it may be a result of her lack of interest in traditional standards of evidence. Klein’s narrative rests heavily on moral disgust with market-based mechanisms and the cold reasoning associated with them. She dismisses the “language of risk assessment,” a traditional economist way of measuring the dangers of climate change, and approvingly quotes a spiritual leader who tells her, “Water is holy.” Klein deems this analytic method superior to economic modelling of how to restrict pollution. “These truths,” she writes, “emerge not out of an abstract theory about ‘the commons’ but out of lived experience.” Klein’s fervently ideological, anti-empiricist style, and her deep skepticism of the mainstream liberals who believe emissions can be controlled without destroying capitalism, places her in odd agreement with the far right. Visiting a conference of climate-science deniers, Klein discovers the kind of absolutist ideological reasoning and suspicion of mushy technocracy to which she can relate. Climate-science deniers see the fight to restrain emissions as a pretext to expand government power over the economy. Since that is exactly how Klein sees climate change, she thinks they are on to something: “I think these hard-core ideologues understand the real significance of climate change better than most of the ‘warmists’ in the political center … ” she writes, “when it comes to the scope and depth of change required to avert catastrophe, they are right on the money.” Finally, somebody else who understands that the real choice is capitalism versus the climate. In the actual world outside this jointly inhabited ideological bubble, capitalism and climate science are discovering ways to co-exist. Klein dismisses the “past quarter century of international negotiations,” which she characterizes as “struggling, sputtering, failing utterly to achieve its goals.” In reality, American greenhouse-gas emissions peaked several years ago. European Union emissions peaked several decades ago. Chinese coal use has peaked, and its energy intensity has fallen. The world may not be decarbonizing as rapidly as it should, but it is moving rapidly. It may be slow by the standards of atmospheric conditions, but it is fast by the standards of global political cooperation. U.N. efforts to fight climate change have only been under way since 1988. Compare this with the notion of replacing capitalism with a radical egalitarian alternative, which has been around for a century and a half. The project does not seem to be moving forward. Waiting to limit the damage of greenhouse-gas emissions until the people can overthrow the yoke of unfettered capitalism may represent the most dangerous advice the left has come up with in a very long time.
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