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+ only v2 has author quals and only v2 is timed

dm me with questions!

## AC v2

### Plan

#### Text: A just Brazil ought to recognize an unconditional right for workers to strike

#### [1] A” implies a singular government – common usage.

**Gorsuch, 20** **(Neil Gorsuch, SCOTUS justice, 4-29-2020, accessed on 11-7-2021, *Supreme Court of the United States*, "Niz-Chavez v. Garland", https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/20pdf/19-863\_6jgm.pdf) //D.Ying**

Start with customary usage. Normally, indefinite articles (like “a” or “an”) precede countable nouns. The examples above illustrate the point: While you might say “she wrote a manuscript” or “he sent three job applications,” no one would say “she wrote manuscript” or “he sent job application.” See The Chicago Manual of Style §5.7, p. 227 (17th ed. 2017); see also R. Huddleston & G. Pullum, The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language §3.1, p. 334 (2002). By contrast, noncountable nouns—including abstractions like “cowardice” or “fun”—“almost never take indefinite articles.” The Chicago Manual of Style §5.7, at 227; see also Huddleston, supra, §3.1, at 334. After all, few would speak of “a cowardice” or “three funs.” These customs matter because the key term before us (notice) can refer to either a countable object (“a notice,” “three notices”) or a noncountable abstraction (“sufficient notice,” “proper notice”). Congress’s decision to use the indefinite article “a” thus supplies some evidence that it used the term in the first of these senses—as a discrete, countable thing. All of which suggests that the government must issue a single statutorily compliant document to trigger the stop-time rule. If IIRIRA had meant to endow the government with the flexibility it supposes, we would have expected the law to use “notice” in its noncountable sense. A statute like that would have said the stop-time rule applies after the government provides “notice” (or perhaps “sufficient notice”) of the mandated information—indicating an indifference about whether notice should come all at once or by installment.

#### [2] Prefer common usage.

**Gorsuch, 20** **(Neil Gorsuch, SCOTUS justice, 4-29-2020, accessed on 11-7-2021, *Supreme Court of the United States*, "Niz-Chavez v. Garland", https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/20pdf/19-863\_6jgm.pdf) //D.Ying**

Of course this is just a clue. Sometimes Congress’s statutes stray a good way from ordinary English. Sometimes, too, Congress chooses to endow seemingly familiar words with specialized definitions. But until and unless someone points to evidence suggesting otherwise, affected individuals and courts alike are entitled to assume statutory terms bear their ordinary meaning. And when it comes to discerning the ordinary meaning of words, there are perhaps few better places to start than the rules governing their usage.

#### Therefore, we must specify a single government that if just, ought to recognize an conditional right to strike.

### Adv 1 – bolsonaro

#### [3] Brazilians are mobilized, militarized and ready to strike against Bolsonaro – 2017 and 2019 prove

AP 19

Associated Press (unbiased reporting society) , 6-14-2019, "AP Explains: Why is there a general strike in Brazil?," AP NEWS, https://apnews.com/0966674e639048e0a681c29248ffe0ad, // HW AW

RIO DE JANEIRO (AP) — Brazil kicked off a general strike Friday that is likely to paralyze major cities across Latin America’s largest country. The nationwide strike is the first since the arrival of far-right President Jair Bolsonaro on Jan. 1. While most participants will be protesting against a pension reform being discussed in Congress, others will be turning out to oppose budget cuts, a sluggish economy and the administration’s conservative agenda. Here is a look at what’s happening and why: FIRST GENERAL STRIKE IN TWO YEARS Workers in all 26 Brazilian states and the federal district of Brasilia are expected to take part in Friday’s strike, according to several unions. Actions blocking roads and public transportation are set to start early in the morning in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo. Turnout should be particularly strong in the northeast, the historic bastion of the opposition Workers’ Party. But general strikes are not so common in Brazil. The last one was held in 2017 against proposals in Congress to loosen labor rules and trim pension benefits. Before that, there hadn’t been a general strike in 20 years. PROTESTS AGAINST BOLSONARO While it will be the first nationwide labor strike against Bolsonaro, he has faced protests since even before he was elected on Oct. 18, 2018. A few weeks before casting their votes, women led large demonstrations across Brazil over the far-right leader’s misogynistic comments and conservative social agenda. They marched under the slogan “Not Him.” In April, indigenous leaders from over 300 ethnicities attended a march in Brasilia to denounce policies they say will facilitate the expansion of mining and industrial farming businesses into their protected lands. Then last month, thousands took to the streets to oppose a decision by Bolsonaro’s government to slash education funds in the largest protest so far. PENSION REFORM Friday’s strike is primarily against the pension reform the Bolsonaro administration is currently pushing for in Congress. The plan would raise the retirement age to 65 for men and 62 for women and increase workers’ contributions. The government says the proposal could save about 1 trillion reals ($260 billion) and that it is essential for saving the troubled social security system and hopefully giving a boost to Latin America’s largest economy. Under the current system, male and female workers can claim pension benefits after 30 to 35 years of contributions, respectively, meaning many can retire as early as 50 or 55. The reform is one of this administration’s signature promises and is currently being reviewed by a special commission in the lower house of congress. A previous pension reform bill, introduced by ex-President Michel Temer, managed to pass the commission and made it to the plenary, but was abandoned after nine months. ANGER OVER BUDGET CUTS Some Brazilians will use the strike as another opportunity to express their opposition to the government’s across-the-board budget cuts, especially to education. Professors, students and academics have protested the decision to pare $1.85 billion from funds for the public education network, from elementary schools to universities. They were particularly distressed by the suspension of some scholarship funding and a 30% freeze on federal universities’ discretionary budgets, which goes to pay utility bills, security, cleaning or maintenance work. Officials have promised to send more money toward education, thanks to an additional government funding measure approved this week by Congress. But they have conditioned even more funding on the passing of the pension reform. A SLUGGISH ECONOMY There is widespread discontent over Brazil’s sluggish economy. Gross domestic product shrank in the first quarter of 2019, while inflation hit nearly 5% in April, the highest in more than two years. Unemployment also remains high at nearly 13%, but even greater —over 30%— among Brazilians aged 18 to 24. Economy Minister Paulo Guedes recently told Brazilian magazine Veja that he would quit his position if Congress tried to pass a watered-down version of his pension proposal. Without the reform, Guedes said the country could go broke as early as next year.

#### [4] Impeachment of Bolsonaro is essential and possible, but it will not happen in the squo, although it’s close and displays of “popular will and outrage” like general strikes and protests are key to ensure it

Kirby 6-4-21

Jen Kirby (foreign and national security reporter @v ox), 6-4-2021, "Jair Bolsonaro is facing a political reckoning in Brazil. How far will it go?," Vox, [https://www.vox.com/2021/6/4/22456981/brazil-jair-bolsonaro-impeachment-protests-coronavirus //](https://www.vox.com/2021/6/4/22456981/brazil-jair-bolsonaro-impeachment-protests-coronavirus%20//) HW AW

The panelaços — the banging of pots and pans — became a socially distanced way for Brazilians [to protest](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-51955679) President Jair Bolsonaro [during the pandemic](https://www.vox.com/2020/5/2/21245243/coronavirus-brazil-bolsonaro-response-video). But last weekend, a [year into a prolonged coronavirus crisis](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanmic/article/PIIS2666-5247(21)00095-1/fulltext), hundreds of thousands [marched in more than 200 cities across Brazil](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/may/29/tens-of-thousands-of-brazilians-march-to-demand-bolsonaros-impeachment) to demand Bolsonaro’s impeachment. Signs bore slogans, such as “fora Bolsonaro” (“Bolsonaro out”) and “genocida,” a reference to Bolsonaro’s mismanagement of the pandemic, which has left more than 460,000 Brazilians dead, one of the worst death rates in the world. Protesters blame Bolsonaro for it. Their case is now being backed up [by a formal Senate inquiry into Bolsonaro’s handling of the pandemic](https://theintercept.com/2021/05/01/covid-brazil-deaths-bolsonaro-investigation/). The hearings have become a public accounting of Bolsonaro’s negligence — [including testimony from a Pfizer executive](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/pfizer-got-no-response-offers-supply-vaccine-brazil-last-year-exec-says-2021-05-13/) who said the pharmaceutical company reached out to Brazil about procuring doses last year, and Bolsonaro’s government didn’t respond for two months. These hearings are taking place as Brazil [still averages around 2,000 coronavirus deaths daily](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/brazil-covid-cases.html), with [many bracing for third wave](https://brazilian.report/society/2021/05/20/third-coronavirus-wave-economy/), and the public-health system is battered to the point of [near-collapse](https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n800). Brazil’s vaccination campaign [is chaos](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/14/world/americas/brazil-coronavirus-vaccine.html), and what is working [is largely happening in spite of Bolsonaro](https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/region/brazil). A little more than 10 percent of the population is fully vaccinated, [according to data from Johns Hopkins University.](https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/region/brazil) [Opinion polls](https://www.cartacapital.com.br/cartaexpressa/poderdata-apoio-ao-impeachment-de-bolsonaro-cresce-e-chega-a-57/) suggest support for impeachment is growing: 57 percent are now in favor, up 11 percentage points from three months ago. All of this would suggest Bolsonaro’s year-long pandemic blunder is finally catching up to him along with plenty of other scandals, from those [involving his family](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/internacional/en/brazil/2021/03/all-four-of-jair-bolsonaros-sons-are-under-investigation.shtml) to his environmental minister who [was allegedly smuggling illegal timber.](https://www.reuters.com/business/environment/brazil-police-investigate-potential-crimes-related-wood-exports-2021-05-19/) Whether this is a real reckoning for Bolsonaro — one that could truly push him from power — is the larger question. The anger and frustration are real, at the handling of the pandemic, at the economic situation, and plenty of other issues. But experts said many of the groups mobilizing against him — including women, students, and labor groups — already largely opposed the president. Bolsonaro himself has remained defiant, [drawing on the unwavering support of his base](https://www.france24.com/en/live-news/20210501-thousands-in-brazil-rally-for-bolsonaro-ignoring-virus). And impeachment is a tricky question, in part because Bolsonaro is up for reelection [in just over a year](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2022_Brazilian_general_election). “I think this is a kind of catharsis movement, you know — ‘I cannot stay at home seeing this anymore. So I prefer to take some risk and go to the streets,’” said Arthur Ituassu, a professor of political communication at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica in Rio de Janeiro. “But if this will have political consequences,” he added, “I don’t know.” The growing push to impeach Bolsonaro, explained Brazil’s coronavirus situation is dire, [but it’s not surprising](https://www.vox.com/2020/4/28/21228512/brazil-bolsonaro-coronavirus-moro) given that Bolsonaro downplayed the pandemic from the beginning. He called it the “[little flu](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-30/-little-flu-can-t-hurt-him-why-bolsonaro-still-shuns-lockdowns).” He shrugged at the country’s mounting death toll by saying “[we’ll all die one day](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/30/tp-captain-corona).” He undermined governors’ attempts to enforce [social distancing](https://www.cfr.org/in-brief/skeptical-bolsonaro-clashes-governors-coronavirus-spreads-brazil) and other measures, insisting economies reopen. He used a homophobic slur to refer to those who wear masks. He has continued [to tout the malaria drug hydroxychloroquine](https://twitter.com/gersonjr/status/1286451690892341252?s=20) and other [unproven drugs](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/man-behind-brazils-search-miracle-covid-19-cures-2021-05-14/) as coronavirus cures. When it comes to Covid-19 vaccinations, Bolsonaro has sowed misinformation and doubt. In December, he said of possible side effects on the Pfizer vaccine, “[If you turn into a crocodile, it’s your problem](https://www.ctvnews.ca/health/coronavirus/brazil-s-bolsonaro-warns-virus-vaccine-can-turn-people-into-crocodiles-1.5237678).” He [strongly criticized](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-bolsonaro/brazils-bolsonaro-says-he-was-right-to-question-chinese-covid-19-vaccine-idUSKBN29I1YL) Chinese-made vaccines, including bashing his own government’s deal to acquire the CoronaVac vaccine. “The Brazilian people WON’T BE ANYONE’S GUINEA PIG,” [he wrote on social media last year.](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-10-21/bolsonaro-slams-chinese-vaccine-his-government-said-it-would-buy) Ultimately, Bolsonaro [had to backtrack early this year](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-china/bolsonaro-thanks-china-for-fast-tracking-covid-19-vaccine-supplies-idUSKBN29U2BH) and thank China for fast-tracking the vaccine, as Brazil faced a deadly wave of the pandemic, with few vaccines available. João Nunes, senior lecturer of international relations at the University of York, said Bolsonaro’s “denialist approach” to the pandemic contributed to its severity, which led to disarray and lack of coordination. “Denialism, botching the vaccination program, continuing to support this myth of precocious treatment based on hydroxychloroquine, denying and going against regulations of the public health authorities promoting social gatherings without masks,” Nunes said, enumerating Bolsonaro’s misdeeds. Just how serious these misdeeds are is being examined by a [parliamentary inquiry](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response) in Brazil’s Senate. The investigation is broadly looking into [the government’s failures during the pandemic](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/5/24/squabbles-and-accusations-inside-brazil-covid-senate-inquiry). It is also examining the government’s blunders in its vaccination strategy, including procurement. The committee has existed for about a month. The testimony has been damning, essentially [showing that Bolsonaro planned to pursue a policy of herd immunity](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/27/opinion/brazil-covid-inquiry-bolsonaro.html), a strategy that not only prolonged the crisis in Brazil [but likely gave rise to new variants](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/22247525/covid-19-variants-uk-south-africa-brazil-b117-why-now). Luiz Henrique Mandetta, Brazil’s former health minister who had backed social distancing [and so found himself quickly fired by Bolsonaro](https://www.vox.com/2020/4/28/21228512/brazil-bolsonaro-coronavirus-moro) last year, told the committee that the government had no communication plan. “[There was no way to do a campaign, they didn’t want to do it](https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/05/americas/bolsonaro-inquiry-intl-latam/index.html),” he said. Mandetta provided a letter, dated March 28, 2020, urging Bolsonaro to follow the scientific recommendations of the health ministry, which the president largely ignored. Bolsonaro’s former communications director, Fábio Wajngarten, testified that letters from Pfizer offering to make deals with Brazil on vaccine doses [went unanswered for months in the fall of 2020](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/internacional/en/brazil/2021/05/wajngarten-evades-questions-and-is-threatened-with-imprisonment-in-cpi-flavio-bolsonaro-calls-renan-a-tramp.shtml). The president of Pfizer for Latin America, Carlos Murillo, also testified that the company had begun outreach to the Brazilian government in May 2020, with two formal offers made in August — [both of which went unanswered](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/pfizer-got-no-response-offers-supply-vaccine-brazil-last-year-exec-says-2021-05-13/). The company sent another request directly to Bolsonaro and the health minister, which languished until at least December. Murillo said that if Bolsonaro had struck a deal in August 2020, Pfizer could have delivered 18.5 million doses to the country by June 2021. Instead, Brazil and Pfizer didn’t strike a deal [until March of this year](https://en.mercopress.com/2021/05/14/brazil-could-have-bought-pfizer-vaccines-much-earlier-but-bolsonaro-ignored-the-offer); as it stands now, [Brazil has received fewer than 6 million doses from Pfizer](https://riotimesonline.com/brazil-news/miscellaneous/covid-19/pfizer-expects-to-deliver-2-4-million-covid-19-vaccine-doses-to-brazil-this-week/). The hearings are a political spectacle, with senators accusing Bolsonaro’s [allies of lying and trying to shield him](https://brazilian.report/liveblog/2021/05/12/hearings-arrest-press-wajngarten/). Bolsonaro’s defenders, meanwhile, are accusing the hearing of being [politically motivated](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response); though on this, they’re not totally wrong. With Brazil’s elections approaching, this public record of Bolsonaro’s dereliction is a potent tool for the opposition. But it is also a legitimate, and some argue necessary, fact-finding mission. If the outcome is incriminating for Bolsonaro, it is largely because the evidence is bearing that out. Many of these revelations are not exactly earth-shattering or even all that new, having already leaked out in news reports. And Bolsonaro’s public record alone makes apparent how he trivialized the pandemic. But the difference, experts say, is that it is all happening in one place. Witnesses are also under oath. Even those who are trying to defend Bolsonaro are [mostly just succeeding in contradicting themselves](https://apnews.com/article/brazil-pandemics-coronavirus-pandemic-health-07dee06a2e4c6ae87f5bac70cfdaefc7) or highlighting the ineptitude of the government. “I think it’s really laid naked what a lot of people suspected, what a lot of reports have said; they are now seeing the actors who were involved, who were in the room,” said Colin Snider, assistant professor of Latin American history at the University of Texas at Tyler. Bolsonaro’s mishandling of the pandemic has created ripple effects in other areas, including the economy and public health care system, all of it increasing the public’s frustration and dissatisfaction. And as some of his critics have pointed out, his mismanagement of the vaccination campaign has made it all but impossible for Brazil to emerge swiftly from this Covid-19 crisis, an irony for a guy who claimed he didn’t want to shut down the economy. “The record that is being put together of incompetence, negligence, bad faith, [and] political opportunism in the Bolsonaro administration dealing with the pandemic is overwhelming,” Paulo Barrozo, an associate law professor at Boston College, said. “But I don’t think that is going to lead to an impeachment Congress,” Barrozo added. “I think there is a record that is being built for historical purposes and also to be used in the next presidential election.” Bolsonaro’s coronavirus record is damning. But maybe don’t expect impeachment just yet. Bolsonaro has [about 130 impeachment petitions against him](https://www.brasilwire.com/29m-anti-bolsonaro-protests/). Some predate the pandemic and cover [all kinds of offenses](https://brazilian.report/cartoons/2021/04/01/the-meltdown-of-bolsonaro-as-a-president-the-brazilian-report/). But the pandemic and Bolsonaro’s handling of it have galvanized the public. “I do think we are now maybe in the worst moment of Bolsonaro’s government,” Pontifícia Universidade Católica’s Ituassu said. But it might not be enough for impeachment — at least not yet. The big thing right now is timing: Impeachment could be a long, drawn-out affair, and Brazil’s elections are just over a year away. If Bolsonaro continues to do nothing about the coronavirus and the crisis continues, voters may kick him out of the job anyway. Bolsonaro is doing what he always does in the face of criticism: doubling down. Just this week, Bolsonaro [offered to host the Copa America](https://www.espn.com/soccer/copa-america/story/4398712/copa-america-2021-brazil-new-hosts-as-tournament-moved-from-argentinacolombia) tournament, after the original hosts, Argentina and Colombia, pulled out, because of a coronavirus surge and unrest, respectively. “Since the beginning of the pandemic I have been saying, I regret the deaths, but we have to live,” [Bolsonaro said](https://www.cnn.com/2021/06/01/americas/brazil-bolsonaro-copa-america-intl-latam/index.html) at the announcement. [Brazil is still seeing about 60,000 Covid-19 cases a day](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/brazil-covid-cases.html) and around 2,000 deaths. The attraction for Bolsonaro supporters is partly the doubling down. [Bolsonaro is often compared to Donald Trump](https://www.google.com/search?q=donald+trump+bolsonaro+vox&rlz=1C5CHFA_enUS769US769&ei=luS4YLiSHsjT5NoPuPS3gAg&oq=donald+trump+bolsonaro+vox&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCAgAELADEIYDMggIABCwAxCGA1DgCliOEGCiEWgBcAB4AIABrAKIAZ0LkgEHMS40LjIuMZgBAKABAaoBB2d3cy13aXrIAQLAAQE&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwi4teXv0_vwAhXIKVkFHTj6DYAQ4dUDCA4&uact=5), and like Trump, Bolsonaro has a steady and unflaggingly loyal base that is, give or take, somewhere around a third of the voting population. The more Bolsonaro feels under attack by the political establishment or the media or his critics, the more he goes after those institutions and the more that fires up his supporters. “He’s lost support. But what has remained is very loyal,” Barrozo said. “So in a way, he is solidifying, crystallizing, [and] firming his bases by doubling down.” And the thing about impeachment is that it can be easily sold to his base as, to borrow a phrase from a Bolsonaro pal, “[the greatest witch-hunt in the history of our country](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-02-14/donald-trump-says-impeachment-trial-part-of-greatest-witch-hunt/13153230)” — which is exactly what Bolsonaro and his backers feed off. Another big factor, experts say, is that Bolsonaro still retains support in Brazil’s Senate and Chamber of Deputies (kind of like the House of Representatives). They are the bodies that are ultimately going to have to take up impeachment. This isn’t ideological or even about party loyalty; in fact, [Bolsonaro doesn’t even have a party affiliation right now](https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/bolsonaro-president-without-party-strategy-depoliticize-brazil/). Instead, it’s about perks. The thing standing in the way is the Centrão (Big Center), a bloc of centrist voting parties in Brazil’s Congress. Bolsonaro has basically had to build alliances with these members of Congress, who agree to work with Bolsonaro in exchange for the president basically giving them what they want. “Bolsonaro has actually gotten pretty good at handing out goodies — like pork-barrel projects — for the members of Congress to bring home the bacon and show their voters that they’re doing their job,” said David Samuels, distinguished McKnight University professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. “And so they’re also happy to see Bolsonaro twist in the wind as long as he keeps the spigots of money going.” Experts said it’s going to take a lot for them to basically turn their back on those goodies — whether they’re cushy jobs or beneficial projects. An [investigation](https://www.economist.com/the-americas/2021/05/29/brazils-president-jair-bolsonaro-is-under-siege) by the Brazilian newspaper O Estado de S. Paulo found that Bolsonaro’s government set aside about 20 billion reais ($3.9 billion) for what are basically pork projects. “The question for impeachment becomes this: **Does popular will and senatorial and deputy outrage turn to the point where enough are willing to abandon that sort of legislative sway over the national political agenda for the sake of impeachment?” Snider of the University of Texas said. Right now, the answer looks like a big “no.” As experts said, because these alliances aren’t born from any real loyalty, they can shift pretty quickly.** But politicians also want to know exactly which way the wind is blowing before they abandon Bolsonaro. **So while** [**Bolsonaro is unpopular**](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-05-07/brazil-s-new-cash-handouts-fail-to-buoy-bolsonaro-s-popularity)**, he may need to get even more unpopular.** **The street protests matter, but they must grow even more massive and consistent. The anti-Bolsonaro coalition on the streets may need to widen to include more centrist and center-right people — folks who may have backed Bolsonaro before but now unequivocally reject him.** Otherwise, lawmakers are content to just let Bolsonaro self-destruct. “I do think they prefer a weak Bolsonaro more than anything else,” Ituassu said. That includes a weak Bolsonaro in the October 2022 election, who could very likely be facing off against former president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, who [just got the clear from courts to be able to run again](https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2021/0319/Brazil-s-Lula-cleared-to-run-again-Can-he-write-a-new-chapter) after corruption charges had barred him from running. Early polls suggest if Lula and Bolsonaro were to face off in a runoff — both polarizing populists in their own way — [Lula would win handily](https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/05/12/brazil-poll-shows-lula-handily-beating-bolsonaro-in-2022/). (If Bolsonaro, sigh, [accepts the results](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-10/bolsonaro-says-fraud-kept-him-from-1st-round-brazil-election-win) — but that’s a crisis for another day.) So **there is a sense of just riding this out until the election. That comes with its own risks for the country, as it continues to battle the pandemic, and those who want to see Bolsonaro defeated. Bolsonaro is not going to change — no one expects him to suddenly become a deft manager of the pandemic — but circumstances around him might**. The economy could bounce back, and the vaccination campaign could gain momentum. If that happens, Bolsonaro’s coronavirus record might not be as potent a force in October 2022. Pressure against Bolsonaro is building. But so far, nothing Bolsonaro has done has really threatened his position or destroyed his loyal base of support. The question may not be whether a reckoning is coming for Bolsonaro but whether it will actually be enough. “This is one more element in place that could lead to Bolsonaro’s downfall,” Jessica Rich, a political science professor at the University of Wisconsin, said. “I don’t think they are yet all in place. But this is a real escalation of the threat against him.”

#### [5] Current general strikes get shut down by police instantly even if they are peaceful – a radical and obvious recognition of the right to strike is key to stop this

Hoffmann 17

Florian Hoffmann (associate professor of finance) 5-18-2017, "The Empire Strikes Back: On the recent general strike in Brazil," Critical Legal Thinking, <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/05/18/empire-strikes-back-recent-general-strike-brazil/> // HW AW

And all of this was, in its own way, reflected in the strike as it unfolded here: early in the morning relatively small pickets managed to blockade both the main bridge and the ferry terminal connecting downtown Rio with its neighbouring city Niteroi, thus causing major commuter congestion. Other acts throughout the city led to further shutdowns, with especially public schools (and many private ones, too) having adhered to the strike. Overall the picture displayed that slightly surreal mixture typical of this city: one could walk along busy shopping streets that would look just like on ordinary workdays, one could encounter, on public squares, small(ish) groups of protesters representing particular constituencies or institutions, and one could, later in the afternoon, congregate towards the Cinelandia square right in the historical city center to attend the main rally of the day, organised by the principal trade unions and a host of civil society organizations around a central stage, quite like any May Day event across the world . Yet, as if to rub in that things are different now, that there is not only a new government and a new politics, but a new ruling episteme, things unfolded rather differently: early on, during an otherwise peaceful march towards the Cinelandia meeting grounds, a small group of, perhaps, twenty individuals had apparently started to turn violent against (some) police and adjacent properties – in its reporting of the incident, the **mainstream press has uniformly tended to frame it as police legitimately reacting against ‘black blocs’ a priori intent on committing acts of violence.** That they, instead, might have been agents provocateurs -as has happened here before-, or simply a pretext for police to violently dissolve the rally was not reflected in (mainstream) news coverage. That the latter might well have been the case was, however, borne out by the facts as they unfolded thereafter, for police immediately reacted with heavy use of teargas and plastic bullets against the main body of the march, which was partially dispersed though managed to regroup to eventually arrive at the designated square. There it encountered a heavy presence of riot police, but otherwise the situation seemed to have calmed down, not least in the main body of demonstrators, which reflected a colourful cross-section of Brazilian society. For a short moment the crowd radiated the calm confidence that organized labour in Europe and, to an extent, North America, had attained, after a century of struggle, during the post-War ‘economic compromise’ and which, in turn, served as one of the models for labour relations during the Lula/Dilma period. It was like a flashback to another time, when union rallies were (almost) stately affairs, when the freedom of assembly felt like the historical achievement of a distant past, and when the police could be relied upon to actually protect that freedom by ensuring that its public exercise could go ahead. This vision was, of course, an illusion, and has been one, in Brazil, since at least the heavy-handed reaction to the 2013 mass protests which happened yet under Dilma’s watch. However, as many especially elderly demonstrators would affirm later on, what happened on April 28 on Cinelandia square went a step further, so far, in fact, that the most frequent comparison by those old enough to know was with the suppression of dissent by successive military governments after the (hot) coup of 1964. For, after about ten minutes, during which nothing violent had occurred within the large main body of demonstrators massed in front of the main stage, the police, without warning and obvious provocation, simply started to shoot teargas right into that very main body as well as directly onto the stage. Unsurprisingly this sent everyone running, resulting in a generalized dispersal into adjacent streets and squares; every so often the now fragmented crowd would stop, whereupon the police would close in and launch further teargas salvoes, block after block, until, well a kilometre from the original venue, people would literally escape into the metro and head home. In this generalized ‘clearing out’ strategy, police went as far as firing teargas into restaurants, shops, and metro stations into which groups of demonstrators had fled. The feeling that pervaded during this collective retreat, inscribed on people’s faces and occasionally vented in spontaneous chanting, was a mixture of incredulity (of the fact that the police had, in fact, just simply broken up a legal and legitimate, and, in the main, peaceful rally) and a rage so strong that it made some simply cry.

#### [6] r2s supercharges Brazilian general strikes – empowers the labor movement by changing the power balance currently struck between workers and companies

Gourevitch, PhD, 16

(Alex, PoliSci@Brown, Gourevitch, A. (2016). Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike. Perspectives on Politics, 14(02), 307–323. doi:10.1017/s1537592716000049 )

We now have a way of explaining the right to strike as something decidedly more modern than just residual protection of some feudal guild privilege. The right to strike springs organically from the fact of structural domination. Striking is a way of resisting that domination at the point in that structure at which workers find themselves—the particular job they are bargaining over. It is not that workers believe they have some special privilege but quite the opposite. It is their lack of privilege, their vulnerability, that generates the claim. Structural domination makes its most immediate appearance in the threat of being exploited by a particular employer, even though the point of structural domination is that workers can be exploited by any potential employer. The sharpest form that the structural domination takes is through the threat of being fired, or of never being hired in the first place. The claim that strikers make to their job is therefore, in the first instance, a dramatization of the fact that their relationship is not voluntary, it is not accidental and contingent. They are always already forced to be in a contractual relationship with some employer or another. The refusal to perform work while retaining the right to the job is a way of bringing to the fore this social and structural element in their condition. It vivifies the real nature of the production relationship that workers find themselves in. Quitting the work but not the job is a way of saying that this society is not and cannot be just a system of voluntary exchanges among independent producers. There is an underlying structure of unequal dependence, maintained through the system of contracts, that even the “most voluntary” arrangements conceal. This is not just a dramaturgical fact about strikes, though the drama has, in many cases, been nearly Greek in its intensity and tragedy. It is a point about power. It would not have the drama if it were not a power play. By demanding the job as a matter of right workers do not just publicize their domination, they attempt to challenge the forcing to which they are subject. Limiting the employer’s ability to make contracts with others, and preventing other workers from taking those jobs, is a way of reversing the power relationship. It is a way of neutralizing the threat of losing the job, which is the most concrete, immediate point of contact with that background structure of domination. If you cannot lose your job, you are less vulnerable, less immediately economically dependent. Of course, this does not do away with the background structure itself, but a particular strike can never do that. Though even here, there are times when a strike, as it becomes a more generalized rejection of structural domination—say in large-scale sympathy strikes or general strikes—can begin to challenge the broad structure of economic control itself.60 This is a challenge to the logic of the capitalist labor market that begins from within, at the location of the strike itself. At that point in the system, strikers temporarily reverse the relationships of power by eliminating that employers’ ability to use the threat of jobloss against them. They do that not just by claiming the job but by claiming it as a matter of right. The thought is that the exploitation of workers is unjustifiable, an unjustifiability that appears in the terms of the employment itself. Workers have the right to the job, and therefore to interfere with the employer’s property rights and other workers’ contract rights, because it is unjustifiable to subject workers to exploitative conditions. To be sure, many strikes and many strikers never articulate the argument in this language. But the point is not what workers always explicitly say, but rather what they do and what that doing presupposes. I am reconstructing the ideal presuppositions of a strike, and in particular, how to think about the peculiar set of assumptions about the right to a job. We have seen that it is no atavistic recovery of traditional rights and guild privileges but is a way of resisting a thoroughly modern form of social domination from a point within that structure of domination. Again, facing a freedom to quit the job but not the work, workers assert a right to quit working but keep the job. To put this all another way, though strikes are still about bargaining, and in that sense like market exchanges, they are simultaneously a challenge to the market as the appropriate standard by which to judge the fairness of workers’ compensation. The market is unfair because of workers’ structural disadvantage. Over and against the market value, strikers can argue that there are shared, or at least shareable, standards of fair compensation that employers should adhere to. While here again we see the echoes of feudal theories of “just price” and equity jurisprudence,61 we must note that in principle the claim is not, or does not have to be, based on special privilege. Rather, it begins by challenging the view that labor“freely” finds its value on the market. Workers are always already in relationships with employers and they cannot leave the basic relationship of earning money only by selling laborpower, no matter how many jobs they might quit. The standards we use for evaluating those kinds of forced relationships, like the state, are different, based on shared conceptions of justice and human need, not private agreement.

#### [7] Bolsonaro will kill the Amazon through deforesting – now is the brink and the election fails

Watts 7-14-21

Johnathan Watts (guardians global environment editor), 7-14-2021, "Amazon rainforest ‘will collapse if Bolsonaro remains president’," [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/14/amazon-rainforest-will-collapse-if-bolsonaro-remains-president //](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/14/amazon-rainforest-will-collapse-if-bolsonaro-remains-president%20//) HW AW

The collapse of the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/amazon-rainforest) is inevitable if Jair Bolsonaro remains president of Brazil, academics and environmental activists have warned amid a fresh government assault on protections for the forest. Despite evidence that fire, drought and land clearance are pushing the Amazon towards a point of no return, they say the [far-right leader is more interested in placating the powerful](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jul/14/bolsonaro-brazil-hospital-hiccups) agribusiness lobby and tapping global markets that reward destructive behaviour. The onslaught on forest safeguards has picked up pace. On Wednesday the lower house was due to vote on legislation that would reward land grabbers by legalising ownership of property that had been illegally invaded and cleared before 2014. The previous day, the government shifted responsibility for forest fire satellite monitoring away from the National Institute for Space Research, a scientifically-robust organisation that had carried out the task for decades. Control has been given to the National Institute of Meteorology, which is under the influence of the agriculture ministry and the farming sector. In the past few months, Congress has also diluted standards for environmental impact assessments and a committee has approved a bill – PL 490 – that has been described as the greatest assault on indigenous rights since the launch of the Brazilian constitution in 1988. All of these measures punch holes in the Amazon’s protective framework and run contrary to scientific advice and the problems on the ground. Brazil is in the midst of a widening drought that has seen water inflows at some hydroelectric plants fall to 91-year lows. This is a cause and an effect of forest clearance. Since Bolsonaro took power in 2019, deforestation and fire in the Amazon have risen to their highest levels in more than a decade. The past three months have continued that trend, though slightly behind last year’s peaks. Given the tinder-dry conditions in many parts of the Amazon, there are fears that the usual peak of the fire season in July and August could be worse than usual. Scientists suspect **the rainforest may be slipping into a series of vicious cycles**. At a local level, land clearance and burning led to extended droughts and higher temperatures, which in turn weakens the resilience of the ecosystem and leads to more fire. At a regional level, this can intensify drought because the respiration of the rainforest normally acts as a pump to drive humid weather systems across a wide area of Brazil, South America and the Atlantic. When the forest weakens, that pump is less effective. There are also global repercussions because land clearance is turning the Amazon region from climate friend to climate foe. A study published in Nature **reveals forest burning** [**now produces about three times more CO2**](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/14/amazon-rainforest-now-emitting-more-co2-than-it-absorbs) **than the remaining vegetation is able to absorb.** This accelerates global heating. Global market forces are partly responsible. [Deforestation](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/deforestation) tends to rise when the prices of soy, beef and gold are high. No government of any stripe has completely managed to stop forest clearance in the past four decades. But government policies make a difference**. Amazon deforestation reduced 80% between 2004 and 2012 under the Workers party administration of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**. Bolsonaro has steadily dismantled or discredited the mechanisms that achieved that – satellite monitoring, personnel on the ground and legislation to punish offenders and demarcate indigenous land and conservation areas. “The main thing this government has done is to undermine the capacity of the state to tackle illegal deforestation,” said Marcio Astrini, executive secretary of the Brazilian Climate Observatory, a network of 50 civil society organisations. In Congress, meanwhile Bolsonaro and the “ruralista” agribusiness lobby have put more supporters in key positions: Arthur Lira as leader of Congress, Carla Zambelli as chair of the lower house Environmental Commission and Bia Kicis as chair of the Justice Commission. These politicians have enabled the ruralistas’ agenda to go forward more aggressively. “The Brazilian government is doing exactly the opposite of what needs to be done. It is actively stimulating deforestation through its policies,” said Erika Berenguer, an expert on Amazon land use change at the Universities of Lancaster and Oxford. “Until recently this was through decrees and ministerial policy changes that cut budgets for combating deforestation. Now, they have taken more important roles in Congress so **we are seeing even more dangerous bills being passed.” This is a global concern**. The US president, Joe Biden, and the French president, Emmanuel Macron, have warned of the dangers posed by the decline of the rainforest. Supermarkets and financial organisations in the UK, Norway, Germany, France and Australia have [threatened](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/may/25/uk-supermarkets-will-seek-soy-alternatives-if-amazon-protections-weakened) to boycott Brazilian products unless supply chains can be guaranteed deforestation free. On Wednesday, 40 companies, include Iceland, Waitrose, Lidl, Tesco and Sainsbury’s issued an open letter warning that further erosions of environmental legislation and indigenous rights would force them to reconsider using Brazilian agricultural commodities. “We would like to reiterate that we consider the Amazon as a vital part of the Earth system that’s essential to the security of our planet as well as being a critical part of a prosperous future for Brazilians and all of society,” they said. Green groups said they now expected these companies to put their threats into effect. Among many consumers Brazil is seen as a toxic brand, and Bolsonaro looks increasingly isolated on the world stage. But this international pressure has had little impact. Last month, Bolsonaro sacked his environmental minister, Ricardo Salles, after a tipoff by the US embassy about his alleged involvement in illegal timber smuggling. But Salles had already gutted the forest surveillance and enforcement bodies, and the real power behind him – the agriculture minister, Tereza Cristina Dias – remains in place. This is partly because commodity prices remain high and demand is strong, particularly in China where the government puts resource procurement above environmental ethics and media pressure is limited by strict censorship. China is Brazil’s biggest market by a large margin. But the major reason is the nationalist ideology of the president. According to Astrini, Bolsonaro is so exclusively focused on domestic politics that he is indifferent to international reputation or global markets. “He is the first Brazilian president who has an overt agenda of destroying environmental protections for political gain. He is not concerned about the country, only his re-election. It’s all about the electoral base,” Astrini says. On a more positive note, he sees Bolsonaro as a catalyst for change. Since he took power, the Amazon rainforest has moved to the centre of political debate. Several candidates in next year’s presidential election now have zero-deforestation commitments in their manifestos. “Even Lula is saying deforestation in the Amazon can no longer be supported by any Brazilian government. He never said this before,” said Astrini. “It is now clear that a solution for the Amazon can only be possible if we change government. There is no hope if Bolsonaro is re-elected president. It is either the Amazon or Bolsonaro. There is no space for both.

#### [8] Amazon destruction means extinction – 3 warrants

1. Co2 capture and o2 production
2. Medicine
3. Agriculture

Mcfall-Johnsen 19

Morgan Mcfall-Johnsen (space and science reporter @ buisness insider) , 8-24-2019, "Earth is a spaceship, and the Amazon is a crucial part of our life-support system, creating up to 20% of our oxygen. Here's why we need the world's largest rainforest.," Business Insider, [https://www.businessinsider.com/why-amazon-rainforest-is-important-life-support-is-burning-2019-8 //](https://www.businessinsider.com/why-amazon-rainforest-is-important-life-support-is-burning-2019-8%20//) HW AW

[Record-breaking fires](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-rainforest-experiencing-record-breaking-deforestation-2019-7) have hit the Amazon rainforest this year, [most of which were lit by people clearing land for farming](https://www.businessinsider.com/fires-in-the-amazon-rainforest-were-started-by-humans-2019-8). If too much of the Amazon disappears, that could put the rainforest on an [irreversible path](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-losing-3-football-fields-worth-of-rainforest-per-minute-2019-8) towards [becoming a savannah](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-fires-may-help-dieback-emit-carbon-hurry-climate-change-2019-8). If we lose the [Amazon](https://www.businessinsider.com/category/amazon-rainforest), we lose a crucial part of the world's life support system: [The Amazon](https://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-help-amazon-rainforest-what-charities-to-donate-to-2019) produces up to 20% of the oxygen in Earth's atmosphere, cycles water that regulates our weather, and [hosts a wealth of undiscovered species](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-forest-is-disappearing-2015-11) with potential for new medicines. It's also one of our best tools for keeping heat-trapping carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere. [Visit Business Insider's homepage for more stories](https://www.businessinsider.com/?hprecirc-bullet). Bottom of Form The Amazon rainforest is burning: Brazil has seen more than 74,000 fires this year ⁠— nearly double 2018's total of about 40,000 fires. About 10,000 new fires [started in the last week alone](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-rainforest-experiencing-record-number-of-wildfires-this-year-2019-8), mostly [lit by people clearing land](https://www.businessinsider.com/fires-in-the-amazon-rainforest-were-started-by-humans-2019-8) for crops and grazing. David Sirota, a political commentator who writes speeches for Bernie Sanders, put the problem like this in a [tweet](https://twitter.com/davidsirota/status/1164278087564980224?s=20): "We're all on a spaceship hurtling through a vacuum. The Amazon rainforest is our spaceship's life support system. Our spaceship's life support system is on fire." It's a fitting analogy, since the Amazon plays a major role in many of the processes that make our planet habitable: water cycles, weather patterns, and the exchange of oxygen and carbon dioxide. The rainforest is also home to more than 30 million [people](https://www.businessinsider.com/drone-footage-reveals-tribe-amazon-no-contact-outside-world-2018-8) and over 10% of the world's biodiversity. Scientists see potential for new medicines in unstudied Amazon plants. The more than 2.5 million square miles of Amazon rainforest are also one of our greatest buffers against the climate crisis, since the trees absorb carbon dioxide, thereby keeping it out of the atmosphere. But deforestation threatens all of that. Humans have cut down nearly 20% of the Amazon in the last 50 years, according to the [World Wildlife Fund](http://wwf.panda.org/knowledge_hub/where_we_work/amazon/about_the_amazon/) (WWF). If [another 20%](https://www.nature.com/articles/35041539) of the Amazon disappears, that could trigger [a "dieback" scenario](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-fires-may-help-dieback-emit-carbon-hurry-climate-change-2019-8) in which the forest would dry out and become a savannah. That process would release billions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and raise global temperatures. A man works in a burning tract of Amazon jungle as it is being cleared by loggers and farmers in Iranduba, Amazonas state, Brazil August 20, 2019. [Bruno Kelly/Reuters](https://www.reutersconnect.com/all?id=tag%3Areuters.com%2C2019%3Anewsml_RC1AF7C54AA0&share=true) Here is what's at risk if we lose the Amazon. The 'lungs of the planet' The Amazon helps keep the atmosphere's carbon-dioxide levels in check. Plants and trees take in carbon dioxide and release oxygen back into the air through the process of photosynthesis. This is why the Amazon is often referred to as the "lungs of the planet": It produces between 6% and 20% of the oxygen in Earth's atmosphere. (Estimates vary — climate scientists [Michael Mann](https://twitter.com/MichaelEMann/status/1164899653525151745) and Jonathan Foley calculated the 6% figure, while a [report](https://amazonwatch.org/assets/files/2019-complicity-in-destruction-2.pdf) from the nonprofit Amazon Watch estimated it's closer to 20%.) The Amazon produces up to 20% of the world's oxygen, as plants absorb carbon dioxide and emit oxygen via photosynthesis. Reuters Researchers [have calculated](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2373903/) that the Amazon holds up to 140 billion tons of carbon dioxide — the equivalent of 14 decades' worth of human emissions. "The Amazon is a major bank of carbon," Ruth DeFries, an ecology professor at Columbia University, [told Vice.](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/wjw5bb/the-amazon-wildfires-arent-natural-blame-humans) "When trees gets burned and carbon is released into the atmosphere, that exacerbates our global warming." Fires aside, deforestation in the Amazon already releases half a billion tons of carbon dioxide each year, according to [WWF](http://wwf.panda.org/knowledge_hub/where_we_work/amazon/about_the_amazon/). Last month, the Amazon saw record-breaking rates of deforestation, primarily due to [infrastructure projects](https://www.businessinsider.com/bolsonaro-plan-to-develop-amazon-rainforest-2019-1), logging, mining, and farming — much of which is not legal. Data from Brazilian satellites have [indicated](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-losing-3-football-fields-worth-of-rainforest-per-minute-2019-8) that about three football fields' worth of Amazonian trees are falling every minute. An anchor for weather patterns A man swims with his kid on the waters of the Parana do Amana river at Vila Nova do Amana community in the Sustainable Development Reserve, in Amazonas state, Brazil, September 22, 2015. [Bruno Kelly/Reuters](https://www.reutersconnect.com/all?id=tag%3Areuters.com%2C2015%3Anewsml_GF10000234640&share=true) A [2018 report](https://www.wriorg.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/ending-tropical-deforestation-tropical-forests-climate-change.pdf) from the World Resources Institute (WRI) found that tropical deforestation disrupts the water cycle so much that it can threaten agriculture halfway around the globe. "Tropical forest loss is having a larger impact on the climate than has been commonly understood," the report authors wrote. The Amazon plays a large role in rain patterns because the moisture that its vegetation traps and releases travels as clouds for thousands of miles. [Climate models](https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/full/10.1175/JHM406.1) show that the Amazon's moisture affects rainfall as far away as the US. If the Amazon were completely deforested, that would cut Texas rainfall by 25%, [cut the Sierra Nevada snowpack in half](https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00775.1), and reduce precipitation by up to 20% in the US coastal northwest. For that reason, large-scale deforestation in the Amazon can "pose a substantial risk to agriculture in key breadbaskets halfway around the world in parts of the US, India, and China," according to the WRI report. Villagers from the Rumao Island community paddle their canoes loaded with arapaima or pirarucu, the largest freshwater fish species in South America, while fishing in the Solimoes river, one of the main tributaries of the Amazon, in the Mamiraua nature reserve, November 24, 2013. REUTERS/Bruno Kelly The Amazon may also play a role in ocean currents, since the Amazon River accounts for over 15% of all fresh water that enters the oceans. Changes in the ocean's balance of fresh water and salt water [can slow down or speed up ocean currents](https://e360.yale.edu/features/will_climate_change_jam_the_global_ocean_conveyor_belt), which regulate weather across the globe. But scientists aren't yet sure how changes in the Amazon River would affect this complicated meteorological system. Degradation of the rainforest could also affect the biology of the Atlantic Ocean in unknown ways, since the Amazon River [dumps debris from the forest into the Atlantic](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/7021/amazon-river-in-the-atlantic-ocean), and those nutrients feed phytoplankton that form the base of the ocean's food chain. Biodiversity that 'brims with promise' for new medicinesBrazilian researchers inspect plants in the search for new cancer drugs in Sao Sebastiao de Cuieiras in Brazil's Amazon rainforest, October 30, 2009. [Sergio Moraes/Reuters](https://www.reutersconnect.com/all?id=tag%3Areuters.com%2C2009%3Anewsml_GM1E5BH0ZOA01&share=true) The Amazon is home to at least 10% of the world's known [biodiversity](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GK_vRtHJZu4) — and that's just the life that we know about. A new species is discovered in the Amazon every [two](https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2017/08/amazon-brazil-new-species-discovered-spd/) or [three](https://www.wwf.org.uk/where-we-work/places/amazon) days. "Every species in this incredibly biodiverse system represents solutions to a set of biological challenges — any one of which has transformative potential and could generate global human benefits," ecologist Thomas Lovejoy told [the World Bank](https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2019/05/22/why-the-amazons-biodiversity-is-critical-for-the-globe). "This rich wealth of species brims with promise, awaiting discovery." People have used Amazonian plants to produce [anti-cancer drugs](https://www.thedailybeast.com/rainforests-are-fast-becoming-a-laboratory-for-cancer-drugs) and the first anti-malarial drug, quinine. Yet scientists estimate that they have only studied 0.5% of the world's flowering plants for their [medicinal potential](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-medicine/in-amazon-a-frustrated-search-for-cancer-cures-idUSTRE5AG00V20091117). A rainbow is seen over a tract of Amazon rainforest which has been cleared by loggers and farmers for agriculture, near Uruara, Brazil on April 22, 2013. Nacho Doce/Reuters The rich array of species in the Amazon are [crucial to the rainforest's other functions](https://www.businessinsider.com/people-killed-half-of-forest-animals-on-earth-since-1970-2019-8), too. Advertisement The South American trees that absorb the most carbon dioxide rely on large birds and primates to eat their fruits and spread the large seeds inside, according to a recent WWF [report](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/below-the-canopy). Thick vines also hold up the structures of the trees whose leaves send water vapor into the atmosphere. And a variety of animals pollinate forest plants, disperse seeds, and nourish the soil with their waste. "Amazon biodiversity also plays a critical role as part of global systems, influencing the global carbon cycle and thus climate change," Lovejoy said.

#### [9] What happens in Brazil does not stay in Brazil - Bolsonaro’s COVID policy has made Brazil the worst breeding ground for variants in the world and covid will never end until he is impeached

Phillips 3-3-21

Tom Phillips (Latin American Correspondent @ the Guardian), 3-3-2021, "Brazil's Covid outbreak is global threat that opens door to lethal variants – scientist," [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/03/brazil-covid-global-threat-new-more-lethal-variants-miguel-nicolelis //](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/03/brazil-covid-global-threat-new-more-lethal-variants-miguel-nicolelis%20//) HW AW

Brazil’s rampant coronavirus outbreak has become a global threat that risks spawning new and even more lethal variants, one of the South American country’s top scientists has warned as it suffered its deadliest day of the pandemic. Speaking to the Guardian, Miguel Nicolelis, a Duke University neuroscientist who is tracking the crisis, urged the international community to challenge the Brazilian government over its failure to contain [an epidemic that has killed more than a quarter of a million Brazilians](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/feb/26/brazil-coronavirus-deaths-record) – about 10% of the global total. “The world must vehemently speak out over the risks Brazil is posing to the fight against the pandemic,” said Nicolelis, who has spent most of the last year confined to his flat on the west side of São Paulo. “What’s the point in sorting the pandemic out in Europe or the United States, if Brazil continues to be a breeding ground for this virus?” Nicolelis said the problem was not simply Brazil – whose far-right president, Jair Bolsonaro, has repeatedly spurned efforts to combat a disease he calls a “little flu” – being “the worst country in the world in its handling of the pandemic”. He said: “It’s that if you allow the virus to proliferate at the levels it is currently proliferating here, you open the door to the occurrence of new mutations and the appearance of even more lethal variants.” [Brazil variant evaded up to 61% of immunity in previous Covid cases, study finds](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/02/brazil-variant-evaded-immunity-previous-covid-cases) Already, [one particularly worrying variant (P1)](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/01/brazil-covid-variant-p1-britain) has been traced to Manaus, the largest city in the Brazilian Amazon, which suffered a devastating healthcare breakdown in January after a surge in infections. Six cases of that variant have so far [been detected in the UK](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/02/brazil-variant-evaded-immunity-previous-covid-cases). “Brazil is an open-air laboratory for the virus to proliferate and eventually create more lethal mutations,” warned Nicolelis. “This is about the world. It’s global.” The alert came as Brazil entered the most deadly chapter of its year-long Covid crisis, with hospitals around the country collapsing or on the verge of collapse and the average weekly death toll hitting new heights. A record 1,726 deaths were reported on Tuesday, the highest number since the pandemic began. “It’s a battlefield,” a doctor in the southern city of Porto Alegre [told local television](https://g1.globo.com/rs/rio-grande-do-sul/noticia/2021/03/02/e-um-campo-de-guerra-diz-superintendente-do-hospital-moinhos-de-vento-em-porto-alegre.ghtml) after his hospital’s intensive care unit and mortuary ran out of space. Nicolelis said Bolsonaro’s failure to halt the outbreak and launch an adequate vaccination campaign had created a domestic tragedy from which Latin America’s most populous nation was unlikely to emerge until late 2022. “We’ve now gone past 250,000 deaths, and my expectation is that if nothing is done we could have lost 500,000 people here in Brazil by next March. It’s a horrifying and tragic prospect, but at this point it’s perfectly possible,” he said, predicting a traumatic month as public and private hospitals buckled. “My forecast is that if the world was appalled by what happened in [Bergamo](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/oct/25/dread-of-history-repeating-itself-grows-in-italian-town-as-infections-rise-again) in Italy and what happened in Manaus a few weeks ago, it’s going to be even more shocked by the rest of Brazil if nothing is done.” The scientist, who has been advising state governments on their Covid response, called for the creation of a special Covid commission to fill the leadership vacuum left by Bolsonaro and an immediate 21-day nationwide lockdown. That, however, seems virtually unthinkable given Bolsonaro’s position. On Wednesday, the Brazilian president will reportedly deliver an address to the nation in which he is expected to again denounce lockdown measures. Nicolelis claimed Brazil’s crisis now posed an international risk as well as a domestic one and claimed Bolsonaro – **who has sabotaged social distancing, promoted unproven remedies such as hydroxychloroquine and belittled masks – had become “the pandemic’s global public enemy No 1”.** He said: “The policies that he is failing to put into practice jeopardize the fight against the pandemic in the entire planet.” Bolsonaro, a former army captain who swept to power in 2018 on a wave of anti-establishment rage, has defended his performance, claiming his opposition to Covid restrictions is about protecting Brazil’s economy. “I haven’t gotten a single thing wrong since March last year,” the 65-year-old [told supporters](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/2021/03/nao-errei-nenhuma-diz-bolsonaro-ao-insistir-em-tratamento-precoce-e-em-criticas-a-isolamento.shtml) this week. José Gomes Temporão, Brazil’s health minister during [the 2009 swine flu pandemic](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/jun/11/swine-flu-pandemic-who-declares), said Bolsonaro’s response had been so lacking that he and other senior administration figures would eventually “have to be held accountable”. “To this day, Brazil doesn’t have a national plan to combat Covid-19,” Temporão complained, attacking Bolsonaro’s failure to secure sufficient vaccines by striking deals to buy shots made by companies such as Pfizer, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson. Just 3.3% of Brazil’s population has so far been vaccinated, compared to 15.2% in the US, 18% in Chile and 29.9% in the UK. **“I don’t think there is any other leader who is so obtuse, so backward, who has such a mistaken and warped vision of reality as the president of Brazil,”** Temporão said. “History will condemn these people.”

#### [10] Variants mean extinction -- every country secured brings the probability down and saves trillions

Duzgun 20 Eren Duzgun teaches Historical Sociology and International Relations at Leiden University, Netherlands. Capitalism, Coronavirus and the Road to Extinction, <https://socialistproject.ca/2020/04/capitalism-coronavirus-and-road-to-extinction/>

The Godzilla-like image of the virus Covid-19 has been haunting the world. Not only has the virus unraveled nightmarish possibilities leading to the extinction of millions of people, but it has also served as a quintessential case revealing the structural contradictions of and existential threats posed by capitalism on a global scale. Several researchers agree that Covid-19 is quite an unprecedented virus. Unlike seasonal influenza, Covid-19 is ten times deadlier, and we have yet to develop a medical remedy or herd immunity to slow it down; the best estimates for the development of a vaccine are at least three to six months away. The virus’s mortality rate seems much lower than earlier pandemics (such as Ebola [1994], Avian flu [1997], SARS [2002], MERS [2012]); yet the manner in which Covid-19 spreads, i.e., its mode of infectivity, seems radically different. Unlike earlier pandemics, the virus has proved infectious even before carriers display any symptoms, which renders it often undetectable during the 14-day incubation period. Facts on the Ground Given that we are unable to detect or cure it, we are completely helpless against the virus’s global march. Emergency measures such as compulsory quarantines, social-distancing and improved hygiene standards may temporarily slow down the virus’s pace, yet once these measures begin to be relaxed – as they surely will be – it is very likely that the virus will be at our door again. This grim picture gets even more complicated by the fact that the virus is likely to go through several mutations. The virus may increase its adaptability to new climatic and generational circumstances, hence targeting not only the elderly, but a broader age group even when summer arrives in the northern hemisphere. Covid-19 is not the first ‘modern’ pathogen with global consequences. The Spanish Flu (1918), for example, was sweeping in terms of its geographical span as well as devastating in terms of its death toll. As Mike Davis notes, the Spanish flu broke out at a time when billions were still in the process of being (forcibly) incorporated into the capitalist world market. The expansion of markets eliminated the very basis of safety-first agriculture, undermining local reciprocities and solidarities that traditionally provided welfare to the poor during crises. Indeed, what prepared the ground for its outbreak and exacerbated the impact of this early 20th century pathogen was the deterioration of nutritional standards under market imperatives as well as the exigencies and scarcities caused by the Great War. Covid-19, by contrast, has begun its journey and taken its biggest toll thus far in the most advanced and affluent parts of the world. This is to say, the contagion is no longer limited to the persistently undernourished, underdeveloped, and war-torn parts of the world; its impact is no longer restricted to a distant wet market or a third world country alone. Instead, it has emerged and expanded in the very heart of the capitalist world order at a time when capitalism has not only been already firmly established across the globe but has been testing the eco-biological limits of the entire planet. Should things remain the same, Covid-19 and its future cousins are likely to claim the lives of not just ‘some’ people as they did in the past, but of humanity as a whole. In this sense, perhaps for the first time in modern history, the biological blitzkrieg activated by the coronavirus has thrown into sharp relief the immediately existential and undeniably global contradictions and consequences generated by capitalism.

### Adv 2 – inequality

#### [11] Inequality breeds instability and conflict and Brazil is the worst case

Maia and OI 19

Oxfam International (charitable organization working towards equality), Katia Maia (Oxfam’s brazil executive director), 2019-10-20 (date in inspect element), "Brazil: extreme inequality in numbers," https://www.oxfam.org/en/brazil-extreme-inequality-numbers, // HW AW

“Extreme inequality breeds conflict, violence, and instability. All Brazilians, regardless of social class or race, are affected by the inequality crisis. This is what unites us.” Katia Maia Oxfam Brazil’s executive director. Economic inequality in Brazil has reached extreme levels, despite being one of largest economies in the world. The last decades have seen incredible progress across Brazil. The country has been able to reduce inequality, taking millions of people out of poverty and thereby raising the base of the social pyramid. But despite this evolution, the pace has been very slow and the **Latin American giant is still listed as one of the most unequal countries on the planet**. Let’s look at the numbers: 75 yrs At the current rate inequality is decreasing in Brazil, it will take the country 75 years to reach United Kingdom's current level of income equality and almost 60 years to meet Spanish standards. Compared to its neighbors, Brazil is 35 years behind Uruguay and 30 behind Argentina. 19 yrs In Brazil, someone earning the minimum monthly wage would have to work 19 years to make the same money a Brazilian from the richest 0.1% of the population makes in one month. 28 M Brazil has lifted 28 million people out of poverty in the last 15 years, reducing poverty to less than 10 percent of the population. But the rich continue to benefit the most: between 2001 and 2015, the richest 10 percent accounted for 61 percent of economic growth. Brazil’s six richest men have the same wealth as poorest 50 percent of the population; around 100 million people. Photo: Apu Gomes/Oxfam 2047At the current pace of progress, Brazilian women will close the wage gap in 2047. Black Brazilians will earn the same as whites in 2089. Brazil is decades away from wage equality. 6 vs 50% Brazil’s six richest men have the same wealth as poorest 50 percent of the population; around 100 million people. The country's richest 5 percent have the same income as the remaining 95 percent. 36 yrs If Brazil’s six richest men pooled their wealth and spent 1 million Brazilian reals a day (around $319,000), it would take them 36 years to spend all their money. Mean while,16 million Brazilians live below the poverty line. Building a more equal and fair country Despite lifting millions of people out of poverty over the last decades, Brazil still faces a huge gap between the country’s richest and the rest of the population. Worse still, inequality threatens to reverse the progress the country has made in ending poverty. Current World Bank projections show up to 3.6 million people are expected to fall back into poverty this year in Brazil. That is why it is urgent to address some of the structural causes of inequality in Brazil, such as an unfair tax system or insufficient investments in social policies.

#### [12] Income inequality undermines democracy making action on existential problems like climate change impossible- it’s the biggest global risk and the root cause of brazilian populism. The only way to ensure we don’t get a bolsonaro clone again is if we address the root cause

Lingis, PhD, 9-29-21

(Alphonso Lingis, a professor emeritus of philosophy at Pennsylvania State University, https://www.tehrantimes.com/news/465571/Inequality-of-wealth-is-greater-in-the-U-S-than-in-any-other)

“Inequality of wealth is greater by far in the United States than in any other developed country and increasing,” Lingis tells the Tehran Times. “One percent of the population in the United States holds 42.5 percent of the national wealth. Just three men—Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and investor Warren Buffett—hold combined fortunes worth more than the total wealth of the poorest half of Americans.” Since wealth means political power in the United States, the gap between tycoons and ordinary people reflects a defect in the political system. Critics say capitalism in the U.S. is going to marginalize democracy. Mass media plays a key role in this regard. “As wealth becomes increasingly concentrated in an ever smaller number of individuals and corporations, so does the potential political power of the wealthiest,” Lingis notes. Meanwhile “the median White family has 10 times more wealth than the median Black family and 7.5 times more wealth than the median Latino family. This increasing economic inequality is damaging to the health, education, job opportunities, and home ownerless possibilities of a growing number of people in the nation,” the professor of philosophy adds. Following is the text of the interview: Q: How do you see the political fallout of Trump's presidency in America and its impact on U.S. democracy? A: Lawyers for President Trump identified 62 incidences of alleged voter fraud in the 2020 election, which the courts individually examined and rejected. Nonetheless, Trump continues to claim that massive voter fraud invalidated the election, a claim shared by more than half of Republican voters. This does undermine public trust in the essential institutions of democracy in the country. Q: U.S. officials claim to defend democratic values, but apparently giant corporations, lobbies, and money have a big influence on U.S. democracy. Is American democracy in favor of the majority or just a tool in the hands of the elites? A: As wealth becomes increasingly concentrated in an ever-smaller number of individuals and corporations, so does the potential political power of the wealthiest. In 2020 candidates for the U.S. Congress spent $8,703,050,547 on their campaigns. Individual candidates spent up to $270 million on a campaign. The greater part of the money spent was donated by a small number of very rich individuals and corporations. One-fifth of the money spent on campaigns was donated by just 2635 individuals. Their influence makes President Trump’s numerous actions against climate change control, environmental protection, and his massive tax reduction for the rich difficult to reverse. Q: What is your comment on Republicans' efforts to restrict voting rights in some states? Do you think the American establishment can protect democracy? A: Since the 2020 election, nine Republican-dominated states have passed new laws that restrict access to voting for poorer people and minorities. Seventeen states have passed laws to expand access to voting for their citizens. A national voting rights law is presently being blocked by Republicans in Congress. Q: Is there any correlation between defending democracy at home and supporting democracy abroad? Apparently, the U.S. has failed to realize this goal in foreign policy. For example, America is a great sponsor of tyrannical regimes in the Persian Gulf. A: President Trump openly admired authoritarian regimes, and leaders such as Bolsonaro in Brazil, Duterte in the Philippines, and Orban in Hungary copied Trump’s rhetoric and domestic policies. President Biden, addressing the United Nations General Assembly, affirmed that his government will exercise “relentless diplomacy” in favor of democratic regimes. He called for international cooperation to address the coronavirus pandemic, global climate change, and cyber threats. He said the United States will double its financial commitment to climate aid and spend $10 billion to fight hunger. He also announced a donation of 1.1 billion doses of the Covid vaccine to poor countries, “for everyone shot we’ve administered to date in America we have now committed to doing three shots to the rest of the world.” Q: Some critics like Bernie Sanders believe that capitalism may push the U.S. and its democracy towards an abyss. What is your comment? A: Inequality of wealth is greater by far in the United States than in any other developed country and increasing. One percent of the population in the United States holds 42.5 percent of the national wealth. Just three men—Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and investor Warren Buffett—hold combined fortunes worth more than the total wealth of the poorest half of Americans. The median White family has 10 times more wealth than the median Black family and 7.5 times more wealth than the median Latino family. This increasing economic inequality is damaging to the health, education, job opportunities, and home ownerless possibilities of a growing number of people in the nation. In 2014, The World Economic Forum based in Davos, Switzerland released its “Global Risks 2014” report, listing income disparity first of the most likely five global risks, followed by extreme weather events, unemployment and underemployment, climate change, and cyber-attacks. Noted economist Thomas Piketty and others have argued that the growing economic inequality is also economically unsustainable.

#### [13] The right to strike is crucial to stop decline of labor unions, the vital internal link to economic inequality

Pope et al. 17

(James Gray Pope Professor of Law and Sidney Reitman Scholar at Rutgers University.Ed Bruno is the former director of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, Peter Kellman is past president of the Southern Maine Labor Council and is currently working with the Movement Building/Education Committee of the Maine AFL-CIO https://bostonreview.net/forum/james-gray-pope-ed-bruno-peter-kellman-right-strike , 5-22)

In December 2005 more than 30,000 New York City transit workers walked out over economic issues despite the state of New York’s Taylor Law, which prohibits all public sector strikes. Not only did the workers face the loss of two days’ pay for each day on strike, but a court ordered that the union be fined $1 million per day. Union president Roger Toussaint held firm, likening the strikers to Rosa Parks. “There is a higher calling than the law,” he declared. “That is justice and equality.” The transit strike exemplified labor civil disobedience at its most effective. The workers were not staging a symbolic event; they brought the city’s transit system to a halt. They claimed their fundamental right to collective action despite a statute that outlawed it. For a precious moment, public attention was riveted on the drama of workers defying a draconian strike ban. How did national labor leaders react? AFL-CIO president John Sweeney issued a routine statement of support, while most others did nothing at all. To anybody watching the drama unfold, the message was clear: there is no right to strike, even in the House of Labor. About a decade earlier in 1996, Stephen Lerner, fresh from a successful campaign to organize Los Angeles janitors, had warned in Boston Review that private sector unions faced an existential crisis: density could soon drop from 10.3 percent to 5 percent if unions did not expand their activity beyond the limits imposed by American law. He called for unions to develop broad organizing strategies—industry-wide and regional—and to engage in civil disobedience. Few embraced these radical strategies. Today private sector union density is about 6.5 percent, not quite as low as Lerner predicted, but down from a high of over 30 percent in the mid-1950s. Union decline matters. For half a century, it has moved in lock step with the increase in income inequality. According to an International Monetary Fund study of twenty advanced economies, . In the heyday of American unionism, CEOs made about 25 times the annual compensation of the average worker; today, the multiple is more than 350. Meanwhile, as Thomas Edsell and others have warned for decades, the decline of unions has deprived the Democratic Party of its strongest link to white workers. The overwhelming majority of unions continue to endorse Democratic candidates (including Hillary Clinton in the 2016 election), but with ever-diminishing effect. Until two decades ago it was possible to blame union decline on backward labor leaders, such as George Meany, who were so steeped in business unionism that they could not see the need to organize broadly, much less to ally with other social movements across lines of race, gender, and immigration status. Since then, however, we have seen continued shrinkage under leaders who are, for the most part, well intentioned and savvy. The problem is structural. National union officials are not well positioned to lead a challenge to corporate power. Institutions with big treasuries and tit-for-tat relations with establishment politicians cannot be expected to undertake risky and polarizing actions. Although leaders might see the need to build working-class power, the immediate incentives all point toward the narrow needs of their particular union’s members. This constraint is rooted in the American system of exclusive representation, which divides workers into thousands of bargaining unit boxes, gives unions property interests in particular boxes, and penalizes unions for doing anything other than defending existing boxes and acquiring new ones. The prospects for union revival may seem bleaker than ever during the Trump administration, even as the triumph of right-wing populism makes more urgent what was already apparent: the need to build a labor movement that can fight for the interests of the working class in the face of corporate power. But prospects are not as grim as they appear. Over the past decade, there has been an undeniable shift toward class politics, most visibly evidenced by Occupy Wall Street, the Bernie Sanders campaign, the Fight for Fifteen, and the rise of a Black Lives Matter movement that supports economic justice demands, including the right to organize. Building the labor movement in this period of danger and opportunity will require not only heeding Lerner’s call for a strategic shift and extralegal action; labor must also reclaim the right to strike and confront the deep structural disabilities that impede unions from challenging corporate power.

#### [14] Studies in brazil show that unions close the wage gap

Campos and Moura PhDs 17

André Gambier Campos, Ana Carolina Moura, (PhDs doing an empirical analysis) 2017, "Union-nonunion wage gap: unexpected findings in Brazil" ipea http://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/8046/3/Discussion%20Paper\_225.pdf, // HW AW

Through a simple comparison of wage averages (direct wages, expressed in R$ of September, 2015), it is possible to find a difference between union and nonunion workers. Focusing on a point estimate, this difference equals R$ 562,18 in absolute terms, in favor of union workers (or 33,5% in relative terms) (table 1).8 Moreover, focusing on interval estimates, it is feasible to notice that **this difference is statistically significant (at a confidence level of 95,0%).** The wage interval of union workers is higher (R$ 2.157,17-R$ 2.318,55) and does not cross the one of nonunion (R$ 1.642,48-R$ 1.708,87) (table 1). Even if we take the natural-logarithm of direct wages, it is possible to encounter a difference between union and nonunion workers. Graphs 1 and 2, a box plot and a density plot, show that the **distributions of wages for both groups of workers are different. In sum, although unexpected, there is a wage differential among Brazilian workers, apparently related to their union affiliation**. And this is rather relevant (in relative numbers, not less than 33,5%). In subsection 3.2, we will try to go further in this differential, to check to what extent it is linked to union status.

#### [15] Income inequality is the source of Brazil’s failing economy – solvency is reverse causal

Bessarria et al 18

Besarria, C. N., Araujo, J. M., Silva, A. F. da, Sobral, E. F. M., & Pereira, T. G. (huge peer reviewed study) (2018). Effects of income inequality on the economic growth of Brazilian states. International Journal of Social Economics, 45(3), 548–563. doi:10.1108/ijse-02-2017-0039 // HW AW

The discussion about the transmission channel for the effects of income inequality on economic growth is not new, and over the years, it has drawn the attention of researchers who attempt to explain the importance of this relationship. This study, for example, uses the theoretical model proposed by Halter et al. (2014), in which a theoretical model ARDL (1, 1, 1) MG PMG DFE Education level effect (eduit) 0.02059 0.00918 0.03191 SD (0.0197) (0.00712) (0.01353) Inequality effect (dit) −0.00157 −0.0020 −0.19038 SD (0.00009) (0.0004) (0.09445) Speed of adjustment (ϕit) −0.62399 −0.53979 −1.68892 SD (0.07557) (0.06482) (0.12355) Log likelihood −133.98 −160.72 −69.45 No. of parameters estimated 77 57 17 Source: Authors Table VIII. Alternative pooled estimates 560 IJSE 45,3 Downloaded by UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND (AUS) At 19:42 30 September 2018 (PT) with a non-monotonic adjustment trajectory leads to a linear model that represents the inequality-growth relationship. The empirical results suggest that, among all of the factors studied, only the effects of education level and income inequality are analyzed in both the short term and the long term. The main conclusion drawn from these analyses is that regardless of which method is adopted (panel model with fixed effects, random effects, instrumental variables, and cointegration analysis), education level and income inequality affect economic growth positively and negatively, respectively, and that these factors are able to explain some of the differences in growth rates among different regions of Brazil. The results suggest that the dynamics of economic growth in the Brazilian states must respond positively to social policies to reduce income inequality and to encourage schooling. In recent years, Brazil has implemented a social program called “Bolsa Família,” which has as main characteristics the transfer of income linked to the maintenance of children in school. This policy, according to the results found, must have a significant impact on the economic growth of the states in the long run. However, in addition to social programs, policies should be adopted that increase the efficiency of public investments in education. The strong educational inequalities between states (see Table IV) are determinant for understanding the economic discrepancies between Brazilian regions. Thus, the success of economic growth policy is strongly associated with the educational performance of the states. A future discussion will address the effects of statistical predictability on economic growth and income inequality using the Granger test of causality. The importance of this analysis is that causality suggests that changes in economic growth are able to predict changes in inequality, and vice versa, an element that has been little explored in the literature. In addition, the Brazilian states will be divided into two groups (those with higher and lower indices of inequality) for the purpose of verifying whether the effect of inequality on growth remains valid or whether other factors become more relevant in explaining the economic growth of these states.

#### [16] brazilian economic success solves everything – nuke war, climate change, development, poverty, disease

**Pascual, 07** (Carlos Pascual, Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy, The Brookings Institution, September 28, 2007)

On the **existential** question of proliferation and the risk of nuclear proliferation, Brazil has been and can be a leader. There are very few countries in the world that have given up nuclear weapons programs, a rejec­tion enshrined in the Constitution in 1988. Brazil has to be a leader in the development of a new non-pro­liferation and disarmament regime that can take into account the complexity of the global environment and which can embrace countries as diverse as India, Iran, and North Korea. Having given up its nuclear weapons program, Brazil has both **credibility** and experience to lead in this effort. On the issue of climate change, Brazil has been a leader. There is no better subject to demonstrate the global na­ture of our interdependence. It does not matter where that next ton of carbon comes from, it ends up in the atmosphere and it mixes together; we all feel the effects and the impacts. For the last thirty years, Brazil has played an important role in the development of ethanol, but that development has not turned itself into a change of practice in the United States, unlike Brazil’s change in automobiles where 80 percent of new cars now run on some form of flex fuel. The implications for the rain forests are tremendous. The rain forests and deforesta­tion actually account for 25 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, and the irony is that the more greenhouse gases that are emitted, the more negative the impact that they actually have on the forests. It was in Rio de Janeiro that the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change provided the very foundation for today’s discussions on climate change. Third, on questions of conflict and peace, Latin America has not developed deep organizational capacity for in­ternational peacekeeping. However, that has started to change. Today we see a Brazilian as the Commander of UN Forces in Haiti, exemplifying the willingness of Bra­zil to take a leadership role in dedicating its military to the promotion of peace in the hemisphere. Finally, we should recognize that poverty and disease also present global threats. Here we have come to un­derstand the **power of Brazil’s engagement in the world economy** and how that has lifted millions of people out of poverty. A critical part of this strategy is the institu­tion of the “Bolsa Familia,” the targeted social program that focuses on those who would be left behind. Further­more, the role that Brazil has played on issues such as health care, especially in Africa, are important. If Brazil is playing this kind of central role international­ly, we must ask whether Brazil is given an adequate voice in our institutional and multilateral structures? By this I mean Brazil’s participation in the United Nations Se­curity Council and other structures of the international security system. Is Brazil’s present-day power and lead­ership given adequate representation in the international system? These are some of the questions that I hope we can address during our discussion and debate today. Brazil is often looked at from an inter-American or, as they call it here in the United States, a “Hemispheric” perspective. I thought that, given Brazil’s foreign policy interests in other regions of the world and its increas­ingly global reach—something that is recognized by Sec­retary of State Condoleezza Rice and others in the U.S. government—it would be interesting to look at Brazil from a wider perspective. To summarize what is specific and interesting about the present moment is that Brazil is enjoying a time of un­usual promise. We have managed to reconcile economic growth while deepening our democratic roots and di­minishing inequality. This seminar can help us showcase this promising moment and hopefully improve the un­derstanding of the American public on developments currently taking place in Brazil right now. Economic performance is the strongest in recent mem­ory. Growth has been around 5 percent for the second quarter this year; exports have gone from $60 billion in 2002, to an expected $152 to $155 billion in 2007. Infla­tion is under target at approximately 3.5 percent. The crisis associated to the foreign debt has been overcome. Reserves stand at around $160 billion. Rather than go­ing from crisis management to crisis management, Brazil finally can look to the future and plan ahead. This has opened tremendous space for diplomatic ac­tivity. President Lula’s foreign policy has not only fo­cused on the region but more broadly, worldwide, in ways that reconfigure the geographic framework within which we operate. Special emphasis is placed on MER­COSUR and the building block represented by the re­lationship with Argentina—which is today the best in recent memory. Beyond that, Brazil is working hard for South American integration at a moment when all governments are democratically elected and all govern­ments have a social agenda, so there is a **strong** com­mon **foundation** to build upon.
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#### Text: A just Brazil ought to recognize an unconditional right for workers to strike

#### Brazilians are mobilized, militarized and ready to strike against Bolsonaro – 2017 and 2019 prove

AP 19

Associated Press, 6-14-2019, "AP Explains: Why is there a general strike in Brazil?," AP NEWS, https://apnews.com/0966674e639048e0a681c29248ffe0ad, // HW AW

RIO DE JANEIRO (AP) — Brazil kicked off a general strike Friday that is likely to paralyze major cities across Latin America’s largest country. The nationwide strike is the first since the arrival of far-right President Jair Bolsonaro on Jan. 1. While most participants will be protesting against a pension reform being discussed in Congress, others will be turning out to oppose budget cuts, a sluggish economy and the administration’s conservative agenda. Here is a look at what’s happening and why: FIRST GENERAL STRIKE IN TWO YEARS Workers in all 26 Brazilian states and the federal district of Brasilia are expected to take part in Friday’s strike, according to several unions. Actions blocking roads and public transportation are set to start early in the morning in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo. Turnout should be particularly strong in the northeast, the historic bastion of the opposition Workers’ Party. But general strikes are not so common in Brazil. The last one was held in 2017 against proposals in Congress to loosen labor rules and trim pension benefits. Before that, there hadn’t been a general strike in 20 years. PROTESTS AGAINST BOLSONARO While it will be the first nationwide labor strike against Bolsonaro, he has faced protests since even before he was elected on Oct. 18, 2018. A few weeks before casting their votes, women led large demonstrations across Brazil over the far-right leader’s misogynistic comments and conservative social agenda. They marched under the slogan “Not Him.” In April, indigenous leaders from over 300 ethnicities attended a march in Brasilia to denounce policies they say will facilitate the expansion of mining and industrial farming businesses into their protected lands. Then last month, thousands took to the streets to oppose a decision by Bolsonaro’s government to slash education funds in the largest protest so far. PENSION REFORM Friday’s strike is primarily against the pension reform the Bolsonaro administration is currently pushing for in Congress. The plan would raise the retirement age to 65 for men and 62 for women and increase workers’ contributions. The government says the proposal could save about 1 trillion reals ($260 billion) and that it is essential for saving the troubled social security system and hopefully giving a boost to Latin America’s largest economy. Under the current system, male and female workers can claim pension benefits after 30 to 35 years of contributions, respectively, meaning many can retire as early as 50 or 55. The reform is one of this administration’s signature promises and is currently being reviewed by a special commission in the lower house of congress. A previous pension reform bill, introduced by ex-President Michel Temer, managed to pass the commission and made it to the plenary, but was abandoned after nine months. ANGER OVER BUDGET CUTS Some Brazilians will use the strike as another opportunity to express their opposition to the government’s across-the-board budget cuts, especially to education. Professors, students and academics have protested the decision to pare $1.85 billion from funds for the public education network, from elementary schools to universities. They were particularly distressed by the suspension of some scholarship funding and a 30% freeze on federal universities’ discretionary budgets, which goes to pay utility bills, security, cleaning or maintenance work. Officials have promised to send more money toward education, thanks to an additional government funding measure approved this week by Congress. But they have conditioned even more funding on the passing of the pension reform. A SLUGGISH ECONOMY There is widespread discontent over Brazil’s sluggish economy. Gross domestic product shrank in the first quarter of 2019, while inflation hit nearly 5% in April, the highest in more than two years. Unemployment also remains high at nearly 13%, but even greater —over 30%— among Brazilians aged 18 to 24. Economy Minister Paulo Guedes recently told Brazilian magazine Veja that he would quit his position if Congress tried to pass a watered-down version of his pension proposal. Without the reform, Guedes said the country could go broke as early as next year.

#### Impeachment of Bolsonaro is essential and possible, but it will not happen in the squo, although it’s close and displays of “popular will and outrage” like general strikes and protests are key to ensure it

\*\*most of the good stuff is at the bold at the end of this card be sure not to overhighlight the beginning\*\*

Kirby 6-4-21

Jen Kirby, 6-4-2021, "Jair Bolsonaro is facing a political reckoning in Brazil. How far will it go?," Vox, [https://www.vox.com/2021/6/4/22456981/brazil-jair-bolsonaro-impeachment-protests-coronavirus //](https://www.vox.com/2021/6/4/22456981/brazil-jair-bolsonaro-impeachment-protests-coronavirus%20//) HW AW

The panelaços — the banging of pots and pans — became a socially distanced way for Brazilians [to protest](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-51955679) President Jair Bolsonaro [during the pandemic](https://www.vox.com/2020/5/2/21245243/coronavirus-brazil-bolsonaro-response-video). But last weekend, a [year into a prolonged coronavirus crisis](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanmic/article/PIIS2666-5247(21)00095-1/fulltext), hundreds of thousands [marched in more than 200 cities across Brazil](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/may/29/tens-of-thousands-of-brazilians-march-to-demand-bolsonaros-impeachment) to demand Bolsonaro’s impeachment. Signs bore slogans, such as “fora Bolsonaro” (“Bolsonaro out”) and “genocida,” a reference to Bolsonaro’s mismanagement of the pandemic, which has left more than 460,000 Brazilians dead, one of the worst death rates in the world. Protesters blame Bolsonaro for it. Their case is now being backed up [by a formal Senate inquiry into Bolsonaro’s handling of the pandemic](https://theintercept.com/2021/05/01/covid-brazil-deaths-bolsonaro-investigation/). The hearings have become a public accounting of Bolsonaro’s negligence — [including testimony from a Pfizer executive](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/pfizer-got-no-response-offers-supply-vaccine-brazil-last-year-exec-says-2021-05-13/) who said the pharmaceutical company reached out to Brazil about procuring doses last year, and Bolsonaro’s government didn’t respond for two months. These hearings are taking place as Brazil [still averages around 2,000 coronavirus deaths daily](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/brazil-covid-cases.html), with [many bracing for third wave](https://brazilian.report/society/2021/05/20/third-coronavirus-wave-economy/), and the public-health system is battered to the point of [near-collapse](https://www.bmj.com/content/372/bmj.n800). Brazil’s vaccination campaign [is chaos](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/14/world/americas/brazil-coronavirus-vaccine.html), and what is working [is largely happening in spite of Bolsonaro](https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/region/brazil). A little more than 10 percent of the population is fully vaccinated, [according to data from Johns Hopkins University.](https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/region/brazil) [Opinion polls](https://www.cartacapital.com.br/cartaexpressa/poderdata-apoio-ao-impeachment-de-bolsonaro-cresce-e-chega-a-57/) suggest support for impeachment is growing: 57 percent are now in favor, up 11 percentage points from three months ago. All of this would suggest Bolsonaro’s year-long pandemic blunder is finally catching up to him along with plenty of other scandals, from those [involving his family](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/internacional/en/brazil/2021/03/all-four-of-jair-bolsonaros-sons-are-under-investigation.shtml) to his environmental minister who [was allegedly smuggling illegal timber.](https://www.reuters.com/business/environment/brazil-police-investigate-potential-crimes-related-wood-exports-2021-05-19/) Whether this is a real reckoning for Bolsonaro — one that could truly push him from power — is the larger question. The anger and frustration are real, at the handling of the pandemic, at the economic situation, and plenty of other issues. But experts said many of the groups mobilizing against him — including women, students, and labor groups — already largely opposed the president. Bolsonaro himself has remained defiant, [drawing on the unwavering support of his base](https://www.france24.com/en/live-news/20210501-thousands-in-brazil-rally-for-bolsonaro-ignoring-virus). And impeachment is a tricky question, in part because Bolsonaro is up for reelection [in just over a year](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2022_Brazilian_general_election). “I think this is a kind of catharsis movement, you know — ‘I cannot stay at home seeing this anymore. So I prefer to take some risk and go to the streets,’” said Arthur Ituassu, a professor of political communication at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica in Rio de Janeiro. “But if this will have political consequences,” he added, “I don’t know.” The growing push to impeach Bolsonaro, explained Brazil’s coronavirus situation is dire, [but it’s not surprising](https://www.vox.com/2020/4/28/21228512/brazil-bolsonaro-coronavirus-moro) given that Bolsonaro downplayed the pandemic from the beginning. He called it the “[little flu](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-30/-little-flu-can-t-hurt-him-why-bolsonaro-still-shuns-lockdowns).” He shrugged at the country’s mounting death toll by saying “[we’ll all die one day](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/30/tp-captain-corona).” He undermined governors’ attempts to enforce [social distancing](https://www.cfr.org/in-brief/skeptical-bolsonaro-clashes-governors-coronavirus-spreads-brazil) and other measures, insisting economies reopen. He used a homophobic slur to refer to those who wear masks. He has continued [to tout the malaria drug hydroxychloroquine](https://twitter.com/gersonjr/status/1286451690892341252?s=20) and other [unproven drugs](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/man-behind-brazils-search-miracle-covid-19-cures-2021-05-14/) as coronavirus cures. When it comes to Covid-19 vaccinations, Bolsonaro has sowed misinformation and doubt. In December, he said of possible side effects on the Pfizer vaccine, “[If you turn into a crocodile, it’s your problem](https://www.ctvnews.ca/health/coronavirus/brazil-s-bolsonaro-warns-virus-vaccine-can-turn-people-into-crocodiles-1.5237678).” He [strongly criticized](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-bolsonaro/brazils-bolsonaro-says-he-was-right-to-question-chinese-covid-19-vaccine-idUSKBN29I1YL) Chinese-made vaccines, including bashing his own government’s deal to acquire the CoronaVac vaccine. “The Brazilian people WON’T BE ANYONE’S GUINEA PIG,” [he wrote on social media last year.](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-10-21/bolsonaro-slams-chinese-vaccine-his-government-said-it-would-buy) Ultimately, Bolsonaro [had to backtrack early this year](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-brazil-china/bolsonaro-thanks-china-for-fast-tracking-covid-19-vaccine-supplies-idUSKBN29U2BH) and thank China for fast-tracking the vaccine, as Brazil faced a deadly wave of the pandemic, with few vaccines available. João Nunes, senior lecturer of international relations at the University of York, said Bolsonaro’s “denialist approach” to the pandemic contributed to its severity, which led to disarray and lack of coordination. “Denialism, botching the vaccination program, continuing to support this myth of precocious treatment based on hydroxychloroquine, denying and going against regulations of the public health authorities promoting social gatherings without masks,” Nunes said, enumerating Bolsonaro’s misdeeds. Just how serious these misdeeds are is being examined by a [parliamentary inquiry](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response) in Brazil’s Senate. The investigation is broadly looking into [the government’s failures during the pandemic](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/5/24/squabbles-and-accusations-inside-brazil-covid-senate-inquiry). It is also examining the government’s blunders in its vaccination strategy, including procurement. The committee has existed for about a month. The testimony has been damning, essentially [showing that Bolsonaro planned to pursue a policy of herd immunity](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/27/opinion/brazil-covid-inquiry-bolsonaro.html), a strategy that not only prolonged the crisis in Brazil [but likely gave rise to new variants](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/22247525/covid-19-variants-uk-south-africa-brazil-b117-why-now). Luiz Henrique Mandetta, Brazil’s former health minister who had backed social distancing [and so found himself quickly fired by Bolsonaro](https://www.vox.com/2020/4/28/21228512/brazil-bolsonaro-coronavirus-moro) last year, told the committee that the government had no communication plan. “[There was no way to do a campaign, they didn’t want to do it](https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/05/americas/bolsonaro-inquiry-intl-latam/index.html),” he said. Mandetta provided a letter, dated March 28, 2020, urging Bolsonaro to follow the scientific recommendations of the health ministry, which the president largely ignored. Bolsonaro’s former communications director, Fábio Wajngarten, testified that letters from Pfizer offering to make deals with Brazil on vaccine doses [went unanswered for months in the fall of 2020](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/internacional/en/brazil/2021/05/wajngarten-evades-questions-and-is-threatened-with-imprisonment-in-cpi-flavio-bolsonaro-calls-renan-a-tramp.shtml). The president of Pfizer for Latin America, Carlos Murillo, also testified that the company had begun outreach to the Brazilian government in May 2020, with two formal offers made in August — [both of which went unanswered](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/pfizer-got-no-response-offers-supply-vaccine-brazil-last-year-exec-says-2021-05-13/). The company sent another request directly to Bolsonaro and the health minister, which languished until at least December. Murillo said that if Bolsonaro had struck a deal in August 2020, Pfizer could have delivered 18.5 million doses to the country by June 2021. Instead, Brazil and Pfizer didn’t strike a deal [until March of this year](https://en.mercopress.com/2021/05/14/brazil-could-have-bought-pfizer-vaccines-much-earlier-but-bolsonaro-ignored-the-offer); as it stands now, [Brazil has received fewer than 6 million doses from Pfizer](https://riotimesonline.com/brazil-news/miscellaneous/covid-19/pfizer-expects-to-deliver-2-4-million-covid-19-vaccine-doses-to-brazil-this-week/). The hearings are a political spectacle, with senators accusing Bolsonaro’s [allies of lying and trying to shield him](https://brazilian.report/liveblog/2021/05/12/hearings-arrest-press-wajngarten/). Bolsonaro’s defenders, meanwhile, are accusing the hearing of being [politically motivated](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response); though on this, they’re not totally wrong. With Brazil’s elections approaching, this public record of Bolsonaro’s dereliction is a potent tool for the opposition. But it is also a legitimate, and some argue necessary, fact-finding mission. If the outcome is incriminating for Bolsonaro, it is largely because the evidence is bearing that out. Many of these revelations are not exactly earth-shattering or even all that new, having already leaked out in news reports. And Bolsonaro’s public record alone makes apparent how he trivialized the pandemic. But the difference, experts say, is that it is all happening in one place. Witnesses are also under oath. Even those who are trying to defend Bolsonaro are [mostly just succeeding in contradicting themselves](https://apnews.com/article/brazil-pandemics-coronavirus-pandemic-health-07dee06a2e4c6ae87f5bac70cfdaefc7) or highlighting the ineptitude of the government. “I think it’s really laid naked what a lot of people suspected, what a lot of reports have said; they are now seeing the actors who were involved, who were in the room,” said Colin Snider, assistant professor of Latin American history at the University of Texas at Tyler. Bolsonaro’s mishandling of the pandemic has created ripple effects in other areas, including the economy and public health care system, all of it increasing the public’s frustration and dissatisfaction. And as some of his critics have pointed out, his mismanagement of the vaccination campaign has made it all but impossible for Brazil to emerge swiftly from this Covid-19 crisis, an irony for a guy who claimed he didn’t want to shut down the economy. “The record that is being put together of incompetence, negligence, bad faith, [and] political opportunism in the Bolsonaro administration dealing with the pandemic is overwhelming,” Paulo Barrozo, an associate law professor at Boston College, said. “But I don’t think that is going to lead to an impeachment Congress,” Barrozo added. “I think there is a record that is being built for historical purposes and also to be used in the next presidential election.” Bolsonaro’s coronavirus record is damning. But maybe don’t expect impeachment just yet. Bolsonaro has [about 130 impeachment petitions against him](https://www.brasilwire.com/29m-anti-bolsonaro-protests/). Some predate the pandemic and cover [all kinds of offenses](https://brazilian.report/cartoons/2021/04/01/the-meltdown-of-bolsonaro-as-a-president-the-brazilian-report/). But the pandemic and Bolsonaro’s handling of it have galvanized the public. “I do think we are now maybe in the worst moment of Bolsonaro’s government,” Pontifícia Universidade Católica’s Ituassu said. But it might not be enough for impeachment — at least not yet. The big thing right now is timing: Impeachment could be a long, drawn-out affair, and Brazil’s elections are just over a year away. If Bolsonaro continues to do nothing about the coronavirus and the crisis continues, voters may kick him out of the job anyway. Bolsonaro is doing what he always does in the face of criticism: doubling down. Just this week, Bolsonaro [offered to host the Copa America](https://www.espn.com/soccer/copa-america/story/4398712/copa-america-2021-brazil-new-hosts-as-tournament-moved-from-argentinacolombia) tournament, after the original hosts, Argentina and Colombia, pulled out, because of a coronavirus surge and unrest, respectively. “Since the beginning of the pandemic I have been saying, I regret the deaths, but we have to live,” [Bolsonaro said](https://www.cnn.com/2021/06/01/americas/brazil-bolsonaro-copa-america-intl-latam/index.html) at the announcement. [Brazil is still seeing about 60,000 Covid-19 cases a day](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/brazil-covid-cases.html) and around 2,000 deaths. The attraction for Bolsonaro supporters is partly the doubling down. [Bolsonaro is often compared to Donald Trump](https://www.google.com/search?q=donald+trump+bolsonaro+vox&rlz=1C5CHFA_enUS769US769&ei=luS4YLiSHsjT5NoPuPS3gAg&oq=donald+trump+bolsonaro+vox&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCAgAELADEIYDMggIABCwAxCGA1DgCliOEGCiEWgBcAB4AIABrAKIAZ0LkgEHMS40LjIuMZgBAKABAaoBB2d3cy13aXrIAQLAAQE&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwi4teXv0_vwAhXIKVkFHTj6DYAQ4dUDCA4&uact=5), and like Trump, Bolsonaro has a steady and unflaggingly loyal base that is, give or take, somewhere around a third of the voting population. The more Bolsonaro feels under attack by the political establishment or the media or his critics, the more he goes after those institutions and the more that fires up his supporters. “He’s lost support. But what has remained is very loyal,” Barrozo said. “So in a way, he is solidifying, crystallizing, [and] firming his bases by doubling down.” And the thing about impeachment is that it can be easily sold to his base as, to borrow a phrase from a Bolsonaro pal, “[the greatest witch-hunt in the history of our country](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-02-14/donald-trump-says-impeachment-trial-part-of-greatest-witch-hunt/13153230)” — which is exactly what Bolsonaro and his backers feed off. Another big factor, experts say, is that Bolsonaro still retains support in Brazil’s Senate and Chamber of Deputies (kind of like the House of Representatives). They are the bodies that are ultimately going to have to take up impeachment. This isn’t ideological or even about party loyalty; in fact, [Bolsonaro doesn’t even have a party affiliation right now](https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/bolsonaro-president-without-party-strategy-depoliticize-brazil/). Instead, it’s about perks. The thing standing in the way is the Centrão (Big Center), a bloc of centrist voting parties in Brazil’s Congress. Bolsonaro has basically had to build alliances with these members of Congress, who agree to work with Bolsonaro in exchange for the president basically giving them what they want. “Bolsonaro has actually gotten pretty good at handing out goodies — like pork-barrel projects — for the members of Congress to bring home the bacon and show their voters that they’re doing their job,” said David Samuels, distinguished McKnight University professor of political science at the University of Minnesota. “And so they’re also happy to see Bolsonaro twist in the wind as long as he keeps the spigots of money going.” Experts said it’s going to take a lot for them to basically turn their back on those goodies — whether they’re cushy jobs or beneficial projects. An [investigation](https://www.economist.com/the-americas/2021/05/29/brazils-president-jair-bolsonaro-is-under-siege) by the Brazilian newspaper O Estado de S. Paulo found that Bolsonaro’s government set aside about 20 billion reais ($3.9 billion) for what are basically pork projects. “The question for impeachment becomes this: **Does popular will and senatorial and deputy outrage turn to the point where enough are willing to abandon that sort of legislative sway over the national political agenda for the sake of impeachment?” Snider of the University of Texas said. Right now, the answer looks like a big “no.” As experts said, because these alliances aren’t born from any real loyalty, they can shift pretty quickly.** But politicians also want to know exactly which way the wind is blowing before they abandon Bolsonaro. **So while** [**Bolsonaro is unpopular**](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-05-07/brazil-s-new-cash-handouts-fail-to-buoy-bolsonaro-s-popularity)**, he may need to get even more unpopular.** **The street protests matter, but they must grow even more massive and consistent. The anti-Bolsonaro coalition on the streets may need to widen to include more centrist and center-right people — folks who may have backed Bolsonaro before but now unequivocally reject him.** Otherwise, lawmakers are content to just let Bolsonaro self-destruct. “I do think they prefer a weak Bolsonaro more than anything else,” Ituassu said. That includes a weak Bolsonaro in the October 2022 election, who could very likely be facing off against former president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, who [just got the clear from courts to be able to run again](https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2021/0319/Brazil-s-Lula-cleared-to-run-again-Can-he-write-a-new-chapter) after corruption charges had barred him from running. Early polls suggest if Lula and Bolsonaro were to face off in a runoff — both polarizing populists in their own way — [Lula would win handily](https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/05/12/brazil-poll-shows-lula-handily-beating-bolsonaro-in-2022/). (If Bolsonaro, sigh, [accepts the results](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-10/bolsonaro-says-fraud-kept-him-from-1st-round-brazil-election-win) — but that’s a crisis for another day.) So **there is a sense of just riding this out until the election. That comes with its own risks for the country, as it continues to battle the pandemic, and those who want to see Bolsonaro defeated. Bolsonaro is not going to change — no one expects him to suddenly become a deft manager of the pandemic — but circumstances around him might**. The economy could bounce back, and the vaccination campaign could gain momentum. If that happens, Bolsonaro’s coronavirus record might not be as potent a force in October 2022. Pressure against Bolsonaro is building. But so far, nothing Bolsonaro has done has really threatened his position or destroyed his loyal base of support. The question may not be whether a reckoning is coming for Bolsonaro but whether it will actually be enough. “This is one more element in place that could lead to Bolsonaro’s downfall,” Jessica Rich, a political science professor at the University of Wisconsin, said. “I don’t think they are yet all in place. But this is a real escalation of the threat against him.”

### solvency

#### Crackdowns are the biggest barrier to squo general strikes, which R2S solves

Hoffmann 17

Florian Hoffmann, 5-18-2017, "The Empire Strikes Back: On the recent general strike in Brazil," Critical Legal Thinking, <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/05/18/empire-strikes-back-recent-general-strike-brazil/> // HW AW

And all of this was, in its own way, reflected in the strike as it unfolded here: early in the morning relatively small pickets managed to blockade both the main bridge and the ferry terminal connecting downtown Rio with its neighbouring city Niteroi, thus causing major commuter congestion. Other acts throughout the city led to further shutdowns, with especially public schools (and many private ones, too) having adhered to the strike. Overall the picture displayed that slightly surreal mixture typical of this city: one could walk along busy shopping streets that would look just like on ordinary workdays, one could encounter, on public squares, small(ish) groups of protesters representing particular constituencies or institutions, and one could, later in the afternoon, congregate towards the Cinelandia square right in the historical city center to attend the main rally of the day, organised by the principal trade unions and a host of civil society organizations around a central stage, quite like any May Day event across the world . Yet, as if to rub in that things are different now, that there is not only a new government and a new politics, but a new ruling episteme, things unfolded rather differently: early on, during an otherwise peaceful march towards the Cinelandia meeting grounds, a small group of, perhaps, twenty individuals had apparently started to turn violent against (some) police and adjacent properties – in its reporting of the incident, the **mainstream press has uniformly tended to frame it as police legitimately reacting against ‘black blocs’ a priori intent on committing acts of violence.** That they, instead, might have been agents provocateurs -as has happened here before-, or simply a pretext for police to violently dissolve the rally was not reflected in (mainstream) news coverage. That the latter might well have been the case was, however, borne out by the facts as they unfolded thereafter, for police immediately reacted with heavy use of teargas and plastic bullets against the main body of the march, which was partially dispersed though managed to regroup to eventually arrive at the designated square. There it encountered a heavy presence of riot police, but otherwise the situation seemed to have calmed down, not least in the main body of demonstrators, which reflected a colourful cross-section of Brazilian society. For a short moment the crowd radiated the calm confidence that organized labour in Europe and, to an extent, North America, had attained, after a century of struggle, during the post-War ‘economic compromise’ and which, in turn, served as one of the models for labour relations during the Lula/Dilma period. It was like a flashback to another time, when union rallies were (almost) stately affairs, when the freedom of assembly felt like the historical achievement of a distant past, and when the police could be relied upon to actually protect that freedom by ensuring that its public exercise could go ahead. This vision was, of course, an illusion, and has been one, in Brazil, since at least the heavy-handed reaction to the 2013 mass protests which happened yet under Dilma’s watch. However, as many especially elderly demonstrators would affirm later on, what happened on April 28 on Cinelandia square went a step further, so far, in fact, that the most frequent comparison by those old enough to know was with the suppression of dissent by successive military governments after the (hot) coup of 1964. For, after about ten minutes, during which nothing violent had occurred within the large main body of demonstrators massed in front of the main stage, the police, without warning and obvious provocation, simply started to shoot teargas right into that very main body as well as directly onto the stage. Unsurprisingly this sent everyone running, resulting in a generalized dispersal into adjacent streets and squares; every so often the now fragmented crowd would stop, whereupon the police would close in and launch further teargas salvoes, block after block, until, well a kilometre from the original venue, people would literally escape into the metro and head home. In this generalized ‘clearing out’ strategy, police went as far as firing teargas into restaurants, shops, and metro stations into which groups of demonstrators had fled. The feeling that pervaded during this collective retreat, inscribed on people’s faces and occasionally vented in spontaneous chanting, was a mixture of incredulity (of the fact that the police had, in fact, just simply broken up a legal and legitimate, and, in the main, peaceful rally) and a rage so strong that it made some simply cry.

#### r2s supercharges Brazilian general strikes – empowers the labor movement by changing the power balance currently struck between workers and companies

Gourevitch, PhD, 16

(Alex, PoliSci@Brown, Gourevitch, A. (2016). Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike. Perspectives on Politics, 14(02), 307–323. doi:10.1017/s1537592716000049 )

We now have a way of explaining the right to strike as something decidedly more modern than just residual protection of some feudal guild privilege. The right to strike springs organically from the fact of structural domination. Striking is a way of resisting that domination at the point in that structure at which workers find themselves—the particular job they are bargaining over. It is not that workers believe they have some special privilege but quite the opposite. It is their lack of privilege, their vulnerability, that generates the claim. Structural domination makes its most immediate appearance in the threat of being exploited by a particular employer, even though the point of structural domination is that workers can be exploited by any potential employer. The sharpest form that the structural domination takes is through the threat of being fired, or of never being hired in the first place. The claim that strikers make to their job is therefore, in the first instance, a dramatization of the fact that their relationship is not voluntary, it is not accidental and contingent. They are always already forced to be in a contractual relationship with some employer or another. The refusal to perform work while retaining the right to the job is a way of bringing to the fore this social and structural element in their condition. It vivifies the real nature of the production relationship that workers find themselves in. Quitting the work but not the job is a way of saying that this society is not and cannot be just a system of voluntary exchanges among independent producers. There is an underlying structure of unequal dependence, maintained through the system of contracts, that even the “most voluntary” arrangements conceal. This is not just a dramaturgical fact about strikes, though the drama has, in many cases, been nearly Greek in its intensity and tragedy. It is a point about power. It would not have the drama if it were not a power play. By demanding the job as a matter of right workers do not just publicize their domination, they attempt to challenge the forcing to which they are subject. Limiting the employer’s ability to make contracts with others, and preventing other workers from taking those jobs, is a way of reversing the power relationship. It is a way of neutralizing the threat of losing the job, which is the most concrete, immediate point of contact with that background structure of domination. If you cannot lose your job, you are less vulnerable, less immediately economically dependent. Of course, this does not do away with the background structure itself, but a particular strike can never do that. Though even here, there are times when a strike, as it becomes a more generalized rejection of structural domination—say in large-scale sympathy strikes or general strikes—can begin to challenge the broad structure of economic control itself.60 This is a challenge to the logic of the capitalist labor market that begins from within, at the location of the strike itself. At that point in the system, strikers temporarily reverse the relationships of power by eliminating that employers’ ability to use the threat of jobloss against them. They do that not just by claiming the job but by claiming it as a matter of right. The thought is that the exploitation of workers is unjustifiable, an unjustifiability that appears in the terms of the employment itself. Workers have the right to the job, and therefore to interfere with the employer’s property rights and other workers’ contract rights, because it is unjustifiable to subject workers to exploitative conditions. To be sure, many strikes and many strikers never articulate the argument in this language. But the point is not what workers always explicitly say, but rather what they do and what that doing presupposes. I am reconstructing the ideal presuppositions of a strike, and in particular, how to think about the peculiar set of assumptions about the right to a job. We have seen that it is no atavistic recovery of traditional rights and guild privileges but is a way of resisting a thoroughly modern form of social domination from a point within that structure of domination. Again, facing a freedom to quit the job but not the work, workers assert a right to quit working but keep the job. To put this all another way, though strikes are still about bargaining, and in that sense like market exchanges, they are simultaneously a challenge to the market as the appropriate standard by which to judge the fairness of workers’ compensation. The market is unfair because of workers’ structural disadvantage. Over and against the market value, strikers can argue that there are shared, or at least shareable, standards of fair compensation that employers should adhere to. While here again we see the echoes of feudal theories of “just price” and equity jurisprudence,61 we must note that in principle the claim is not, or does not have to be, based on special privilege. Rather, it begins by challenging the view that labor“freely” finds its value on the market. Workers are always already in relationships with employers and they cannot leave the basic relationship of earning money only by selling laborpower, no matter how many jobs they might quit. The standards we use for evaluating those kinds of forced relationships, like the state, are different, based on shared conceptions of justice and human need, not private agreement.

### scenario 1: trees

#### Bolsonaro will kill the Amazon through deforesting – now is the brink and the election fails

Watts 7-14-21

Johnathan Watts, 7-14-2021, "Amazon rainforest ‘will collapse if Bolsonaro remains president’," [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/14/amazon-rainforest-will-collapse-if-bolsonaro-remains-president //](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/14/amazon-rainforest-will-collapse-if-bolsonaro-remains-president%20//) HW AW

The collapse of the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/amazon-rainforest) is inevitable if Jair Bolsonaro remains president of Brazil, academics and environmental activists have warned amid a fresh government assault on protections for the forest. Despite evidence that fire, drought and land clearance are pushing the Amazon towards a point of no return, they say the [far-right leader is more interested in placating the powerful](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jul/14/bolsonaro-brazil-hospital-hiccups) agribusiness lobby and tapping global markets that reward destructive behaviour. The onslaught on forest safeguards has picked up pace. On Wednesday the lower house was due to vote on legislation that would reward land grabbers by legalising ownership of property that had been illegally invaded and cleared before 2014. The previous day, the government shifted responsibility for forest fire satellite monitoring away from the National Institute for Space Research, a scientifically-robust organisation that had carried out the task for decades. Control has been given to the National Institute of Meteorology, which is under the influence of the agriculture ministry and the farming sector. In the past few months, Congress has also diluted standards for environmental impact assessments and a committee has approved a bill – PL 490 – that has been described as the greatest assault on indigenous rights since the launch of the Brazilian constitution in 1988. All of these measures punch holes in the Amazon’s protective framework and run contrary to scientific advice and the problems on the ground. Brazil is in the midst of a widening drought that has seen water inflows at some hydroelectric plants fall to 91-year lows. This is a cause and an effect of forest clearance. Since Bolsonaro took power in 2019, deforestation and fire in the Amazon have risen to their highest levels in more than a decade. The past three months have continued that trend, though slightly behind last year’s peaks. Given the tinder-dry conditions in many parts of the Amazon, there are fears that the usual peak of the fire season in July and August could be worse than usual. Scientists suspect **the rainforest may be slipping into a series of vicious cycles**. At a local level, land clearance and burning led to extended droughts and higher temperatures, which in turn weakens the resilience of the ecosystem and leads to more fire. At a regional level, this can intensify drought because the respiration of the rainforest normally acts as a pump to drive humid weather systems across a wide area of Brazil, South America and the Atlantic. When the forest weakens, that pump is less effective. There are also global repercussions because land clearance is turning the Amazon region from climate friend to climate foe. A study published in Nature **reveals forest burning** [**now produces about three times more CO2**](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/14/amazon-rainforest-now-emitting-more-co2-than-it-absorbs) **than the remaining vegetation is able to absorb.** This accelerates global heating. Global market forces are partly responsible. [Deforestation](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/deforestation) tends to rise when the prices of soy, beef and gold are high. No government of any stripe has completely managed to stop forest clearance in the past four decades. But government policies make a difference**. Amazon deforestation reduced 80% between 2004 and 2012 under the Workers party administration of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva**. Bolsonaro has steadily dismantled or discredited the mechanisms that achieved that – satellite monitoring, personnel on the ground and legislation to punish offenders and demarcate indigenous land and conservation areas. “The main thing this government has done is to undermine the capacity of the state to tackle illegal deforestation,” said Marcio Astrini, executive secretary of the Brazilian Climate Observatory, a network of 50 civil society organisations. In Congress, meanwhile Bolsonaro and the “ruralista” agribusiness lobby have put more supporters in key positions: Arthur Lira as leader of Congress, Carla Zambelli as chair of the lower house Environmental Commission and Bia Kicis as chair of the Justice Commission. These politicians have enabled the ruralistas’ agenda to go forward more aggressively. “The Brazilian government is doing exactly the opposite of what needs to be done. It is actively stimulating deforestation through its policies,” said Erika Berenguer, an expert on Amazon land use change at the Universities of Lancaster and Oxford. “Until recently this was through decrees and ministerial policy changes that cut budgets for combating deforestation. Now, they have taken more important roles in Congress so **we are seeing even more dangerous bills being passed.” This is a global concern**. The US president, Joe Biden, and the French president, Emmanuel Macron, have warned of the dangers posed by the decline of the rainforest. Supermarkets and financial organisations in the UK, Norway, Germany, France and Australia have [threatened](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/may/25/uk-supermarkets-will-seek-soy-alternatives-if-amazon-protections-weakened) to boycott Brazilian products unless supply chains can be guaranteed deforestation free. On Wednesday, 40 companies, include Iceland, Waitrose, Lidl, Tesco and Sainsbury’s issued an open letter warning that further erosions of environmental legislation and indigenous rights would force them to reconsider using Brazilian agricultural commodities. “We would like to reiterate that we consider the Amazon as a vital part of the Earth system that’s essential to the security of our planet as well as being a critical part of a prosperous future for Brazilians and all of society,” they said. Green groups said they now expected these companies to put their threats into effect. Among many consumers Brazil is seen as a toxic brand, and Bolsonaro looks increasingly isolated on the world stage. But this international pressure has had little impact. Last month, Bolsonaro sacked his environmental minister, Ricardo Salles, after a tipoff by the US embassy about his alleged involvement in illegal timber smuggling. But Salles had already gutted the forest surveillance and enforcement bodies, and the real power behind him – the agriculture minister, Tereza Cristina Dias – remains in place. This is partly because commodity prices remain high and demand is strong, particularly in China where the government puts resource procurement above environmental ethics and media pressure is limited by strict censorship. China is Brazil’s biggest market by a large margin. But the major reason is the nationalist ideology of the president. According to Astrini, Bolsonaro is so exclusively focused on domestic politics that he is indifferent to international reputation or global markets. “He is the first Brazilian president who has an overt agenda of destroying environmental protections for political gain. He is not concerned about the country, only his re-election. It’s all about the electoral base,” Astrini says. On a more positive note, he sees Bolsonaro as a catalyst for change. Since he took power, the Amazon rainforest has moved to the centre of political debate. Several candidates in next year’s presidential election now have zero-deforestation commitments in their manifestos. “Even Lula is saying deforestation in the Amazon can no longer be supported by any Brazilian government. He never said this before,” said Astrini. “It is now clear that a solution for the Amazon can only be possible if we change government. There is no hope if Bolsonaro is re-elected president. It is either the Amazon or Bolsonaro. There is no space for both.

#### Amazon destruction means extinction – 5 warrants

1. Co2 capture and o2 production
2. Medicine
3. Agriculture
4. Weather/superstorms
5. Water cycles

Mcfall-Johnsen 19

Morgan Mcfall-Johnsen, 8-24-2019, "Earth is a spaceship, and the Amazon is a crucial part of our life-support system, creating up to 20% of our oxygen. Here's why we need the world's largest rainforest.," Business Insider, [https://www.businessinsider.com/why-amazon-rainforest-is-important-life-support-is-burning-2019-8 //](https://www.businessinsider.com/why-amazon-rainforest-is-important-life-support-is-burning-2019-8%20//) HW AW

[Record-breaking fires](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-rainforest-experiencing-record-breaking-deforestation-2019-7) have hit the Amazon rainforest this year, [most of which were lit by people clearing land for farming](https://www.businessinsider.com/fires-in-the-amazon-rainforest-were-started-by-humans-2019-8). If too much of the Amazon disappears, that could put the rainforest on an [irreversible path](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-losing-3-football-fields-worth-of-rainforest-per-minute-2019-8) towards [becoming a savannah](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-fires-may-help-dieback-emit-carbon-hurry-climate-change-2019-8). If we lose the [Amazon](https://www.businessinsider.com/category/amazon-rainforest), we lose a crucial part of the world's life support system: [The Amazon](https://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-help-amazon-rainforest-what-charities-to-donate-to-2019) produces up to 20% of the oxygen in Earth's atmosphere, cycles water that regulates our weather, and [hosts a wealth of undiscovered species](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-forest-is-disappearing-2015-11) with potential for new medicines. It's also one of our best tools for keeping heat-trapping carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere. [Visit Business Insider's homepage for more stories](https://www.businessinsider.com/?hprecirc-bullet). Bottom of Form The Amazon rainforest is burning: Brazil has seen more than 74,000 fires this year ⁠— nearly double 2018's total of about 40,000 fires. About 10,000 new fires [started in the last week alone](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-rainforest-experiencing-record-number-of-wildfires-this-year-2019-8), mostly [lit by people clearing land](https://www.businessinsider.com/fires-in-the-amazon-rainforest-were-started-by-humans-2019-8) for crops and grazing. David Sirota, a political commentator who writes speeches for Bernie Sanders, put the problem like this in a [tweet](https://twitter.com/davidsirota/status/1164278087564980224?s=20): "We're all on a spaceship hurtling through a vacuum. The Amazon rainforest is our spaceship's life support system. Our spaceship's life support system is on fire." It's a fitting analogy, since the Amazon plays a major role in many of the processes that make our planet habitable: water cycles, weather patterns, and the exchange of oxygen and carbon dioxide. The rainforest is also home to more than 30 million [people](https://www.businessinsider.com/drone-footage-reveals-tribe-amazon-no-contact-outside-world-2018-8) and over 10% of the world's biodiversity. Scientists see potential for new medicines in unstudied Amazon plants. The more than 2.5 million square miles of Amazon rainforest are also one of our greatest buffers against the climate crisis, since the trees absorb carbon dioxide, thereby keeping it out of the atmosphere. But deforestation threatens all of that. Humans have cut down nearly 20% of the Amazon in the last 50 years, according to the [World Wildlife Fund](http://wwf.panda.org/knowledge_hub/where_we_work/amazon/about_the_amazon/) (WWF). If [another 20%](https://www.nature.com/articles/35041539) of the Amazon disappears, that could trigger [a "dieback" scenario](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-fires-may-help-dieback-emit-carbon-hurry-climate-change-2019-8) in which the forest would dry out and become a savannah. That process would release billions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and raise global temperatures. A man works in a burning tract of Amazon jungle as it is being cleared by loggers and farmers in Iranduba, Amazonas state, Brazil August 20, 2019. [Bruno Kelly/Reuters](https://www.reutersconnect.com/all?id=tag%3Areuters.com%2C2019%3Anewsml_RC1AF7C54AA0&share=true) Here is what's at risk if we lose the Amazon. The 'lungs of the planet' The Amazon helps keep the atmosphere's carbon-dioxide levels in check. Plants and trees take in carbon dioxide and release oxygen back into the air through the process of photosynthesis. This is why the Amazon is often referred to as the "lungs of the planet": It produces between 6% and 20% of the oxygen in Earth's atmosphere. (Estimates vary — climate scientists [Michael Mann](https://twitter.com/MichaelEMann/status/1164899653525151745) and Jonathan Foley calculated the 6% figure, while a [report](https://amazonwatch.org/assets/files/2019-complicity-in-destruction-2.pdf) from the nonprofit Amazon Watch estimated it's closer to 20%.) The Amazon produces up to 20% of the world's oxygen, as plants absorb carbon dioxide and emit oxygen via photosynthesis. Reuters Researchers [have calculated](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2373903/) that the Amazon holds up to 140 billion tons of carbon dioxide — the equivalent of 14 decades' worth of human emissions. "The Amazon is a major bank of carbon," Ruth DeFries, an ecology professor at Columbia University, [told Vice.](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/wjw5bb/the-amazon-wildfires-arent-natural-blame-humans) "When trees gets burned and carbon is released into the atmosphere, that exacerbates our global warming." Fires aside, deforestation in the Amazon already releases half a billion tons of carbon dioxide each year, according to [WWF](http://wwf.panda.org/knowledge_hub/where_we_work/amazon/about_the_amazon/). Last month, the Amazon saw record-breaking rates of deforestation, primarily due to [infrastructure projects](https://www.businessinsider.com/bolsonaro-plan-to-develop-amazon-rainforest-2019-1), logging, mining, and farming — much of which is not legal. Data from Brazilian satellites have [indicated](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-losing-3-football-fields-worth-of-rainforest-per-minute-2019-8) that about three football fields' worth of Amazonian trees are falling every minute. An anchor for weather patterns A man swims with his kid on the waters of the Parana do Amana river at Vila Nova do Amana community in the Sustainable Development Reserve, in Amazonas state, Brazil, September 22, 2015. [Bruno Kelly/Reuters](https://www.reutersconnect.com/all?id=tag%3Areuters.com%2C2015%3Anewsml_GF10000234640&share=true) A [2018 report](https://www.wriorg.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/ending-tropical-deforestation-tropical-forests-climate-change.pdf) from the World Resources Institute (WRI) found that tropical deforestation disrupts the water cycle so much that it can threaten agriculture halfway around the globe. "Tropical forest loss is having a larger impact on the climate than has been commonly understood," the report authors wrote. The Amazon plays a large role in rain patterns because the moisture that its vegetation traps and releases travels as clouds for thousands of miles. [Climate models](https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/full/10.1175/JHM406.1) show that the Amazon's moisture affects rainfall as far away as the US. If the Amazon were completely deforested, that would cut Texas rainfall by 25%, [cut the Sierra Nevada snowpack in half](https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00775.1), and reduce precipitation by up to 20% in the US coastal northwest. For that reason, large-scale deforestation in the Amazon can "pose a substantial risk to agriculture in key breadbaskets halfway around the world in parts of the US, India, and China," according to the WRI report. Villagers from the Rumao Island community paddle their canoes loaded with arapaima or pirarucu, the largest freshwater fish species in South America, while fishing in the Solimoes river, one of the main tributaries of the Amazon, in the Mamiraua nature reserve, November 24, 2013. REUTERS/Bruno Kelly The Amazon may also play a role in ocean currents, since the Amazon River accounts for over 15% of all fresh water that enters the oceans. Changes in the ocean's balance of fresh water and salt water [can slow down or speed up ocean currents](https://e360.yale.edu/features/will_climate_change_jam_the_global_ocean_conveyor_belt), which regulate weather across the globe. But scientists aren't yet sure how changes in the Amazon River would affect this complicated meteorological system. Degradation of the rainforest could also affect the biology of the Atlantic Ocean in unknown ways, since the Amazon River [dumps debris from the forest into the Atlantic](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/images/7021/amazon-river-in-the-atlantic-ocean), and those nutrients feed phytoplankton that form the base of the ocean's food chain. Biodiversity that 'brims with promise' for new medicinesBrazilian researchers inspect plants in the search for new cancer drugs in Sao Sebastiao de Cuieiras in Brazil's Amazon rainforest, October 30, 2009. [Sergio Moraes/Reuters](https://www.reutersconnect.com/all?id=tag%3Areuters.com%2C2009%3Anewsml_GM1E5BH0ZOA01&share=true) The Amazon is home to at least 10% of the world's known [biodiversity](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GK_vRtHJZu4) — and that's just the life that we know about. A new species is discovered in the Amazon every [two](https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2017/08/amazon-brazil-new-species-discovered-spd/) or [three](https://www.wwf.org.uk/where-we-work/places/amazon) days. "Every species in this incredibly biodiverse system represents solutions to a set of biological challenges — any one of which has transformative potential and could generate global human benefits," ecologist Thomas Lovejoy told [the World Bank](https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2019/05/22/why-the-amazons-biodiversity-is-critical-for-the-globe). "This rich wealth of species brims with promise, awaiting discovery." People have used Amazonian plants to produce [anti-cancer drugs](https://www.thedailybeast.com/rainforests-are-fast-becoming-a-laboratory-for-cancer-drugs) and the first anti-malarial drug, quinine. Yet scientists estimate that they have only studied 0.5% of the world's flowering plants for their [medicinal potential](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-medicine/in-amazon-a-frustrated-search-for-cancer-cures-idUSTRE5AG00V20091117). A rainbow is seen over a tract of Amazon rainforest which has been cleared by loggers and farmers for agriculture, near Uruara, Brazil on April 22, 2013. Nacho Doce/Reuters The rich array of species in the Amazon are [crucial to the rainforest's other functions](https://www.businessinsider.com/people-killed-half-of-forest-animals-on-earth-since-1970-2019-8), too. Advertisement The South American trees that absorb the most carbon dioxide rely on large birds and primates to eat their fruits and spread the large seeds inside, according to a recent WWF [report](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/below-the-canopy). Thick vines also hold up the structures of the trees whose leaves send water vapor into the atmosphere. And a variety of animals pollinate forest plants, disperse seeds, and nourish the soil with their waste. "Amazon biodiversity also plays a critical role as part of global systems, influencing the global carbon cycle and thus climate change," Lovejoy said.

### Scenario 2: covid

#### Bolsonaro’s COVID response has been bad and not getting better – downplays the virus and risk of variants, vaccine denial, criminally slow response

Phillips 10-20-21

Tom Phillips, 10-20-2021, "Bolsonaro should be charged with crimes against humanity, Covid inquiry finds," [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/20/jair-bolsonaro-crimes-against-humanity-inquiry //](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/20/jair-bolsonaro-crimes-against-humanity-inquiry%20//) HW AW

[Jair Bolsonaro](https://www.theguardian.com/world/jair-bolsonaro) should be charged with crimes against humanity and jailed for his “macabre” reaction to a Covid outbreak that has killed more than 600,000 Brazilians, including a disproportionate number of indigenous citizens, a congressional inquiry has found. Two of [the most dramatic accusations against the Brazilian president](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/19/bolsonaro-coronavirus-brazil-murder-charges-senate-report) – murder and genocide of the country’s indigenous populations – were removed from a previous draft of the report on Tuesday night after talks between opposition senators serving on the inquiry. But the final draft suggests the committee will recommend Brazil’s populist president be charged with nine separate offenses including charlatanism, incitement to commit crimes, the propagation of pathogenic germs, and crimes against humanity. The investigation, which Bolsonaro’s political rivals hope will wreck his chances of re-election, [was set up in April](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response) and is scheduled to conclude next Tuesday when senators vote on its final report. That 1,180-page document – which savages the Bolsonaro administration’s anti-scientific and “slovenly” pandemic response – will make profoundly uncomfortable reading for Brazil’s far-right leader and dozens of allies, against whom charges are also recommended. “[We must] never forget what happened in this country or the innocent people who lost their lives as a result of the government’s reckless handling of the pandemic,” says the final draft of the report, seen by the Guardian on Wednesday. “The president committed many crimes and he will pay for them,” the inquiry’s president, Senator Omar Aziz, told a hearing in the capital, Brasília, on Wednesday before the document’s official presentation. Senator Randolfe Rodrigues, the inquiry’s vice-president, told reporters the alleged crimes meant Bolsonaro’s future should lie behind bars. “The report assigns more than 100 years in prison to the president of the republic. That is what the collection of suggested crimes points to,” Rodrigues said. The accusation of crimes against humanity – which the report says will be referred to the international criminal court in The Hague – relates to what the report calls the Bolsonaro administration’s “deliberate neglect” of indigenous people as Covid tore across the South American country and into their supposedly protected territories. “The federal government found in the virus an ally to strike the indigenous,” the document claims, highlighting Bolsonaro’s [well-documented hostility](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/26/bolsonaro-amazon-tribes-indigenous-brazil-dictatorship) to the original inhabitants of the lands that became Brazil after Portuguese colonizers arrived in 1500. “There is a clear causal link between the anti-indigenous posture of [Brazil’s] top leader and the harm suffered by indigenous people, even if he might not have directly killed anyone,” the report alleges. “Even before the pandemic, President [Jair Bolsonaro](https://www.theguardian.com/world/jair-bolsonaro) commanded an anti-indigenous policy that deliberately exposed native peoples to a lack of assistance, harassment, land invasions and violence, with these acts of outright hostility intensifying … after the arrival of the virus.” “By allowing the virus to proceed … he caused death and suffering remotely. The constant harassment and deliberate neglect, combined with the pandemic, were worse than weapons.” The report is also scathing about Bolsonaro’s broader pandemic response, including what it calls his calculated bid to achieve herd immunity by allowing Covid’s uncontrolled spread, and attempts to undermine vaccination and containment measures such as face masks and social distancing. “The consequences of this macabre strategy were measured by science,” the report says. “Had non-pharmaceutical interventions been systematically implemented, transmission rates could have been reduced by about 40%, which means 120,000 lives could have been saved by the end of March 2021.” The government’s most serious failing was the “unjustifiable and intentional delay” in negotiating the purchase of Covid vaccines with companies such as Pfizer, whose approaches were repeatedly ignored. “Brazil could have been the first country in the world to start vaccination, together with the UK … this mistaken strategy cost the country dearly,” the report says. Speaking at an event in north-east Brazil, Bolsonaro attacked the Covid inquiry, claiming it had “produced nothing but hatred and resentment”. “We know that we bear absolutely no guilt. We know we did the right thing from the very start,” Bolsonaro said, as supporters shouted insults at the report’s author, Senator Renan Calheiros, who they called a “bum”. Experts say Bolsonaro is unlikely to be prosecuted or impeached in the short-term. The most likely impact will be on his ability to win a second term in next year’s election. Deisy Ventura, a professor from the University of São Paulo’s public health faculty, said that whatever Bolsonaro’s immediate political future, the report was hugely significant because it recognised that the push for herd immunity through infection had been a deliberate strategy. “Even among those who don’t support the president … there was this very strong belief that [this happened] because the president is mad, or the government is really incompetent … when this was actually all intentional,” said Ventura, whose research was cited by the inquiry. Ventura added: “If this isn’t recognized as a crime, as something that needs punishing, then the risk is that this could become natural. The biggest fear those of us who study pandemics have is that the use of the herd immunity through infection strategy might be legitimized as a response to other epidemics.” The president is not the only member of the Bolsonaro clan cited in the Covid report, which is expected to be approved by senators next Tuesday. Three of his politician sons – Carlos, Eduardo and Flávio Bolsonaro – are denounced over their alleged role in [commanding a fake news network](https://oglobo.globo.com/politica/cpi-da-covidfilhosde-bolsonaro-comandaram-rede-de-fake-news-na-pandemia-aponta-relatorio-final-25243495) that flooded social media with disinformation about the pandemic.

#### What happens in Brazil does not stay in Brazil - Bolsonaro’s COVID policy has made Brazil the worst breeding ground for variants in the world and covid will never end until he is impeached

Phillips 3-3-21

Tom Phillips, 3-3-2021, "Brazil's Covid outbreak is global threat that opens door to lethal variants – scientist," [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/03/brazil-covid-global-threat-new-more-lethal-variants-miguel-nicolelis //](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/03/brazil-covid-global-threat-new-more-lethal-variants-miguel-nicolelis%20//) HW AW

Brazil’s rampant coronavirus outbreak has become a global threat that risks spawning new and even more lethal variants, one of the South American country’s top scientists has warned as it suffered its deadliest day of the pandemic. Speaking to the Guardian, Miguel Nicolelis, a Duke University neuroscientist who is tracking the crisis, urged the international community to challenge the Brazilian government over its failure to contain [an epidemic that has killed more than a quarter of a million Brazilians](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/feb/26/brazil-coronavirus-deaths-record) – about 10% of the global total. “The world must vehemently speak out over the risks Brazil is posing to the fight against the pandemic,” said Nicolelis, who has spent most of the last year confined to his flat on the west side of São Paulo. “What’s the point in sorting the pandemic out in Europe or the United States, if Brazil continues to be a breeding ground for this virus?” Nicolelis said the problem was not simply Brazil – whose far-right president, Jair Bolsonaro, has repeatedly spurned efforts to combat a disease he calls a “little flu” – being “the worst country in the world in its handling of the pandemic”. He said: “It’s that if you allow the virus to proliferate at the levels it is currently proliferating here, you open the door to the occurrence of new mutations and the appearance of even more lethal variants.” [Brazil variant evaded up to 61% of immunity in previous Covid cases, study finds](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/02/brazil-variant-evaded-immunity-previous-covid-cases) Already, [one particularly worrying variant (P1)](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/01/brazil-covid-variant-p1-britain) has been traced to Manaus, the largest city in the Brazilian Amazon, which suffered a devastating healthcare breakdown in January after a surge in infections. Six cases of that variant have so far [been detected in the UK](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/02/brazil-variant-evaded-immunity-previous-covid-cases). “Brazil is an open-air laboratory for the virus to proliferate and eventually create more lethal mutations,” warned Nicolelis. “This is about the world. It’s global.” The alert came as Brazil entered the most deadly chapter of its year-long Covid crisis, with hospitals around the country collapsing or on the verge of collapse and the average weekly death toll hitting new heights. A record 1,726 deaths were reported on Tuesday, the highest number since the pandemic began. “It’s a battlefield,” a doctor in the southern city of Porto Alegre [told local television](https://g1.globo.com/rs/rio-grande-do-sul/noticia/2021/03/02/e-um-campo-de-guerra-diz-superintendente-do-hospital-moinhos-de-vento-em-porto-alegre.ghtml) after his hospital’s intensive care unit and mortuary ran out of space. Nicolelis said Bolsonaro’s failure to halt the outbreak and launch an adequate vaccination campaign had created a domestic tragedy from which Latin America’s most populous nation was unlikely to emerge until late 2022. “We’ve now gone past 250,000 deaths, and my expectation is that if nothing is done we could have lost 500,000 people here in Brazil by next March. It’s a horrifying and tragic prospect, but at this point it’s perfectly possible,” he said, predicting a traumatic month as public and private hospitals buckled. “My forecast is that if the world was appalled by what happened in [Bergamo](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/oct/25/dread-of-history-repeating-itself-grows-in-italian-town-as-infections-rise-again) in Italy and what happened in Manaus a few weeks ago, it’s going to be even more shocked by the rest of Brazil if nothing is done.” The scientist, who has been advising state governments on their Covid response, called for the creation of a special Covid commission to fill the leadership vacuum left by Bolsonaro and an immediate 21-day nationwide lockdown. That, however, seems virtually unthinkable given Bolsonaro’s position. On Wednesday, the Brazilian president will reportedly deliver an address to the nation in which he is expected to again denounce lockdown measures. Nicolelis claimed Brazil’s crisis now posed an international risk as well as a domestic one and claimed Bolsonaro – **who has sabotaged social distancing, promoted unproven remedies such as hydroxychloroquine and belittled masks – had become “the pandemic’s global public enemy No 1”.** He said: “The policies that he is failing to put into practice jeopardize the fight against the pandemic in the entire planet.” Bolsonaro, a former army captain who swept to power in 2018 on a wave of anti-establishment rage, has defended his performance, claiming his opposition to Covid restrictions is about protecting Brazil’s economy. “I haven’t gotten a single thing wrong since March last year,” the 65-year-old [told supporters](https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/equilibrioesaude/2021/03/nao-errei-nenhuma-diz-bolsonaro-ao-insistir-em-tratamento-precoce-e-em-criticas-a-isolamento.shtml) this week. José Gomes Temporão, Brazil’s health minister during [the 2009 swine flu pandemic](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/jun/11/swine-flu-pandemic-who-declares), said Bolsonaro’s response had been so lacking that he and other senior administration figures would eventually “have to be held accountable”. “To this day, Brazil doesn’t have a national plan to combat Covid-19,” Temporão complained, attacking Bolsonaro’s failure to secure sufficient vaccines by striking deals to buy shots made by companies such as Pfizer, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson. Just 3.3% of Brazil’s population has so far been vaccinated, compared to 15.2% in the US, 18% in Chile and 29.9% in the UK. **“I don’t think there is any other leader who is so obtuse, so backward, who has such a mistaken and warped vision of reality as the president of Brazil,”** Temporão said. “History will condemn these people.”

#### Variants mean extinction -- every country secured brings the probability down and saves trillions

Duzgun 20 Eren Duzgun teaches Historical Sociology and International Relations at Leiden University, Netherlands. Capitalism, Coronavirus and the Road to Extinction, <https://socialistproject.ca/2020/04/capitalism-coronavirus-and-road-to-extinction/>

The Godzilla-like image of the virus Covid-19 has been haunting the world. Not only has the virus unraveled nightmarish possibilities leading to the extinction of millions of people, but it has also served as a quintessential case revealing the structural contradictions of and existential threats posed by capitalism on a global scale. Several researchers agree that Covid-19 is quite an unprecedented virus. Unlike seasonal influenza, Covid-19 is ten times deadlier, and we have yet to develop a medical remedy or herd immunity to slow it down; the best estimates for the development of a vaccine are at least three to six months away. The virus’s mortality rate seems much lower than earlier pandemics (such as Ebola [1994], Avian flu [1997], SARS [2002], MERS [2012]); yet the manner in which Covid-19 spreads, i.e., its mode of infectivity, seems radically different. Unlike earlier pandemics, the virus has proved infectious even before carriers display any symptoms, which renders it often undetectable during the 14-day incubation period. Facts on the Ground Given that we are unable to detect or cure it, we are completely helpless against the virus’s global march. Emergency measures such as compulsory quarantines, social-distancing and improved hygiene standards may temporarily slow down the virus’s pace, yet once these measures begin to be relaxed – as they surely will be – it is very likely that the virus will be at our door again. This grim picture gets even more complicated by the fact that the virus is likely to go through several mutations. The virus may increase its adaptability to new climatic and generational circumstances, hence targeting not only the elderly, but a broader age group even when summer arrives in the northern hemisphere. Covid-19 is not the first ‘modern’ pathogen with global consequences. The Spanish Flu (1918), for example, was sweeping in terms of its geographical span as well as devastating in terms of its death toll. As Mike Davis notes, the Spanish flu broke out at a time when billions were still in the process of being (forcibly) incorporated into the capitalist world market. The expansion of markets eliminated the very basis of safety-first agriculture, undermining local reciprocities and solidarities that traditionally provided welfare to the poor during crises. Indeed, what prepared the ground for its outbreak and exacerbated the impact of this early 20th century pathogen was the deterioration of nutritional standards under market imperatives as well as the exigencies and scarcities caused by the Great War. Covid-19, by contrast, has begun its journey and taken its biggest toll thus far in the most advanced and affluent parts of the world. This is to say, the contagion is no longer limited to the persistently undernourished, underdeveloped, and war-torn parts of the world; its impact is no longer restricted to a distant wet market or a third world country alone. Instead, it has emerged and expanded in the very heart of the capitalist world order at a time when capitalism has not only been already firmly established across the globe but has been testing the eco-biological limits of the entire planet. Should things remain the same, Covid-19 and its future cousins are likely to claim the lives of not just ‘some’ people as they did in the past, but of humanity as a whole. In this sense, perhaps for the first time in modern history, the biological blitzkrieg activated by the coronavirus has thrown into sharp relief the immediately existential and undeniably global contradictions and consequences generated by capitalism.

#### COVID prevents world leaders from effectively addressing climate change.

Wilkinson, JD, and Téllez Chávez, MA, 20

(Wilkinson, Daniel (Managing Director for the Americas@Human Rights Watch, JD@Yale Law School), Téllez Chávez, Luciana (Training Fellow for the Americas@Frontline Defenders, MA Conflict, Security, and Development@Kings’ College London, MA I-Law and HR@UN University for Peace). “How Covid-19 Could Impact the Climate Crisis,” Human Rights Watch, April 16, 2020. https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/04/16/how-covid-19-could-impact-climate-crisis//SHL)

When the lockdowns are lifted and life returns to what it once was, so too will the pollution that clouds the skies and with it the greenhouse gases that fuel global warming. In fact, the **rebound could be even worse**. In the initial aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008, global CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion and cement production decreased by 1.4 percent, only to rise by 5.9 percent in 2010. And the crisis this time could have a **longer-term impact** on the environment — at **far greater cost** to human health, security, and life — if it **derails global efforts** to address climate change. This was supposed to be a “a **pivotal year**” for those efforts to address climate change, as UN Secretary General António Guterres put it at a recent briefing on the UN’s annual climate summit, which was scheduled to take place in Glasgow in November. Ahead of the summit, 196 countries were expected to introduce revamped plans to meet the emission reduction goals established under the 2015 Paris Agreement. Yet on April 1, in the face of the spreading coronavirus pandemic, the UN announced that it was **postponing the summit until sometime next year**. It was only the latest sign that the casualties of Covid-19 may include global efforts to address climate change. Other international meetings related to climate — on biodiversity and oceans — have also been disrupted. While the need to mobilize governments to act on climate has never been more urgent, the **inability to gather world leaders to address the issue** could make it all the more difficult to do so.

#### 2050 scenario highly plausible- traditional impact assessment systemically undervalues climate impacts and we need action now

Ahmed, PhD, 19

(Naveez, <https://www.vice.com/en/article/597kpd/new-report-suggests-high-likelihood-of-human-civilization-coming-to-an-end-in-2050>, 6-3)

A harrowing scenario analysis of how human civilization might collapse in coming decades due to climate change has been endorsed by a former Australian defense chief and senior royal navy commander. The analysis, published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, a think-tank in Melbourne, Australia, describes climate change as “a near- to mid-term existential threat to human civilization” and sets out a plausible scenario of where business-as-usual could lead over the next 30 years. The paper argues that the potentially “extremely serious outcomes” of climate-related security threats are often far more probable than conventionally assumed, but almost impossible to quantify because they “fall outside the human experience of the last thousand years.” On our current trajectory, the report warns, “planetary and human systems [are] reaching a ‘point of no return’ by mid-century, in which the prospect of a largely uninhabitable Earth leads to the breakdown of nations and the international order.” The only way to avoid the risks of this scenario is what the report describes as “akin in scale to the World War II emergency mobilization”—but this time focused on rapidly building out a zero-emissions industrial system to set in train the restoration of a safe climate. The scenario warns that our current trajectory will likely lock in at least 3 degrees Celsius (C) of global heating, which in turn could trigger further amplifying feedbacks unleashing further warming. This would drive the accelerating collapse of key ecosystems “including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic.” The results would be devastating. Some one billion people would be forced to attempt to relocate from unlivable conditions, and two billion would face scarcity of water supplies. Agriculture would collapse in the sub-tropics, and food production would suffer dramatically worldwide. The internal cohesion of nation-states like the US and China would unravel. ADVERTISEMENT “Even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated and in high-end scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model with a high likelihood of human civilization coming to an end,” the report notes. The new policy briefing is written by David Spratt, Breakthrough’s research director and Ian Dunlop, a former senior executive of Royal Dutch Shell who previously chaired the Australian Coal Association. Read More: Scientists Warn the UN of Capitalism's Imminent Demise In the briefing’s foreword, retired Admiral Chris Barrie—Chief of the Australian Defence Force from 1998 to 2002 and former Deputy Chief of the Australian Navy—commends the paper for laying “bare the unvarnished truth about the desperate situation humans, and our planet, are in, painting a disturbing picture of the real possibility that human life on Earth may be on the way to extinction, in the most horrible way.” Barrie now works for the Climate Change Institute at Australian National University, Canberra. Spratt told Motherboard that a key reason the risks are not understood is that “much knowledge produced for policymakers is too conservative. Because the risks are now existential, a new approach to climate and security risk assessment is required using scenario analysis.” Last October, Motherboard reported on scientific evidence that the UN’s summary report for government policymakers on climate change—whose findings were widely recognized as “devastating”—were in fact too optimistic. While the Breakthrough scenario sets out some of the more ‘high end’ risk possibilities, it is often not possible to meaningfully quantify their probabilities. As a result, the authors emphasize that conventional risk approaches tend to downplay worst-case scenarios despite their plausibility. Spratt and Dunlop’s 2050 scenario illustrates how easy it could be to end up in an accelerating runaway climate scenario which would lead to a largely uninhabitable planet within just a few decades. “A high-end 2050 scenario finds a world in social breakdown and outright chaos,” said Spratt. “But a short window of opportunity exists for an emergency, global mobilization of resources, in which the logistical and planning experiences of the national security sector could play a valuable role.”

### Scenario 3: ecomony

#### Bolsonaro is making promises he can’t keep, which kills the Brazilian economy and dooms Brazil’s rise

Andrade et al 10-21-21

Vinicius Andrade, Daniel Carvalho, Martha Viotti Beck, 10-21-2021, "Brazil Markets Plunge as Bolsonaro Vows to Dole Out More Aid," Bloomberg, [https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-10-21/brazil-markets-plunge-after-bolsonaro-vows-to-dole-out-more-aid //](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-10-21/brazil-markets-plunge-after-bolsonaro-vows-to-dole-out-more-aid%20//) HW AW

Brazilian assets tumbled Thursday as prospects the government will bypass fiscal rules to boost spending fueled concern over the nation’s fiscal trajectory. The benchmark stock index dropped 2.8%, extending its decline this week past 6%, and interest-rate swap contracts surged as traders weighed President Jair Bolsonaro’s pledge to offer aid to truckers and news his administration will seek to change how the spending cap that limits the growth of public expenses is calculated. The government is seeking budget space for a new social program that Bolsonaro has been pushing for as he seeks to boost his record-low popularity before 2022 elections. The plan is to use the previous year’s inflation to adjust public spending limits, instead of the inflation of a 12-month period ended in June, as required under current rules. [BRAZIL INSIGHT: Waiver Chatter Signals Spending Cap’s Demise](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/terminal/R1BX4CT0G1KW) Amid concern about fiscal largesse, traders have boosted bets the central bank will hike the benchmark rate by 125 or even 150 basis points when members meet next week, according to data from local exchange B3. That would be the biggest increase in almost two decades after the bank already raised interest rates by more than 4 percentage points this year. The change to the budget rule, being debated in the lower house, will free up about 40 billion reais ($7 billion) for spending, according to people familiar with the matter. The government hopes the bill will be voted on today by a commission, and be taken to the house floor soon after, the people said, asking not to be identified because discussions are private. The bill also creates a yearly limit for [court-ordered payments](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/terminal/QZQGV5T0AFB6), which frees up around another 40 billion reais, bringing the total budget room to about 80 billion reais. The president, who’s seen his popularity slide amid soaring food and fuel inflation, said on Thursday that the government will give a payment [to truck drivers](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/terminal/R1C9F4T0AFB6) to offset the impact of higher diesel prices. Bolsonaro, who’s up for re-election in 2022, **gave no details on how he’ll fund the aid**, which should help about 750,000 self-employed truckers. O Globo newspaper reported the monthly stipend is expected to be at 400 reais and should be valid until December of next year. **The Ibovespa stock index fell to an 11-month low, with the daily decline the biggest among more than 90 primary global indexes tracked by Bloomberg**. The Brazilian real weakened 0.9%, while swap rate contracts due in January 2023 surged 61 basis points. [READ MORE: Brazil Swap Rates in Panic Mode On Reports of Extra Spending](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/terminal/R1C99UT0AFB8) Undermining the spending cap will keep downward pressure on asset prices until the government moves to reassure investors about its fiscal health, Carlos Woelz, a founding partner at hedge fund manager Kapitalo Investimentos, said at an event. **“It looks like magic: You spend more, no expenses are cut. No one pays the bill,” Woelz said. “That won’t work.”**

#### Brazil’s rise as a global power is key to preventing multiple sources of global instability, but Bolsonaro’s policies are in direct contrast with what Brazil should be doing

**Pascual, 07** (Carlos Pascual, Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy, The Brookings Institution, September 28, 2007)

On the **existential** question of proliferation and the risk of nuclear proliferation, Brazil has been and can be a leader. There are very few countries in the world that have given up nuclear weapons programs, a rejec­tion enshrined in the Constitution in 1988. Brazil has to be a leader in the development of a new non-pro­liferation and disarmament regime that can take into account the complexity of the global environment and which can embrace countries as diverse as India, Iran, and North Korea. Having given up its nuclear weapons program, Brazil has both **credibility** and experience to lead in this effort. On the issue of climate change, Brazil has been a leader. There is no better subject to demonstrate the global na­ture of our interdependence. It does not matter where that next ton of carbon comes from, it ends up in the atmosphere and it mixes together; we all feel the effects and the impacts. For the last thirty years, Brazil has played an important role in the development of ethanol, but that development has not turned itself into a change of practice in the United States, unlike Brazil’s change in automobiles where 80 percent of new cars now run on some form of flex fuel. The implications for the rain forests are tremendous. The rain forests and deforesta­tion actually account for 25 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, and the irony is that the more greenhouse gases that are emitted, the more negative the impact that they actually have on the forests. It was in Rio de Janeiro that the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change provided the very foundation for today’s discussions on climate change. Third, on questions of conflict and peace, Latin America has not developed deep organizational capacity for in­ternational peacekeeping. However, that has started to change. Today we see a Brazilian as the Commander of UN Forces in Haiti, exemplifying the willingness of Bra­zil to take a leadership role in dedicating its military to the promotion of peace in the hemisphere. Finally, we should recognize that poverty and disease also present global threats. Here we have come to un­derstand the power of Brazil’s engagement in the world economy and how that has lifted millions of people out of poverty. A critical part of this strategy is the institu­tion of the “Bolsa Familia,” the targeted social program that focuses on those who would be left behind. Further­more, the role that Brazil has played on issues such as health care, especially in Africa, are important. If Brazil is playing this kind of central role international­ly, we must ask whether Brazil is given an adequate voice in our institutional and multilateral structures? By this I mean Brazil’s participation in the United Nations Se­curity Council and other structures of the international security system. Is Brazil’s present-day power and lead­ership given adequate representation in the international system? These are some of the questions that I hope we can address during our discussion and debate today. Brazil is often looked at from an inter-American or, as they call it here in the United States, a “Hemispheric” perspective. I thought that, given Brazil’s foreign policy interests in other regions of the world and its increas­ingly global reach—something that is recognized by Sec­retary of State Condoleezza Rice and others in the U.S. government—it would be interesting to look at Brazil from a wider perspective. To summarize what is specific and interesting about the present moment is that Brazil is enjoying a time of un­usual promise. We have managed to reconcile economic growth while deepening our democratic roots and di­minishing inequality. This seminar can help us showcase this promising moment and hopefully improve the un­derstanding of the American public on developments currently taking place in Brazil right now. Economic performance is the strongest in recent mem­ory. Growth has been around 5 percent for the second quarter this year; exports have gone from $60 billion in 2002, to an expected $152 to $155 billion in 2007. Infla­tion is under target at approximately 3.5 percent. The crisis associated to the foreign debt has been overcome. Reserves stand at around $160 billion. Rather than go­ing from crisis management to crisis management, Brazil finally can look to the future and plan ahead. This has opened tremendous space for diplomatic ac­tivity. President Lula’s foreign policy has not only fo­cused on the region but more broadly, worldwide, in ways that reconfigure the geographic framework within which we operate. Special emphasis is placed on MER­COSUR and the building block represented by the re­lationship with Argentina—which is today the best in recent memory. Beyond that, Brazil is working hard for South American integration at a moment when all governments are democratically elected and all govern­ments have a social agenda, so there is a **strong** com­mon **foundation** to build upon.

### Scenario 4: science!

#### Bolsonaro cutting research funding by 90%

McKie 11-11-21

Anna McKie, 11-11-2021, "Brazil cuts federal science spending by 90 percent," No Publication, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/11/11/brazil-cuts-federal-science-spending-90-percent, // HW AW

Brazilian academics have said they are losing hope over the future of science in the country after another devastating blow to research funding. Many projects already underway will have to stop, and there is likely to be significant brain drain after President Jair Bolsonaro signed a bill that reduces the federal science budget by 90 percent, experts told Times Higher Education. Renato Janine Ribeiro, president of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science, said the cuts, which diverted 600 million reais ($108 million) earmarked for the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation to other departments, will cause “serious damage.” Ribeiro, a former education minister, said the budget had represented the bulk of Brazilian institutions’ research funding and that many graduates were now “looking to go abroad.” “This government has repeatedly shown it is against education, and against science,” he said. “We are doing our best to keep up hope, we are fighting, but I am pessimistic.” Jefferson Cardia Simões, deputy provost for research at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, said the last-minute diversion of the money means that there would be little left of the 200 million reais ($36 million) that had already been promised for about 8,000 researcher grants, and that research laboratories would have to be suspended “because there is no money for maintenance.” “There is something more troubling in the air, which is the denial of the rational and the attack on the entire Brazilian scientific community,” Simões said. Marcelo Knobel, professor of physics and a former rector of the University of Campinas, said the best hope for research in the country was the end of Bolsonaro’s presidency. Although a Senate committee recommended in October that the president should be charged with nine offenses, including crimes against humanity, for mishandling the coronavirus pandemic, his opponents may have to wait until October 2022 for the chance to vote him out of office. Knobel said the research community had been desperately trying to show Parliament “the importance of science and technology for the future of the country, but it has been useless.” “Without scholarships for students and fellowships for postgraduate students, the next generation of scholars will be lost,” he said. Knobel said scientists were trying to mobilize international pressure. “**But if the government is ignoring the international community on climate change, I don’t think it will be very different in this case. We have very little hope.”**

#### No funding kills the Brazilian AI sector – k2 opening up the global south and propelling forward global development and a laundry list of good impacts

1. Propelling economy of Brazil and latin america as a whole
2. Reduced pollution
3. Reduced traffic
4. Improved quality of life

Henriques 20

Bruno Henriques, Vp Of Growth and Ai At Ifood, 1-12-2020, "Brazil is emerging as a world-class AI innovation hub," VentureBeat, https://venturebeat.com/2020/01/12/brazil-is-emerging-as-a-world-class-ai-innovation-hub/, // HW AW

Brazil’s government has big plans for AI, despite having come late to the party. In Oxford Insights’ [AI Readiness Index 2019](https://www.oxfordinsights.com/ai-readiness2019), Brazil was ranked 40 out of 192 countries, a sign that the South American powerhouse is moving up in the AI world. The report looks at how ready countries are to take advantage of the AI technologies [PwC](https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/issues/data-and-analytics/publications/artificial-intelligence-study.html) forecasts will add $15 trillion to the global economy by 2030. The 2019 report also cautions that the “Global South could be left behind by the so-called fourth industrial revolution.” But even as some of the planet’s richest nations, including Canada, China, Germany, Japan, Singapore, and the U.S, have become recognized AI innovation hubs, according to studies by [Deloitte](https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/focus/cognitive-technologies/ai-investment-by-country.html) and others, South America — led by Brazil — is rapidly emerging as a leader in AI-enabled businesses. **Brazil’s future economy is banking on a big contribution from AI technologies, and the country is leading the rest of Latin America, based on a proprietary** [**AI Global Vibrancy Tool**](https://vibrancy.aiindex.org/) **used to compile the recent** [**2019 AI Index**](https://venturebeat.com/2019/12/11/ai-index-2019-assesses-global-ai-research-investment-and-impact/) **report from Stanford University**. The study found that during the last four years Brazil has shifted into high gear as one of the top five countries in the world with the fastest growth in AI hiring. [Accenture](https://www.accenture.com/us-en/insight-artificial-intelligence-south-america) forecast that by 2035 AI will boost annual growth rates across South America by about one full percentage point of GDP. For Brazil, already the largest Latin American economy, that prediction would “boost the 2035 GVA of the Brazilian economy by $432 billion, which represents an increase of 0.9 percentage points in comparison with the baseline scenario.” Other Latin American countries stand to gain AI-driven boosts in annual GVA in that same time frame — notably $78 billion in Colombia, $63 billion in Chile, and $59 billion in Argentina. “Artificial intelligence offers South America a long-awaited opportunity to leapfrog toward greater levels of innovation, productivity, and socio-economic progress,” wrote Armen Ovanessoff, principal director of Accenture Research, in the report. Where opportunity lies One area that’s particularly ripe for AI innovation is the financial services sector that was hit hard, and then heavily regulated, after major bank crashes in the 1980s and 1990s. Brazilian financial tech companies creating workarounds to the many bureaucratic hurdles and old ways of doing things are now booming in Brazil, according to [CB Insights](https://www.law.com/corpcounsel/2019/08/14/latin-america-fintech-boom-continues-while-asia-remains-in-slump/), [LAVCA](https://lavca.org/industry-data/inside-another-record-breaking-year-lavcas-annual-review-of-tech-investment-in-latin-america/), and other organizations tracking hot investment sectors there. Other fast-growth sectors that AI is redefining in Brazil include ecommerce, on-demand delivery, logistics, and digital media and entertainment. Fortunately, the Brazilian population is tech savvy and already uses a lot of online services, which means AI technologies have a greater chance of impacting industries on a scale that matters. Mary Meeker’s [Internet Trends 2019](https://www.bondcap.com/pdf/Internet_Trends_2019.pdf) report ranks Brazil’s population as the fifth largest group of internet consumers in the world. A global consumer insights survey by [PwC](https://voicebot.ai/2018/03/19/chinese-consumers-lead-globe-ai-device-ownership-pwc/) in 2018 found that 59% of Brazilians plan to purchase an AI device, the highest score amongst the top 10 countries in the poll. After the U.S., Brazil has the largest number of social media users on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube, per [Kwintessential](https://www.kwintessential.co.uk/blog/localisation/brazils-booming-social-media-revolution-trends-growth). Mobile devices outnumber people, and a majority of Brazil’s more than 211 million citizens are avid online shoppers and consumers of internet entertainment, according to [PagBrasil](https://www.pagbrasil.com/insights/digital-in-2019-brazil/). Of the 149 million internet users in Brazil, 139 million are mobile, and Brazilians downloaded more than 7.3 billion apps in 2018, ranking it top 4 in the world, according to [Forbes](https://www.forbes.com/sites/eladnatanson/2019/07/01/from-food-delivery-to-fintech-the-new-app-convergence-in-brazil/#71922bce57cc). Two important applications for AI are tackling the traffic congestion issues created by Brazil’s massive cities and reaching people across a land mass of 3.28 million square miles. AI has an opportunity to make local and cross-country delivery of products quicker and more efficient, which would mean reduced pollution, lower costs, and less traffic. New R&D labs Brazil and other large Latin American countries are catching up with their counterparts when it comes to funding AI innovation. The Brazilian government [recently announced](https://www.zdnet.com/article/brazilian-government-announces-creation-of-ai-lab-network/) the creation of an AI R&D network of eight labs. During the launch announcement in November, Marcos Pontes, Brazil’s minister of science, technology, innovation, and communications, said the eight R&D labs will boost “the ability to reason, plan, and think about Brazil’s future and our ability to create tools to solve problems and improve the quality of life.” One of the new labs will involve the Brazilian Army and will focus on edge AI technology in areas like cybersecurity. The other seven R&D centers will work on breakthroughs tied to the country’s [national IoT plan](https://www.bnamericas.com/en/news/brazil-issues-decree-for-national-iot-plan), which is focused on its four main verticals: agribusiness, health care, manufacturing, and smart cities. Brazil understands that **to keep up in the international AI race, it needs to nurture and retain strong domestic talent.** Beyond the lure of bigger paychecks, the best of the best are drawn to opportunities where they can solve the most important challenges of our time. To keep talent in the country, [IBM is set to launch an AI lab](http://www.brazilmonitor.com/index.php/2019/02/12/ibm-to-open-artificial-intelligence-center-in-brazil/) in São Paulo in 2020. It will be the first Latin American-based institute from IBM’s AI Horizons Network, created by the company in 2016 for collaboration between universities, students, and IBM researchers. It will be run in conjunction with the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and focus on solving real problems in Brazil, such as the best use of natural resources and innovation in agribusiness and health care. Addressing the AI skills gap According to an [IBM study](https://newsroom.ibm.com/2019-09-06-IBM-Study-The-Skills-Gap-is-Not-a-Myth-But-Can-Be-Addressed-with-Real-Solutions) released in September, “the skills gap is not a myth, but can be addressed with real solutions.” The researchers — who polled 5,670 global executives in 48 countries — found that as many as 120 million workers in the world’s 12 largest economies may need to be retrained or reskilled to succeed in an age of AI and intelligent automation. A [Gartner study](https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2019-01-21-gartner-surve) released at the beginning of 2019 found that 37% of organizations have implemented AI in some form but struggle with acute [talent shortages](https://www.gartner.com/smarterwithgartner/a-roadmap-to-discover-digital-talent-infographic/). Despite a current AI skills gap, Gartner found that the number of enterprises employing AI grew 270% over a four-year period. Google’s Peter Norvig, a legendary AI expert, spoke about the skills gap and competition for top AI talent at the recent BayBrazil conference in Silicon Valley. He said he meets with many startups that complain they can’t hire the top AI experts from MIT or Stanford because the big tech companies get to them first. When he hears this concern, Norvig offers sage advice via an analogy. “If a new restaurant owner told me, ‘What the business needs most now is a PhD in stove design from MIT,’ that’s really a faulty way of thinking. In reality, what that restaurant owner really needs is a chef who knows how to cook tasty food who will tell the owner what stove to buy. You don’t need to design a new stove from scratch.” The issue now is training more people to understand not only how to use AI tools but also how to implement them at every level of business. With both the Brazilian government and the private sector boosting investment in AI research, that skills gap will begin to close. Going forward, AI will play an essential role in how people, not machines, make decisions. **For Latin America — led by Brazil — the technology promises to create a significant competitive advantage in the commercial sector, faster GDP growth, broader societal benefits, and more socio-economic progress for all.**

#### AI enhances deterrence and information gathering – solves war

Boulanin, PhD, 18

(Vincent, Senior Researcher at SIPRI, <https://cpr.unu.edu/ai-global-governance-ai-and-nuclear-weapons-promise-and-perils-of-ai-for-nuclear-stability.html>, 12-7)

What might change with the current AI renaissance, which is seeing breakthroughs in the areas of machine learning and autonomous systems? Recent advances in AI could be leveraged in all aspects of the nuclear enterprise. Machine learning could boost the detection capabilities of extant early warning systems and improve the possibility for human analysts to do a cross-analysis of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) data. Machine learning could be used to enhance the protection of the command and control architecture against cyberattacks and improve the way resources, including human forces, are managed. Machine learning advances could boost the capabilities of non-nuclear means of deterrence: be it conventional (air defence systems), electronic (jamming) or cyber. Autonomous systems could be used to conduct remote sensing operations in areas that were previously hardly accessible for manned and remotely-controlled systems, such as in the deep sea. Autonomous unmanned systems such as aerial drones or unmanned underwater vehicles could also be seen by nuclear weapon states as an alternative to intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) as well as manned bomber and submarines for nuclear weapon delivery. These would be recoverable (unlike missiles and torpedoes) and could be deployed in ultra-long loitering periods – days, months or even years. At least one nuclear-armed state is already considering that possibility: In 2015, Russia revealed that it was pursuing the development of a nuclear-armed unmanned submarine, called Status-6.

## AR

### OVV

#### Brazil’s economic inequality and right-wing populist president Bolsonaro are driving us straight to extinction. The only way to solve is to take out bolsonaro right now with impeachment. Elections are too slow because they allow

#### Covid variants to be created which guarantees extinction – even though they can come from other places too, extinction framing means that reducing variant risk by 1% is literally trillions of future lives

#### The amazon to be permanently destroyed – once it crosses the threshold to turn into a savannah, there’s no turning back and that’s going to happen prior to the election

#### There are 5 warrants to amazon destruction leading to extinction – we’ll explain them now

#### Co2 sequestration and o2 production – the Amazon doesn’t have to be the greatest o2 creator to be important – it holds 140 years of co2 that is released through deforestation

#### Agriculture – amazon regulates water cycles and rain which is k2 agruculture

#### Brazil and the amazon has untapped medicine potential – k2 stopping future pandemics

#### Inequality – brazil has intense economic inequality and the way to heal it is unions. We have empirical evidence on wage differentials between unionized and non-unionized workers that shows unionizing totally solves the wage gaps

### T – Nebel

#### Counter interp: the AFF may defend a subset

#### Xt gorsuch evidence from the 1ac – the resolution greenlights subsets because it uses A which is singular and prefer that definition because they dropped prefer common usage in every scenario

#### Generic statements are proven true by subsets.

Cimpian et al, PhDs, 10

(Andrei, Amanda C. Brandone, Susan A. Gelman, Generic statements require little evidence for acceptance but have powerful implications, Cogn Sci. 2010 Nov 1; 34(8): 1452–1482)

Generic statements (e.g., “Birds lay eggs”) express generalizations about categories. In this paper, we hypothesized that there is a paradoxical asymmetry at the core of generic meaning, such that these sentences have extremely strong implications but require little evidence to be judged true. Four experiments confirmed the hypothesized asymmetry: Participants interpreted novel generics such as “Lorches have purple feathers” as referring to nearly all lorches, but they judged the same novel generics to be true given a wide range of prevalence levels (e.g., even when only 10% or 30% of lorches had purple feathers). A second hypothesis, also confirmed by the results, was that novel generic sentences about dangerous or distinctive properties would be more acceptable than generic sentences that were similar but did not have these connotations. In addition to clarifying important aspects of generics’ meaning, these findings are applicable to a range of real-world processes such as stereotyping and political discourse. Keywords: generic language, concepts, truth conditions, prevalence implications, quantifiers, semantics Go to: 1. Introduction A statement is generic if it expresses a generalization about the members of a kind, as in “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus” or “Birds lay eggs” (e.g., Carlson, 1977; Carlson & Pelletier, 1995; Leslie, 2008). Such generalizations are commonplace in everyday conversation and child-directed speech (Gelman, Coley, Rosengren, Hartman, & Pappas, 1998; Gelman, Taylor, & Nguyen, 2004; Gelman, Goetz, Sarnecka, & Flukes, 2008), and are likely to foster the growth of children’s conceptual knowledge (Cimpian & Markman, 2009; Gelman, 2004, 2009). Here, however, we explore the semantics of generic sentences—and, in particular, the relationship between generic meaning and the statistical prevalence of the relevant properties (e.g., what proportion of birds lay eggs). Consider, first, generics’ truth conditions: Generic sentences are often judged true despite weak statistical evidence. Few people would dispute the truth of “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus”, yet only about 1% of mosquitoes are actually carriers (Cox, 2004). Similarly, only a minority of birds lays eggs (the healthy, mature females), but “Birds lay eggs” is uncontroversial. This loose, almost negligible relationship between the prevalence of a property within a category and the acceptance of the corresponding generic sentence has long puzzled linguists and philosophers, and has led to many attempts to describe the truth conditions of generic statements (for reviews, see Carlson, 1995; Leslie, 2008). Though generics’ truth conditions may be unrelated to property prevalence (cf. Prasada & Dillingham, 2006), the same cannot be said about the implications of generic statements. When provided with a novel generic sentence, one often has the impression that the property talked about is widespread. For example, if we were unfamiliar with the West Nile virus and were told (generically) that mosquitoes carry it, it would not be unreasonable to assume that all, or at least a majority of, mosquitoes are carriers (Gelman, Star, & Flukes, 2002). It is this paradoxical combination of flexible, almost prevalence-independent truth conditions, on the one hand, and widespread prevalence implications, on the other, that is the main focus of this article. We will attempt to demonstrate empirically that the prevalence level that is sufficient to judge a generic sentence as true is indeed significantly lower than the prevalence level implied by that very same sentence. If told that, say, “Lorches have purple feathers,” people might expect almost all lorches to have these feathers (illustrating generics’ high implied prevalence), but they may still agree that the sentence is true even if the actual prevalence of purple feathers among lorches turned out to be much lower (illustrating generics’ flexible truth conditions). Additionally, we propose that this asymmetry is peculiar to generic statements and does not extend to sentences with quantified noun phrases as subjects. That is, the prevalence implied by a sentence such as “Most lorches have purple feathers” may be more closely aligned with the prevalence that would be needed to judge it as true. Before describing our studies, we provide a brief overview of previous research on the truth conditions and the prevalence implications of generic statements. 1.1. Generics’ truth conditions Some of the first experimental evidence for the idea that the truth of a generic statement does not depend on the underlying statistics was provided by Gilson and Abelson (1965; Abelson & Kanouse, 1966) in their studies of “the psychology of audience reaction” to “persuasive communication” in the form of generic assertions (Abelson & Kanouse, 1966, p. 171). Participants were presented with novel items such as the following: Altogether there are three kinds of tribes—Southern, Northern, Central. Southern tribes have sports magazines. Northern tribes do not have sports magazines. Central tribes do not have sports magazines. Do tribes have sports magazines? All items had the same critical feature: only one third of the target category possessed the relevant property. Despite the low prevalence, participants answered “yes” approximately 70% of the time to “Do tribes have sports magazines?” and other generic questions similar to it. Thus, people’s acceptance of the generics did not seem contingent on strong statistical evidence, leaving the door open for persuasion, and perhaps manipulation, by ill-intentioned communicators. A similar conclusion about the relationship between statistical prevalence and generics’ truth conditions emerged from the linguistics literature on this topic (e.g., Carlson, 1977; Carlson & Pelletier, 1995; Dahl, 1975; Declerck, 1986, 1991; Lawler, 1973). For example, Carlson (1977) writes that “there are many cases where […] less than half of the individuals under consideration have some certain property, yet we still can truly predicate that property of the appropriate bare plural” (p. 67), as is the case with “Birds lay eggs” and “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus” but also with “Lions have manes” (only males do), “Cardinals are red” (only males are), and others. He points out, moreover, that there are many properties that, although present in a majority of a kind, nevertheless cannot be predicated truthfully of that kind (e.g., more than 50% of books are paperbacks but “Books are paperbacks” is false). Thus, acceptance of a generic sentence is doubly dissociated from the prevalence of the property it refers to—not only can true generics refer to low-prevalence properties, but high-prevalence properties are also not guaranteed to be true in generic form.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Pragmatics outweigh – Framers intended ground not definitional excellence and when debaters do prep they consider circuit norms not semantic trash – their terminal impact is predictability which pragmatics accomplish better and o/w

#### B] Jurisdiction is nonsense -- judges vote for non-T affs

#### 2] Clash – overlimiting discourages in depth research because the unifying aff ground is only surface level and one aff for 2 months produces stale debates

#### 3] Aff ground – PICs cause the same debates but in reverse which is net worse since it’s more late-breaking, the 1AR is time crunched and there’s no universal advantage

#### 4] No limits offense – affs need a solvency advocate and robust literature or else they lose to generics like the Innovation DA and the distribution CP.

#### 5] Use reasonability with the bright-line of in-round engagement – key to deter frivolous theory – evaluate neg offense versus the inherent substance DA to voting off T. Intervention is inevitable so intervene for substance

### T A

#### **Semantics are racist---voting issue for deterrence and its key to punish racism as a judge.**

Niemi 15 Rebar. “Nebel T: I sip it.” Premier Debate. September 22, 2015.

Correctness is racism. Correctness is “you must be either a boy or a girl or you are wrong.” Correctness is “the ideal functioning body versus all others.” Correctness is one kind of person having access to The Truth and others lacking it. Correctness is “sit down and shut up.” Correctness is “your kind aren’t welcome here.” Any debater who runs so called “Nebel T” and any judge who votes for this argument must acknowledge that they are situationally and strategically embracing a perspective from which there is an implicit or explicit metric of what it means to be a competent english speaker. What is the logical conclusion of speaking competent english? The notion that “mongrel” forms of english are inferior, diminished, unpersuasive, and should not have access to the ballot. Quite possibly the notion that those who can’t live up to these standards should not be involved in debate. After all, their dialects are not what resolutions are written in---it is people like Mr. Nebel whose dialect prescribes correct resolutional meaning.

#### Counter-interp: Indefinite articles such as “a” refer to particular members of a group.

**EF (EF, EF Education First is a company that teaches languages, No Date, accessed on 10-8-2021, *Resources for learning English*, "Indefinite Articles", https://www.ef.co.uk/english-resources/english-grammar/indefinite-articles/) //D.Ying**

In English, the two indefinite articles are a and an. Like other articles, indefinite articles are invariable. You use one or the other, depending on the first letter of the word following the article, for pronunciation reasons. Use a when the next word starts with a consonant, or before words starting in u and eu when they sound like you. Use an when the next word starts with a vowel (a,e,i,o,u) or with a mute h. Examples • a boy • an apple • a car • a helicopter • an elephant • a big elephant • an itchy sweater • an ugly duck • a european • a university • a unit • an hour • an honor The indefinite article is used to refer to something for the first time or to refer to a particular member of a group or class. Some use cases and examples are given below.

#### Extend the gorsuch ev from the AC – they didn’t answer prefer common usage or that a as a singular noun is the single common usage – even thought they read ev that a can mean a general nonspecific, we have to prefer common usage since we are

1. Policymakers. Gorsuch says that using common usage of words is beneficial
2. Common people. We aren’t semantic experts, and it’s our job to interpret the resolution in the most accessible way that we can.

#### We defend the whole resolution – just specify which country we choose. Otherwise, negating is impossible because I read generic ev and shift to a single country in the ar which kills neg offense. My specificy makes it easier to negate since I have to choose a single country, it’s better for you to know than not

#### 1] Ground- There is only 1 type of policy affirmative under their interp which kills all depth and clash and creates an irreciprocal prep burden because the negative gets generics and specifics while we only get one position.

#### 2] Defending whole rez means negs are structurally incentivized to Pic out of affs which make specification inevitable and worse because it creates late breaking debates and steals most of the aff. Turns limit since we have to prep every pic.

#### 3] Functional limits – solvency advocate proves point of controversy in literature and massively limits the number of advocacies and along with disclosure means you can reasonably prepare.

#### 1] Pragmatics first - The terminal impact of their semantics voter is based on a pragmatics.

#### 2] Wiki controls internal link to pre round prep because people write case negs based on the wiki not solely the rez.

#### 3] Reciprocal engagement – we can’t rely on lay topic committees to create better debates – picking an aff that’s better for topic lit or reciprocal engagement incentivizes deep research and allows leveraging affs vs Disads.

#### 1] TVA: Cross apply pics, and that there is only one aff under their TVA

#### 2] Pigeonholing us into one aff is worse

### T just

#### c/i: We don’t have to support a just government, we solely have to say that the “just” thing to do, which ensures the most justice, or good

#### I meet – we aren’t supporting Brazil do it, we are saying if Brazil were to suddenly be just, then it ought to recognize an uncondo right to strike

#### Brazil is unjust because of bolsonaro – the aff solves their offense

#### Bolsonaro biggest source of brazil’s injustness

Phillips 10-20-21

Tom Phillips, 10-20-2021, "Bolsonaro should be charged with crimes against humanity, Covid inquiry finds," [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/20/jair-bolsonaro-crimes-against-humanity-inquiry //](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/20/jair-bolsonaro-crimes-against-humanity-inquiry%20//) HW AW

[Jair Bolsonaro](https://www.theguardian.com/world/jair-bolsonaro) should be charged with crimes against humanity and jailed for his “macabre” reaction to a Covid outbreak that has killed more than 600,000 Brazilians, including a disproportionate number of indigenous citizens, a congressional inquiry has found. Two of [the most dramatic accusations against the Brazilian president](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/19/bolsonaro-coronavirus-brazil-murder-charges-senate-report) – murder and genocide of the country’s indigenous populations – were removed from a previous draft of the report on Tuesday night after talks between opposition senators serving on the inquiry. But the final draft suggests the committee will recommend Brazil’s populist president be charged with nine separate offenses including charlatanism, incitement to commit crimes, the propagation of pathogenic germs, and crimes against humanity. The investigation, which Bolsonaro’s political rivals hope will wreck his chances of re-election, [was set up in April](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response) and is scheduled to conclude next Tuesday when senators vote on its final report. That 1,180-page document – which savages the Bolsonaro administration’s anti-scientific and “slovenly” pandemic response – will make profoundly uncomfortable reading for Brazil’s far-right leader and dozens of allies, against whom charges are also recommended. “[We must] never forget what happened in this country or the innocent people who lost their lives as a result of the government’s reckless handling of the pandemic,” says the final draft of the report, seen by the Guardian on Wednesday. “The president committed many crimes and he will pay for them,” the inquiry’s president, Senator Omar Aziz, told a hearing in the capital, Brasília, on Wednesday before the document’s official presentation. Senator Randolfe Rodrigues, the inquiry’s vice-president, told reporters the alleged crimes meant Bolsonaro’s future should lie behind bars. “The report assigns more than 100 years in prison to the president of the republic. That is what the collection of suggested crimes points to,” Rodrigues said. The accusation of crimes against humanity – which the report says will be referred to the international criminal court in The Hague – relates to what the report calls the Bolsonaro administration’s “deliberate neglect” of indigenous people as Covid tore across the South American country and into their supposedly protected territories. “The federal government found in the virus an ally to strike the indigenous,” the document claims, highlighting Bolsonaro’s [well-documented hostility](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/26/bolsonaro-amazon-tribes-indigenous-brazil-dictatorship) to the original inhabitants of the lands that became Brazil after Portuguese colonizers arrived in 1500. “There is a clear causal link between the anti-indigenous posture of [Brazil’s] top leader and the harm suffered by indigenous people, even if he might not have directly killed anyone,” the report alleges. “Even before the pandemic, President [Jair Bolsonaro](https://www.theguardian.com/world/jair-bolsonaro) commanded an anti-indigenous policy that deliberately exposed native peoples to a lack of assistance, harassment, land invasions and violence, with these acts of outright hostility intensifying … after the arrival of the virus.” “By allowing the virus to proceed … he caused death and suffering remotely. The constant harassment and deliberate neglect, combined with the pandemic, were worse than weapons.” The report is also scathing about Bolsonaro’s broader pandemic response, including what it calls his calculated bid to achieve herd immunity by allowing Covid’s uncontrolled spread, and attempts to undermine vaccination and containment measures such as face masks and social distancing. “The consequences of this macabre strategy were measured by science,” the report says. “Had non-pharmaceutical interventions been systematically implemented, transmission rates could have been reduced by about 40%, which means 120,000 lives could have been saved by the end of March 2021.” The government’s most serious failing was the “unjustifiable and intentional delay” in negotiating the purchase of Covid vaccines with companies such as Pfizer, whose approaches were repeatedly ignored. “Brazil could have been the first country in the world to start vaccination, together with the UK … this mistaken strategy cost the country dearly,” the report says. Speaking at an event in north-east Brazil, Bolsonaro attacked the Covid inquiry, claiming it had “produced nothing but hatred and resentment”. “We know that we bear absolutely no guilt. We know we did the right thing from the very start,” Bolsonaro said, as supporters shouted insults at the report’s author, Senator Renan Calheiros, who they called a “bum”. Experts say Bolsonaro is unlikely to be prosecuted or impeached in the short-term. The most likely impact will be on his ability to win a second term in next year’s election. Deisy Ventura, a professor from the University of São Paulo’s public health faculty, said that whatever Bolsonaro’s immediate political future, the report was hugely significant because it recognised that the push for herd immunity through infection had been a deliberate strategy. “Even among those who don’t support the president … there was this very strong belief that [this happened] because the president is mad, or the government is really incompetent … when this was actually all intentional,” said Ventura, whose research was cited by the inquiry. Ventura added: “If this isn’t recognized as a crime, as something that needs punishing, then the risk is that this could become natural. The biggest fear those of us who study pandemics have is that the use of the herd immunity through infection strategy might be legitimized as a response to other epidemics.” The president is not the only member of the Bolsonaro clan cited in the Covid report, which is expected to be approved by senators next Tuesday. Three of his politician sons – Carlos, Eduardo and Flávio Bolsonaro – are denounced over their alleged role in [commanding a fake news network](https://oglobo.globo.com/politica/cpi-da-covidfilhosde-bolsonaro-comandaram-rede-de-fake-news-na-pandemia-aponta-relatorio-final-25243495) that flooded social media with disinformation about the pandemic.

**Rejet the T shell for racism - Ideal Theory is anti-Black – the 1NC’s abstraction from the material consequences of racialized violence absolves white philosophers of their contributions to America’s apathy towards Black death – their race-neutral rhetoric and assertion of universal humanistic principles reduces systemic racism to a problem of recognition that prevents effective mobilization against white supremacy – vote negative to reject the Western metaphysical tradition and recognize the permanent failure of white philosophy.**

Tommy J. **Curry and Curry 18** [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244

We begin with the first author’s reflections on philosophy and its recurring problem of denying the realities of race and racism, reflections that have arisen as a Black (male) philosopher whose life has been threatened for doing Black philosophy. The experience of confronting death, being fearful of being killed doing my job as a critical race theorist, and being threatened with violence for thinking about racism in America has a profound effect on concretizing what is at stake in our theories about anti-Black racism. Whereas my work on race and racism in philosophy earlier in my career was dedicated to the problems created by the mass ignorance of the discipline to the political debates and ethnological history of Black philosophers in the 19th and 20th centuries, I now find myself thinking more seriously about the way that **philosophy**, really theory itself—our present categories of knowledge, such as race, class, and gender, found through disciplines—actually **hastens the deaths of subjugated peoples in the U**nited **S**tates. **Academic philosophy routinely abstracts away from**—directs thought to not attend to the realities of death, dying, and despair created by—**antiBlack racism. Black, Brown, and Indigenous populations are routinely rationalized as disposable flesh. The deaths of these groups launch philosophical discussions** of social injustice and spark awareness by whites, **while the deaths of white people direct policy and demand outrage. Because racialized bodies are confined to inhumane living conditions that nurture violence** and despair **that become attributed to the savage nature of nonwhites and evidence of their inhumanity, the deaths of these** **dehumanized peoples are** often **measured against the dangers they are thought to pose to others**.

**The interpretation of the inferior position that racialized groups occupy in the U**nited **S**tates **is grounded in how whites often think of themselves in relation to problem populations. This relationship is** often **rationalized by avoidance and by** the **denials** of whites **about being causally related to the harsh conditions imposed on nonwhites in the world. Philosophy, and its glorification of the rational individual, ignores the complexity of anti-Black racism by blaming the complacency**, if not outright hostility, **towards Blacks on the mass ignorance of white America**. To remedy this problem, Black philosophers are asked to respond by gearing their writings, lectures, and professional presence to further educate and dialogue with white philosophers in order to enable them to better understand anti-Black racism and white supremacy (Curry 2008, 2015). This therapy is often rewarded as scholarship. **Philosophical positions that analyze racism as a problem of miscommunication, misunderstanding, and ignorance** (philosophies predicated on the capacity of whites to change) **are rewarded and praised as the cutting edge and most impactful theories about race and racism. Reducing racism to a problem of recognition** and understanding **allows white philosophers to remain absolved of their contribution to the apathy that white America has to the death** and subjugation **Black Americans endure** at the hands of the white race.

To some readers, speaking about races as different groups with opposite, if not antagonistic, social lives seems to run contrary to the idea that there are no real races, just people, only the human race. This is the core of **race-neutral theory** in academic philosophy. Race neutrality **asserts that while race, class, and gender may** in fact **differentiate bodies, the capacity for reason—the human essence beneath it all—is what is ultimately at stake in the recognition of difference**. While **this mantra** has been offered to whites since the integrationist strategies of the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1950s under Chief Justice Earl Warren, it **has had little effect in restructuring the psychology of white individuals or remedying** the **institutional** practices of **racism that continue to exclude** or punish **Black Americans**. How are Black scholars to speak about racism, specifically the violence and death that seem to gravitate towards Black bodies if the rules of philosophy and the fragility of white Americans insist that racism is not the cause of the disproportionate death Black Americans suffer and race is not a significant factor in Black people’s lives?

This article is an attempt to debunk the seemingly neutral starting point of academic philosophy. **For decades, Black philosophers have attempted to** educate white philosophers and **reorient the philosophical anthropologies of the discipline. Black, Brown, and Indigenous philosophers have dedicated their lives** and careers **to educating white philosophers** and students, **with little to no effect on the composition** and disposition **of the discipline**. While it is not uncommon for philosophy departments to say they support diversity, the reality is that many, if not most, Black philosophers continue to write about the problem of racism, their experiences of marginalization, and the violence they suffer from white colleagues, disciplinary organizations, and universities. **This article should be read as an attempt not to amend the Western metaphysical tradition but to reveal the obstacles that indicate its perennial failure**. It is the position of the authors that many of the demands for disciplinary change are often expressed as politics, when in reality **there are issues of metaphysics** (the concerns of being) **and philosophical anthropology** (the concerns about the (non)being capable of thinking) **that are unaddressed in much of the current literature**. Section I of this article describes what Black philosophy has taken to be the problem of racism in academic philosophy more broadly. Since the 1970s Black philosophers have criticized, attacked, and attempted to reform the discipline with little effect. This section interrogates why that is the case. Section II argues that the failure of philosophy to change is a problem of metaphysics or the illusion that Blackness is compatible with the idea of the white human. Section III presents the social scientific evidence demonstrating the seeming permanence of anti-Black racism and the dangerous nature of colorblind ideology, which does not recognize that societal organization and racism determine the life chances of Blacks. This article ends with a suggestion of what Black philosophy would look like if its primary mandate were not to persuade whites to remedy their own racist practices, but to diagnose and build strategies against the present problems of racism in philosophy before us.

#### Even if we violate their interp don’t vote on T – we don’t hurt any of their standards

#### Stasis point – we literally affirm the resolution we aren’t deviating from it and governments being just or not is not a significant part of the literature – every DA or CP or K still applies, the justness of the government has nothing to do with acutal neg ground

#### Prefer pragmatics over semantics – we give whatever offense you want even if we’re not semantically correct – don’t conflate your interpretation with nebel, your ideal topic vision is not whole res so don’t give them offense on this

### Impeachment CP

#### Perm do both – solves the entire aff when we get the rest of the aff to do inequality which turns their net benefit

#### Doesn’t solve inequality advantage – the rc of inequality is lack of strikes

#### No solvency on inequality means they can’t solve for populism – lingis says that more right wing populists are otw and trump proves and they can’t solve the root cause which is inequality which means they don’t solve the regular advantage anyway

#### hardcore extend the inequality advantage throughout the flow – brazil’s rise and integration into the international economy solves for nuke war, poverty and climate in ways that impeachment has not and the only way to ensure that is through minimizing income inequality through the revitalization of the r2s

#### inequality breeds internal conflict which even the best replacement politician can’t stop – brazilian infighting and civil war is inevitable because of divides along class lines

### Setcol

#### Bolsonaro perpetuates colonialism – we get offense under their ROB

Phillips 10-20-21

Tom Phillips, 10-20-2021, "Bolsonaro should be charged with crimes against humanity, Covid inquiry finds," [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/20/jair-bolsonaro-crimes-against-humanity-inquiry //](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/20/jair-bolsonaro-crimes-against-humanity-inquiry%20//) HW AW

[Jair Bolsonaro](https://www.theguardian.com/world/jair-bolsonaro) should be charged with crimes against humanity and jailed for his “macabre” reaction to a Covid outbreak that has killed more than 600,000 Brazilians, including a disproportionate number of indigenous citizens, a congressional inquiry has found. Two of [the most dramatic accusations against the Brazilian president](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/oct/19/bolsonaro-coronavirus-brazil-murder-charges-senate-report) – murder and genocide of the country’s indigenous populations – were removed from a previous draft of the report on Tuesday night after talks between opposition senators serving on the inquiry. But the final draft suggests the committee will recommend Brazil’s populist president be charged with nine separate offenses including charlatanism, incitement to commit crimes, the propagation of pathogenic germs, and crimes against humanity. The investigation, which Bolsonaro’s political rivals hope will wreck his chances of re-election, [was set up in April](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/27/brazil-begins-parliamentary-inquiry-into-bolsonaros-covid-response) and is scheduled to conclude next Tuesday when senators vote on its final report. That 1,180-page document – which savages the Bolsonaro administration’s anti-scientific and “slovenly” pandemic response – will make profoundly uncomfortable reading for Brazil’s far-right leader and dozens of allies, against whom charges are also recommended. “[We must] never forget what happened in this country or the innocent people who lost their lives as a result of the government’s reckless handling of the pandemic,” says the final draft of the report, seen by the Guardian on Wednesday. “The president committed many crimes and he will pay for them,” the inquiry’s president, Senator Omar Aziz, told a hearing in the capital, Brasília, on Wednesday before the document’s official presentation. Senator Randolfe Rodrigues, the inquiry’s vice-president, told reporters the alleged crimes meant Bolsonaro’s future should lie behind bars. “The report assigns more than 100 years in prison to the president of the republic. That is what the collection of suggested crimes points to,” Rodrigues said. The accusation of crimes against humanity – which the report says will be referred to the international criminal court in The Hague – relates to what the report calls the Bolsonaro administration’s “deliberate neglect” of indigenous people as Covid tore across the South American country and into their supposedly protected territories. “The federal government found in the virus an ally to strike the indigenous,” the document claims, highlighting Bolsonaro’s [well-documented hostility](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jul/26/bolsonaro-amazon-tribes-indigenous-brazil-dictatorship) to the original inhabitants of the lands that became Brazil after Portuguese colonizers arrived in 1500. “There is a clear causal link between the anti-indigenous posture of [Brazil’s] top leader and the harm suffered by indigenous people, even if he might not have directly killed anyone,” the report alleges. “Even before the pandemic, President [Jair Bolsonaro](https://www.theguardian.com/world/jair-bolsonaro) commanded an anti-indigenous policy that deliberately exposed native peoples to a lack of assistance, harassment, land invasions and violence, with these acts of outright hostility intensifying … after the arrival of the virus.” “By allowing the virus to proceed … he caused death and suffering remotely. The constant harassment and deliberate neglect, combined with the pandemic, were worse than weapons.” The report is also scathing about Bolsonaro’s broader pandemic response, including what it calls his calculated bid to achieve herd immunity by allowing Covid’s uncontrolled spread, and attempts to undermine vaccination and containment measures such as face masks and social distancing. “The consequences of this macabre strategy were measured by science,” the report says. “Had non-pharmaceutical interventions been systematically implemented, transmission rates could have been reduced by about 40%, which means 120,000 lives could have been saved by the end of March 2021.” The government’s most serious failing was the “unjustifiable and intentional delay” in negotiating the purchase of Covid vaccines with companies such as Pfizer, whose approaches were repeatedly ignored. “Brazil could have been the first country in the world to start vaccination, together with the UK … this mistaken strategy cost the country dearly,” the report says. Speaking at an event in north-east Brazil, Bolsonaro attacked the Covid inquiry, claiming it had “produced nothing but hatred and resentment”. “We know that we bear absolutely no guilt. We know we did the right thing from the very start,” Bolsonaro said, as supporters shouted insults at the report’s author, Senator Renan Calheiros, who they called a “bum”. Experts say Bolsonaro is unlikely to be prosecuted or impeached in the short-term. The most likely impact will be on his ability to win a second term in next year’s election. Deisy Ventura, a professor from the University of São Paulo’s public health faculty, said that whatever Bolsonaro’s immediate political future, the report was hugely significant because it recognised that the push for herd immunity through infection had been a deliberate strategy. “Even among those who don’t support the president … there was this very strong belief that [this happened] because the president is mad, or the government is really incompetent … when this was actually all intentional,” said Ventura, whose research was cited by the inquiry. Ventura added: “If this isn’t recognized as a crime, as something that needs punishing, then the risk is that this could become natural. The biggest fear those of us who study pandemics have is that the use of the herd immunity through infection strategy might be legitimized as a response to other epidemics.” The president is not the only member of the Bolsonaro clan cited in the Covid report, which is expected to be approved by senators next Tuesday. Three of his politician sons – Carlos, Eduardo and Flávio Bolsonaro – are denounced over their alleged role in [commanding a fake news network](https://oglobo.globo.com/politica/cpi-da-covidfilhosde-bolsonaro-comandaram-rede-de-fake-news-na-pandemia-aponta-relatorio-final-25243495) that flooded social media with disinformation about the pandemic.

### poverty

#### Bolsonaro’s bad economy exacerbates poverty

Richards 4-19-21

Peter Richards, 4-19-2021, "Brazil’s economic crisis, prolonged by COVID-19, poses an enormous challenge to the Amazon," Conversation, https://theconversation.com/brazils-economic-crisis-prolonged-by-covid-19-poses-an-enormous-challenge-to-the-amazon-157556, // HW AW

Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro [confirmed his country’s participation in a virtual climate summit](https://www.cnn.com/2021/04/15/americas/bolsonaro-biden-amazon-deforestation-intl/index.html) convened by the U.S. for April 22 and 23, vowing in a recent letter to U.S. President Joe Biden to end illegal deforestation in Brazil by 2030 – a striking about-face from a longtime adversary to the country’s environmental policies. But Bolsonaro warned that Brazil will need “massive resources”, including considerable financial help, to protect the Amazon. Brazil is currently in the midst [of a deadly wave of the COVID-19 pandemic](https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2021/03/23/980391847/brazil-is-looking-like-the-worst-place-on-earth-for-covid-19), and its economy [shrunk by a record 5.8%](https://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/NGDP_RPCH@WEO/BRA?year=2021) last year. The Biden administration, meanwhile, is considering paying [Brazil to protect its environment](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/11/negotiating-with-your-worst-enemy-biden-in-risky-talks-to-pay-brazil-to-save-amazon). But not so long ago, both Brazil’s economy and its Amazon were prospering. In 2014, Brazil was closing out nearly a decade of continuous [economic growth](https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/NAEXKP01BRQ657S). [Per capita GDP](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=BR) – the total value of the economy divided among the population – had grown by 400% in just 10 years and economic inequality was falling to record lows in a country that long had the world’s largest gap between rich and poor. Between 2004 and 2014, some 35 million Brazilians [joined the ranks of the middle class](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2014/apr/17/brazil-role-model-development-africa). Help experts spread facts Give today As Brazil’s economy thrived, [deforestation in the Amazon](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/344/6188/1118.abstract) slowed. Deforestation levels in 2012 were [one-sixth of what they were in 2004](http://www.obt.inpe.br/OBT/assuntos/programas/amazonia/prodes). Back then, falling deforestation rates were hailed as a testament to the [country’s prowess](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1248525) in environmental policymaking. But after nearly a decade of [researching and writing about Amazon forest loss](https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=M3iEyN0AAAAJ), I’ve become convinced that Brazil’s successes in reducing deforestation a decade earlier likely had just as much to do with basic economics as environmental policy. Rise and fall of deforestation Forest loss in the Amazon has long reflected Brazil’s economic health. For much of the late 20th century, when Brazil’s economy boomed, the federal government redirected public investment to the Amazon. Many of these investments – [the massive land distribution programs of the 1980s](https://news.mongabay.com/2012/01/colonization-program-remains-important-driver-of-deforestation-in-brazil/), [road projects](https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422ASOC256V1922016) and the enormous public subsidies for farming and ranching – were closely associated with forest loss. So, in the 20th century, when Brazil’s economy boomed, deforestation often followed. Today, however, forest loss in Brazil’s Amazon tends to be more closely associated with international demand for commodities like soybeans, beef and gold than with government investments. And for farmers, prices for these commodities don’t just rise and fall with global demand. They also rise and fall inversely to Brazil’s economic health. The underlying [economic reasons for this connection are complicated](https://theconversation.com/brazils-thriving-soy-industry-threatens-its-forests-and-global-climate-targets-56973). But in short, it has to do with how the value of Brazil’s currency, the real, affects farmers who grow animals or crops for export. Of currencies and commodities That’s because, historically, when Brazil’s economy struggles, its currency loses value against the U.S. dollar – the currency of international markets. About 20% of Brazil’s beef and more than 80% of its soybeans are exported. For Brazilian farmers and ranchers who contribute to these export markets – including many who live or operate in the Amazon region – a struggling domestic economy and weak currency is actually a plus. It means that when foreign buyers purchase Brazilian exports in dollars, Brazilian farmers are being paid more in their local currency. This gives them more money – money that can potentially be used for [purchasing and clearing forested land](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aace8e/meta). A lucrative export market is also a compelling reason to start purchasing and clearing new land. Conversely, when the economy is strong, so is the Brazilian real. For Amazonian farmers in Brazil, that means less money earned, less to invest in clearing forests and less incentive to clear new land. A decade ago, when [Brazil’s economy was working well](https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/NAEXKP01BRQ657S) and the real [was particularly strong](https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/DEXBZUS), economic growth, nationally, was putting a brake on deforestation by [suppressing farmers’ and ranchers’ profits](https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2021.613313). Economic crises are environmental crises The economic brakes that once guarded against Amazon deforestation have come off. In 2015 [Brazil entered a severe recession](https://theconversation.com/how-did-brazil-go-from-rising-bric-to-sinking-ship-57029). Now in its sixth consecutive year of slow or even negative economic growth, the Brazilian economy remains beset by [lower global commodity prices](https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/eb201601_focus01.en.pdf) and a [rising deficit](https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/GGGDTABRA188N). Poverty is rising. Per capita GDP today is now about US$1,000 less per person than [it was a decade ago](https://tradingeconomics.com/brazil/gdp-per-capita). Meanwhile, Brazil is one of the countries worst hit by COVID-19, with [4,000 people dying on its worst days](https://www.npr.org/sections/coronavirus-live-updates/2021/04/07/984991377/brazil-tops-4-000-daily-covid-19-deaths-nears-u-s-peak). The pandemic is prolonged and exacerbating the country’s economic crisis. Today, valued at about 18 U.S. cents, the real sits [at a record low](https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/DEXBZUS). The last time the real was this low was in 2003 – another year, not coincidentally, that deforestation in the Amazon surged. The weak Brazilian currency has pushed prices for [soybeans](https://www.cepea.esalq.usp.br/br/indicador/soja.aspx), [beef](https://www.cepea.esalq.usp.br/br/indicador/boi-gordo.aspx) and [gold](https://goldprice.org/gold-price-brazil.html) to heights which, 10 years ago, would have astounded. Soybean prices are five times higher than they were 15 years ago. Beef and gold prices are more than triple. For the farmers, ranchers and prospectors who work in the Amazon or at its periphery, these are very profitable times. Last year, deforestation in the Amazon reached [its highest level](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41559-020-01368-x) in over a decade. Unless something changes, I expect more land-clearing forest fires this July and August, when the Amazon’s dry season reaches its apex. To end deforestation, fix Brazil’s economy In today’s globalized economic system, the fates of Brazil’s economy and the Amazon forest are linked. Brazil’s current economic crisis rewards the Amazon’s ranchers, [gold prospectors](https://www.sapiens.org/culture/amazon-gold-mining/) and farmers with higher profits, creating serious financial incentives to clear more land. By some estimates, such fires in Brazil account for [70% of the country’s total greenhouse gas emissions](https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/10333_Measuring_Carbon_Emissions_from_Tropical_Deforestation--An_Overview.pdf). [Over 100,000 readers rely on The Conversation’s newsletter to understand the world. [Sign up today](https://theconversation.com/us/newsletters/the-daily-3?utm_source=TCUS&utm_medium=inline-link&utm_campaign=newsletter-text&utm_content=100Ksignup).] The global debate about how to best protect the Amazon has largely focused on concerns over the [state of Brazilian environmental policy](https://theconversation.com/amazon-deforestation-already-rising-may-spike-under-bolsonaro-109940) under President Bolsonaro. My research suggests the need to strengthen Brazil’s economy should be a critical part of these discussions. When Brazil’s economy struggles, its farmers and ranchers will reap – and the Amazon will suffer.