## K

#### Haack 21’s union-focused politics privatizes worker struggle – it channels it towards specific employers rather than class domination as a whole while ensuring the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by privileging alternative modes of settlement outside and in spite of the specifics of the law itself.

Feldman, 94

[George, Assistant Prof. @ Wayne State Law: “Unions, Solidarity, and Class: The Limits of Liberal Labor Law,” Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, Volume 15, No. 2, 1994. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/berkjemp15&div=14&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=&collection=journals#]//AD

In other ways, however, the liberal vision of labor law that Justice Brennan exemplified has been severely limited. 19 One obvious limitation, for instance, has been the Court's preference for arbitration.20 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 20. The Court's tendency to privilege arbitration has led it to impose legal limitations on the right to strike that are unsupported by the language, policy, or history of the labor laws. See Boys Mkts., Inc. v. Retail Clerks Union, Local 770, 398 U.S. 235 (1970); Gateway Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers of Am., 414 U.S. 368 (1974), discussed infra at part III.C. For criticism of the Court's weakening of the right to strike, see Matthew W. Finkin, Labor Policy and the Enervation of the Economic Strike, 1990 U. ILL. L. REV. 547, 548-49; JAMES B. ATLESON, VALUES & AssuMiPTIONS IN AMERICAN LABOR LAW \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 ENDS HERE\*\*\* (1983). Yet a different kind of limit also has been present in the labor jurisprudence of the Court's liberal wing-a limit that is less obvious, usually has less immediate impact, but that is perhaps more deeply seated. The Court's privileging of arbitration restricts the means by which unions legally may act in response to concerns that are concededly legitimate. The limits discussed here, by contrast, define the legitimate boundaries of collective actions and collective concerns. The cases discussed here reflect the liberal doctrine that labor law protects unions only insofar as they limit their role to that of representative of the employees of an individual employer, and that the law will resist any union attempt to move beyond this limitation. That doctrine rejects protection when the underlying issue implicates the proper role of unions in American society. That question emerges in a variety of contexts. In some, a broad definition of unions' societal function may require, or may seem to require, limiting individual rights;21 in others, the Court's conclusion, or something very similar to it, is so clearly required by statute that the conclusion cannot be ascribed to the conscious or unconscious ideological views of the Justices.22 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 21. When such a conflict is actually present, the proper place to draw the line is fairly subject to debate; a judge determined to protect both strong unions and individual employee rights might resolve apparent conflicts between the two in different ways without forfeiting a claim of taking each seriously. See infra notes 237-41; cf Emporium Capwell Co. v. Western Addition Community Org., 420 U.S. 50 (1975). \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 ENDS HERE\*\*\* At other times, however, liberal members of the Court have narrowed the range of permissible union concerns and therefore of unions' social role in contexts in which the law would have allowed a broader understanding, and in which the danger of conflict with individual rights was either absent or too attenuated to serve as a reasonable justification. In some cases this desire to narrow the sphere of union activity is central to the Court's reasoning; in others, it is a subsidiary theme, or is present only as an underlying assumption, unstated and perhaps unconscious, whose presence helps account for the result reached. This article examines what the members of the Supreme Court who have been identified with its liberal wing have said explicitly or by necessary implication about what is the legitimate sphere of union activity in American life. This vision of the role that unions should play in society has both practical and ideological consequences. Modern labor law, faithful to the Wagner Act's premises, aims to particularize rather than generalize workers' struggles; it directs them towards their specific relationship to their employer, rather than to the larger relationship of their class to employers and to work; it privatizes and depoliticizes those struggles.23 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 23. It is in this sense that I think the frequently voiced point of authors associated with the Critical Legal Studies movement is correct. It is not that workers' struggles are channeled to arbitration rather than to a public body like the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), see Katherine Van Wezel Stone, The Post-War Paradigm in American Labor Law, 90 YALE L.J. 1509 (1981). but rather that whatever method workers employ-even including a strike or other collective job actions-the locus of the struggle remains the particular workplace or employer. It is in this sense that workers' struggles are channeled away from "political" dimensions. \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 ENDS HERE\*\*\* Given the contextual limitations mentioned, this analysis necessarily must be cautious. It must take account of the constraints of statutory language and congressional intent and, where applicable, of judicial deference to the decisions of the NLRB. 24 This analysis also must recognize the presence of other policy or ideological considerations that are unrelated to the theme of limiting the breadth of union concerns. Nonetheless, this theme is demonstrably present in a wide variety of legal settings, transecting the doctrinal categorizations that abound in labor law.

#### Class consciousness enables the revolution
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This was precisely the purpose of Marx’s political activities: he sought to generate class consciousness—an awareness on the part of the working class of its common relationship to the means of production and common source of the workers’ oppressive conditions. Marx believed that this awareness was a vital key for sparking a revolution that would create a “dictatorship of the proletariat,” transforming it from a wage-earning, propertyless mass into the ruling class. Unlike all previous class-based revolutions, however, this one would be fought in the interests of the vast majority of the population and not for the benefit of a few, because the particular class interests of the proletariat had come to represent the universal interests of humanity. The epoch of capitalism was a necessary stage in this evolution—and the last historical period rooted in competitive class conflict (see Figure 2.2). Capitalism, with its unleashing of immense economic productivity, had created the capital and technology needed to sustain a communist society—the final stage of history —capable of providing for the needs of all of its inhabitants

#### Attempting to save the chinese economy from disaster as in roberts 10 is a neoliberal excuse for intervention, reshaping the world for capitalist production. Neocleous 08

Neocleous 8 – Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, 2008 Critique of Security, p.101-105

In other words, the new international order moved very quickly to reassert the connection between economic and national security: the commitment to the former was simultaneously a commitment to the latter, and vice versa. As the doctrine of national security was being born, the major player on the international stage would aim to use perhaps its most important power of all – its economic strength – in order to re-order the world. And this re-ordering was conducted through the idea of ‘economic security’.99 Despite the fact that ‘economic security’ would never be formally deﬁned beyond ‘economic order’ or ‘economic well-being’,100 the signiﬁcant conceptual consistency between economic security and liberal order-building also had a strategic ideological role. By playing on notions of ‘economic well-being’, economic security seemed to emphasise economic and thus ‘human’ needs over military ones. The reshaping of global capital, international order and the exercise of state power could thus look decidedly liberal and ‘humanitarian’. This appearance helped co-opt the liberal Left into the process and, of course, played on individual desire for personal security by using notions such as ‘personal freedom’ and ‘social equality’.101 Marx and Engels once highlighted the historical role of the bourgeoisie in shaping the world according to its own interests. The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere . . . It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them . . . to become bourgeois in themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.102 In the second half of the twentieth century this ability to ‘batter down all Chinese walls’ would still rest heavily on the logic of capital, but would also come about in part under the guise of security. The whole world became a garden to be cultivated – to be recast according to the logic of security. In the space of ﬁfteen years the concept ‘economic security’ had moved from connoting insurance policies for working people to the desire to shape the world in a capitalist fashion – and back again. In fact, it has constantly shifted between these registers ever since, being used for the constant reshaping of world order and resulting in a comprehensive level of intervention and policing all over the globe. Global order has come to be fabricated and administered according to a security doctrine underpinned by the logic of capital accumulation and a bourgeois conception of order. By incorporating within it a particular vision of economic order, the concept of national security implies the interrelatedness of so many different social, econ omic, political and military factors that more or less any development anywhere can be said to impact on liberal order in general and America’s core interests in particular. Not only could bourgeois Europe be recast around the regime of capital, but so too could the whole international order as capital not only nestled, settled and established connections, but also ‘secured’ everywhere. Security politics thereby became the basis of a distinctly liberal philosophy of global ‘intervention’, fusing global issues of economic management with domestic policy formations in an ambitious and frequently violent strategy. Here lies the Janus-faced character of American foreign policy.103 One face is the ‘good liberal cop’: friendly, prosperous and democratic, sending money and help around the globe when problems emerge, so that the world’s nations are shown how they can alleviate their misery and perhaps even enjoy some prosperity. The other face is the ‘bad liberal cop’: should one of these nations decide, either through parliamentary procedure, demands for self-determination or violent revolution to address its own social problems in ways that conﬂict with the interests of capital and the bourgeois concept of liberty, then the authoritarian dimension of liberalism shows its face; the ‘liberal moment’ becomes the moment of violence. This Janus-faced character has meant that through the mandate of security the US, as the national security state par excellence, has seen ﬁt to either overtly or covertly re-order the affairs of myriads of nations – those ‘rogue’ or ‘outlaw’ states on the ‘wrong side of history’.104 ‘Extrapolating the ﬁgures as best we can’, one CIA agent commented in 1991,‘there have been about 3,000 major covert operations and over 10,000 minor operations – all illegal, and all designed to disrupt, destabilize, or modify the activities of other countries’, adding that ‘every covert operation has been rationalized in terms of U.S. national security’.105 These would include ‘interventions’ in Greece, Italy, France, Turkey, Macedonia, the Ukraine, Cambodia, Indonesia, China, Korea, Burma, Vietnam, Thailand, Ecuador, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Bolivia, Grenada, Paraguay, Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Philippines, Honduras, Haiti, Venezuela, Panama, Angola, Ghana, Congo, South Africa, Albania, Lebanon, Grenada, Libya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and many more, and many of these more than once. Next up are the ‘60 or more’ countries identiﬁed as the bases of ‘terror cells’ by Bush in a speech on 1 June 2002.106 The methods used have varied: most popular has been the favoured technique of liberal security – ‘making the economy scream’ via controls, interventions and the imposition of neo-liberal regulations. But a wide range of other techniques have been used: terror bombing; subversion; rigging elections; the use of the CIA’s ‘Health Alteration Committee’ whose mandate was to ‘incapacitate’ foreign ofﬁcials; drug-trafﬁcking;107 and the sponsorship of terror groups, counterinsurgency agencies, death squads. Unsurprisingly, some plain old fascist groups and parties have been co-opted into the project, from the attempt at reviving the remnants of the Nazi collaborationist Vlasov Army for use against the USSR to the use of fascist forces to undermine democratically elected governments, such as in Chile; indeed, one of the reasons fascism ﬂowed into Latin America was because of the ideology of national security.108 Concomitantly, ‘national security’ has meant a policy of non-intervention where satisfactory ‘security partnerships’ could be established with certain authoritarian and military regimes: Spain under Franco, the Greek junta, Chile, Iraq, Iran, Korea, Indonesia, Cambodia, Taiwan, South Vietnam, the Philippines, Turkey, the ﬁve Central Asian republics that emerged with the break-up of the USSR, and China. Either way, the whole world was to be included in the new‘secure’ global liberal order. The result has been the slaughter of untold numbers. John Stock well, who was part of a CIA project in Angola which led to the deaths of over 20,000 people, puts it like this: Coming to grips with these U.S./CIA activities in broad numbers and ﬁguring out how many people have been killed in the jungles of Laos or the hills of Nicaragua is very difﬁcult. But, adding them up as best we can, we come up with a ﬁgure of six million people killed – and this is a minimum ﬁgure. Included are: one million killed in the Korean War, two million killed in the Vietnam War, 800,000 killed in Indonesia, one million in Cambodia, 20,000 killed in Angola – the operation I was part of – and 22,000 killed in Nicaragua.109 Note that the six million is a minimum ﬁgure, that he omits to mention rather a lot of other interventions, and that he was writing in 1991. This is security as the slaughter bench of history. All of this has been more than conﬁrmed by events in the twenty ﬁrst century: in a speech on 1 June 2002, which became the basis of the ofﬁcial National Security Strategy of the United States in September of that year, President Bush reiterated that the US has a unilateral right to overthrow any government in the world, and launched a new round of slaughtering to prove it. While much has been made about the supposedly ‘new’ doctrine of preemption in the early twenty-ﬁrst century, the policy of preemption has a long history as part of national security doctrine. The United States has long maintained the option of pre-emptive actions to counter a sufﬁcient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction – and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves . . . To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act pre emptively.110 In other words, the security policy of the world’s only superpower in its current ‘war on terror’ is still underpinned by a notion of liberal order-building based on a certain vision of ‘economic order’. The National Security Strategy concerns itself with a ‘single sustainable model for national success’ based on ‘political and economic liberty’, with whole sections devoted to the security beneﬁts of ‘economic liberty’, and the beneﬁts to liberty of the security strategy proposed.111 Economic security (that is, ‘capitalist accumulation’) in the guise of ‘national security’ is now used as the justiﬁcation for all kinds of ‘intervention’, still conducted where necessary in alliance with fascists, gangsters and drug cartels, and the proliferation of ‘national security’ type regimes has been the result. So while the national security state was in one sense a structural bi-product of the US’s place in global capitalism, it was also vital to the fabrication of an international order founded on the power of capital. National security, in effect, became the perfect strategic tool for landscaping the human garden.112 This was to also have huge domestic consequences, as the idea of containment would also come to reshape the American social order, helping fabricate a security apparatus intimately bound up with national identity and thus the politics of loyalty.

#### Neoliberalism turns chinese legitmacy in Yamei 18 and military expansion in Cai 18 by creating an environment of misinformation that promotes fascism in the political sphere – the uyghur genocide and controlling policies like the social credit system prove in China and Trump is a key example in America

Giroux, 18 [Distinguished Scholar in Critical Pedagogy, The Politics of Neoliberal Fascism, <https://www.tikkun.org/the-politics-of-neoliberal-fascism>, 8/21/18] -TB

Democracy is the scourge of neoliberalism and its ultimate humiliation. As the ideas, values, and institutions crucial to a democracy have withered under a savage neoliberalism, which has been fifty years in the making, fascistic notions of racial superiority, social cleansing, apocalyptic populism, hyper-militarism, and ultra-nationalism have gained in intensity moving from the repressed recesses of US history to the centers of state and corporate power. [7] Decades of mass inequality, wage slavery, the collapse of the manufacturing sector, tax giveaways to the financial elite, and savage austerity policies that drove a frontal attack on the welfare state have further strengthened fascistic discourses and redirected populist anger against vulnerable populations and undocumented immigrants, Muslims, the racially oppressed, women, LGBTQ people, public servants, critical intellectuals, and workers. Not only has neoliberalism undermined the basic elements of democracy by escalating the mutually reinforcing dynamics of economic inequality and political inequality– accentuating the downhill spiral of social and economic mobility–it has also created conditions that make fascist ideas and principles more attractive. Under these accelerated circumstances, neoliberalism and fascism conjoin and advance in a comfortable and mutually compatible movement that connects the worst excesses of capitalism with authoritarian “strong man” ideals—the veneration of war, a hatred of reason and truth; a celebration of ultra-nationalism and racial purity; the suppression of freedom and dissent; a culture which promotes lies, spectacles, scapegoating the other, a discourse of deterioration, brutal violence, and ultimately erupting in state violence in heterogeneous forms. In the Trump administration, neoliberal fascism is on steroids and represents a fusion of the worse dimensions and excesses of gangster capitalism with the fascist ideals of white nationalism and racial supremacy associated with the horrors of the past.[8] Neoliberal structural transformation has both undermined and refigured “the principles, practices, cultures, subjects and institution of democracy understood as rule by the people.”[9] Since the earlier seventies, the neoliberal project has mutated into a revolt against human rights, democracy, and created a powerful narrative that refigures freedom and authority so as to legitimate and produce massive inequities in wealth and power.[10] Its practices of offshoring, restructuring everything according to the dictates of profit margins, slashing progressive taxation, eliminating corporate regulations, unchecked privatization, and the ongoing commercializing of all social interactions “inflicts alienating misery” on a polity newly vulnerable to fascist ideals, rhetoric, and politically extremist movements.[11] Furthermore, the merging of neoliberalism and fascism has accelerated as civic culture is eroded, notions of shared citizenship and responsibility disappear, and reason and informed judgment are replaced by the forces of civic illiteracy. State sanctioned attacks on the truth, facts, and scientific reason in Trump’s America are camouflaged as one expect of the first Reality TV president– by a corporate controlled culture of vulgarity that merges celebrity culture with a non-stop spectacle of violence. Neoliberalism strips democracy of any substance by promoting an irrational belief in the ability of the market to solve all social problems and shape all aspects of society. This shift from a market economy to a market-driven society has been accompanied by a savage attack on equality, the social contract, and social provisions as wages have been gutted, pensions destroyed, health care put out of reach for millions, job security undermined, and access to crucial public goods such as public and higher education considerably weakened for the lower and middle classes. In the current historical moment, neoliberalism represents more than a form of hyper capitalism, it also denotes the death of democracy if not politics itself. Anis Shivani’s articulation of the threat neoliberalism poses to democracy is worth quoting at length: Neoliberalism believes that markets are self-sufficient unto themselves, that they do not need regulation, and that they are the best guarantors of human welfare. Everything that promotes the market, i.e., privatization, deregulation, mobility of finance and capital, abandonment of government-provided social welfare, and the reconception of human beings as human capital, needs to be encouraged, while everything that supposedly diminishes the market, i.e., government services, regulation, restrictions on finance and capital, and conceptualization of human beings in transcendent terms, is to be discouraged….One way to sum up neoliberalism is to say that everything—everything—is to be made over in the image of the market, including the state, civil society, and of course human beings. Democracy becomes reinterpreted as the market, and politics succumbs to neoliberal economic theory, so we are speaking of the end of democratic politics as we have known it for two and a half centuries.[12] What is particularly distinctive about the conjuncture of neoliberalism and fascism is how the full-fledged liberation of capital now merges with an out-and-out attack on the racially oppressed and vulnerable populations considered disposable. Not only do the oppressive political, economic and financial structures of casino capitalism bear down on people’s lives, but there is also a frontal attack on the shared understandings and beliefs that hold a people together. One crucial and distinctive place where neoliberalism and fascism converge is in the undermining of social bonds and moral boundaries. Displacement, disintegration, atomization, social isolation, and deracination have a long history in the United States, which has been aggressively exploited by Trump, taking on a distinctive right-wing twenty-first century register. There is more at work here than the heavy neoliberal toll of social abandonment. There is also, under the incessant pedagogical propaganda of right-wing and corporate controlled media, a culture that has become cruel and cultivates an appetite for maliciousness that undermines the capacity for empathy, making people indifferent to the suffering of others or, even worse, willing participants in their violent exclusion. Irish journalist, Fintan O’Toole, warns that fascism unravels the ethical imagination through a process in which individuals eventually “learn to think the unthinkable…followed, he writes, “by a crucial next step, usually the trickiest of all.”: You have to undermine moral boundaries, inure people to the acceptance of acts of extreme cruelty. Like hounds, people have to be blooded. They have to be given the taste for savagery. Fascism does this by building up the sense of threat from a despised out-group. This allows the members of that group to be dehumanised. Once that has been achieved, you can gradually up the ante, working through the stages from breaking windows to extermination.[13] What is often labeled as an economic crisis in American society is also a crisis of morality, of sociality, and of community. Since the 1970s, increasing unregulated capitalism has hardened into a form of market fundamentalism that has accelerated the hollowing out of democracy through its capacity to reshape the commanding political, social, and economic institutions of American society, making it vulnerable to the fascist solutions proposed by Trump. As an integrated system of structures, ideologies, and values, neoliberalism economizes every aspect of life, separates economic activity from social costs, and depoliticizes the public through corporate controlled disimagination machines that trade in post-truth narratives, enshrine the spectacle of violence, debase language, and distort history. Neoliberalism now wages a battle against any viable notion of the social, solidarity, the collective imagination, the public good, and the institutions that support them. As the realm of the political is defined in strictly economic terms, the institutions, public goods, formative cultures, and modes of identity essential to a democracy disappear along with the informed citizens necessary to sustain them.

#### Bailey 18 shows the aff’s capitalist fantasy of global neoliberal governance – another link

#### Another link – they said we have a china economic global governance worldwide which is capitalist in cx

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause goes unquestioned – and treat this as a no long-term solvency argument – the inequalities of labor relations are fundamental to capitalism. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only party organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct chauvinist tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for global liberation.

#### Reject methodologial pluralism – we have links to the plan

Escalante, Philosophy @ UOregon, 18

[Alyson, M.A., is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>] rVs

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### It sends a global signal

Li 16—PhD in Economics from U of Massachusetts Amherst and an Associate Professor of Economics at U of Utah [Minqi, *China and the 21st Century Crisis*, 2016, p. 11-12, Print]

Historically, capitalists have responded to the rising labor and taxation costs by relocating capital to new areas where labor force is relatively cheap and abundant. China may turn out to be the last large geographic area that can provide a large cheap labor force in combination with other necessary conditions required for effective capital accumulation. As the Chinese working class starts to demand economic and social rights, both the Chinese and the global labor cost will tend to rise and there is not another large geographic area to which global capital can relocate.

The pursuit of infinite economic growth is the defining feature of modern capitalism. But the exponential growth of material production and consumption has depleted natural resources and degraded the environment. Much of the global environmental space was used up by the global capitalist expansion during the second half of the twentieth century. In the early twenty-first century, various global ecological systems are on the verge of collapse. In particular, impending climate catastrophes threaten to undermine the foundation of human civilization.

These developments suggest that the various conditions, which historically have underpinned the normal operation of the capitalist world system, are being fundamentally transformed and the basic laws of motion of capitalism can no longer be sustained.

China is set to overtake the United States to become the world's largest economy. The Chinese working class is the world's largest. In a few years, a militant working class movement is likely to emerge in China. China is also the world's largest energy consumer and greenhouse gas emitter. Therefore, China is at the center of the contemporary global economic, social, and ecological contradictions.

In the 1970s, China was one of the key battlegrounds in the global class struggle. The defeat of the Maoist revolutionaries paved the way for China's transition to capitalism and was probably a decisive factor in deciding the outcome of the global class war in the late twentieth century. In the coming years, China will again be a key battleground in the global class struggle. Victory or defeat by the Chinese working class may largely decide how the global crisis of the twenty-first century will be resolved.

#### K First - There is no material world that we can separate from the lens through which we view it. Deconstructing the AFF scholarship is a prior question that has material effects.

#### And the plan never passes – deconstructing the assumptions behind the politics which the aff supports is the only impact

#### Therefore the ROB is one of deconstruction – vote for the side which best challenges neoliberal “scholarship”

Springer 12

Simon Springer - Department of Geography, University of Otago. “Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism.” Routledge. May 2012. JJN from file \*bracketing in original

Conclusion In arguing for an understanding of neoliberalism as discourse, I do not presume that comprehending neoliberalism separately as a hegemonic ideology, a policy and program, a state form, or as a form of governmentality is wrong or not useful. Rather I have simply attempted to provoke some consideration for the potential reconcilability of the different approaches. My argument should accordingly be read as an effort to destabilize the ostensible incompatibility that some scholars undertaking their separate usage seem keen to assume. Without at least attempting to reconcile the four approaches we risk being deprived of a coherent concept with which to work, and thus concede some measure of credibility to Barnett’s (2005) claim that ‘there is no such thing as neoliberalism’. Such a position renders the entire body of scholarship on neoliberalism questionable, as scholars cannot be sure that they are even discussing the same thing. More perilously, to accept such a claim throws the project of constructing solidarities across space into an uneasy quandary, where the resonant violent geographies of our current moment may go unnoticed, a condition that plays perfectly into the ideological denial maintained by the current capitalist order (Zizek, 2011). In ignoring such relational possibilities for resistance to the contemporary zeitgeist, Barnett (2005) seems keen to engage in disarticulation ad nauseam. Yet deconstruction is meant to be interruptive not debilitating. As Spivak (1996, p. 27) contends, ‘Deconstruction does not say there is no subject, there is no truth, there is no history. ... It is constantly and persistently looking into how truths are formed’. It is about noticing what we inevitably leave out of even the most searching and inclusive accounts of phenomena like neoliberalism, which opens up and allows for discursive understandings. Rather than making nice symmetrical accounts of the ‘real’ at the meeting point of representational performance and structural forces, neoliberalism understood as a discourse is attuned to processual interpretation and ongoing debate. While there are inevitable tensions between the four views of neoliberalism that are not entirely commensurable, their content is not diametrically opposed, and indeed a considered understanding of how power similarly operates in both a Gramscian sense of hegemony and a Foucauldian sense of governmentality points toward a dialectical relationship. Understanding neoliberalism as discourse allows for a much more integral approach to social relations than speech performances alone. This is a discourse that encompasses material forms in state formation through policy and program, and via the subjectivation of individuals on the ground, even if this articulation still takes place through discursive performatives. By formulating discourse in this fashion, we need not revert to a presupposed ‘real-world’ referent to recognize a materiality that is both constituted by and constitutive of discourse. Instead, materiality and discourse become integral, where one cannot exist without the other. It is precisely this understanding of discourse that points to a similitude between poststructuralism and Marxian political economy approaches and their shared concern for power relations. I do not want to conclude that I have worked out all these tensions, my ambition has been much more humble. I have simply sought to open an avenue for dialogue between scholars on either side of the political economy/ poststructuralist divide. The importance of bridging this gap is commensurate with ‘the role of the intellectual ... [in] shaking up habits, ways of acting and thinking, of dispelling commonplace beliefs, of taking a new measure of rules and institutions ... and participating in the formation of a political will’ (Foucault, quoted in Goldstein, 1991, pp. 11– 12). Such reflexivity necessarily involves opening ourselves to the possibility of finding common ground between the epistemic and ontological understandings of political economy and poststructuralism so that together they may assist in disestablishing neoliberalism’s rationalities, deconstructing its strategies, disassembling its technologies, and ultimately destroying its techniques. In changing our minds then, so too might we change the world.

## case

### inherency

#### Your dongfang 11 card concedes that a legal right to strike is irrelevant – squo strikes already are successful and leaders are not facing any legal consequences

Dongfang 11 Han Dongfang 4-6-2011 "Liberate China's Workers" <https://archive.md/7RvDG#selection-307.0-316.0> (director of China Labour Bulletin, a nongovernmental organization that defends the rights of workers in China.)//Elmer

HONG KONG — There is no legal right to strike in China, but there are strikes every day. Factory workers, hotel employees, teachers and taxi drivers regularly withdraw their labor and demand a better deal from their employer. Strikes are often successful, and these days **strike leaders hardly ever get put in prison.**

#### Dongfang also concedes that collective bargaining is more important than the strike – they can walk out but they can’t leverage, which makes the aff irrelevant and nowhere in the card does it say r2s leads to collective bargaining power

The **right to strike** **is** clearly important, but the most vital and fundamental right of workers is **the right to collective bargaining**. After all, **why do workers go out on strike**? Very simply, they go on strike **for higher pay and better working conditions**. **The strike is not an end in itself but is part of a bargaining process.** And **if the collective bargaining process were more effective**, in many cases, **workers would not need to go out on strike at all**.

**Fact check their tag - no legal prohibition on workers strike in China and government officials themselves participate in strikes**

**Workers do have right to collectively bargain – Merkely and McGovern as well as Dongfang are too old  
China Labour Bulletin, 9/30/2020, “Workers’ rights and labour relations in China”,** [**https://clb.org.hk/content/workers%E2%80%99-rights-and-labour-relations-china**](https://clb.org.hk/content/workers%E2%80%99-rights-and-labour-relations-china)**, //NL**

The first point to note in any discussion of collective action in China is that although the right to strike was removed from the Constitution of the People’s Republic of China in 1982, there is no legal prohibition on workers taking strike action. In fact, there have been numerous headline-grabbing strikes over the last decade, most notably the 2010 Nanhai Honda Strike in which the workers secured a 35 percent (500 yuan per month) pay increase after defying the local trade union; the 2014 Yue Yuen shoe factory strike in Dongguan in which around 40,000 workers walked off the job for two weeks; the 2015 Lide shoe factory strike in which workers secured millions of yuan in unpaid social insurance contributions; and the nationwide strikes organized by tower crane operators and truck drivers in May and June 2018, respectively.

Many strikes have led to ad hoc or spontaneous collective bargaining, in which workers elected their own representatives and devised strategies to force management to come to the negotiating table. Often local government and trade union officials become involved in an attempt to bring about a compromise agreement. The authorities typically pressure both sides to make concessions and resume production as quickly as possible. However, these quick fixes rarely address the underlying causes of the dispute, and, as a result, it is not unusual for another strike to break out six months or a year later.

### other

**Terminal link defense – strikes hurt unions exactly as much as they do the company**

**Gardapee 12**

Pamela Gardapee (studied accounting, computers and writing before offering her tax, computer and writing services to others, 2012-08-16 (date found in source code), "How Do Strikes Affect Labor Union Members?," Your Business, [https://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/strikes-affect-labor-union-members-2432.html //](https://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/strikes-affect-labor-union-members-2432.html%20//) AW

Whether you are a small business or a big business, strikes can hurt both the business and the members. Although companies have options during a strike, the labor union members have very few options after the strike vote is cast and the members walk out. **The affect of a strike on union members is just as hard as it is for the business.** Earnings The earnings that a labor union member is used to making will stop. Although there is a strike fund that provides some money to strikers every week, the amount doesn’t make up for lost wages. Every union is different, but members could only make a fraction of their normal wages, depending on the union to which they belong and the funds available. However, the only way to get paid from the union strike fund is to walk the picket line. If an employee belongs to the union, that person cannot choose to work without resigning from the union or he could face fines because he is not abiding by the bylaws set forth by the union. If a union member doesn’t resign from the union before working for the employer, the union will fine that person and can sue him for the money. Benefits ref Labor union members who strike for long periods of time can lose benefits such as sick pay, vacation and medical insurance. The company can only stop benefits if the actual expired contract stipulates it, however. Some unions also have funds to pay for some or all employee benefits during a strike. Morale Moral is likely to deteriorate if the strike drags on. Companies will be watching for this problem with labor union members. Members start feeling the strain from loss of wages, benefits and available work. Relationships feel the strain when a wage earner is no longer bringing home enough money to feed the family or pay the bills. When the strike lasts longer than a few weeks, morale continues to decline. Communication Communication with the company may stop. This can affect all the striking members. Companies can opt to hire workers to replace the striking members. When and if the strikers return to work, there will be a strain between the members and the management team caused by a strike. The workers hired during the strike can keep their jobs even after the strike is over if the company chooses, which means labor union members will lose their jobs. The company does not have to rehire the union members.

#### Chinese economic collapse inevitable- omicron, housing

Economist 12-1-21 https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/chinas-economy-looks-especially-vulnerable-to-the-spread-of-omicron/21806564

Travel is vital to innovation. Unfortunately what is true of business is also true of viruses. At some point on its journey around the globe the covid-19 virus re invented itself. The new Omicron variant will further entrench China’s tight restrictions on business travel. Indeed it may cause more disruption to China’s economy than to other gdp heavyweights. That is not because the virus will spread more widely in China. On the contrary. It is because the government will try so hard to stop it from doing so. Since the end of May, China has recorded 7,728 covid-19 infections. America has recorded 15.2m. And yet China’s curbs on movement and gathering have been tighter, especially near outbreaks (see chart 1). Its policy of “zero tolerance” towards covid-19 also entails limited tolerance for international travel. It requires visitors to endure a quarantine of at least 14 days in an assigned hotel. The number of mainlanders crossing the border has dropped by 99%, according to Wind, a data provider. These restrictions have stopped previous variants from spreading. But periodic local lockdowns have also depressed consumption, especially of services like catering. And the restrictions on cross-border travel will inflict unseen damage on innovation. Cutting business-travel spending in half is as bad for a country’s productivity as cutting r&d spending by a quarter, according to one study by Mariacristina Piva of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan and her co-authors. If the Omicron variant is more infectious than other strains, it will increase the likelihood of covid-19 outbreaks in China, leading to more frequent lockdowns. If the restrictions were as severe as those China briefly imposed in mid-August, when it was fighting an outbreak that began in the city of Nanjing, the toll on growth could be considerable. If imposed for an entire quarter, the curbs could subtract almost $130bn from China’s gdp, according to our calculations based on a model of lockdowns by Goldman Sachs, a bank—equivalent to around 3% of quarterly output. Omicron is not the only threat to China’s economy. Even before its emergence, most forecasters thought that China’s growth would slow to 4.5-5.5% next year, as a crackdown on private business and a property slowdown bite. Worse scenarios are imaginable. If China suffers a property slump as bad as the one it endured in 2014-15, gdp growth could fall to 3% in the fourth quarter of 2022, compared with a year earlier, according to Oxford Economics, a consultancy. That would drag growth for the whole year down to 3.8%. If housing investment instead crashed as badly as it did in America or Spain in the second half of the 2000s, growth in China could fall to 1% in the final quarter of 2022 (see chart 2). That would take growth for the year down to 2.1%. Losses would leave “numerous” smaller banks with less capital than the regulatory minimum of 10.5%, the firm says.

#### Chinese government failing to stabilize economy

Tang 12-2-21

(Frank, https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3158194/chinas-economic-growth-biggest-challenge-beijing-2022-senior)

Stabilising economic growth in the coming year will require Beijing to implement new measures, as a larger-than-expected decline in the growth rate this year has sparked market concerns over China’s development prospects, a senior government adviser warned on Thursday. The comments by Yang Weimin, deputy director of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC)’s Economic Affairs Committee, suggest that Beijing’s policymakers could rally more supportive policies in 2022 in response to economic deterioration and rising external challenges. A raft of pressing issues will be discussed at the upcoming central economic work conference in mid-December, including stabilising the economy and markets through cross-cyclical adjustments; balancing the pandemic control and economic growth; managing the risks caused by the domestic slowdown and external spillover; and maintaining exports by improving external relations.

#### China will use power aggressively

Jennifer Lind 18, Associate Professor, Department of Government, Dartmouth College, March/April 2018, “Life in China's Asia,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 97, No. 2

It may be tempting to believe that China will be a relatively benign regional hegemon. Economic interdependence, one argument goes, should restrain Chinese aggression: because the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) rests on economic growth, which depends on trade, Beijing would maintain peaceful relations with its neighbors. Moreover, China claims to be a different sort of great power. Chinese officials and scholars regularly decry interventionism and reject the notion of "spheres of influence" as a Cold War relic. Chinese President Xi Jinping has said that his country has "never engaged in colonialism or aggression" thanks to its "peace-loving cultural tradition." In this view, life in China's Asia would not be so different from what it is today. But this is not how regional hegemons behave. Great powers typically dominate their regions in their quest for security. They develop and wield tremendous economic power. They build massive militaries, expel external rivals, and use regional institutions and cultural programs to entrench their influence. Because hegemons fear that neighboring countries will allow external rivals to establish a military foothold, they develop a profound interest in the domestic politics of their neighborhood, and even seek to spread their culture to draw other countries closer. China is already following the strategies of previous regional hegemons. It is using economic coercion to bend other countries to its will. It is building up its military to ward off challengers. It is intervening in other countries' domestic politics to get friendlier policies. And it is investing massively in educational and cultural programs to enhance its soft power. As Chinese power and ambition grow, such efforts will only increase. China's neighbors must start debating how comfortable they are with this future, and what costs they are willing to pay to shape or forestall it.

#### No nuke war - The US would not get involved in a China-Taiwan war due to inherent Chinese advantages and escalation risks.

White, former Australian DOD official, ‘19

(Hugh, former Deputy Secretary for Strategy and Intelligence in the Australian Department of Defence from 1995 to 2000, EmeritusProfStrategicStudies@AustralianNationalUniversity, <https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/the-us-shouldnt-go-to-war-with-china-over-taiwan-and-nor-should-australia/>, February 13) BW

That depends on who would win the war. Such a war, like any war, would be a calculus of uncertainties, but at the very least one could say that a swift, cheap and decisive US victory over China would be very unlikely. America’s military power is very great, but China’s military power, and especially its capacity to deny its air and sea approaches to US forces, has grown sharply, and is now formidable. China also has big advantages of location and resolve: Taiwan is closer to China than to America, and it matters more to the Chinese. And any hopes that US nuclear forces would swing the balance back America’s way run up against China’s capacity to retaliate in kind, and the risk of a nuclear exchange targeting US cities would at least have to be considered by US leaders in deciding to go to war. These sombre facts would have to be taken into account in Washington and Canberra in any deliberations about war. They imply that the choice in both capitals would not be the simple one that Dibb suggests—a choice between going to war and preserving the US-led order in Asia or stepping back and destroying it. A long, costly and indecisive US–China war would destroy the regional order anyway, because America’s leadership in Asia wouldn’t survive a war with China. Most probably it would lead to America’s withdrawal from Asia—just as its long, indecisive but far less costly wars in the Middle East have led it to withdraw from that region. If so, Australia’s alliance with America would wither too. So the real choice Washington would face would be to abandon its position in Asia by fighting China, or by not fighting China. Given the cost and risks of war with a nuclear power, it is easy to see which America *should* choose, and I think probably *would* choose. Dibb’s counterargument is that America was willing to fight a nuclear war to save West Germany from the Soviets in the Cold War. That’s a compelling argument to the extent that China’s ambitions today pose as big a threat to America as the Soviets’ did in the Cold War. It was the fear that the expansion of Soviet power would threaten the survival of America itself which drove US leaders and voters to accept the risk of nuclear war to make containment work. I don’t think that China poses a similar threat today, which is why I don’t think America should fight China over Taiwan.

#### China’s economic growth = nuclear modernization

Delpech 12 (Therese Delpech Thérèse Delpech was a French international relations expert and prolific public intellectual. &quot;Nuclear Deterrence in the 21st Century: Lessons from the Cold War for a New Era of Strategic Piracy,&quot; published posthumously by the RAND corporation. www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2012/RAND\_MG1103.pdf)

Why do they believe this when there is little evidence supporting this view? The first beneficiary of China’s growth seems to be the Chinese military. Beijing has continually increased its military spending by more than 10 percent every year for almost 20 years, beyond its annual growth during the same period. China’s public explanation is related to improved welfare of the military personnel and better logistical support. However, a large part of the military spending is meant to finance more serious programs: nuclear missiles, energy weapons, space warfare, antiballistic defenses, nuclear and conventionally advanced submarines, amphibious assault ships, electronic intelligence, cyber capabilities, and antiship ballistic missiles (a critical antiaccess capability). In addition to this impressive list, where the sky seems to be the limit, it is noteworthy that China is able to dramatically reduce its cycle of research, development, and production because of its access to Western—and in particular American—technologies, often thanks to espionage. Sometimes seen in America as the only serious interlocutor of the United States to address the world’s problems (the already worn-out G-2 concept), China may become its most serious challenger in the 21st century. If China acquires a challenging military capability and decides to come out in the open with a series of technical demonstrations,22 by that time it may be too late to react.

#### Chinese economic decline is an impact filter

Glaser and Funaiole , 15, 11-16-2015, "Geopolitical Consequences of China’s Slowdown," Bonnie Glaser is Senior Adviser for Asia and Director, China Power Project. Matthew Funaiole is a Fellow on the China Power Project.https://www.csis.org/analysis/geopolitical-consequences-china%E2%80%99s-slowdown

Overinvestment in economic initiatives leaves Beijing susceptible to the same vulnerabilities that threaten the Chinese economy. Should the Chinese economy stumble, aspects of the AIIB and OBOR will need to be scaled back. The knock-on effects of an economic slowdown could diminish China’s future role in the region. The smaller countries of Asia have tolerated Chinese assertiveness in exchange for economic gains and because they fear that challenging China could cause Beijing to punish them economically. If China is no longer able to afford those benefits, many smaller countries may be less willing to show deference and more willing to push back against Chinese threats to their interests. In the South China Sea, where in recent years China has incrementally altered the status quo in its favor, such a development could have a positive effect. Myriad steps taken by some of the other claimants to the disputed land features, as well as by the United States, Japan, and other concerned members of the international community, have not persuaded Beijing to moderate its assertiveness and seek cooperative solutions to the extant territorial disputes. Any reduction in Chinese influence may diminish the disincentives that smaller claimant states and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) face vis-à-vis China. Firmer and coordinated policies among Vietnam, the Philippines, and Malaysia, combined with greater unity among all the ASEAN member countries, might induce Beijing to conclude a binding code of conduct for the South China Sea that ensures disputes are managed peacefully and in accordance with international law. Similarly, China’s economic slowdown could offer Japan an occasion to gain leverage in the Sino-Japanese relationship, creating the possibility to tamp down tensions in the East China Sea and stabilize bilateral ties that remain a fragile, but critically important, component of the regional security landscape. Perhaps most significantly, a Chinese economic slowdown affords the United States an opportunity to buttress its political, economic, and military position in the Asia-Pacific, and assuage worries that the United States lacks sufficient strategic vision and political commitment to the region. The outcome relies on how Washington plays its hand, but the result could be the strengthening of a rules-based, U.S.-led security architecture in the Asia-Pacific region for years to come.

#### Chinese nuclear modernization ensures extinction – regional conflicts escalate

Eric Heginbotham et. al. 15 2015. Michael Nixon, Forrest E. Morgan, Jacob L. Heim, Jeff Hagen, Sheng Li, Jeffrey Engstrom, Martin C. Libicki, Paul DeLuca, David A. Shlapak, David R. Frelinger, Burgess Laird, Kyle Brady, Lyle J. Morris Eric Heginbotham is a senior political scientist at the nonprofit RAND Corporation “The US China military scorecard” RAND. http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research\_reports/RR300/RR392/RAND\_RR392.pdf

Nevertheless, further moves by China to increase the size of its nuclear arsenal could have serious consequences. Such moves could undermine U.S. and Russian efforts to pursue further reductions in their own forces. Thus far, second-tier nuclear powers, such as China, India, and Pakistan, have had little impact on U.S. and Russian force planning—even as those second-tier powers increasingly interact with one another. However, continued growth in China’s nuclear inventory will further undermine political support for cuts beyond those required by New START; this support is already highly uncertain in the wake of continuing Russian aggression in Ukraine. Washington, Moscow, or both may wish to ensure that China does not make a dash for parity while the former Cold War superpowers reduce their nuclear forces. Even without pursuing parity, a larger Chinese nuclear inventory may complicate future U.S. and Russian planning if either contemplates simultaneous nuclear threats by China and another power. And finally, as China’s second-strike capability becomes more secure—and it has many options to improve that survivability—Beijing may become bolder in its international behavior. As the other scorecards in this report indicate, the potential costs of a conventional military conflict with China are growing for the United States. And as this scorecard suggests, Chinese leaders might believe that the United States no longer has the option of escalating to the nuclear level without suffering powerful retaliation. Hence, they may believe that the United States, without absolute escalation dominance, will be less likely to intervene in the event of a regional conflict… Finally, some mention should be made of measures to reduce the possibility of nuclear escalation. The scorecard results suggest that although the chances of crossing the nuclear threshold would remain low, even in the event of war, those risks may be growing. China maintains a nuclear no-first-use policy, and the United States has also pledged to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in its national security planning.15 Nevertheless, history suggests that certain structural conditions can increase the probability of states taking military actions during crises that they did not originally anticipate. In the contemporary East Asian context, the threat of vertical escalation has been increased by two developments: first and foremost, the blurring of conventional and nuclear boundaries and, second, growing incentives for U.S. forces to strike targets on the mainland in the event of war. Although there are no quick or easy solutions, it is in the interests of both parties to address and minimize those risks. The blurring of the conventional and nuclear realms has been driven in part by the development of two types of “crossover” capabilities on both sides: variants of systems originally designed for nuclear missions but also suited to conventional attack roles and conventional systems designed to attack nuclear weapons. In the U.S. case, the “conventional prompt global strike” (CPGS) capabilities are being pursued to buttress U.S. efforts to deter or defeat adversaries by enabling the United States to attack high-value or fleeting targets at the beginning of a conflict. Congress blocked funding for deploying conventional warheads on SLBMs, but the United States is pursuing development of a hypersonic glide delivery vehicle that would be deployed on a modified Peacekeeper ICBM (a system called the conventional strike missile, or CSM).16 In the Chinese case, the PLA is already heavily invested in conventionally armed ballistic missiles. It is currently developing a new generation of ballistic missiles capable of attacking ships at sea. These systems pose two potential problems. The first and admittedly lesser possibility is that the launch of one or more of these missiles could be taken as a possible nuclear attack, compelling the receiving side to launch a nuclear counterattack. This danger is, in the current context, probably more theoretical than real, since a small salvo of ballistic missiles would be unlikely to prompt an adversary to launch a warning. (Also, China has only limited early-warning capabilities and would be unlikely to know it was under attack until ballistic missiles landed.) A more significant danger is that the use (or possibility of use) of conventionally armed ballistic missiles would make those systems high-value targets in the event of war. Attacks on such systems could inadvertently jeopardize the survival of the targeted side’s nuclear forces. Given the very substantial threat posed by Chinese ballistic missiles, particularly DF-21Cs and DF-21Ds, U.S. military planners would have very high incentives to find and destroy these missiles. However, conventionally armed DF-21s may be difficult or impossible to distinguish from nuclear-armed DF-21s, and the hunt for conventionally armed missiles could result in the attrition of China’s nuclearcapable missile force. This could ultimately create a “use-them-or-lose-them” dilemma for Chinese strategic planners, particularly if other parts of China’s strategic system (such as SSBNs) were under attack. The scorecard results suggest that the incentives for U.S. forces to strike a range of targets on the mainland in the event of a conflict, particularly a Taiwan scenario, are growing. In a difficult fight with potentially high losses to the U.S. side, military leaders will look to strike high-value targets. They might, for example, look to strike command-and-control facilities, satellite control or downlink facilities, and OTH radar arrays. Many of these targets did not exist in 1996, and the United States might have prevailed in some scenarios even without striking those that did exist. Today, the incentives are much higher. Modeling of an air superiority campaign over Taiwan illustrates the change. Our model showed that striking air bases on the mainland would not have lowered the overall force requirements needed to prevail in 1996, but by 2010, such attacks would have contributed significantly.