### Off 1

#### **The aff makes economic production possible through updating social relations between workers and employers.**

Azhiim 19 [Rizma Afian Azhiim May 2019, "(PDF) A Disciplined Freedom: The Paradox of Labour Rights in Post-Reformasi Indonesia," ResearchGate, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332999998\_A\_Disciplined\_Freedom\_The\_Paradox\_of\_Labour\_Rights\_in\_Post-Reformasi\_Indonesia]/ISEE](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332999998_A_Disciplined_Freedom_The_Paradox_of_Labour_Rights_in_Post-Reformasi_Indonesia%5d/ISEE)

Within sovereign nation States, regulation (as operated through bills of law) functions as a normative foundation for every citizen. At the same time, it also creates a security apparatus to discipline noncompliant bodies as well as exercise social control by establishing a hierarchical difference between those who are considered normal and abnormal, proper and improper, good citizens and bad, legal and illegal, well-behaved and criminal, etc. (Lemke, 2011, p. 47). The State’s power, as exercised through legal regulation, continues to transform along with social conditions, as precipitated by scientific and technological innovations. Transformations within legal regulations create conditions of discontinuity within society, which is evidenced within historical episodes due to the continuous reproduction of social security through legal regulation. Regulation, as a security apparatus and a normative foundation for society, is one element that sustains economic production and life within the territory of the nation State. In this case, legal regulation is also a technology and mechanism that provides the security and control necessary to ensure production and the stability of society’s economic system. In fact, in the context of manpower, regulation has the goal of securing “harmonious industrial relations” between capital owners and workers for the sake of State sovereignty. Through legal regulations, we can analyse the arrangements that make economic production possible. In Indonesia, the legal regulation that sustains production through the social relations between workers and employers has been implemented through the Manpower Law, which regulates industrial relations between capital owners/employers, workers/labour, and the government. As a social security and control technology, Indonesia’s Manpower Law sustains economic production and life within the country, and transforms along with the social conditions in society to create specific historical periods. Through the concept of biopolitical power, adopted from the writings of Foucault, we can analyse how the Indonesian State’s legal regulation works as a discourse in normalising wages, labour relations, and labour welfare to create conditions that enable the State, corporations, and society to sustain the social relations of production within the sovereign territory of the Republic of Indonesia. The Securement of Labour Movement during the New Order Era Using Foucault’s biopolitics as a framework, it can be seen that the New Order regime sought to direct the collective body of the population (more specifically, labour movements) through the doctrine of Pancasila Labour Relations (Hubungan Perburuhan Pancasila/HPP), which was later renamed Pancasila Industrial Relations (Hubungan Industrial Pancasila). This doctrine emphasised that “labour, private businesses, and the state were components of one big harmonious family, with the state itself playing the role of benevolent father figure” (Hadiz, 2002, p. 132). The New Order regime justified labour’s alienation as laying a foundation for social order and political stability (Purwaningsih, 2008, p. 143). However, such stability could only be sustained due to the use of Pancasila Industrial Relations to justify the government’s use of punitive actions against inharmonious behaviour to ensure that the disappointment and alienation of the workforce would not develop into resistance. Freedom of association is actually considered a human right due to advocacy led by the International Labour Organisation (ILO). However, before Reformasi, or more specifically before President Habibie ratified ILO Convention No. 87 on Freedom of Association, this right was not guaranteed by the Indonesian government (Tjandraningsih, 2007). When asked about its obligation to protect labour rights, the New Order regime would point to the Indonesian Trade Union (Serikat Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia/SPSI) as an avenue for protecting labour rights in Indonesia. However, SPSI’s structure was dominated by individuals affiliated with the Golkar Party— Soeharto’s political vehicle. As such, SPSI was unable to be free of the government’s power, and it ultimately became an apparatus of power through which the government implemented Pancasila Industrial Relations instead. Ultimately, efforts to fulfil labour’s demands were always given less emphasis than the interests of employers, whom the New Order regime considered more important in sustaining Indonesia’s economic growth (Levine, 2007). Resistance against the authoritarian labour regime represented by SPSI can be seen in the establishment of new unions outside of SPSI, such as the Indonesian Welfare Labour Union (Serikat Buruh Sejahtera Indonesia/SBSI), which operated outside of the corridor expected by the government and directly challenged SPSI’s legitimacy. This forced the New Order regime to deploy its resources, i.e. the military, by giving it the right to intervene in industrial relations disputes (Tjandraningsih & Herawati, 2008). The New Order regime also used labour as an instrument of propaganda by establishing the doctrine of Pancasila Labour Relations as a unitary ideology to disconnect labour movements from socialist ideology by labelling them as communist—an ideology banned by the New Order. Instead of repressing the labour movement’s desire to resist, these policies actually give birth to new figures of resistance that operated through non-union labour organisations funded by foreign grants, such as from Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) Indonesia paid through the Indonesian Labour Foundation (Yayasan Tenaga Kerja Indonesia/YTKI) (Soegiri & Cahyono, 2003). To top it all, the repressive policies implemented by the New Order regime found their ‘Achilles heel’ after the appearance of a martyr figure named Marsinah (Avonius, 2008, p. 105). The atrocious murder and rape of Marsinah, a woman worker and labour activist from Sidoarjo, after she led a strike in 1993 enabled the fragmented labour resistance to unite through the establishment of the Solidarity Committee for Marsinah (Komite Solidaritas untuk Marsinah/KSUM) (Soegiri & Cahyono, 2003, p. 38). According to Avonius (2008, p. 105), the tragedy of Marsinah’s murder enabled labour movements to transform into civil society actors that were able “to change the political morality previously considered to be an absolute truth by the State.” This tragedy also invited sympathy from neighbouring States, including Japan, Singapore, Australia, and the Philippines (Soegiri & Cahyono, 2003, p. 39), who questioned the New Order regime’s usage of the military to deal with labour issues. This, in turn, created pressure for the government to accept supervision by the United Nations (Avonius, 2008, p. 104). In the end, a more organised labour movement was capable of launching radical actions that were not predicted by the New Order regime (Tjandraningsih, 2007). Looking back, the control of labour through terror and repressive policies has occurred in Indonesia since the colonial era, a fact highlighted by the torture of farm workers who refused to work, which ultimately paved the way for the creation of the Communist Party of Indonesia (Partai Komunis Indonesia/PKI) and its agenda of overthrowing the colonial government (Soegiri & Cahyono, 2003). Indonesia’s experiences under the colonial and New Order regimes show the fatal flaw of rule through vertical relations of fear. So-called times of “political stability” were not actually stable, as they were vulnerable to spontaneous acts of resistance that resulted from the accumulation of repressed workers’ disappointment and alienation. Compared to labour movements in the Reformasi era, whose freedom of association is guaranteed by the State, labour movement actions under these regimes tended to be more disciplined and in-line with the legal expectations of the government. The next section will explain how freedom of association, as regulated by the Manpower Law, has allowed the discipline of the labour movement and ensured the security of the State.

#### Serial policy failure---their political heuristic locks in reforms that uphold the current system and preclude broader questions about the dynamics undergirding contemporary political life. Thus the role of the ballot is to : evaluate the plan and kritik through philosophical competition---they can weigh their case against our alternative, BUT if we win that the 1AC carries forth an ideological commitment contrary to the alt, reject perms on severance grounds.

McCarraher '19 [Eugene; 11/12/19; Associate Professor of Humanities at Villanova University, PhD in US Cultural and Intellectual History from Rutgers University; The Enchantments of Mammon: How Capitalism Became the Religion of Modernity, p. 15-18]

Words such as “paradise” or “love” or “communion” are certainly absent from our political vernacular, excluded on account of their “utopian” connotations or their lack of steely-eyed “realism.” Although this is a book about the past, I have always kept before me its larger contemporary religious, philosophical, and political implications. The book should make these clear enough; I will only say here that one of my broader intentions is to challenge the canons of “realism,” especially as defined in the “science” of economics. As the master science of desire in advanced capitalist nations, economics and its acolytes define the parameters of our moral and political imaginations, patrolling the boundaries of possibility and censoring any more generous conception of human affairs. Under the regime of neoliberalism, it has been the chief weapon in the arsenal of what David Graeber has characterized as “a war on the imagination,” a relentless assault on our capacity to envision an end to the despotism of money.24 Insistent, in Margaret Thatcher’s ominous ukase, that “there is no alternative” to capitalism, our corporate plutocracy has been busy imposing its own beatific vision on the world: the empire of capital, with an imperial aristocracy enriched by the labor of a fearful, overburdened, and cheerfully servile population of human resources. Every avenue of escape from accumulation and wage servitude must be closed, or better yet, rendered inconceivable; any map of the world that includes utopia must be burned before it can be glanced at. Better to follow Miller’s wisdom: we already inhabit paradise, and we can never make ourselves fit to live in it if we obey the avaricious and punitive sophistry professed in the dismal pseudoscience.

The grotesque ontology of scarcity and money, the tawdry humanism of acquisitiveness and conflict, the reduction of rationality to the mercenary principles of pecuniary reason—this ensemble of falsehoods that comprise the foundation of economics must be resisted and supplanted. Economics must be challenged, not only as a sanction for injustice but also as a specious portrayal of human beings and a fictional account of their history. As a legion of anthropologists and historians have repeatedly demonstrated, economics, in Graeber’s forthright dismissal, has “little to do with anything we observe when we examine how economic life is actually conducted.” From its historically illiterate “myth of barter” to its shabby and degrading claims about human nature, economics is not just a dismal but a fundamentally fraudulent science as well, akin, as Ruskin wrote in Unto This Last, to “alchemy, astrology, witchcraft, and other such popular creeds.”25

Ruskin’s courageous and bracing indictment of economics arose from his Romantic imagination, and this book partakes unashamedly of his sacramental Romanticism. “Imagination” was, to the Romantics, primarily a form of vision, a mode of realism, an insight into the nature of reality that was irreducible to, but not contradictory of, the knowledge provided by scientific investigation. Romantic social criticism did not claim the imprimatur of science as did Marxism and other modern social theories, yet the Romantic lineage of opposition to “disenchantment” and capitalism has proved to be more resilient and humane than Marxism, “progressivism,” or social democracy. Indeed, it is more urgently relevant to a world hurtling ever faster to barbarism and ecological calamity. I wrote this book in part out of a belief that many on the “left” continue to share far too much with their antagonists: an ideology of “progress” defined as unlimited economic growth and technological development, as well as an acceptance of the myth of disenchantment that underwrites the pursuit of such expansion. The Romantic antipathy to capitalism, mechanization, and disenchantment stemmed not from a facile and nostalgic desire to return to the past, but from a view that much of what passed for “progress” was in fact inimical to human flourishing: a specious productivity that required the acceptance of venality, injustice, and despoliation; a technological and organizational efficiency that entailed the industrialization of human beings; and the primacy of the production of goods over the cultivation and nurturance of men and women. This train of iniquities followed inevitably from the chauvinism of what William Blake called “single vision,” a blindness to the enormity of reality that led to a “Babylon builded in the waste.”26

Romantics redefined rather than rejected “realism” and “progress,” drawing on the premodern customs and traditions of peasants, artisans, and artists: craftsmanship, mutual aid, and a conception of property that harkened back to the medieval practices of “the commons.” Whether they believed in some traditional form of religion or translated it into secular idioms of enchantment, such as “art” or “beauty” or “organism,” Romantic anticapitalists tended to favor direct workers’ control of production; the restoration of a human scale in technics and social relations; a sensitivity to the natural world that precluded its reduction to mere instrumental value; and an apotheosis of pleasure in making sometimes referred to as poesis, a union of reason, imagination, and creativity, an ideal of labor as a poetry of everyday life, and a form of human divinity. In work free of alienation and toil, we receive “the reward of creation,” as William Morris described it through a character in News from Nowhere (1890), “the wages that God gets, as people might have said time agone.”27

Rendered gaudy and impoverished by the tyranny of economics and the enchantment of neoliberal capitalism, our sensibilities need replenishment from the sacramental imagination. As Americans begin to experience the initial stages of imperial sclerosis and decline, and as the advanced capitalist world in general discovers the reality of ecological limits, we may find in what Marx called the “prehistory” of our species a perennial and redemptive wisdom. We will not be saved by our money, our weapons, or our technological virtuosity; we might be rescued by the joyful and unprofitable pursuits of love, beauty, and contemplation. No doubt this will all seem foolish to the shamans and magicians of pecuniary enchantment. But there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of on Wall Street or in Silicon Valley.

#### Capitalism is unsustainable and locks in planetary extinction.

Foster '19 [John Bellamy; 2/1/19; Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, PhD in Political Science from York University, President and Board Member of the Monthly Review; "Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?" https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/]

The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38

If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40

Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity.

Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42

We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs of war, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expense of an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43

#### Capitalism is the root cause of their their impacts – kills aff solvency

#### The alternative is to reject the plan in favor of commitment to organizing anti-capitalist international revolution.

Tavan '21 [Luca; 3/7/21; writer for Red Flag; "Worldwide revolution is possible and necessary," <https://redflag.org.au/article/worldwide-revolution-possible-and-necessary/>]

From the moment Marx and Engels urged workers of the world to unite at the climax of the Communist Manifesto, the goal of international revolution has been at the core of Marxist politics.

International revolution isn’t just a romantic dream, but an urgent necessity. It’s the only means by which capitalism can be permanently uprooted and replaced with socialism. This is because capitalism, unlike previous class societies, is a globally integrated system. “For the first time in history”, wrote British Marxist Colin Barker of this phenomenon, “capitalism has created a genuinely world society, where all our lives are entwined together in a common history and a common fate”.

Capitalism has linked every nation in a global chain of production. Take your mobile phone for example. It was likely assembled in China, using computer chips manufactured in Taiwan, powered by coal exported from Australia and produced with minerals mined in the Democratic Republic of Congo according to specifications developed in Europe or the United States. No single country produces all the things necessary to satisfy its population’s needs, unlike the various forms of society that came before capitalism, which were mostly self-sufficient and organised around small local economies.

Capitalism was established as a world system through immense robbery and violence—from the international slave trade, which fuelled the Industrial Revolution, to the murderous colonisation of what is now Australia. That same violence is today used by states to defend their imperialist interests, and discipline any movements that get in their way. Movements that aspire to national independence or that back left-wing reformist governments have been demolished with the aid of the great capitalist powers countless times in the past century, from the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile in 1973 to the 2019 Bolivian coup.

Revolutionary movements that attempt to overturn the entire capitalist system face a much more severe response. This was confirmed by the defeat of the Russian Revolution. In 1917 workers, radicalised by years of war and economic crisis, overthrew the tsarist regime and eventually took power into their own hands. In response, the capitalist powers of the world united to crush the workers’ state, in alliance with reactionaries who wanted to restore the tsarist regime. Unless revolutions can spread internationally and challenge the imperialist powers that have an interest in destroying them, they will be crushed.

A heroic effort by Russian workers and peasants fought off 16 foreign invading armies, but at a great cost. The working class was decimated, the factories were depopulated, and the radical working-class democracy that had been built withered. The isolation and poverty imposed on Russia made building socialism an impossibility, and a new Stalinist regime emerged that reversed most of the gains of the revolution.

Because Russian revolutionary socialists who pinned their hopes on spreading revolution across the globe were ultimately defeated, their example is used by defenders of capitalism as a cautionary tale today: that a worldwide revolution against the system is an impossible dream.

But capitalism’s global nature means that revolts tend to spread across national borders. Workers today share increasingly similar experiences: conditions of work, forms of consumption, lifestyles and political cultures. And the global integration of production serves to transmit struggle from one country to another. In 1974, for instance, resistance to the brutal military dictatorship in Chile spread to East Kilbride, Scotland, of all places. Workers at the Rolls Royce factory there learned that the engines they were repairing were being used by the Chilean air force to drop bombs on workers resisting the coup. They downed tools and refused to work on the engines, keeping them out of the hands of the military junta for four years.

While nationalism still has a powerful hold on the consciousness of many, it’s increasingly clear that the real line of polarisation across the globe is between the minority ruling class and the majority working class. And when revolts break out in one part of the world, people can identify with the causes and motivations of their struggles, and draw comparisons with their own situation. “Languages remain different,” observed UK Marxist Chris Harman in 1992, “but what they say is increasingly the same”. Harman’s words ring true in every wave of political radicalisation.

1968 is remembered as a year of global revolt, when millions of workers, students and oppressed people drew inspiration from each other’s movements. Activists in the US were radicalised by the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people to American imperialism. Irish civil rights activists emulated the militant politics of the Black Panthers. When students and workers united to launch a massive general strike in France in May, it taught student radicals in Australia that they needed to link up with the power of the organised working class in order to win.

The movements of 1968 united people across superficially very different societies. For decades, Cold War common sense had dictated that the greatest divide on the planet was between Western liberal capitalism and Stalinist “Communism”. But in 1968, both sides of the iron curtain exploded in revolt. The triggers for the struggles may have been different, but they were all responses to similar issues: inequality, exploitation and war, imposed by monstrous bureaucratic states.

In 2011, a poor Tunisian street vendor set himself alight to protest against police harassment. Within days, his act had inspired anti-government protests across the country. Within weeks, the protests escalated into a regional revolt that challenged regimes across the Arab world. One small act tapped into resentment against inequality, unemployment and state violence that engulfed an entire region. The radical wave spread even further: at a massive demonstration against an anti-union bill in the US city of Madison, Wisconsin, a man held up a poster with a picture of Egyptian dictator Hosni Mubarak beside Republican Governor Scott Walker. The caption read: “One dictator down. One to go”. The Arab revolutions went on to inspire the Occupy movement, which spread to more than 80 countries.

Today, more than ever, insurgent social movements and working-class uprisings are spurring action in other parts of the world—from Hong Kong to Chile, from Lebanon to France. One placard at a memorial for protesters murdered while resisting the military coup in Myanmar took up Marx’s incitement: “Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains”.

While the Russian Revolution is cynically held up by capitalist ideologists as the ultimate argument against international revolution, it actually proves the opposite. It shows that the goal is not only necessary, but also that it’s possible. The news of workers seizing power in Russia, overthrowing their capitalist government and declaring their withdrawal from WWI, created shock waves across the planet. Workers in Germany rose in revolt a year later, ending the war for good and building soviets, a form of radical working-class democracy inspired by the Russian example. This was followed by uprisings in France, Italy and Hungary.

The revolutionary wave spread further. A classified British government report from 1919 noted a “very widespread feeling among workers that thrones have become anachronisms, and that the Soviet may be the best form of Government for a democracy”.

The rising tide of radicalism had an impact in Australia too. Meatworkers in the Queensland city of Townsville donned red jumpers, stormed the local police station to free jailed unionists, and placed the city under workers’ control. The editor of the conservative Townsville Daily Bulletin lamented: “Townsville for the last year or so has been developing Bolshevism ... the mob management of affairs in this city, differs very little, from the Petrograd and Moscow brand”.

The Russian Bolsheviks, the revolutionary working-class party that led the revolution to victory in 1917, didn’t just passively wait for revolutions elsewhere. They actively organised to spread the revolt. In 1919, they established the Communist International, an organisation for debate, discussion and coordination between different revolutionary workers’ parties. Revolutionaries in Russia, Italy, France, Germany, the US, Australia and elsewhere attempted to clarify and develop a strategy for overthrowing capitalism everywhere. In none of these countries was there a party like the Bolsheviks, steeled in years of organising working-class struggle to overthrow the state, and capable of leading a revolution. But for a number of years, workers came close to overthrowing capitalism in several countries.

In periods of stability, when social conservatism dominates, international revolution can seem like a pipe dream. Defenders of the status quo actively work to reinforce this illusion. Buts history proves that the crises that the system generates are international, and that they will inevitably provoke international resistance.

Capitalism is a global system. It requires a global movement to tear it up, root and branch. But it also makes global revolution more possible, and more likely. The most important thing that socialists can do, whether you live in Hong Kong or France, Myanmar or Australia, is to get stuck into organising for it today.

#### Peaceful transition is possible but try or die for recovery post conflict if there’s war.

Hanappi '19 [Hardy; 1/7/19; PhD in Economics from the University of Vienna, chair for Political Economy at the European Commission and director of the Vienna Institute for Political Economy Research; "From Integrated Capitalism to Disintegrating Capitalism. Scenarios of a Third World War," <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/91397/1/MPRA_paper_91397.pdf/>]

It should not come as a surprise that a change of the dominant mode of production of human society takes place by a clash of brute forces, of worldwide war. Limiting his attention to the aspect of equality of men the anthropologist Walter Scheidel describes in fascinating historical detail how wars always preceded the setup of large scale new organization of society, see [Scheidel, 2017]. To which extent such a war again is on the agenda today - contrary to the existence of DC - clearly is a question of forecasting. The previous section of this chapter used a scenario technique to sketch some contours of a possible third World War. These scenarios are not independent, mixtures of them are to be expected, e.g. a common strategy of a player in scenario 1 is to stir up national civil war (scenario 2) in a satellite country of its opponent (e.g. Yugoslavia); or to use the rhetoric of scenario 3 to support the fight of national class struggle (scenario 2). But will WW3 happen at all?

Not necessarily, but with a frightening high probability. Some counterstrategies already have been mentioned along the discussion of the scenarios. The immediate candidate, of course, is a global peace movement. This movement already played a pivotal role in ending the Vietnam War, being an incubator for the worldwide cultural revolution of 1968. As the short life and the macroeconomic impotence30 of this rebellion showed, any movement with durable impact needs not only roots in personal perceptions and feelings, it also needs a very sophisticated and well-developed blueprint of the overall working of a global democratic society. A mode of production is a complicated political economy entity, which needs a complicated system design. Fortunately, the explosive accumulation of human knowledge, of science, should be able to provide just that – if it were not handcuffed by the singular tasks tailored by Disintegrating Capitalism. The next best counteraction thus is to organize the carriers of this knowledge, e.g. scientists, in a progressive global class. Even if WW3 happens, chances are that a restart is possible and the blueprint of a better mode of production is needed. In this case Umberto Eco’s vision of an upcoming new Middle Ages31, with monasteries (today: universities?) preserving and developing secret knowledge, might become reality.

#### The perm erodes political choice in the name of urgency---reducing political deliberation to policy decisions displaces competing visions of social order and forces the alternative towards the status quo.

Nikula '17 [Ilari; 8/6/17; PhD Researcher in Social and Economic Geography at the University of Lapland; "Neoliberal Environmentalism," http://web.isanet.org/Web/Conferences/HKU2017-s/Archive/ceb6c473-5cb9-4308-9e23-efe6157f7785.pdf]

The language of environmentalism is full of talk of ‘necessities’ and ‘imperatives’, and often rests on the idea of impending catastrophe. Ferry (1993, 140) argues that fear is a fundamental political ambition and the foundation pillar of the political programme of environmentalism. Instead of argument, the sheer force of necessity and urgency seems to be the grounds for actualizing the environmental prescriptions without consideration of wider social scenarios. Thus, while politics is the art of contingent, it cannot operate in a field of necessity. Furthermore, speeded by this urgency and the global nature of the issue, ecological crisis reduces the sphere of democratic political deliberation and debate as issues are centralized under technocratic management and consensual policymaking of global institutions, like Kyoto protocol. In this process fundamental ideological disputes and disagreements are denied, as the current presentation of the ecological crisis as a “supra-national and non-class-specific global crisis” transcends all social differences. Swyngedouw (2010, 219) furthermore argues that sustaining and nurturing catastrophic imaginaries is an integral and vital part of the new cultural politics of capitalism for which the management of fear is a central leitmotif. At the symbolic level, catastrophic imaginaries are extraordinarily powerful in disavowing or displacing social conflict and antagonisms. As such, catastrophic imaginations are decidedly populist and foreclose a proper political framing (ibid.).

It is argued that the environmental problematique is moving us towards a post-political, or post-democratic state. The writers such as Chantal Mouffe, Slavoj Žižek, and Jascues Rancière have written about this post-political world. Post-politics emphasizes the need to leave old ideological visions behind, we are persuaded to confront new issues, armed, not with democratic decision making processes, but with the necessary expert knowledge of enlightened cosmopolitan technocrats. Post-politics is marked by the predominance of a managerial logic in all aspects of life. The political is reduced to administration where decision-making is increasingly considered to be a question of expert knowledge and not of political position. The political as the space of litigation in which the excluded can protest the injustice done to them is, thus, foreclosed. Proper political choice between competing visions of a different social order is slowly reduced by totalizing threats that permit only one direction. (Swyngedouw 2010.) This post-political world eludes choice and freedom, other than those tolerated by the consensus.

### Off 2 - T Unconditional

#### **Interp; Unconditional = Absolute**

Merriam Webster ND "Definition of UNCONDITIONAL," No Publication, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconditional

Definition of unconditional

1: not conditional or limited : ABSOLUTE, UNQUALIFIED

#### Violation: they do not defend an unconditional right of workers to strike but a specific explansion

#### Standards:

#### Predictable Ground –rant

#### Limits - rant

Voter for fairness x education

### Econ

#### Economic decline stops war—studies prove

Clary 15 – Christopher Clary, PhD in Political Science from MIT, M.A. in National Security Affairs, Brown University, 2015 (“Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries,” April 25th, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2597712>) HAH

Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns encourage austerity and economizing behavior in foreign policy? This paper provides new evidence that economic stress is associated with conciliatory policies between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on data from 109 distinct rival dyads since 1950, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately twice as likely to terminate during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true controlling for all of the main alternative explanations for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may result from economic troubles Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns encourage austerity and economizing behavior in foreign policy? This paper provides new evidence that economic stress is associated with conciliatory policies between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on data from 109 distinct rival dyads since 1950, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately twice as likely to terminate during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true controlling for all of the main alternative explanations for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may result from economic troubles. Defining and Measuring Rivalry and Rivalry Termination I define a rivalry as the perception by national elites of two states that the other state possesses conflicting interests and presents a military threat of sufficient severity that future military conflict is likely. Rivalry termination is the transition from a state of rivalry to one where conflicts of interest are not viewed as being so severe as to provoke interstate conflict and/or where a mutual recognition of the imbalance in military capabilities makes conflict-causing bargaining failures Updated April 21, 2015 Clary 3 unlikely. In other words, rivalries terminate when the elites assess that the risks of military conflict between rivals has been reduced dramatically. This definition draws on a growing quantitative literature most closely associated with the research programs of William Thompson, J. Joseph Hewitt, and James P. Klein, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl.1 My definition conforms to that of William Thompson. In work with Karen Rasler, they define rivalries as situations in which “[b]oth actors view each other as a significant politicalmilitary threat and, therefore, an enemy.”2 In other work, Thompson writing with Michael Colaresi, explains further: The presumption is that decisionmakers explicitly identify who they think are their foreign enemies. They orient their military preparations and foreign policies toward meeting their threats. They assure their constituents that they will not let their adversaries take advantage. Usually, these activities are done in public. Hence, we should be able to follow the explicit cues in decisionmaker utterances and writings, as well as in the descriptive political histories written about the foreign policies of specific countries.3 Drawing from available records and histories, Thompson and David Dreyer have generated a universe of strategic rivalries from 1494 to 2010 that serves as the basis for this project’s empirical analysis.4 This project measures rivalry termination as occurring on the last year that Thompson and Dreyer record the existence of a rivalry.5 Why Might Economic Crisis Cause Rivalry Termination? Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to austerity pressures, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to cut defense expenditures. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to threat deflation, where elites attempt to downplay the seriousness of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to consider threat prioritization, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from international economic cooperation. Leaders seek foreign aid, enhanced trade, and increased investment from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as capable of resolving economic difficulties, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. Collectively, these mechanisms make it much more likely that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this causal logic in greater detail, while also providing historical examples that these mechanisms recur in practice.

#### Growth triggers war

Boehmer, Charles R., 5-14-2010, "ECONOMIC GROWTH AND VIOLENT INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT: 1875–1999," Taylor & Francis, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10242690903568801

The theory set forth earlier theorizes that economic growth increases perceptions of state strength, increasing the likelihood of violent interstate conflicts. Economic growth appears to increase the resolve of leaders to stand against challenges and the willingness to escalate disputes. A non‐random pattern exists where higher rates of GDP growth over multiple years are positively and significantly related to the most severe international conflicts, whereas this is not true for overall conflict initiations. Moreover, growth of military expenditures, as a measure of the war chest proposition, does not offer any explanation for violent interstate conflicts. This is not to say that growth of military expenditures never has any effect on the occurrence of war, although such a link is not generally true in the aggregate using a large sample of states. In comparison, higher rates of economic growth are significantly related to violent interstate conflicts in the aggregate. States with growing economies are more apt to reciprocate military challenges by other states and become involved in violent interstate conflicts. The results also show that theories from the Crisis‐Scarcity perspective lack explanatory power linking GDP growth rates to war at the state level of analysis. This is not to say that such theories completely lack explanatory power in general, but more particularly that they cannot directly link economic growth rates to state behavior in violent interstate conflicts. In contrast, theories of diversionary conflict may well hold some explanatory power, although not regarding GDP growth in a general test of states from all regions of the world across time. Perhaps diversionary theory better explains state behaviors short of war, where the costs of externalizing domestic tensions do not become too costly, or in relation to the foreign policies of particular countries. In many circumstances, engaging in a war to divert attention away from domestic conditions would seemingly exacerbate domestic crisis conditions unless the chances of victory were practically assured. Nonetheless, this study does show that domestic conflict is associated with interstate conflict. If diversionary conflict theory has any traction as an economic explanation of violent interstate conflicts, it may require the study of other explanatory variables besides overall GDP growth rates, such as unemployment or inflation rates. The contribution of this article has been to examine propositions about economic growth in a global study. Most existing studies on this topic focus on only the United States, samples of countries that are more developed on average (due to data availability in the past), or are based on historical information and not economic GDP data. While I have shown that there is no strong evidence linking military expenditures to violent interstate conflicts at the state level of analysis, much of the remaining Growth‐as‐Catalyst perspective is grounded in propositions that are not directly germane to questions about state conflict behavior, such as those linking state behavior to long‐cycles, or those that remain at the systemic level. What answer remains linking economic growth to war once we eliminate military expenditures as an explanation? Considering that the concept of foreign policy mood is difficult to identify and measure, and that the bulk of the literature relies solely on the American historical experience, I do not rely on that concept. It is still possible that such moods affect some decision‐makers. Instead, similar to Blainey, I find that economic growth, when sustained over a stretch of years, has its strongest effect on states once they find themselves in an international crisis. The results of this study suggest that states such as China, which have a higher level of opportunity to become involved in violent interstate conflicts due to their capabilities, geographic location, history of conflict, and so on, should also have a higher willingness to fight after enjoying multiple years of recent economic growth. One does not have to assume that an aggressive China will emerge from growth. If conflicts do present themselves, then China may be more likely to escalate a war given its recent national performance.

#### Economic growth causes climate change and biodiversity loss.

Dan O'Neill, 2013 (lecturer in ecological economics at the University of Leeds), THE GUARDIAN, May 1, 2013. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018 from <https://www.theguardian.com/business/economics-blog/2013/may/01/economics-of-enough>

In our new book, Enough Is Enough: Building a Sustainable Economy in a World of Finite Resources, Rob Dietz and I argue that it's time to abandon the pursuit of growth in wealthy nations and consider a new strategy – an economy of enough. Suppose that instead of chasing after more stuff, more jobs, more consumption, and more income, we aimed for enough stuff, enough jobs, enough consumption and enough income. Abandoning the pursuit of growth may seem like a radical idea, but there's a strong case to be made for it. Economic growth is causing a number of global environmental problems, ranging from climate change to biodiversity loss. At the same time, economic growth is no longer improving people's lives in wealthy nations like the UK. To continue to pursue growth for growth's sake is simply irresponsible.

#### Biodiversity loss means extinction

Wernick, Adam, 5-20-2019, "A UN report says Earth faces 'unprecedented' threat to biodiversity," Public Radio International, https://www.pri.org/stories/2019-05-20/un-report-says-earth-faces-unprecedented-threat-biodiversity

UN scientists warn that roughly 1 million plant and animal species are on the verge of extinction due to human activity. It would be the first mass extinction since humans started walking the earth and has dire implications for the survival of our own species. Already, humans are losing key ecosystem services that nature provides, including crop pollination, storm mitigation, and clean air and water. “We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.” Sir Robert Watson, chair of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services “The overwhelming evidence of the IPBES Global Assessment, from a wide range of different fields of knowledge, presents an ominous picture,” said Sir Robert Watson, chair of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. “The health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever. We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.” Hundreds of scientists from around the globe came together and compiled information on species extinctions and loss of habitat. They arrived at the figure of one million at-risk species by measuring diversity in different areas, the amount of habitat that has been lost and the amount of habitat projected to be lost in the coming years. “We're already losing so many species because of our footprint, because of altered habitats. ... It makes it even harder for species to adapt to climate change because their ability to move is impacted by habitat loss and fragmentation.” Noah Greenwald, endangered species director at the Center for Biological Diversity “The UN wants to bring this issue to the forefront in the same way that climate change has been brought to the forefront with [the] IPCC reports,” explains Noah Greenwald, endangered species director at the Center for Biological Diversity. For many species, extinction could occur in the next couple of decades if humanity doesn’t take action soon. And our ability to reverse the current trends diminishes as time goes on, he adds. Species loss and climate change are deeply interrelated. “We're already losing so many species because of our footprint, because of altered habitats,” Greenwald explains. “It makes it even harder for species to adapt to climate change because their ability to move is impacted by habitat loss and fragmentation.” Habitat that remains may be less suitable for many species if local conditions become too warm, too wet or too dry. Or in other cases, the climate might still be right for plants, but not for their pollinators. In addition to habitat destruction, invasive species, pollution and direct exploitation are the primary threats to species worldwide, Greenwald says. While oceans and tropical rain forests are particularly vulnerable, species of all kinds in every type of ecosystem require protection from extinction. The report concluded that a third of all fisheries are unsustainable, and while efforts have been made to slow tropical deforestation, it continues at an alarming rate. “The conversion to palm plantations in Indonesia has been one of the most striking examples in recent years, but there are others as well,” Greenwald says. “We have to figure out a way to help these countries not destroy their forests and protect their forests,” he maintains. “It's critically important for biodiversity. It's also critically important for climate because these forests help regulate our climate and store massive amounts of carbon.” Coral reefs, which are enormously important to biodiversity in the oceans, also continue to suffer great losses. Fifty percent of the world’s coral reefs have died since 1870. Greenwald has witnessed this loss personally. He spent a month in 1990 at a campground in Maui, where he swam in a coral reef teeming with life. He returned to the same campground this spring and “observed, largely, a dead reef where there had once been this incredibly live, beautiful reef,” he says. Near-shore habitats, whether tropical or nontropical, contain most of the species in the ocean; human activity has the most impact on these areas, he points out. Closer to home, in North America, the leading edge of the extinction crisis is our freshwater ecosystems — our rivers and streams, Greenwald says. “That’s where the most species have been lost. We're at risk of losing many fish, mussels, crayfish. We’ve been working to get these species protected under the Endangered Species Act.” Greenwald believes the report did a good job of highlighting the concept of “ecosystem services,” which explain why biodiversity loss affects humanity. Noah Greenwald, endangered species director at the Center for Biological Diversity “Most of our medicines come from species and from ecosystems; all of our food; ecosystems clean our water, clean our air, moderate floods, moderate our climate. We need ecosystems for our quality of life and for our very own survival.”

#### High levels of growth causes a decrease in democracy- dedev solves

Gang Guo 05, University of Rochester Political Science Professor , “Democracy or Non-Democracy- From the Perspective of Economic Development”; http://home.olemiss.edu/~gg/paperhtm/dmcrecnm.htm

\*edited for ableist language

Some authors hold that democracy and economic development have a reciprocal effect on each other. A classical example is Friedman, Justin's favorite. Friedman believes that more democratic political rights will reinforce economic rights and therefore will be beneficial to economic development; on the other hand, the assurance of the individual's economic freedom results in, and is predicted upon, the maintenance of a free-enterprise exchange economy that constitutes an ideal economic arrangement for a free society (Friedman 1962). Although he also stressed that some activities of the democratic government, such as income redistribution, would tend to retard economic development, these activities are not peculiar to democracies. In Friedman's opinion, what retards economic development is not democracy, but governmental interference. (I owe this point to Justin Fox).¶ Some scholars view the favorable effects between democracy and economic development as single-directional; that is, economic development leads to democracy, but democracy retards economic development. Therefore democracy would be directly related with economic level, but inversely related with economic growth, since wealthy countries might have reached high economic level for other reasons, but would slow down after democracy is established, while for poor countries economic development has not create a favorable environment for democracy but thus they would also enjoy economic growth not [hindered] by democracy. Almost all the advanced economies of the world, including the United States, Japan, Germany, Great Britain, Russia, etc., and also almost all the emerging economies in contemporary world, made their initial take-off and fastest growth under non-democracy, or at least not under the kind of democracy we have in mind today. This view can be stretched as far as stating that "dictatorships are needed to generate development" (Przeworski and Limongi 1997:177).¶ The third hypothesis is quite close to the second one, but in this hypothesis economic level is controlled for and the relationship between democracy and economic growth is non-linear, or curvilinear. That is, at lower stages of economic level, democracy would be unfavorable to economic development, while at the higher level, democracy would do a better job than non-democracy in encouraging economic development. Another way to put this curvilinear relationship is to control for level of democracy. As Barro concluded, "the middle level of democracy is most favorable to growth, the lowest level comes second, and the highest level comes third"(Barro 1996:14).

Go on the flow liz

### Underview

#### 1AC 6 – not a question of cognitive bias – just says extinction is underestimated not anything else lol