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#### We’re going to ! turn the– aff—capitalism is good and sustainable. Hold the line--their bottom two cards prove they defend an anti-capitalist rejection of the current economic model and class consciousness as a method of worker uprisings. Don’t let the 1AR shift out of what they defend—their solvency advocates are the only stasis point for preround prep. At worst, they don’t get access to spillover claims that remedy inequality because they’re premised on the communist revolution’s success.

#### [1] Sustainability: Capitalist growth is good for the environment, sustainable, and resolves inequality – This is probably the best sustainability card you will hear

Harry Saunders 16, Managing Director, Decision Processes Incorporated, “Does Capitalism Require Endless Growth?” Summer, https://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/journal/issue-6/does-capitalism-require-endless-growth

The modern notion that capitalism harbors the seeds of its own ecological destruction owes its provenance to a most unlikely duo of canonical economic thinkers. The Reverend Thomas Malthus claimed in the eighteenth century that a collision between the growing number of mouths to feed and the capacity to add productive agricultural land was inevitable. Karl Marx argued in the nineteenth century that technological change would bring with it falling wages, declining profits, and hence, ultimately, the collapse of capital formation. The argument of Malthus was famously resurrected in the early 1970s in the Club of Rome report The Limits to Growth.1 Around the same time, ecological economists Nicholas Georgescu-Rosen, Herman Daly, Robert Costanza, Robert Ayres, and others advanced the idea that all human economic activity fundamentally relies on a limited planetary endowment of what they call “natural capital.” On the other side, Marxist scholars like Paul Sweezy2, Fred Magdoff, and John Foster3 have extended Marx’s insight, directing our attention to what they call the “growth imperative of capitalism,” by which they mean the indispensable necessity of capitalism to continually accumulate capital and generate a reserve of unemployed workers if it is to remain viable. Without continual economic growth, they argue, capitalism will collapse. Or, as Giorgos Kallis recently so succinctly put it, “Growth is what capitalism needs, knows, and does.”4 Taken together, the dilemma is evident: An economic system that requires perpetual economic growth on a spherical planet with finite resources simply cannot last. Merging Marx and Malthus in this way has made Malthusian arguments accessible to elements of the global left that had historically rejected them. Capitalism and environmental sustainability simply could not be reconciled. Constraining the economy to keep it within a safe margin of ecological limits would only hasten capitalism’s collapse, while allowing capitalism to grow unconstrained would result in ecological collapse. Either way, the choice was clear: abandon capitalism or risk the end of the human project. But Marx and Malthus are not so easily reconciled. Marx’s central insight was that capitalism would collapse of its own contradictions, including rising inequality and immiseration of labor that would ultimately destroy the market for the goods that capitalists produced. As it turns out, the mechanism by which this would occur, technological change driving greater economic productivity, was precisely the mechanism that Malthus failed to anticipate when he predicted that food production would fail to keep up with population growth. In Marx’s crisis lay precisely the mechanism that would prevent Malthus’ prophecy. We see much evidence for this today. Improving technologies have driven a major expansion in food availability, along with continuing production efficiencies across the global economy more generally. The world faces no shortage of ecological challenges — species extinctions, collapsing fisheries, depleted aquifers, poisoned land, and, of course, the inexorable rise of global temperatures as atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases increase. And economists today concern themselves with the threat of “secular stagnation,” chronically low growth rates that threaten long-term prosperity. But it is important to distinguish these challenges from the sweeping claims made originally by Sweezy, Magdoff, and Foster and repeated today by prominent intellectuals and activists such as Naomi Klein and Bill McKibben. In the pages that follow, I will demonstrate that both neoclassical growth theory and empirical evidence suggest that capitalist economies do not require endless growth but are rather much more likely to evolve toward a steady state once consumption demands of the global population have been satisfied. Those demands demonstrably saturate once economies achieve a certain level of affluence. For these reasons, a capitalist economy is as likely as any other to see stable and declining demands on natural resources and ecological services. Indeed, with the right policies and institutions, capitalist economies are more likely to achieve high living standards and low environmental impacts than just about any other economic system. 1.From the window of his Manchester home in the mid-1840s, Marx’s colleague and contemporary Friedrich Engels looked out on a horrifying microcosm of what was happening in England and throughout the newly industrializing world — a stark imbalance between the luxurious wealth of capital owners and the miserable poverty of the workers they employed. Marx himself had witnessed firsthand this same imbalance, and over several decades of intense study came to propose that a core flaw of capitalism resides in excessive claims placed by privately owned capital as against labor on the economic value created by their combination. Herein lay the fundamental contradiction, in Marx’s view, which would bring an end to capitalism. As capitalists invested in ever-newer technologies, Marx predicted that their dependence on labor would decline. As this occurred, returns to labor in the form of earned wages would decline. If there were no return to households for their labor, there would be no income with which to consume goods produced by capital owners, nor savings that households might reinvest in new capital. An economic system in which declining returns to labor due to technological change immiserated most households was a system in which the market for goods sold by capital owners could not long survive.Notably, Marx did not dispute the necessity of capital for producing what households need, only who in society need control this resource. The problem, as Marx saw it, was that the surplus value created by labor was being unfairly conscripted by capital owners. In the first decades of the twenty-first century, a number of prominent analyses have suggested that Marx’s prophecy is perhaps coming true. MIT economists Erik Brynjolfsson and Andrew McAfee5 in recent years have suggested that continuing automation and rising labor productivity threaten mass unemployment, a problem foreseen by Keynes in 1930.6 Thomas Piketty, in his much-lauded book Capital in the Twenty-first Century7, finds that returns to capital have exceeded real economic growth in the industrialized world in recent decades, attributing that shift to ever-increasing concentration of limited capital in the hands of the few. The economist Robert Gordon8,9 finds that growth rates slow dramatically as societies become wealthier. The growth associated with the enormous rise in economic productivity and output associated with the transition from agrarian to industrial societies cannot be sustained as societies shift from industrial to post-industrial economies. Meanwhile, Paul Mason and others in the “post capitalism" movement contend that “an economy based on the full utilization of information cannot tolerate the free market.”10 His argument is that capitalist corporations will not prove capable of capturing value from the technology they deliver, value adequate to sustain them over time. Before considering whether these various challenges to advanced capitalist economies portend their collapse, it is important to note what none of these analyses suggest, which is that capitalism’s unquenchable demand for growth has run up against fundamental biophysical limits. If anything, these analyses suggest the opposite: that the limits to continuing growth in capitalist economies are social or technological, not biophysical. Brynjolfsson and McAfee, and Piketty, through technically different mechanisms, ultimately raise concerns that center around the immiseration of labor. Whether due to technological change, growing returns to capital, or both, all three centrally focus on declining wages and employment as the central challenge that threatens robust and equitable growth in capitalist economies. Mason, conversely, projects that technological change threatens returns to capital. The commodification of everything — material goods, knowledge, and information — ultimately brings with it an end to profits and hence both capital accumulation and capital reinvestment.11 Gordon, meanwhile, observes that there is simply no further techno-economic revolution that can replicate the one-time boost in economic productivity that comes with the shift from agrarian to industrial economies.12 If there is a common theme in these challenges to capitalist economies it is that all find their way, to one degree or another, back to Marx, not Malthus. The long-term challenge for capitalist economies, these analyses suggest, is too little growth, not too much. 2. The headwinds facing advanced industrial economies — stagnant growth and rising inequality — tell us something about the prospects for low- or zero-growth capitalist economies. Gordon’s analysis suggests that industrialized economies in relatively short order achieve a “satisficing” level of household consumption. Once that level is achieved, and once societies have built out the basic infrastructure of modernity — cities, roads, electrical grids, water and sewage systems, and the like — the growth rates characterized by the early stages of industrialization cannot be sustained by the knowledge and service sectors that increasingly dominate post-industrial societies. World Bank data clearly show this. Economic growth rates decline as countries become richer. Growth in GDP per capita in OECD countries slowed from an average of about 3 percent per year in the period 1961–1985 to about half of that in the period 1986–2014.13 Gordon’s analysis is supported not only by the long-term slowing of growth in industrialized economies but also by saturating household consumption in those economies. According to the World Bank, OECD growth in real household consumption per capita (consumption of both goods and services) has shown steady decline each decade from around 3 percent per year in the 1970s to around 1 percent per year since 2000.14 Brynjolfsson and McAfee, and Piketty, suggest that declining returns to households from their labor will drive worsening inequality and stagnant or declining wages. But that does not imply a declining material standard of living. The same technology gains and capital mobility that have eroded the power of labor in developed world labor markets have also persistently reduced the real prices of goods and services, making them ever more affordable.Even as nominal wage growth has slowed or stagnated in the US and other advanced developed economies, households are able to buy more with less of their incomes. This is because the cost of goods and services has grown even more anemically, inflation nearly disappearing in these countries over the same time period, meaning wages have grown in real terms. OECD data show that real wages OECD-wide have grown by about 1 percent per year between 2000 and 2014, including real growth in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany.15 Growth in the Scandinavian economies (Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland) has exceeded this.16 This is true even at the bottom of the income distribution. Virtually all low-income homes in the United States today boast a refrigerator, modern heating and cooling, and electricity. Large majorities have dishwashers, washers and dryers, computers, cable television, and large-screen displays. Consumer goods and services once considered luxuries in the United States and other developed countries are today widely available and utilized by all citizens. That is mostly because home appliances and other goods today cost a small fraction, measured in the work time necessary to purchase them, of what they did thirty years ago.17,18 Of course, rising economic inequality raises a range of concerns beyond those related to access to goods and services. Higher rates of inequality may threaten social mobility, social cohesion, and perhaps even democratic governance. Even so, inequality appears to decline as nations industrialize and become wealthier. In rich Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark), inequality has essentially halved since World War II.19 Declines recently are less impressive in the United States, United Kingdom, and other parts of Europe20, but, nonetheless, inequality remains reliably lower than in most developing economies21, where aggressive but still insufficient capital formation in the presence of large labor forces tends to result in higher levels of inequality. Moreover, increased capital mobility has driven declining inequality between countries, even as it may be worsening inequality within them. Thanks to global trade and international supply chains, firms have become increasingly able to locate production facilities in the developing world, where labor with the requisite skills can be employed at lower wages. As might be expected, labor in industrialized countries is not happy with this turn of events. But the result has been a long-term convergence of wages between producing and consuming countries, declining inequality globally, and a dramatic decline in absolute levels of poverty. The ILO reports that between 2000 and 2011, real average wages approximately doubled in Asia.22 In Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa they also rose substantially, well above the developed world average23, while in developed economies they increased by only about 5 percent, far below the world average24, leading to what leading ILO observer Patrick Belser has dubbed “the great convergence”25 — a dynamic that was incidentally predicted many decades ago on theoretical grounds by famed economist Paul Samuelson.26 Meanwhile, according to the World Bank, the global share of people living on less than $1.90 per day (the World Bank definition of extreme poverty) fell from 44 percent in 1981 to 13 percent in 2012.27 Taken together, then, the dynamics transforming the global economy, while not without challenges, paint an interesting picture of slowing growth, converging global incomes, falling cost, and saturating demand for goods and services. Should these dynamics hold, it is not hard to imagine a future in which the global economy gravitates toward a prosperous and equitable zero-growth economy placing relatively modest demands on the biocapacity of the planet. But getting from here to there will require a number of further conditions.

#### [2] War: Multilateral economic ties forged through capitalism are key to interdependence which sets a cap on conflict – Robust models prove

Jackson and Nei 15 – Matthew O. Jackson, William D. Eberle Professor of Economics at Stanford, and PhD in economics from Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stephen Nei, Economics PhD candidate at Stanford University (“Networks of military alliances, wars, and international trade,” *Proceedings of the National Academies of Science of the United States*, December 15th, 112(50), pp. 15277–15284, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4687585/)

We provided a model of networks of military alliances and the interactions of those with international trade. We showed that regardless of military technologies and asymmetries among countries, nonempty stable networks fail to exist unless trade considerations are substantial. Moreover, the network perspective gives us an understanding of how trade might prevent conflict, by discouraging countries from turning against their allies and encouraging countries to defend their trade partners. Although this points to trade as a necessary condition for stability, whether it is sufficient for stability depends on size of the costs and benefits of war. In closing, we comment on several other features of international relations that are part of the larger picture of interstate war. A notable change in alliances during the Cold-War period was from a “multipolar” to a “bipolar” structure, something which has been extensively discussed in the Cold-War literature (e.g., see ref. 12 for references). Although this lasted for part of the postwar period, and was characterized by a stalemate between the Eastern and Western blocs, such a system of two competing cliques of alliances is only war-stable if there are sufficient trade benefits between members of a clique, as shown in our second theorem. Moreover, it is more of a historical observation than a theory, and it does not account at all for the continued peace that has ensued over the last several decades. Thus, this fits well within the scope of the model and does not account for the overall trend in peace. Another institutional observation regarding the post-WWII calm is that institutions have allowed for coordination of countries onto a peaceful “collective security” equilibrium where any country disrupting international peace is punished by all other countries, so that war against one is war against all. However, as shown by ref. 34, this equilibrium is in some sense “weak”: It relies heavily upon the assurance that a country tempted to join an attacking coalition will refuse and that all countries will follow through on their punishment commitments, so that far-sighted expectations of off-equilibrium behavior are correct. Given that various small conflicts since WWII did not precipitate a global response, such doubts of some countries’ commitment to follow through on punishments seem reasonable.§§§§ Although collective security does not seem to explain the lasting peace, it nonetheless does suggest an interesting avenue for extension of our model: taking a repeated games approach to networked conflict and trade. One more relevant observation regarding changes in patterns of conflict is the so-called democratic peace: Democracies rarely go to war with each other. This coupled with a large growth of democracies might be thought to explain the increase in peace. However, once one brings trade back into the picture, it seems that much of the democratic peace may be due to the fact that well-established democracies tend to be better-developed and trade more. Indeed, studies (38, 39) indicate that poor democracies are actually significantly more likely to fight each other than other countries, and that paired democracy is only significantly correlated with peace when the countries involved have high levels of economic development, which is consistent with trade’s playing the major role rather than the government structure. Our model abstracts from political considerations, which still could be significant, and so this suggests another avenue for further extension.

#### [3] Space colonization: Capitalism is key to drive private investment and research

Spring 16 (Todd, 6/3/16, The Policy, “A Case for Capitalism, In Regards to Space Travel,” https://thepolicy.us/a-case-for-capitalism-in-regards-to-space-travel-d77e50f8116e#.q49v6pqm2, 9/7/16, SM)

As of now, N.A.S.A. does not plan on sending a ~~manned~~ mission to Mars until the 2030s — assuming, of course, they get the government funding they need to undertake such a massive project. Considering the recent cuts to deep space exploration, down nearly $300 million from 2016, I am not certain what the condition of the program will look like in another two years…much less the gap between now and the 2030s. Where, then — if the government and its agencies will not provide us with the money for exploration — will we turn to slake our thirst for cosmic space travel? SpaceX. Private corporations. Capitalism. Seeing this article in the news, reading day after day the story of budget cuts to N.A.S.A. in regards to deep-space exploration and other related programs, got me thinking about just how important it will be for private companies and corporations to undertake these projects…such as Elon Musk’s SpaceX, and countless others (read the full list here). The problem is that we have gotten it into our heads that Capitalism is the root cause of our economic woes in the United States, perhaps failing to understand that such policies are something like a double-edged sword: they could also be our salvation. This article provides a great list of the pro’s and con’s of Capitalism. I would recommend you take the short passing of time it requires to read it through-and-through before continuing. Now then. I have never been for fully-unhindered Capitalism. I do not believe that the government should stay out of economic affairs entirely, for as provided in the article many of the con’s relate to improper regulation (monopolization) as opposed to something fundamentally wrong, but I do not believe that any government should be going about shoving their claws into every economic affair either. There must be a healthy balance, especially if Capitalism is to work as it is supposed to work. The same goes for any policy. The government should be there to bolster competition between businesses…not favor one or bail-out the other. The more regulation, the more interference or amendment, the less it works…but this mix of regulation and free market must fall in the “goldilocks zone” if the citizens of said society are to reap its full benefit. If not, like planets about a star, the society shall either burn or freeze. One of those benefits is highlighted by Elon Musk’s SpaceX: the intervention of privately-funded companies to do things that a traditional government agency cannot. Namely, the exploration and eventual colonization of Mars in a reasonable, step-by-step timeframe…unlike the “we will get to it eventually” mindset plaguing the bowels of the United States government. Were not the policies in place to foster the growth of private companies, our best chance at getting people out of Earth-orbit — the Bush-approved, now-cancelled, insanely-expensive Constellation program — would have gone the way of promises and well-wishes. It is my hope that Elon Musk and space entrepreneurs like him are not simply blowing steam, and that one day — perhaps even within my lifetime — I could be on my way to a space hotel on the Moon, flying aboard a space airliner with the name of a private company plastered across the side. Regardless, if we humans are to truly become a multi-planet species we must not hinder economic growth with narrow thoughts. We must not become confused that the “problems down here” and the “problem of getting out there” must be in conflict; they do not need to, and we must not suppose they should. They are two separate issues with two unique sets of problems, and thus this policy of taking resources from one to give to the other will only ensure that neither issue is given that which it needs, or enough to fix what must be solved. Therefore I propose that we support these pioneers of space travel in any way that we are able. Let us not forget that solving the issue of “how do we get there” might just lead to the end of our “problems down here”.

#### They can’t win any offense – Getting off the rock solves every single extinction threat

Smith and Davies 2012 (Cameron M., Anthropology Professor, Evan T., Writer; "A Choice of Catastrophes: Common Arguments for Space Colonization", Emigrating Beyond Earth: Human Adaptation and Space Colonization, http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4614-1165-9\_4)

These limits are not entirely mythological. Even if humanity were to end war,¶ overpopulation, disease and pollution, ensure global justice and build a network¶ of defenses against such cosmic dangers as solar eruptions and wandering comets¶ and asteroids, the Sun cannot be prevented burning out, at which time its plasma¶ shell will expand and incinerate the Earth and all human works. The Sun's¶ expansion is not expected to occur for another five billion years, and may be¶ thought of in a somewhat mythical way. But there are certainly serious and¶ immediate threats to the human species that, we argue, make a compelling case¶ for beginning the migration from Earth sooner rather than later.¶ We are not the first to point these out, of course; in his 1979 book A Choice of¶ Catllstrophes3 Isaac Asimov discussed a variety of plausible natural and culturally caused¶ events that could cause the extinction of humanity, or at least collapse¶ global civilization. While humanity has taken action on some of these threats -¶ for example, an international effort now scans the sky for 'civilization-killer'¶ comets and asteroids4 - many of Asimov's proposed calamities could still occur¶ today. Unfortunately, some are more likely today than in the past, such as the¶ use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons by individuals or small¶ organizations, and the already-apparent effects of global over-consumption of¶ natural resources, which defense organizations worldwide already recognize as¶ likely leading to resource wars in the relatively short term.¶ Asimov made many of these points nearly 40 years ago, but more recent¶ surveys of the possibility of relatively near-term human catastrophe have been¶ published, and they are not encouraging. A context for these projections has¶ been forwarded by philosopher Robert Heilbroner, who has argued in the book¶ Visions of the Future that from the time of early humans to the 17th century AD,¶ most of humanity saw its future as essentially changeless in its material and¶ economic conditions, a position that paints with quite a broad brush. Perhaps¶ more perceptively, he also argues that from the 18th century AD to the mid-¶ 1900s, Western civilization (at least) saw its future as essentially bright and¶ positive, to be achieved through the application of science, whereas since the¶ mid-1900s (significantly, after two World Wars and the invention of nuclear¶ weapons) there has been a more varied conception involving negatives resulting¶ from "impersonal, disruptive, hazardous and foreboding" factors,' though¶ including some positive hope.¶ Technology figures large in these conceptions, and it is clear that science and¶ the technologies that derive from it can yield great opportunities as well as¶ terrible risks. These were important issues to Asimov, and are more important¶ today. A recent review by Oxford University philosopher and futurist Nick¶ Bostrom points out that three recent discussions of the near human future by¶ prominent thinkers have highlighted significant threats to human existence within the next 1-5 centuries; John Leslie gives humanity a 30% chance of¶ becoming extinct in the next five centuries, Astronomer Royal Martin Rees has¶ weighed in with a figure of a 50% chance of extinction within the next 90 years,¶ and Bostrom himself giving humanity a greater than 25% chance of extinction¶ in the next century. Of course, these are speculations, but they are informed¶ speculations and they reflect technological and other realities that could not¶ have informed earlier, mythical doomsday concepts we discussed above.¶ 6¶ Natural threats to humanity include impacts on Earth from extraterrestrial¶ objects such as asteroids and comets. Human-caused threats to humanity, or at¶ least civilization (defined and discussed in Chapter 2), include ecological¶ overexploitation and conflicts using nuclear, biological and/or chemical¶ weapons. The magnitude of threats to humanity range widely (e.g. from¶ extinction to substantial reduction of the species population); we focus on the¶ levels of (a) the extinction of Homo sapiens sapiens or (b) the collapse of modem¶ civilization.¶ Extinction¶ Extinct species are those whose members have all died out; they may be known¶ to humanity in the fossil and/or DNA record of ancient life forms, but are no¶ longer living at present. Humanity has only been scientifically aware of the 4.5-¶ billion-year age of the Earth for about 100 years, and for much of humanity's¶ more recent history we have considered Earth to be a relatively safe and benign¶ home, at least between cyclic catastrophes. But palaeoenvironmental and fossil¶ records show that calamities and extinctions have been common through time.¶ In a comprehensive survey of the paleontological record paleontologist David¶ Raup has documented that over 99% of all species that have ever lived on Earth¶ have become extinct, and that most species (e.g. sapiens) have a duration of¶ about four million years, while most genera (e.g. Homo) have a duration of about¶ 20 million years. 7 While these are fascinating figures, we must recall that, as we¶ will see through this book, such figures apply to life forms that do not know they¶ are evolving in the first place, and can therefore do nothing proactively about¶ significant threats to their selective environments- their habitats. Humanity, as¶ we saw in Chapters 2 and 3, however, is unique in its ability to both perceive¶ such changes and, if time allows, adapt to them. We return to this important¶ point at the end of this chapter.¶ Extinction normally takes place over multiple generations; millions of¶ generations for faster-reproducing species, thousands for slower-reproducing¶ species. It often results from changes in selective environments that are too rapid¶ for a given species to adapt biologically. For example, when a comet (or asteroid) struck the Earth around 65 million years ago , selective environments changed¶ due to the cloud of debris that was spewed into the atmosphere; the cloud¶ blocked sunlight, which caused changes in temperature, vegetation regimes and¶ so on. This was a change of selective environment so rapid that dinosaurs were¶ unable to adapt with the biological evolution of novel traits suitable to their new¶ selective pressures. Species can also become extinct if they are out-competed by¶ other life forms that are more proficient at life in a given selective environment,¶ as when North American mammals migrated south and replaced many South¶ American marsupials, starting around 3 million years ago.¶ The history of life on Earth includes several well-documented mass-extinction¶ events in which large percentages of Earth life - or some segment of Earth life -¶ became extinct. These events are so distinctive in the fossil record that the¶ disappearance of an established life form and the appearance of new one in the¶ paleontological record are often used to define the beginnings and ends of the¶ geological periods. Such events could occur again and it is clear that most¶ would either cause human extinction at least the collapse of modern¶ civilization.¶ Some mass extinctions occurred over millions of years due to gradual¶ changes in the environment, and some - as in the well-known comet or¶ asteroid impact that ended the reign of the dinosaurs - occurred, from the¶ perspective of life form adaptation, instantly. In each case, full recovery of the¶ Earth's biodiversity took tens of millions of years. We will examine some such¶ extinction events after considering another possible scenario: not extinction,¶ but civilization collapse. ¶

#### [4] Environment: Capitalism fosters growth and trade that reduce CO2 emissions – It also facilitates the transition to renewables – We cite the most conclusive studies

Ozturk et al 15 – Ilhan Ozturk, senior lecturer in the Faculty of Business and Economics at Cag University, Slim Ben Youssef, Manouba University, ESC de Tunis, Mehdi Ben Jebli, Amen Bank, Kef Agency, Tunisia, 2015 (“Testing environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: The role of renewable and non-renewable energy consumption and trade in OECD countries,” *Ecological Indicators*, September 2nd, Available To Subscribing Institutions Through Science Direct)

For both models we show that increasing renewable energy consumption reduces CO2 emissions in the long-run. Thus, encouraging renewable energy use by granting research and development (R&D) programs, reinforcing regulatory framework, etc. is a good policy for OECD countries to combat global warming. This result is consistent with that of Ben Jebli and Ben Youssef (2015a) for the export model. However, our result is not similar to that of Apergis et al. (2010) as they show that more renewable energy consumption increases CO2 emissions for the panel of 19 developed and developing countries they consider. We show that increasing exports or imports reduces CO2 emissions. This result could be explained by the fact that most countries of our considered panel are developed countries. Since trade has a positive effect on per capita GDP and knowing that the inverted U-shaped EKC hypothesis is verified for this panel of OECD countries, the increase in per capita trade leads to a reduction in per capita CO2 emissions in the long-run. This result is similar to that of Shahbaz et al. (2014) who show that the EKC hypothesis is verified in UAE and that increasing exports in UAE reduces CO2 emissions in the long-run. This result is contrary to that found by Ben Jebli and Ben Youssef (2015a) as they show that increasing trade increases CO2 emissions. Their result is due to the fact that the inverted U-shaped EKC hypothesis is not verified in Tunisia considered as a developing country. In addition, our result differs from that of Halicioglu (2009) showing that increasing the trade openness ratio in turkey increases per capita CO2 emissions in the long-run, whereas the EKC hypothesis is verified analytically but not graphically. It is evident from these empirical studies that when the EKC hypothesis is verified, there is a great chance that trade has a beneficial and reducing impact on CO2 emissions. 4. Conclusion and policy implications In this paper, we use panel cointegration techniques to investigate the short and long-run causal nexus between per capita carbon dioxide emissions, economic growth, renewable and non-renewable energy consumption and trade (exports or imports) for a panel of 25 OECD countries over the period 1980–2010. We also try to test the validity of the inverted U-shaped EKC hypothesis for this panel of countries. Our short-run Granger causality tests show the existence of a unidirectional causality running from trade to CO2 emissions, a unidirectional causality running from exports to renewable energy consumption, bidirectional causality between imports and renewable energy consumption, and bidirectional causality between renewable and non-renewable energy consumption. This last causality is indicative of short-run substitutability between the two energy sources. In the long-run however, there is evidence of bidirectional causal relationships between per capita CO2 emissions, real GDP, renewable and non-renewable energy consumption, real exports (or imports). The FMOLS and DOLS long-run estimates support the inverted U-shaped EKC hypothesis between per capita CO2 emissions and GDP. This result is not surprising as most of the considered countries in our panel are developed countries. As expected, increasing non-renewable energy consumption increases CO2 emissions in the long-run. However, increasing renewable energy consumption reduces CO2 emissions in the long-run. Therefore, and because of the substitutability between non-renewable and renewable energy, increasing the consumption of renewable energy leads to a reduction in CO2 emissions and may reduce the dependency of these OECD countries on fossil energy. Long-run estimates show also that increasing trade reduces CO2 emissions. Thus, increasing international commercial exchanges, which has been shown to be increasing economic growth in most empirical studies, is actually helping in combating global warming for this panel of OECD countries.

#### Any alternative to capitalism is terrible for the environment – Leads to inefficiencies, deforestation, increased land use and more emissions

Phillips 15 (Leigh Phillips is a science writer and European Union affairs journalist. Writing for Nature, the Guardian, the Daily Telegraph, the New Statesman, Jacobin, Scientific American, amongst other outlets, “Austerity Ecology & the Collapse-porn Addicts A defence of growth, progress, industry and stuff” ebook) DAH

But the Kool-Aid of the cult of localism is not just being drunk by Rob and Tony and Naomi. Localism is pushed by Bill McKibben—the ex-New Yorker journalist, initiator of the 400,000-strong People’s Climate March outside the UN climate talks in New York in the fall of 2014, and supremo of international climate-change activist group 350.org—in his latest book, Eaarth: Making a Life on a Tough New Planet (yes, that’s spelt correctly—McKibben added an extra ‘a’). Localism is the focus of novelist Barbara Kingsolver’s Animal, Vegetable, Miracle, a memoir of her family’s efforts to eat only food that they had grown themselves or obtain locally for a full year; as it is of The 100-Mile Diet by Alisa Smith and James MacKinnon, and most of food writer Michael Pollan’s oeuvre. There’s Local: The New Face of Food and Farming in America by Douglas Gayeton; The Locavore’s Handbook by Leda Meredith and Sandor Ellix Katz; cookbooks like Local Flavors: Cooking and Eating from America’s Farmers’ Markets by Deborah Madison. Twee little signs hand-calligraphed or rubber-stamp-printed on moss-green parchment and lavender-blush vellum card-stock in cafes, farmers’ markets and high-end grocery stores declare the localist virtue and upstandingness of their muffins, cranberry horseradish and herbal alternatives to deodorant. Busybody Facebook commissars enforce localist doctrine criticising the consumer choices of their friends (when they’re not judging their parenting choices). The local food movement has achieved such ubiquity that it became the mocking subject of satirical comedy series Portlandia in a sketch called ‘Is it Local?’, in which a pair of ethical restaurant-goers grill their waitress about the sustainable pedigree of the dish they are thinking of ordering, which involves a woodland-raised, heritage-breed chicken that has been fed a diet of sheep’s milk, soy and hazelnuts, from 30 miles south of Portland, and is named Colin. It seems so simple: food (or anything else) produced locally will not require the carbon-spewing transportation of such items via cargo ship or truck or plane from far away. It appears to be an easy rule of thumb enabling consumers to do the right thing. But the reality is a great deal more complicated. Instead of the crude heuristic of ‘food miles’, if we are genuinely concerned about greenhouse gas emissions, we need to make sure we are actually doing good, not just feeling good. That means that we need to base such decisions on full life-cycle assessment (LCA) studies—a method of analysis that takes into account all aspects of the production and distribution of a product. And when we do look at LCAs, for some products, it turns out that yes, indeed, it does make sense to relocalise production, but for many, many other items, the economies of scale involved make the amount of energy employed and thus greenhouse-gas emissions per item far less than an item that is locally produced, despite the thousands of ‘food-miles’. According to a 2005 UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs analysis,64 tomato farmers in sunny Spain produce less CO2 than tomato farmers in frequently overcast Britain employing heated greenhouses (630 kg of CO2 vs 2,394 kg of CO2 per tonne). The same is true of Kenyan versus Dutch rose growers, with the former producing six tonnes of CO2 per 12,000 roses cut, and the latter producing 35 tonnes of CO2 for the same amount.65 It is the production of food that that has the largest energy appetite, rather than transportation. Again, it is simply more efficient to have the roses grown where flower production depends almost entirely on the warmth of the sun in equatorial Kenya rather than on the heating and lighting systems of the temperate Netherlands. A similar investigation in 2008 by Carnegie Mellon researchers Christopher Weber and Scott Matthews,66 covering the American situation, found that 83 percent of an average household’s carbon footprint came from emissions during the production phase, with just four percent of full life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions coming from transport from producer to retailer. Weber and Matthews found that due to the different carbon-intensity of the production and distribution of different items, with red meat on average roughly 150 percent more carbon-intensive than chicken or fish, a far more effective rule of thumb than “buying local” would be a dietary shift away from beef and milk. “Shifting less than one day per week’s worth of calories from red meat and dairy products to chicken, fish, eggs or a vegetable-based diet achieves a greater greenhouse gas reduction than buying all locally sourced food,” they conclude. In a similar fashion, in terms of the amount of water used, it can be far more sensible to produce food in areas with heavy precipitation than in arid zones, reducing the need for irrigation, disruption of natural river flows, and piercing of aquifers. Some 70 percent of our freshwater use occurs in agriculture, so this should be a key concern of the localist eco-defenders. Geographer Pierre Desrochers and public policy analyst Hiroko Shimizu describe how agriculture that is local, small-scale, less-technology-intensive—and crucially, by definition, low in productivity—is necessarily more extensive, that is, it uses up much more land for the same amount of food. There is a very simple reason for this. Not every plot of land, with its particular climate, soil type, geology, topography and so on—its terroir, if you will (and I use that term fully aware of the irony of its presence in an essay arguing against localism)—is equally well suited to all types of plant and animal. Specialisation and a division of labour between different regions that are better at growing different items is thus a more efficient use of land: you’ll get more calories produced per hectare.67 The inverse of this process—disintensification, which localism requires—means turning more forest, wetlands and grasslands into agricultural space, releasing vast quantities of carbon in the immediate term and, in the future, eliminating the carbon sinks that forests would have represented. This process of indirect land-use change is essentially why biofuels have proven to be no climate solution. The defenders of localism are in thus little different to the biofuels industry, clinging to a particular agricultural practice long after the evidence has shown it to actually exacerbate climate change. A focus on local seasonality fails for the same reason. If we say: Buy as seasonally as possible, the first question that must be asked in response is: Which region’s seasonality are we talking about? New Zealand’s apple harvest season happens when it’s winter in the UK, making it more sensible to ship fresh granny smiths all the way from the Antipodes to Europe than to keep British apples in cold storage for six months. The same goes for New Zealand lamb, dairy products and onions, according to a trio of researchers at Wellington’s Lincoln University.68 Meanwhile another 2003 study from German researchers Elmar Schlich and Ulla Fleissner69 found via a full life-cycle assessment that large-scale Brazilian orange juice producers shipping their product around the world had lower per-unit energy demands than small-scale German apple juice squeezers driving their truck just ten kilometres to market. If the advice instead is not local seasonality, but ‘global seasonality’, picking things to eat when they’re in season wherever they come from, then yes, in principle, you may see some carbon emission reductions due to shorter storage periods. But in the modern era, most food items are always in season somewhere in the world. This isn’t true for all items, and for such products, a preference for their seasonality might make sense, but then again, this should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, using an LCA to take into account all the other variables related to carbon emissions. To do this would require something like a very detailed spreadsheet comparing all the different products and their component inputs, transport, storage requirements and packaging rather than the clumsy heuristic of “Buy seasonal!”, which, as demonstrated, in a number of cases is actually detrimental in terms of mitigating climate change. Such Excel Hell might make sense for more rational agricultural planning, but as far as an individual consumer is concerned, it would be far more effective to expend one’s time fighting for clean energy infrastructure than on this sort of faff.

#### [5] Living Conditions: Globalization and capitalism have empirically reduced inequality and drastically improved living conditions

Economist 16 —[“Why they’re wrong,” *The Economist*, 2016, http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21707926-globalisations-critics-say-it-benefits-only-elite-fact-less-open-world-would-hurt, accessed 4 Dec 2016]

The backlash against trade is just one symptom of a pervasive anxiety about the effects of open economies. Britain’s Brexit vote reflected concerns about the impact of unfettered migration on public services, jobs and culture. Big businesses are slammed for using foreign boltholes to dodge taxes. Such critiques contain some truth: more must be done to help those who lose out from openness. But there is a world of difference between improving globalisation and reversing it. The idea that globalisation is a scam that benefits only corporations and the rich could scarcely be more wrong. The real pro-poor policy Exhibit A is the vast improvement in global living standards in the decades after the second world war, which was underpinned by an explosion in world trade. Exports of goods rose from 8% of world GDP in 1950 to almost 20% a half-century later. Export-led growth and foreign investment have dragged hundreds of millions out of poverty in China, and transformed economies from Ireland to South Korea. Plainly, Western voters are not much comforted by this extraordinary transformation in the fortunes of emerging markets. But at home, too, the overall benefits of free trade are unarguable. Exporting firms are more productive and pay higher wages than those that serve only the domestic market. Half of America’s exports go to countries with which it has a free-trade deal, even though their economies account for less than a tenth of global GDP. Protectionism, by contrast, hurts consumers and does little for workers. The worst-off benefit far more from trade than the rich. A study of 40 countries found that the richest consumers would lose 28 [percent] of their purchasing power if cross-border trade ended; but those in the bottom tenth would lose 63 [percent]. The annual cost to American consumers of switching to non-Chinese tyres after Barack Obama slapped on anti-dumping tariffs in 2009 was around $1.1 billion, according to the Peterson Institute for International Economics. That amounts to over $900,000 for each of the 1,200 jobs that were “saved”. Openness delivers other benefits. Migrants improve not just their own lives but the economies of host countries: European immigrants who arrived in Britain since 2000 have been net contributors to the exchequer, adding more than £20 billion ($34 billion) to the public finances between 2001 and 2011. Foreign direct investment delivers competition, technology, management know-how and jobs, which is why China’s overly cautious moves to encourage FDI disappoint (see article). What have you done for me lately? None of this is to deny that globalisation has its flaws. Since the 1840s advocates of free trade have known that, though the great majority benefit, some lose out. Too little has been done to help these people. Perhaps a fifth of the 6m or so net job losses in American manufacturing between 1999 and 2011 stemmed from Chinese competition; many of those who lost jobs did not find new ones. With hindsight, politicians in Britain were too blithe about the pressures that migration from new EU member states in eastern Europe brought to bear on public services. And although there are no street protests about the speed and fickleness in the tides of short-term capital, its ebb and flow across borders have often proved damaging, not least in the euro zone’s debt-ridden countries. As our special report this week argues, more must be done to tackle these downsides. America spends a paltry 0.1% of its GDP, one-sixth of the rich-country average, on policies to retrain workers and help them find new jobs. In this context, it is lamentable that neither Mr Trump nor Mrs Clinton offers policies to help those whose jobs have been affected by trade or cheaper technology. On migration, it makes sense to follow the example of Denmark and link local-government revenues to the number of incomers, so that strains on schools, hospitals and housing can be eased. Many see the rules that bind signatories to trade pacts as an affront to democracy. But there are ways that shared rules can enhance national autonomy. Harmonising norms on how multinational firms are taxed would give countries greater command over their public finances. A co-ordinated approach to curbing volatile capital flows would restore mastery over national monetary policy. These are the sensible responses to the peddlers of protectionism and nativism. The worst answer would be for countries to turn their backs on globalisation. The case for openness remains much the same as it did when this newspaper was founded to support the repeal of the Corn Laws. There are more—and more varied—opportunities in open economies than in closed ones. And, in general, greater opportunity makes people better off. Since the 1840s, free-traders have believed that closed economies favour the powerful and hurt the labouring classes. They were right then. They are right now.

#### The world is getting better because of capitalism – violence, genocide, and war are down and poverty has been drastically reduced

**Wyne**, MA contributing analyst at Wikistrat and a Global Fellow at PS21, **2015** (Ali, “The World Is Becoming Safer, Wealthier and Healthier”, Huffington Post, March 16, 2015, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ali-wyne/the-world-is-becoming-saf\_b\_6878664.html)

There are plenty of reasons to despair about the state of the world: ISIL's depredations in the Middle East, Boko Haram's atrocities in Nigeria, and Russia's slow-drip incursion into Ukraine are just a few. These phenomena are more distressing when one considers that they're occurring against the backdrop of an eroding postwar order. Contrary to the oft-heard refrain, though, that the world is becoming more dangerous -- or, according to some observers, has never been more dangerous -- it has actually never been safer. Steven Pinker and Andrew Mack recently documented the declines in global rates of homicide, violence against women, genocide, and war, among other categories. We're also becoming more prosperous. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, real global GDP more than tripled between 1970 and 2010, and real global GDP per capita nearly doubled. Last month the Economist reported that the percent of the world's population living in "abject poverty" fell from 36 in 1990 to 18 in 2010 (translating to about 900 million people who escaped that condition). Finally, we're living longer, better lives. The University of Washington's Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation found that "global life expectancy increased by 5.8 years for men and 6.6 years for women" between 1990 and 2013. According to the United Nations, moreover, the mortality rate for children under five fell from 90 per thousand births to 46 during that same period, while the percent of the world's population that is "clinically malnourished" fell more than seven points. It's no accident the world is becoming safer, wealthier and healthier: there are extraordinary people around the world who're trying to make it better. Too often, though, their names remain unknown; their contributions, unacknowledged. "What's Working" is a crucial platform for spotlighting them. When the news of the day feels overwhelming, I take comfort in three facts. First, the ingenuity of our minds has always scaled with the magnitude of our calling. There's no reason to believe it won't continue doing so. Second, we're pushing forward the frontiers of possibility every second, far more rapidly than we can comprehend. Before coming to MIT, I believed certain problems were simply too hard for human beings to address. In retrospect, though, my skepticism simply reflected my failure of imagination. I now assume that once a problem has been identified, folks will eventually solve it or find a way to manage it. The tipping point for me came six years ago, when MIT News ran an article discussing a new project Professor Angela Belcher and a few of her colleagues had undertaken. "For the first time," it explained, "MIT researchers have shown they can genetically engineer viruses to build both the positively and negatively charged ends of a lithium-ion battery." If we can figure out how to make batteries from viruses -- I never imagined I'd see those two words in the same sentence, and I still can't get my head around the idea -- what can't we do? Third, no matter what problem keeps you up at night, there are brilliant, passionate people around the world who're working on it. You may not hear about them amid the daily barrage of depressing headlines, but they're easy to find if you want to find them. Among the extraordinary individuals I've met, spoken to over e-mail, or reconnected with in recent months: Ruzwana Bashir, the cofounder and CEO of Peek, who's using her own experience of sexual abuse to help other victims find their voices; Pardis Sabeti, a professor of organismic and evolutionary biology at Harvard, who's developing treatments to fight Ebola; Donald Sadoway, a professor of materials chemistry at MIT, whose work on liquid-metal batteries could revolutionize electricity storage; Shiza Shahid, the cofounder of the Malala Fund, who's working to give young women around the world a chance at an education; and Wes Moore, author of The Other Wes Moore and The Work, who cofounded BridgeEdU to help at-risk youth in Baltimore graduate from college. There's an enormous amount of work to be done -- slowing the course of climate change, feeding a growing population and resettling tens of millions of refugees, to name but a few challenges -- but dwelling on everything that's wrong and fretting about everything that could go wrong won't help. Let's spend less time lamenting the state of the world and more time supporting those who're making it better.

#### Productivity is good for global quality of life and reducing structural violence—they’re reductionist.

Iacono ‘16, Corey Iacono is a student at the University of Rhode Island studying Pharmaceutical Science and Economics, “How Capitalism and Globalization Have Made the World a Better Place,” Quillette, January 16, 2016, <http://quillette.com/2016/01/16/how-capitalism-and-globalization-have-made-the-world-a-better-place>, msm

Just kidding, that’s not what happened at all. In fact, as the world has become more capitalist and more globalized, the quality of life for the average person, and especially for the average poor person, has increased substantially. In 1990, 37% of the global population lived on less than $1.90 per day. By 2012, that number had been reduced to 12.8%, and in 2015 it was under 10%. The source of this progress isn’t a massive wealth redistribution program; it’s massive wealth creation — that is, economic growth. Economists David Dollar and Aart Kraay found that, in a global sample of over 100 countries, changes in the income growth of the bottom 40% of the world’s income earners are highly correlated with economic growth rates. On the other hand, changes in inequality contributed relatively little to changes in social welfare of the poor over the last few decades. There is good reason to believe that the expansion of free trade, facilitated by international organizations like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), have had a considerable impact in accelerating the economic development of developing countries. In the 1990s GATT facilitated reforms which moved 125 countries towards freer trade by reducing the burden of government imposed trade barriers like tariffs. This was the first serious attempt at trade reform for most developing countries at the time, and arguably presents a unique natural experiment on the economic effects of trade reform. In fact, a paper published by the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), specifically examined how trade reforms facilitated by GATT affected the economic development of the reforming countries. In the paper, the authors compared the trends in economic growth before and after trade reform in the reforming countries. Then they compared those results to trends in economic growth of a control group of countries which didn’t undergo trade reform. What they found was very encouraging for proponents of free trade. Prior to reform, the economic development of reformers and non-reformers was practically identical, but after reform, the economic development of reforming countries accelerated while non-reforming countries saw their economies stagnate and decline. The results suggest that the reforms towards freer trade lead to an increase in income per capita of around 20% in the long-run, an effect so large that it almost certainly had a positive and non-trivial impact on poverty reduction. Similarly, other research has shown that more free market trade policies result in lower rates of extreme poverty and child mortality in developing countries. There are other benefits as well. One study on trade reform in Indonesia found that reductions of import tariffs led to an increase in disposable income among poor households, which allowed them to pull their children out of the labor force, leading to “a strong decline” in the incidence of child labor. Unfortunately, many activists have reflexively taken up the cause of opposing the expansion of global capitalism, for a number of reasons. Western anti-sweatshop activists, for example, will often argue in favor of government imposed barriers to trade with poor countries because their working conditions are terrible in comparison to those in developed Western nations. In their view, western consumers should not be promoting a cycle of capitalist exploitation by buying products made in Vietnamese sweat-shops. But satisfactory working conditions aren’t the natural state of mankind; they are a consequence of decades of economic development. Erecting barriers to trade with poor countries is surely a large impediment to their development, in fact, research suggests that existing developed world tariffs depress economic growth rates in the developing world by 0.6 to 1.6 percent per person, a considerably large effect. Moreover, the sweat-shops which produce clothing for Westerners are often much better than alternative forms of domestic employment. In poor countries like Bangladesh, China, and Vietnam, the apparel industry consistently pays more than most other domestic industries. According to research by economist Ben Powell, in poor countries “most sweatshop jobs provide an above average standard of living for their workers.” Notably, a paper published in the Journal of Development Economics found that the expansion of the garments industry in Bangladesh lead to an increase in employment and income among young women, giving them the means to finance their own education. Remarkably the authors found that, “the demand for education generated through manufacturing growth appears to have a much larger effect on female educational attainment compared to a large-scale government conditional cash transfer program to encourage female schooling.” Foreign investment is also more desirable than opponents of capitalism and globalization give it credit for. The conventional wisdom among activists in wealthy countries is that multinational corporations exploit poor workers in third world countries for cheap labor, profiting off people working in sweatshop conditions. It should come as a surprise to the individuals who hold this view to learn that 85% of people in developing countries believe that foreign companies building factories in their countries is a good thing, according to Pew Research. In fact, for all the talk of exploitative multinational corporations, research shows that, in general, these corporations provide higher wages and better working conditions than domestic employers in developing countries. Additionally, when multinational corporations build factories in poor countries, it raises the demand for low-skilled workers, resulting in higher wages for local workers. Consistent with this fact, recent empirical evidence demonstrates that investment by foreign companies in developing countries reduces both poverty and income inequality by raising the incomes of low-skilled workers. Foreign investment can also make people in relatively low-income countries better off by providing better or more inexpensive products. A recent analysis published by the NBER found that foreign retailers like Wal-Mart greatly reduce the cost of living for both the rich and poor in Mexico, making everyone along the income distribution better off. Global capitalism is by no means a perfect phenomenon. Many businesses do have questionable labor practices that are worthy of contempt. And free market policies may in many instances lead to socially undesirable outcomes, sometimes on a large scale. However, the one-dimensional, automatic denunciation of capitalism and the accompanying refusal to give it any credit for its successes — as social media activists have done — reflects an uncompromising, and quite frankly ignorant worldview. It is one in which capitalism is always bad, no matter what the evidence tells us.

#### Cap key to ending oppression of women

(Ann E Cudd 14, professor of philosophy at Boston University, Dean of the college of Arts and Sciences, Formerly Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Distinguished philosophy professor at KU. She has a particular interest in Feminist Theory and the Philosophy of economics. 5/21/14, “Is Capitalism good for women?,”, (https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/15280/ACudd\_JofBusinessEthics\_21May2014.pdf?sequence=1, Kent Denver - YB-JL//Recut Aanya)

Capitalism offers four mechanisms for overthrowing tradition, and forging a path to end patriarchal oppression of women. Materially, capitalism subverts traditional forms of deformed desires and false consciousness by offering options that expand[ing] opportunities for women. By offering jobs and wages to women, capitalism offers women an opportunity for activities outside 16 the home and for income that opens other doors. In some developing countries, mainly those where men’s human capital is relatively low as well, women will immediately compete with men for equal wages. This gives women greater bargaining power within families and communities, and thus a greater ability to resist violence and exploitation by men of their community. Capitalism also offers the option for women to become entrepreneurs and thus their own bosses. The Grameen Bank founded by Yunus Muhammad and its many offshoot social enterprises provide concrete evidence that this is a real option for women in the developing world. (Muhammad 2007) The second mechanism capitalism offers to overthrow traditional culture is the ideology of individual rights, which can be adopted by women to disrupt the traditional gender ideology. (Gordon 1996) Capitalism derives its prime justification from the maximization of individual liberty, and capitalist societies promulgate the ideology of individualism, which helps to break down patriarchal and sexist norms and practices of traditional cultures. A good example of this is the resistance to contraception and the forbidding of abortion common in traditional cultures. Capitalism directly provides incentives to fight against this resistance by making children less valuable as uneducated, unskilled laborers and more valuable when educated and raised to adulthood before going into paid employment. Capitalism also indirectly incentivizes having fewer children by allowing families to afford nutrition and health care, and thus improving health outcomes, of infants and children. Even in capitalist societies women and men must struggle against the forces of tradition to preserve women’s rights to reproductive and bodily autonomy. The ideology of individualism which capitalism reinforces and relies upon helps women and men to see women as valuable in themselves, and not only for the subordinated social roles that they fulfill. At the very least they are consumers who have their own preferences and tastes that 17 the market attempts to satisfy. But capitalism is also part of the liberal worldview, which values individuals and individual autonomy above all else. Once the ideology of individual rights becomes widely known and discussed, the false beliefs of inferiority of women can be challenged and countered, and this in turn challenges evaluations of women as inferior. Third, in promoting free market exchange, capitalism promotes the idea of mutual advantage. Adam Smith’s notion of the invisible hand is one original formulation of this idea. In capitalism, each person pursues their own advantage and the advantage of the group arises. Another formulation of the idea of mutual advantage comes from the idea of a positive sum game, in which all the players may gain at the same time. By playing by the rules within a suitably constrained and monitored system, each one can strive to achieve without depriving others. Mutual advantage opposes the notion that women should sacrifice their own interests for the sake of others without any expectation of benefit. (Gauthier 1986) In this way, capitalism enshrines the idea of equality in market exchange itself. Finally, because capitalism promotes innovation, capitalist governments and firms promote science as a path to technical innovation. Science offers a means for critical analysis of beliefs, and hence a way to uncover and debunk false consciousness.9 In the quest for a creative, innovative workforce, successful firms seek out highly educated individuals and individuals from widely varying backgrounds. If a society is to support such innovation, it needs to support the education of individuals from all walks of life in order to maximize the potential for finding the uniquely creative individuals who will invent new technologies and new forms of life. But an inevitable by product of such broadly distributed education will be the creation of individuals capable of critical thinking, who question the fetishes of the current generation. In this way capitalism creates the conditions for trenchant critiques of capitalist fetishes, as well.

#### [6] Epistemology DA to all of their scholarship - they don’t get offense - their evidence is futile and biased intellectual pride

**Saunders 7** (Peter, Adjunct Professor at the [Australian Graduate School of Management](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Graduate_School_of_Management), Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, <http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html> //shree)

Andrew Norton notes that disaffected **intellectuals** since Rousseau **have been attacking capitalism** for its failure to meet ‘true human needs.’[(26)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#26) **The claim is unfounded**, so what is it about capitalism that so upsets them?  Joseph Schumpeter offered part of the answer. He observed that **capitalism has brought into being an educated class that** has no responsibility for practical affairs, and that this class can only make a mark by criticising the system that feeds them.[(27)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#27) Intellectuals **attack capitalism because that is how the**y sell books and **build careers**.   More recently, Robert Nozick has noted that **intellectuals spend their childhoods excelling** at school, where they occupy the top positions in the hierarchy, **only to find later in life that their market value is** much **lower than they believe they are worth**. Seeing ‘mere traders’ enjoying higher pay than them is unbearable, and it generates irreconcilable disaffection with the market system.[(28)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#28)  But the best explanation for the intellectuals’ distaste for capitalism was offered by Friedrich Hayek in The Fatal Conceit.[(29)](http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders_summer07.html#29) Hayek understood that **capitalism offends intellectual pride, while socialism flatters it**. Humans like to believe they can design better systems than those that tradition or evolution have bequeathed. **We distrust evolved systems, like markets**, which seem to work without intelligent direction according to laws and dynamics that no one fully understands.   **Nobody planned the global capitalist system**, nobody **runs it, and** nobody really **comprehends it**. **This** particularly **offends intellectuals**, for capitalism renders them redundant. It gets on perfectly well without them. It does not need them to make it run, to coordinate it, or to redesign it. The intellectual critics of capitalism believe they know what is good for us, but millions of people interacting in the marketplace keep rebuffing them. This, ultimately, is why they believe capitalism is ‘bad for the soul’: it fulfils human needs without first seeking their moral approval.

## Case

#### Top-Level—they are missing uniqueness—none of their evidence is specific to an unconditional RTS, just strikes in general, which means they are the status quo and the aff doesn’t casually decrease any of their harms.

#### Recognition politics co-opts the fight for equality---attributes suffering to identities instead of political structures. Fraser 13

(Nancy, Loeb Professor of Philosophy and Politics at the New School for Social Research, Einstein Fellow of the city of Berlin, and holder of the “Global Justice” Chair at the Collège d’études mondiales in Paris. Her books include Redistribution or Recognition; Adding Insult to Injury; Scales of Justice; Justice Interruptus; and Unruly Practices) Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis. Verso Books, 2013.

Enter the politics of recognition. **If the initial thrust of postwar feminism was to “ engender” the socialist imaginary, the later tendency was to redefine gender justice as a project aimed at “ recognizing difference.” “ Recognition,” accordingly, became the chief grammar of feminist claims-making at the fin de siecle. A venerable category o f Hegelian philosophy, resuscitated by political theorists, this notion captured the distinctive character of “post-socialist” struggles, which often took the form of identity politics, aimed more at valorizing cultural difference than at promoting economic equality.** Whether the question was care work, sexual violence, or gender disparities in political representation, **feminists increasingly resorted to the grammar of recognition to press their claims.** **Unable to transform the deep gender structures of the capitalist economy, they preferred to target harms rooted in androcentric patterns o f cultural value or status hierarchies. The result was a major shift in the feminist imaginary: whereas the previous generation had sought to remake political economy, this one focused more on transforming culture.** The results were decidedly **mixed. On the one hand, the new feminist struggles for recognition continued the earlier project of expanding the political agenda beyond the confines o f class redistribution; in principle they served to broaden, and to radicalize, the concept of justice. On the other hand, however, the figure o f the struggle for recognition so thoroughly captured the feminist imagination that it served more to displace than to deepen the socialist imaginary.** **The effect was to subordinate social struggles to cultural struggles, the politics of redistribution to the politics o f recognition.**That was not, to be sure, the original intention. It was assumed, rather, by proponents of the cultural turn that a feminist politics o f identity and difference would synergize with struggles for gender equality. But that assumption fell prey to the larger Zeitgeist. In the fin de siecle context, **the turn to recognition dovetailed all too neady with a rising neoliberalism that wanted nothing more than to repress all memory of social egalitarianism. The result was a tragic historical irony. Instead of arriving at a broader, richer paradigm that could encompass both redistribution and recognition, feminists effectively tradedone truncated paradigm for another— a truncated economism for a truncated culturalism**. Today, however, perspectives centered on recognition alone lack all credibility. In the context of escalating capitalist crisis, the critique of political economy is regaining its central place in theory and practice. No serious social movement, least of all feminism, can ignore the evisceration of democracy and the assault on social reproduction now being waged by finance capital. Under these conditions, **a feminist theory worth its salt must revive the “ economic” concerns of Act One— without, however, neglecting the “ cultural” insights of Act Two.** But that is not all. It must integrate these not only with one another but also with a new set of “political” concerns made salient by globalization: How might emancipatory struggles serve to secure democratic legitimacy and to expand and equalize political influence in a time when the powers that govern our lives increasingly overrun the borders of territorial states? How might feminist movements foster equal participation transnation- ally, across entrenched power asymmetries and divergent worldviews? Struggling simultaneously on three fronts— call them redistribution, recognition, and representation— the feminism of Act Three must join with other anti-capitalist forces, even while exposing their continued failure to absorb the insights of decades of feminist activism. **Today’s feminism must, moreover, be sensitive to the historical context in which we operate. Situating ourselves vis-a-vis the broader constellation of political forces, we need to keep our distance both from market-besotted neoliberals and from those who seek to “ defend society” (replete with hierarchy and exclusion) from the market.** Charting a third path between that Scylla and Charybdis, a feminism worthy of Act Three must join other emancipatory movements in integrating our fundamental interest in non-domination with protectionists’ legitimate concerns for social security, without neglecting the importance of negative liberty, which is usually associated with liberalism.

#### Labor Unions exclude women and perpetuate unfair treatment, lack of representation, abuse and discount the voices of women thus forcing them to take normative stances.

#### **Crain ’95**

Crain, M. ., *Women, labor unions, and hostile work environment sexual harassment: The untold story* , 4(1) Tex. J. Women & L. 9 (1995).

The culture of the union responsible for representing a particular victim is the best predictor of the union's response to her sexual harassment complaint. A. Unions in Traditionally Female and Gender-Mixed Occupations Union presence in traditionally female occupations is statistically very low compared with union presence in male-dominated occupations.98 When one focuses on the problem of sexual harassment in many female- dominated occupations, such as clerical work and retail work, then, the union's role is nonexistent: the story of union attitudes toward harassment of these women is that the unions simply are not there. Union density is high, however, in some female-dominated occupations such as the public sector, teaching, garment work, nursing, and the airline industry (i.e., flight attendants).99 In general, the unions that have dedicated themselves to organizing workforces that are predominantly female have been quite aggressive in addressing sexual harassment on behalf of their female members.100 This behavior on the part of unions whose membership is predominantly female is quite rational: sexual harassment in workplaces where the bargaining unit is predominantly female rarely presents a role conflict for the union. Much of the harassment in these workplaces tends toward the quid pro quo variety and is perpetrated by supervisors who are not union members. Even among unions whose membership includes a significant percentage of women, however, **gender bias exists, often at the highest levels of the union hierarchy.** Some of the most egregious sexual harassment cases involve a perpetrator who uses the power conferred upon him through his status as a union official to harass female unit members.102 The incidence of peer harassment is significant in gender- mixed workplaces as well. In industries such as grocery stores and auto assembly plants, male and female workers are often segregated rather strictly by sex into particular job categories (female bakery workers and cashiers, male stock inventory clerks and butchers) with accompanying pay differentials,103 and strategic sexual harassment designed to preserve those boundaries is common. Union performance in this area has been mixed, which is not surprising in light of the ambivalent position in which elected union officials find themselves when the bargaining unit is well integrated by sex.104 Unions that represent the harasser in these circumstances face the real possibility of a bargaining unit cleavage.105 (reporting that the union represented a female shop helper in a grievance alleging sexual harassment by two supervisors). B. Unions in Male-Dominated Occupations Union density in male-dominated occupations is much higher than it is in female-dominated occupations.106 Unions representing workers in traditionally male occupations have rather consistently privileged their male members' gender interests at the expense of their female members' interests and of class solidarity. In some cases, union leaders have been active participants in the sexual harassment-particularly the hostile work environment variety.107 An extreme illustrative case involved a female apprentice carpenter who complained to her union stewards about calendars featuring nude women in sexually submissive postures that were displayed at the worksite in locations where she had to go to store her clothing, receive job assignments and paychecks, and punch in on a timeclock. The calendars were printed at the union's request and bore the union's name, logo, address and telephone number, and were distributed by the union's business agents. 108 The union stewards either laughed at her concern or became angry. Further, the plaintiff alleged that one of the union business agents personally harassed her with hostile and offensive remarks about her anatomy.110 More frequently, **unions perpetuate hostile work environments in male-dominated workplaces by ignoring the problem**. The percentage of collective bargaining agreements containing clauses specifically prohibiting sexual harassment and authorizing the filing of grievances by female victims is surprisingly low.111 Even where the collective agreement does contain an antidiscrimination clause or a list of general offenses, such as gross insubordination, that could be construed to ground a grievance for sexual harassment,112 defining certain conduct as sexual harassment and persuading the union to take action on a woman's behalf are significant barriers.113 Some **union stewards discourage women from complaining about sexual harassment by co-workers by pointing to problems of proof and emphasizing the lack of "any real concrete detail" in the women's stories.**114 Others seem reluctant to create schisms within the unit by processing grievances on behalf of women members against male members.115 Most unions take the view that sexual harassment is the employer's problem since Title VII mandates that the employer maintain a workplace 109. free of sexual harassment.116 Unfortunately, this approach tends to expose the harassers to discipline by the employer, a situation which might be avoided altogether if the union took a more active role in addressing sexual harassment of one unit member by another. In a typical case, a United Mineworkers' District president had to be prompted by a call from the international union's legal office to assist a woman miner in filing a sexual harassment grievance against three male co-workers that she had caught peeping into the women's dressing room.117 Although the female employee subsequently indicated that she would have been satisfied with an admission of guilt made by the men in front of their co-workers, the union evidently did not pursue the woman's grievance once it had been filed, and she took her complaint to the employer. The employer imposed a five-day suspension on the men, and the union then represented them in their grievances protesting the suspension. 118 A few unions, recognizing their obligation to serve their members fairly, and/or responding to the implicit threat of a claim of breach of duty of fair representation by the unrepresented woman unionist, will try to resolve the problem of member-to-member harassment inside the union through mediation or counseling, attempting to avoid placing the workers in a vulnerable position vis-a-vis the employer.119 Or, if the employer has already disciplined the alleged harasser, the union may file grievances on behalf of both the harasser and the victim, appointing separate representatives for each. 120 Alternatively, the union may investigate the 116. situation, determine which employee it will represent, and represent that employee in a grievance against the employer.121 Reluctance by union stewards to pursue grievances, as well as the circulation of unofficial information about union responses to similar claims, has a disproportionately powerful effect on those women who display a "generalized aversion to confrontation," and are likely to address the problem through indirect methods, such as avoidance strategies.122 These women are often immobilized by the prospect of conflict or fear retribution for making the claim.123 Of course, women who are aware of the fact that the union contract does not address sexual harassment are also less likely to approach the union for assistance.124

#### Labor Unions are not effective at creating better working conditions for women.

#### Timm’16

Timm, Jonathan. “A Labor Movement That’s More About Women.” The Atlantic. August 25, 2016. <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/08/the-womens-labor-movement/497294/>

The labor movement was once led by male union bosses representing a mostly male workforce. They fought for protections that tended to benefit men; in some cases, male union leaders brushed aside the needs and priorities of women or excluded them altogether. The University of Toledo law professor Nicole Buonocore Porter writes that many unions in the early 1900s [excluded women](http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1543&context=nlj) from their ranks because they feared that the competition would lower men’s wages and harm the traditional family structure. As late as 1992, only 7 percent of women in unions had contracts that guaranteed equal pay for equal work. Even the Fair Labor Standards Act—one of the most significant pieces of pro-labor legislation in American history—was the result of [compromises](http://backstoryradio.org/shows/fair-wages/) that excluded many low-earning women, such as domestic and clerical workers, from its key protections such as the minimum wage, according to the University of Virginia law professor Risa Goluboff. But today’s working world is different. Women now make up [47 percent](https://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/qf-laborforce-10.htm) of the American workforce and are the equal if not primary breadwinners in [40 percent of](http://www.iwpr.org/initiatives/pay-equity-and-discrimination) families. In 2014, about 60 percent of women aged 16 and older worked outside of the home, up from about 33 percent in 1950 and 43 percent in 1970. As the workforce’s demographics have changed, so have unions. [About half](https://media.sps.cuny.edu/filestore/8/6/3_bc4b97196c5659e/863_916e1989d05f0e6.pdf) of union members today are women, many of the highest positions are held by women, and the issues that most affect women—such as paid family leave and child care—have landed among their top [priorities](http://www.working-families.org/publications/labor_participation.pdf). At the same time, though, unions aren’t the powerhouses they once were. Since the 1950s, when unions had their highest rate of membership, the economy has changed and [anti-labor legislation has proliferated](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/14/magazine/scott-walker-and-the-fate-of-the-union.html).**The vast majority of working women—about** [**90 percent**](http://statusofwomendata.org/women-in-unions/)**—do not belong to unions.** (Nor do the vast majority of men, for that matter.) As a result, for millions of working women today, improving working conditions at the bargaining table—the traditional and arguably most effective way of doing so—is just not an option. The decline of unions has contributed to a flourishing of labor advocacy groups that are often called either “alt-labor groups” “new actors,” or “worker centers.” Janice Fine, a professor at Rutgers University, has been researching these kinds of organizations since 1992. Back then, there were only five worker centers in the country, she says, and they focused mainly on helping workers understand what rights they already had, and then helping them to make a legal case when those rights were violated, but not obtaining new rights. But by 2012, the number of worker centers had grown to 214 and expanded their scope. Now, they wage campaigns for pro-labor legislation, experiment with new forms of organization and coalition building, conduct research, and provide resources and education to workers and employers. As they’ve grown, worker centers have become one of the most potent forces for advancing women’s economic interests, such as equal pay, equal protection under the law, and access to family-friendly workplace benefits. It’s no coincidence that many of the most prominent alt-labor groups are run by women. Tipped workers face poverty at twice the rate of the rest of the workforce. Two-thirds of that group are women. One of these is the [Restaurant Opportunities Center United](http://rocunited.org/), or ROC, led by the organization’s co-founder and co-director, Saru Jayaraman. A lawyer, professor, and acclaimed labor organizer, Jayaraman and her colleagues created ROC to support the surviving workers of a restaurant located at the World Trade Center in 2001. Since then, they have won [more than $10 million](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/21/business/an-outspoken-force-to-give-food-workers-a-seat-at-the-table.html?_r=0) in back wages for restaurant workers, [waged successful political campaigns](http://rocunited.org/democratic-platform-1fw/), and built a membership of 18,000 restaurant workers in 15 states. Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics [show](http://www.bls.gov/iag/tgs/iag722.htm) that the restaurant industry is one of the country’s largest and fastest-growing employers, with more than 11 million employees, many of whom depend on tips. According to the [National Women’s Law Center](https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/tipped_minimum_wage_worker_wage_gap_may_2015.pdf), tipped workers face poverty at twice the rate of the rest of the workforce. Two-thirds of that group are women. In the course of widespread debate about whether to raise the federal minimum wage above $7.25, the fact that there are actually two federal minimum wages is often overlooked. Most workers are supposed to get $7.25 per hour (or more, where states have imposed a higher minimum rate), but tipped workers are promised a base rate of only $2.13 per hour. While employers are required to “top off” their staff’s wages when tips don’t bring their wages up to at least the higher minimum wage, many employers [neglect](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/20140325minimumwageandwomenreportfinal.pdf) to make up the difference—and they rarely face penalties. This state of affairs is in large part because each time the federal minimum wage has been raised, the National Restaurant Association, one of the nation’s most powerful lobbies, fights hard to keep the minimum wage for tipped workers frozen, [arguing that](http://www.restaurant.org/News-Research/News/Restaurateurs-struggle-with-wage-hikes) raising the minimum wage would force restaurateurs to reduce hours, lay off staff, or close their doors. Making matters worse, the dependence on tips forces many women to stomach frequent sexual harassment from customers. According to ROC, women restaurant workers suffer from “the worst sexual harassment of any industry in the United States.” For example, as Aisha Thurman, a restaurant worker, told ROC, men “think, you know, my body is for them to enjoy, to look at, touch, say what they want. They think if they throw me a couple dollars in the form of a tip, it’s OK.” And bosses often brush aside the complaints of female workers.“I’ve on occasion gone to a manager and told them, you know, ‘This guest is being a little bit difficult, and I’m not sure how to handle it,’” a restaurant worker named Ashley Ogogor [told Democracy Now](http://www.democracynow.org/2014/10/13/campaigners_call_for_one_fair_wage). “And they ask me, ‘Well, what are they saying?’ Just, you know, comments about how pretty I am, and, you know, I’ve had guests ask me out on dates. And they said….it’s OK, you know? You should be fine.” In an effort to reduce the widespread poverty and sexual harassment restaurant workers face, Jayaraman and ROC launched a campaign called [“One Fair Wage](http://rocunited.org/one-fair-wage/).” The campaign aims to eliminate the lower minimum wage for tipped workers or eliminate tipping altogether. In the past three years, One Fair Wage legislation has been introduced in eight states, and, most recently, won the support of Hillary Clinton and the [Democratic party's platform](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers_pdf/117717.pdf). The primary beneficiaries of such a law would be women, though men who work for tips would of course be helped too. “The traditional oppositional model of bargaining is one that doesn’t work [for domestic workers].” Another majority-women class that is unprotected by conventional labor laws is domestic workers. According to a [national survey](http://www.domesticworkers.org/sites/default/files/HomeEconomicsEnglish.pdf), **there are between two and three million domestic workers in the United States. Ninety-five percent of them are women, almost half are immigrants, and almost a quarter of them are paid below the minimum wage. Like the separate minimum wage for tipped workers, domestic workers are not protected by one of the broadest and most powerful labor laws in the United States, the National Labor Relations Act.** They are prohibited from joining unions or engaging in collective bargaining and excluded from basic overtime and safety protections. Ai-jen Poo is the founder of the National Domestic Workers Alliance (NDWA), one of the largest of the alt-labor groups. The NDWA may be best known for its campaigns for “Domestic Bill of Rights” legislation, first passed in New York state, with several others following suit, which aim to better align working conditions for domestic workers with conventional labor standards. Improving working conditions for domestic workers is particularly difficult given that, by definition, they work in private spaces, almost always by themselves. What’s more, the intimate nature of their work—often caring for vulnerable loved ones—means that maintaining the relationship between the employer and worker is critical. “The traditional oppositional model of bargaining is one that doesn’t work in our sector,” Poo told me. “And that’s forced us to be creative about finding the right partnerships and the right opportunities to elevate working conditions and standards together with employers and consumers.” In large part, the poor conditions for domestic workers stem from the culture around the work. Many employers of domestic workers don’t think of themselves as employers. It’s for that reason that one of the NDWA’s largest priorities in campaigns and partnerships is to open the eyes of employers (who in this case are also consumers), helping them to value the work more as well as understand the difficulties domestic workers face, and to commit to improving working conditions. With its partners, NDWA has won legislation that aims to protect domestic workers in seven states. Since its founding in 2007, it has formed partnerships with 53 organizations across the country and started its first local chapter in Atlanta, which, all told, represent some 20,000 nannies, housekeepers, and caregivers for the elderly. They’ve also worked with Care.com to raise awareness about the issues domestic workers face and establish high standards for working conditions. They are also experimenting with providing training and benefits to dues-paying members. Taken together, NDWA is using several strategies to find new ways to improve both the culture around its industry and the economic well-being of domestic workers, all without necessarily organizing domestic workers into unions or forming new ones. “We’re on the front lines of developing a vision for the future of workers’ movements in this country, and there are some unions who are partners in that endeavor,” Poo told me. “But we are trying to look to what’s next.” \*\*\* Both in spite of and because of considerable obstacles, alt-labor groups like ROC and NDWA have set a promising example of how to advance labor interests. “The shift of activity has clearly moved to more general advocacy than from the unions,” says Ariane Hegewisch, a researcher at the Institute for Women’s Policy Research. But what isn’t clear is whether alt-labor groups can scale their impact without unions. The question in part boils down to funding models. Large unions are funded by dues-paying members; by contrast, alt-labor groups often depend on small, foundation-funded budgets and the support of traditional unions whose future is uncertain. Unions have resources, infrastructure, political connections, and members that can be mobilized—all things that non-union groups do not necessarily have. When unions are involved in campaigns, “there are much bigger victories,” says Ruth Milkman, a professor of sociology at City University of New York (CUNY). “Women are still largely responsible for their families and communities as well as their jobs.” One of the biggest unions, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), has partnered with alt-labor groups and community organizations including NDWA and ROC in campaigns around the country, their best-known being the “Fight for 15.” “[Unions] are the single independent, self-sustaining, self-financing movement in the entire progressive space,” SEIU president Mary Kay Henry told me. “We operate at a scale that nobody else can at this moment.” One of the best examples of this is California’s Paid Family Leave [law](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paid_Family_Leave_(California)). In 2002, a union-led coalition of labor advocacy groups and unions, including the AFL-CIO, campaigned to expand unemployment disability compensation to include people who take time off to care for a loved one or newborn. As the first state to pass a law that requires paid family leave, it was a landmark victory for labor and women in particular. Three other states now have similar laws on the books. According to labor experts, their campaigns would have failed without the work of unions. “We never would have won without labor support,” says Netsy Firestein, who led the coalition that campaigned for the California law and later founded the Labor Project for Working Families. Another major limitation of alt-labor’s emphasis on broad legislative change is that passing a law is one thing, but enforcing it is another. Perhaps the most important purpose of a union is to make sure that contracts and labor laws are followed and enforced. When workers are on their own, employers routinely violate labor laws because the penalties are small and the Department of Labor is not well-resourced enough to investigate every claim. Milkman, the CUNY professor, researched the same paid family law in California. She [found](http://cepr.net/documents/publications/paid-family-leave-1-2011.pdf) that most low-income workers were not aware of the program. Thirty-seven percent of workers, even if they were aware of paid family leave and needed it, feared that their employer would be unhappy with them for taking it, would block them from advancement, or fire them. [A separate survey](http://www.field.com/fieldpollonline/subscribers/Rls2494.pdf) showed that only 36 percent of voters in California were aware of the program. Having led such a challenging campaign to victory, Firestein says that the fact that so many workers did not know about or exercise their new rights after the law passed “drove [her] insane.” “Enforcement and awareness is a hard slog, and a lot of groups don’t know how to do it,” Firestein told me. “What happens is that groups pass laws, and then they go on to the next thing. Somebody has to stay behind and do that grunt work of making sure people know about it.” (One alt-labor group, [Family Values At Work](http://familyvaluesatwork.org/), is focused on precisely that.) Milkman says that NDWA and groups like them have won significant victories but haven’t figured out how to bring their model to scale. “They’ve been very successful at naming and shaming, shining a bright light on abuses,” Milkman told me. “But winning concrete benefits for domestic workers, not so much, because the legislation is largely symbolic.” SEIU sees its partnerships with alt-labor groups as both a way to advance its political ambitions and an investment in the union’s own members.

#### The right to strike does nothing to companies who actually exploit workers—they just hire consultants and employ shady tactics

**Lafer and Loustaunau 20**-- Gordon Lafer [political economist and is a Professor at the University of Oregon] and Lola Loustaunau [assistant research fellow at the Labor Education and Research Center, University of Oregon]; Fear at work: An inside account of how employers threaten, intimidate, and harass workers to stop them from exercising their right to collective bargaining; July 23, 2020; Economic Policy Institute; <https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/>. (AG DebateDrills)

Even when employers obey the law, they rely on a set of tactics that are legal under the NLRA but illegal in elections for Congress, city council, or any other public office. **A $340 million industry of “union avoidance” consultants helps employers exploit the weaknesses of federal labor law to deny workers the right to collective bargaining.**17 Over the past five years, employers using union avoidance consultants have included FedEx, Bed Bath & Beyond, and LabCorp, among others. Table 1, reproduced from an EPI report published in late 2019, lists just a few of these employers, along with the reported financial investments they made to thwart union organizing during the specified years.18 **These firms’ tactics lie at the core of explaining why so few American workers who want a union actually get one, and their success in blocking unionization efforts represents a significant contribution to the country’s ongoing crisis of economic inequality.** The lack of a right of free speech enables coercion NLRB elections are fundamentally framed by one-sided control over communication, with no free-speech rights for workers. **Under current law, employers may require workers to attend mass anti-union meetings as often as once a day** (mandatory meetings at which the employer delivers anti-union messaging are dubbed “captive audience meetings” in labor law). Not only is the union not granted equal time, but pro-union employees may be required to attend on condition that they not ask questions; those who speak up despite this condition can be legally fired on the spot.19 **The most recent data show that nearly 90% of employers force employees to attend such anti-union campaign rallies, with the average employer holding 10 such mandatory meetings during the course of an election campaign.**20 In addition to group meetings, employers typically have supervisors talk one-on-one with each of their direct subordinates.21 In these conversations, the same person who controls one’s schedule, assigns job duties, approves vacation requests, grants raises, and has the power to terminate employees “at will” conveys how important it is that their underlings oppose unionization. As one longtime consultant explained, a supervisor’s message is especially powerful because “the warnings…come from…the people counted on for that good review and that weekly paycheck.”22 Within this lopsided campaign environment, the employer’s message typically focuses on a few key themes: unions will drive employers out of business, unions only care about extorting dues payments from workers, and unionization is futile because employees can’t make management do something it doesn’t want to do.23 Many of these arguments are highly deceptive or even mutually contradictory. For instance, the dues message stands in direct contradiction to management’s warnings that unions inevitably lead to strikes and unemployment. **If a union were primarily interested in extracting dues money from workers, it would never risk a strike or bankruptcy, because no one pays dues when they are on strike or out of work. But in an atmosphere in which pro-union employees have [with] little effective right of reply, these messages may prove extremely powerful.**