# 1nc

## Off

### 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not defend that only one or a small subset of just governments recognize an unconditional right to strike. To clarify, debaters must defend that all just governments recognize an unconditional right to strike.

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “Just government” in the topic – indefinite articles are not specific and refer to the entire class of the object being modified

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation: They specify [X COUNTRY OR GROUP OF COUNTRIES]

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – Allowing them to get away with specifying one country explodes the prep burden because the adjective ‘just’ does not have a clear definition. They could choose any country on Earth and have some absurd definition of ‘just’ to prove why their niche country is topical. They could choose a group of countries and make an infinite caselist through any possible grouping of countries. Only a whole rez affs solves – this is also offense under pragmatics since it’s a pragmatic reason our interp is good. PICs turning limits is incoherent absent a warrant for why a whole rez aff causes PICs.

#### 2] Semantics – It matters since otherwise each debater has their own subjective understanding of the topic. It is the only objective interpretation that has an intent to define indefinite articles. Reasons why semantics is bad/wrong is not a reason the shell is wrong but a reason to change the topic since it does not change the meaning of the topic.

#### [3] tva – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole res advocacy, solves all ur offense- Potential abuse doesn’t permit 1AC abuse – allows you to be infinitely abusive in the 1AC-– if the neg doesn’t have specific prep, they’ll resort to cheaty word PICs which are net worse

#### Paradigm Issues

#### 1 – Drop the debater – their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start and we can’t come back

#### 2 - Comes before 1AR theory — A - If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff, B – Neg abuse outweighs aff abuse because we control the depth of the debate if we can’t engage depth is impossible

#### 3 - Use competing interps on T – A – T is a yes/no question, you can’t be half topical or mostly topical B - reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### 4 - No RVIs – A - Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat, B - discourages checking real abuse C - Encourages baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quick

### 2

#### Counterplan text: Federal Republic of Germany ought to recognize the unconditional right to strike for workers except for police officers and other law enforcement workers.

#### [1] Empirics prove – when police unions get more power, police abuse it.

Greenhouse 6/18

Greenhouse, Steven, “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power.” The New Yorker, 18 June 2020, [https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses. //](https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses.%20//) Phoenix

Police unions have long had a singular—and divisive—place in American labor. What is different at this fraught moment, however, is that these unions, long considered untouchable, due to their extraordinary power on the streets and among politicians, face a potential reckoning, as their conduct roils not just one city but the entire nation. Since the nineteen-sixties, when police unions first became like traditional unions and won the right to bargain collectively, they have had a controversial history. And recent studies suggest that their political and bargaining power has enabled them to win disciplinary systems so lax that they have helped increase police abuses in the United States.

A 2018 University of Oxford study of the hundred largest American cities found that the extent of protections in police contracts was directly and positively correlated with police violence and other abuses against citizens. A 2019 University of Chicago study found that [extending collective-bargaining rights](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/55ad38b1e4b0185f0285195f/t/5d92b749ad13ae3d9b293125/1569896278868/Sheriffs+Unions+Misconduct.pdf) to Florida sheriffs’ deputies led to a forty per cent statewide increase in cases of violent misconduct—translating to nearly twelve additional such incidents annually.

In a forthcoming study, Rob Gillezeau, a professor and researcher, concluded that, from the nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-eighties, the ability of police to collectively bargain led to a substantial rise in police killings of civilians, with a greater impact on people of color. “With the caveat that this is very early work,” Gillezeau [wrote](https://twitter.com/robgillezeau/status/1266834185055956997) on Twitter, on May 30th, “it looks like collective bargaining rights are being used to protect the ability of officers to discriminate in the disproportionate use of force against the non-white population.”

## On

### ROTB

#### The role of the ballot is to determine if the aff’s a good idea—anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate.

#### Extinction first –

#### 1 – Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible

#### 2 – Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### 3 – Moral obligation – allowing people to die is unethical and should be prevented because it creates ethics towards other people

#### 4 – Objectivity – body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### 5 – Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it

### LBL

AT Robinson – aff endorses a world of capitalism

AT Leyton – warrants of Leyton are misrepresented – police has historically been a benefactor of racialized violence all over the world and especially high racist sentiments in european countries actively push out other demographics (like this is literally happening right now with populism in europe countries like Poland and Germany)

### Adv 2 - Green Work

#### [1] Empirics prove – Climate strikes do nothing – emissions went up after students’ strikes

Harvey ‘19

Harvey, Fiona. “Greta Thunberg Says School Strikes Have Achieved Nothing.” The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 6 Dec. 2019, [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/dec/06/greta-thunberg-says-school-strikes-have-achieved-nothing. //](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/dec/06/greta-thunberg-says-school-strikes-have-achieved-nothing.%20//) Phoenix

The global wave of school strikes for the climate over the past year has “achieved nothing” because greenhouse gas emissions have continued to rise, [Greta Thunberg](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/greta-thunberg) has told activists at UN climate talks in Madrid.

Thousands of young people were expected to gather at the UN climate conference and in the streets of the Spanish capital on Friday to protest against the lack of progress in tackling the climate emergency, as officials from more than 190 countries wrangled over the niceties of wording in documents related to the Paris accord.

In the four years since the [landmark agreement](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/dec/12/paris-climate-deal-200-nations-sign-finish-fossil-fuel-era) was signed, greenhouse gas emissions have risen by 4% and the talks this year are not expected to produce new commitments on carbon from the world’s biggest emitters.

Thunberg, whose [solo protest](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/mar/11/greta-thunberg-schoolgirl-climate-change-warrior-some-people-can-let-things-go-i-cant) in Sweden in 2018 has since snowballed into a [global movement](https://www.theguardian.com/science/2019/dec/01/island-states-want-decisive-action-to-prevent-inundation), spoke at a press conference before a march through the centre of Madrid. She said that although schoolchildren had been striking around the world, this “has not translated into action” from governments.

“I’m just an activist and we need more activists,” she said. “Some people are afraid to change – they try so desperately to silence us.”

Thunberg expressed hope for the UN negotiations but doubted whether governments had got the message, and warned the world could not afford continued inaction.

“I sincerely hope COP25 will reach something concrete and increase awareness among people, and that world leaders and people in power grasp the urgency of the climate crisis, because right now it does not seem that they are,” she said.

Although young people would keep striking, Thunberg said, they wanted to stop – if governments made credible promises and showed a willingness to act.

“We can’t go on like this; it is not sustainable that children skip school and we don’t want to continue – we would love some action from the people in power. People are suffering and dying today. We can’t wait any longer,” she said.

Put their 2nd adv in a double bind – either they strike aren’t protest and the aff is effects topical or strikes are protest and Harvey 19 is true

#### [2] Fossil fuels are deeply rooted in the economy – strikes aren’t enough

Hayes 19 [Jason; Contributor to The Hill, director of environmental policy at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a research and education institute in Midland, Mich; “A global climate strike isn't enough,” The Hill; 9/19/19; <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/461809-a-global-climate-strike-isnt-enough>] Justin

A collective of influential green groups and corporations is supporting a campaign for a global climate strike from Sept. 20-27. The strike pushes young people to walk out of schools and workplaces to protest the energy sources that keep us alive and thriving. That many people are concerned about the global climate is obvious, but how will encouraging them to abandon their jobs or schools for a day or two, or seven, reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

The campaign website — globalclimatestrike.net — tells people they must “demand an end to the age of fossil fuels.” But, in the United States, we rely on these fuels for over 80 percent of the energy we use to provide basic necessities such as food, clean water, heating and air conditioning, medicine, transportation and so much more.

To make things worse, the energy sources offered up as replacements for fossil fuels — typically wind and solar — couldn’t even exist without fossil fuels. Natural gas, oil and coal are needed to mine, refine, process and ship the metals, rare earth minerals, silicone, plastics and various chemicals that go into renewables. Without steel, there are no towers to hold up wind turbines. Without rare earths, there are no solar panels. Adding to this conundrum is the fact that wind and solar cannot provide reliable power. They are intermittent, meaning they must be propped up by more reliable energy sources, such as natural gas.

A group of environmental policy experts has put together MyClimatePledge.com as our response, because we’d like to challenge climate strikers and to help them appreciate that striking won’t be enough.

#### [3] Strikes do nothing – strikers lack leverage

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

But strikers must have the leverage to accomplish their goals

Strikers represent the demand for climate action. But who will supply these policies and what leverage do strikers have over these policymakers? This is where climate strikes could run into a problem.

Strikers have leverage when their absence from work disrupts activities that are valuable to policymakers. If railway workers go on strike, trains cannot run and the public is upset. When airline pilots go on strike, people cannot fly, and airlines lose revenue. By some accounts, the 48-hour strike of British Airways pilots (regarding a pay dispute) in September 2019 will cost the company about £100 million.

What leverage do the climate strikers have? Assuming most of the strikers are students, what costs might their strikes impose on the actors that need to change their climate policies (namely, governments and fossil fuel firms)?

Student strikes probably do not disrupt the government or fossil fuel firms. The main bearer of these costs are the conscientious teachers who need to figure out how they are going to make up for the lost teaching time.

#### **US climate action is key to world wide action**

Beeler 19 (Carolyn Beeler; 9/18/19; PRI; *“Top US leadership is 'missing ingredient' in climate change action”*; accessed 8/27/21; <https://www.pri.org/stories/2019-09-18/top-us-leadership-missing-ingredient-climate-change-action>; Carolyn Beeler leads environment coverage for The World. She reports and edits stories focused on the people and places most impacted by climate change, and what they're doing to address it. She has reported from all seven continents and won national and regional awards for her breaking news and in-depth feature reporting. Before joining The World, Carolyn helped pilot the weekly health and science show, The Pulse, at WHYY in Philadelphia, and reported from Berlin for a year as a Robert Bosch Foundation fellow. She studied journalism at Northwestern University and got her start in radio as a Kroc fellow at NPR.) HB

World leaders will meet in New York next week for the United Nations Climate Summit, an event called by the Secretary-General to push for more and faster cuts to global greenhouse gas emissions. Notably missing at the summit: American leadership. Five years ago, a joint climate policy announcement from the US and China paved the way for the Paris climate accord to come to fruition after decades of failed attempts at an international climate pact. Then in June 2017, President Donald Trump announced that he would withdraw the US from the very same agreement his country had helped broker just a few years before. Under the rules of the accord, countries can announce the intention to leave, but must wait two years before being allowed to do so. Two years later, what impact has this policy whiplash had on the climate? Inside the US, that answer is relatively simple to quantify. Across the country, some 4,000 state and local governments, institutions and businesses have declared that, though the federal government intends to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, they’re still on board with cutting emissions. One of those local governments is in Arlington, Massachusetts, where the town hall was illuminated green after Trump’s 2017 Paris withdrawal announcement. “We’ve come to the realization that if the federal government’s not going to do it, it’s going to fall to the local level,” said Adam Chapdelaine, Arlington’s town manager. “Somebody has to step up and be a leader.” Even before the Paris Agreement, the town has long worked to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, from switching its street lights to LED bulbs to buying electric vehicles for its official fleet. Residents can opt-in to 100% renewable energy in their homes and the town is advocating for all-electric heating and cooling systems. Since the US federal government reversed its climate change policies, Arlington has gotten perhaps more ambitious: The town’s new high school is being designed to run on geothermal and solar energy and the whole town aims to go carbon-neutral by 2050. These state and local actions are being highlighted as “answering the global call to combat the climate crisis” by a coalition of sub-national actors formed by New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg and former California Gov. Jerry Brown. But these actions have only partly counteracted sweeping federal changes under the Trump administration. Trump has slashed regulations on emissions from power plants, air conditioners and refrigerators, and oil and gas drilling nationwide. He moved to revoke California’s ability to set its own strict vehicle emission rules on Wednesday, highlighting the limits of state-based action on climate change. So how does the emissions balance sheet tally up today, two years after the US backed away from the Paris agreement? Kate Larsen, a director at the independent research firm the Rhodium Group, said US carbon emissions are a few percentage points higher than they would have been if former President Barack Obama-era policies were in place. Projected forward five years, that gap will just grow. “Under the current set of Trump administration policies, the US is on track to achieve only about 14 to 17% emission reductions below 2005 levels in 2025,” Larsen said. That’s about half of the 26 to 28% emission reductions that the US promised in the climate accord. “[It's] a long way from the commitment that Obama reached in Paris,” Larsen said. Scientists say that to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius and avoid the worst impacts of climate change, global emissions must be cut nearly in half by 2030. Inside the US, local action is partly, but not wholly, counteracting federal policies. The bigger question is how much global ambition to tackle the climate crisis will flag if the world’s largest historic emitter is no longer leading the push. Will countries, seeing the US doing less on climate change, do the same themselves? Under Obama, the US put its full diplomatic muscle into getting countries signed on to the Paris Agreement. “If you were a head of state from India, from China, or from anywhere and you were going to meet with the United States, you knew that you'd have to be prepared to speak about climate change and the Paris Agreement,” said Elan Strait, a former climate negotiator on the Paris Agreement who now works at the World Wildlife Foundation. By 2020, countries are requested to announce new carbon cuts as part of the Paris process. Those cuts have to be more ambitious if countries hope to meet the Paris Agreement goal of keeping warming “well below” 2 degrees Celsius and pursue efforts to limit warming to the scientist-recommended 1.5 degree Celsius. “I completely believe that the missing ingredient this time around is the United States leadership driving climate as a head-of-state agenda,” Strait said. Only when those 2020 climate pledges start rolling in will the international community start to see the full impact of the US climate policy reversal.

### Adv 1 - Strikes

#### Flow this on Robinson ev - Strikes have been made productive by capital – resistance only strengthens the system.

Beller 95

[Jonathan; Adjunct Professor of English, Film Studies, and Women’s Gender and Sexuality Studies at Barnard. In the 1990s in articles for Communication Research, boundary 2 andpostmodern culture, he became the first critical theorist of what he called "attention economy" and formulated the attention theory of value. His work in media studies includes materialist analysis of cinema, photography, computation, information, and money/finance. This work understands media platforms as various forms of social mediation, semiotics and political economy. His research is situated in film studies, media studies, critical race theory, feminist theory and anti-imperialist and decolonial epistemology and struggle. Beller's books include The Cinematic Mode of Production: Attention Economy and the Society of the Spectacle (2006); Acquiring Eyes: Philippine Visuality, Nationalist Struggle, and the World-Media System (2006); The Message is Murder: Substrates of Computational Capital (2017) and The World Computer: Derivative Conditions of Racial Capitalism (2019, forthcoming Duke University Press). Current interests include the utilization of programmable money for activist projects and work on a new book tentatively entitled Derivative Revolution. He is a member of the Social Text editorial collective; “The Spectatorship of the Proletariat,” Duke University Press; Autumn 1995; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/303727.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A1fcfb260a82662c726f0fac8b621a07b>] Justin

Because today capital "thinks" several cycles in advance of itself, or, to put it another way, because it has several historical stages of its own development simultaneously available to itself that can be utilized in vary- ing proportions, one could well argue that isolated labor strikes are made productive for capital and that phenomena such as the general strike or Samir Amin's "de-linking" are impossible.' The argument for the productive value of the strike for capital would not in itself necessarily be to ignore what Jacques Derrida has recently called "Marx's injunction."2 In discuss- ing the capitalization of the resistance to capital, given perhaps its most dramatic form in and after 1989, one might still hear the ghostly admoni- tions of the "specter of Marx," which, for Derrida "reaffirms the question of life and death." Furthermore, one might hear the moans and intimations of such an absent presence without oneself becoming as dead as Marxism is purported to be

Though this essay is in no way directly concerned with the viability of the labor strike per se, it is most definitely concerned with the objective of the strike, that is, the reappropriation of historically sedimented human labor (the means of production) by disenfranchised individuals and groups. Such reappropriation of historically sedimented labor and of living labor, I suggest, is, in fact, going on all the time; it is endemic to social change. As Antonio Negri argues, in endeavoring to establish the subjectivity of labor in history, not only does labor produce capital, but labor, in its resistance to capital exploitation forces structural and technological innovations in capi- talism. Though this is surely the case, we have lacked, since the advent of cinema in particular, a specific theory that accounts for the development of certain new regimes for the production of cultural and economic value via mental activity; we do not yet know how to account for the present-day dynamics of value production and appropriation that operate through the conversion of mental activity into social force. The capitalization of mental activity is an enabling factor in capital's ability to continue all previous forms of violation. By looking at the recycling of the resistance to capital by capital (the making productive of the strike against capital by capital) our affective production of hegemony may be foregrounded, and possibilities for the dis- ruption of coercion and exploitation may be foregrounded as well. Toward those ends (and perhaps to the surprise of some), I would like to discuss the development of mass media during the time of early modern cinema, more specifically, those particular developments that can be found to crys- tallize in Sergei Mikhailovich Eisenstein's 1924-1925 film The Strike.3 For it was here, precisely, in revolutionary cinema, that capital's encroachment into the visual sphere met with resistance. And yet, in spite of its intentions, The Strike, like capital itself, participates in producing a new regime of the sensorium by advancing an increasing integration of machines and culture, of labor and perception. We can use The Strike to mark an emergent socio- historical change in the character of what Marx called "sensuous labor" and, by direct implication, to mark as well a new strategy for the production and appropriation of value.

#### Capitalists are only getting stronger – strikes are obviously not overthrowing capital

Picchi 3/31

Picchi, Aimee. “Billionaires Got 54% Richer during Pandemic, Sparking Calls for ‘Wealth Tax.’” CBS News, CBS Interactive, 31 Mar. 2021, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/billionaire-wealth-covid-pandemic-12-trillion-jeff-bezos-wealth-tax/. // Phoenix

The world's 2,365 billionaires enjoyed a $4 trillion boost to their wealth during the first year of the pandemic, increasing their fortunes by 54%, according to a new analysis by the Program on Inequality at the left-leaning Institute for Policy Studies.

Between March 18, 2020, and March 18, 2021, the wealth held by the world's billionaires jumped from $8.04 trillion to $12.39 trillion, according to the IPS' analysis of data from Forbes, Bloomberg and Wealth-X. Amazon.com founder Jeff Bezos, the world's wealthiest person, saw his fortune soar to $178 billion from $113 billion, or 57%, during that time, the study found. All told, the total wealth of the world's billionaire class grew 54% during the pandemic year, IPS reported.

#### Empirics disprove – labor has a very rich history, especially in European countries, except capitalism has only grown stronger.

#### Unions prevent climate action – they want to keep their fossil fuel jobs

Kahn ‘20

DEBRA KAHN, SAMANTHA MALDONADO and CATHERINE BOUDREAU. “Unions Fracture over Climate.” POLITICO, 1 Sept. 2020, [https://www.politico.com/newsletters/the-long-game/2020/09/01/unions-fracture-over-climate-490237. //](https://www.politico.com/newsletters/the-long-game/2020/09/01/unions-fracture-over-climate-490237.%20//) Phoenix

A DIVIDED MOVEMENT — Organized labor is often viewed as a cheerleader for the left, helping shape the agendas of Democratic lawmakers. But in statehouses from coast to coast and at the national level, unions have had no problem blocking green initiatives if they decide they're not in their members' interests.

Those who stand to lose the most from tightening environmental policies have been wielding their power the past few months to kill proposals in statehouses across the country. Broadly, the split among unions is most marked between trade unions whose jobs are tied to the fossil fuel industry and those representing the service sector, like health care, government and custodial workers.

“In recent years, the public employees have been siding mostly with the environmentalists and the private sector have been siding with our opinion, which is yes, we're pro-environment but ... we also want to be able to afford to live here and have jobs here,” said Kate Gibbs, deputy director of the Engineers Labor-Employer Cooperative, a trades union.

Environmental protection and union jobs are a fault line among Democrats, which will only be magnified nationwide if Joe Biden defeats President Donald Trump in November. Biden will be under pressure from the left to enact major climate action similar to the "Green New Deal," which many national labor union leaders oppose. The Democratic National Committee last month [scrapped language in its platform](https://www.politico.com/news/2020/08/19/sponsor-of-climate-language-blasts-dnc-398734) calling for an end to fossil fuel tax breaks and subsidies, despite Biden's campaign arguing the move would ultimately benefit unions.

Take California, where Democrats dominate state government. In a recent tug of war over the blue-collar constituency, the unions proved decisive. Electrical and ironworkers, pipe fitters, boilermakers and construction workers, along with oil companies and the state Chamber of Commerce, persuaded three Democratic senators to vote against a bill that would have mandated no-drill zones around certain populous areas — killing the effort for the year.

"We've got a little bit stronger voice for working people than most other people," said Robbie Hunter, president of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, the parent organization for 160 local unions that represent 400,000 workers across more than a dozen different trades, which spearheaded opposition to the bill.

In Pennsylvania, Democratic state lawmakers [were recently frustrated](https://www.penncapital-star.com/commentary/pa-s-building-trade-unions-need-to-be-allies-not-opponents-of-a-cleaner-climate-opinion/) by AFL-CIO, Building Trades and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers' support of a bill that would block the state from joining the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, a cap-and-trade program to reduce emissions from the power sector.

“It's this fundamental tension,” a California state lawmaker said on condition of anonymity to avoid political repercussion. “It underlies everything from the Green New Deal at the national level to California's climate action agenda.”

#### Cap is good:

#### It’s sustainable – data proves we’re entering the golden age

**Hausfather 21** – a climate scientist and energy systems analyst whose research focuses on observational temperature records, climate models, and mitigation technologies. He spent 10 years working as a data scientist and entrepreneur in the cleantech sector, where he was the lead data scientist at Essess, the chief scientist at C3.ai, and the cofounder and chief scientist of Efficiency 2.0. He also worked as a research scientist with Berkeley Earth, was the senior climate analyst at Project Drawdown, and the US analyst for Carbon Brief. He has masters degrees in environmental science from Yale University and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and a PhD in climate science from the University of California, Berkeley. (Zeke, "Absolute Decoupling of Economic Growth and Emissions in 32 Countries," Breakthrough Institute, 4-6-2021, https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/absolute-decoupling-of-economic-growth-and-emissions-in-32-countries, Accessed 4-11-2021, LASA-SC)

The past 30 years have seen immense progress **in improving the quality of life for much of humanity**. Extreme poverty — the number of people living on less than $1.90 per day — has fallen by nearly two-thirds, from 1.9 **billion to** around 650 **million**. Life expectancy has risen in most of the world, along with literacy and access to education, while infant mortality has fallen. Despite perceptions to the contrary, **the average person born today is likely to have access to more opportunities and have a better quality of life than at any other point in human history**. Much of this increase in human wellbeing has been propelled by rapid economic growth driven largely by state-led industrial policy, particularly in poor-to-middle income countries. However, this growth has come at a cost: between 1990 and 2019, global emissions of CO2 **increased by 56%.** Historically, economic growth has been closely linked to increased energy consumption — and increased CO2 emissions in particular — leading some to argue that a more prosperous world is one that necessarily has more impacts on our natural environment and climate. There is a lively academic debate about our ability to “absolutely decouple” emissions and growth — that is, the extent to which the adoption of clean energy technology can allow emissions to decline while economic growth continues. Over the past 15 years, however, **something has begun to change.** Rather than a 21st century dominated by coal that energy modelers foresaw, **global coal use peaked in 2013 and is now in structural decline**. We have succeeded in making clean energy cheap, with solar power and battery storage costs falling 10-fold since 2009. The world produced more electricity from clean energy — solar, wind, hydro, and nuclear — than from coal over the past two years. And, according to some major oil companies, **peak oil is upon us** — not because we have run out of cheap oil to produce, but because demand is falling and companies expect further decline as consumers increasingly shift to electric vehicles. The world has long been experiencing a relative **decoupling** between economic growth and CO2 emissions, with the emissions per unit of GDP **falling for the past 60 years**. This is the case even in countries like **India and China** that have been undergoing rapid economic growth. But relative decoupling alone is inadequate in a world where global CO2 emissions need to peak and decline in the next decade to give us any chance at limiting warming to well below 2℃, in line with Paris Agreement targets. Thankfully, there is increasing evidence that the world is on track **to absolutely decouple CO2 emissions and economic growth** — with global CO2 emissions potentially having peaked in 2019 **and unlikely to increase substantially in the coming decade**. While an emissions peak is just the first and easiest step towards eventually reaching the net-zero emissions required to stop the world from continuing to warm, it demonstrates that linkages between emissions and economic activity are not an immutable law, but rather simply a result of our current means of energy production. In recent years we have seen more and more examples of absolute decoupling — economic growth accompanied by falling CO2 emissions. Since 2005, 32 countries with a population of at least one million people **have absolutely decoupled** emissions from economic growth, both for terrestrial emissions (those within national borders) and consumption emissions (emissions embodied in the goods consumed in a country). This includes the United States, Japan, Mexico, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Hungary, Belarus, Austria, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Singapore, Denmark, Finland, Slovakia, Norway, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Jamaica, Lithuania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Cyprus. Figure 1, below, shows the declines in territorial emissions (blue) and increases in GDP (red). To qualify as having experienced absolute decoupling, we require countries included in this analysis to pass four separate filters: a population of at least one million (to focus the analysis on more representative cases), declining territorial emissions over the 2005-2019 period (based on a linear regression), declining consumption emissions, and increasing real GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis, using constant 2017 international $USD). We chose not to include 2020 in this analysis because it is not particularly representative of longer-term trends, and consumption and territorial emissions estimates are not yet available for many countries. There is a wide range of rates of economic growth between 2005-2019 among countries experiencing absolute decoupling. Somewhat counterintuitively, there is no significant relationship between the rate of economic growth and the magnitude of emissions reductions within the group. **While it is unlikely that there is not at least some linkage between the two factors, there are plenty of examples of countries (e.g., Singapore, Romania, and Ireland) experiencing both extremely rapid economic growth and large reductions in CO2 emissions.** One of the primary criticisms of some prior analyses of absolute decoupling is that they ignore **leakage**. Specifically, the offshoring of manufacturing from high-income countries over the past three decades to countries like China has led to “illusory” drops in emissions, where the emissions associated with high-income country consumption are simply shipped overseas and no longer show up in territorial emissions accounting. There is some truth in this critique, as there was a large increase in emissions embodied in imports from developing countries between 1990 and 2005. After 2005, however, structural changes in China and a growing domestic market led to a reversal of these trends; the amount of emissions “exported” from developed countries to developing countries **has actually declined over the past 15 years.** This means that, for many countries, both territorial emissions and consumption emissions (which include any emissions “exported” to other countries) **have jointly declined**. In fact, on average, consumption emissions have been declining slightly faster than territorial emissions since 2005 in the 32 countries we identify as experiencing absolute decoupling. Figure 2, below, shows the change in consumption emissions (teal) and GDP (red) between 2005 and 2019. There is a pretty wide variation in the extent to which these countries have reduced their territorial and consumption emissions since 2005. Some countries — such as the UK, Denmark, Finland, and Singapore – have seen territorial emissions fall faster than consumption emissions, while the US, Japan, Germany, and Spain (among others) have seen consumption emissions fall faster. Figure 3 shows reductions in consumption and territorial emissions for each country, with the size of the dot representing the size of the population in 2019. **Absolute decoupling is possible.** There is no physical law requiring economic growth — and broader increases in human wellbeing — to necessarily be linked to CO2 emissions. All of the **services that we rely on today that emit fossil fuels** — electricity, transportation, heating, food — can in principle **be replaced by near-zero carbon alternatives**, though these are more mature in some sectors (electricity, transportation, buildings) than in others (industrial processes, agriculture).

#### Tech dematerialization secures sustainability.

**McAfee 19**, \*Andrew Paul McAfee, a principal research scientist at MIT, is cofounder and codirector of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy at the MIT Sloan School of Management; (2019, “More from Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources and What Happens Next”, https://b-ok.cc/book/5327561/8acdbe)

There is **no shortage** of examples of dematerialization. I chose the ones in this chapter because they illustrate a set of fundamental principles at the intersection of business, economics, innovation, and our impact on our planet. They are:

We do want more all the time, but **not more resources**. Alfred Marshall was right, but William Jevons was wrong. Our wants and desires keep growing, evidently without end, and therefore so do our economies. But our use of the earth’s resources **does not**. We do want more beverage options, but we don’t want to keep using more aluminum in drink cans. We want to communicate and compute and listen to music, but we don’t want an arsenal of gadgets; we’re happy with a single smartphone. As our population increases, we want more food, but we don’t have any desire to consume more fertilizer or use more land for crops.

Jevons was correct at the time he wrote that total British demand for coal was increasing even though steam engines were becoming much more efficient. He was right, in other words, that the price elasticity of demand for coal-supplied power was greater than one in the 1860s. But he was wrong to conclude that this would be permanent. Elasticities of demand can change over time for several reasons, the most fundamental of which is **technological change**. Coal provides a clear example of this. When fracking made natural gas much cheaper, total **demand** for coal in the United States **went down** even though its price decreased.

With the help of **innovation** and **new technologies**, economic growth in America and other rich countries—growth in all of the wants and needs that we spend money on—has become **decoupled** from resource **consumption**. This is a recent development and a **profound** one.

Materials cost money that companies locked in competition would rather **not spend**. The root of Jevons’s mistake is simple and **boring**: resources cost **money**. He realized this, of course. What he didn’t sufficiently realize was how strong the **incentive** is for a company in a contested market to **reduce** its spending on **resources** (or anything else) and so eke out a bit more profit. After all, a penny saved is a penny earned.

Monopolists can just pass costs on to their customers, but companies with a lot of competitors can’t. So American farmers who battle with each other (and increasingly with tough rivals in other countries) are eager to cut their spending on land, water, and fertilizer. Beer and soda companies want to minimize their aluminum purchases. Producers of magnets and high-tech gear run away from REE as soon as prices start to spike. In the United States, the 1980 Staggers Act removed government subsidies for freight-hauling railroads, forcing them into **competition** and **cost cutting** and making them all the more eager to not have expensive railcars sit idle. Again and again, we see that **competition** spurs **dematerialization**.

There are multiple paths to dematerialization. As profit-hungry companies seek to use fewer resources, they can go down four main paths. First, they can simply find ways to use **less** of a **given material**. This is what happened as beverage companies and the companies that supply them with cans teamed up to use less aluminum. It’s also the story with American farmers, who keep getting bigger harvests while using less land, water, and fertilizer. Magnet makers found ways to use fewer rare earth metals when it looked as if China might cut off their supply.

Second, it often becomes possible to **substitute** one resource for **another**. Total US coal consumption started to decrease after 2007 because fracking made natural gas more attractive to electricity generators. If nuclear power becomes more popular in the United States (a topic we’ll take up in chapter 15), we could use both less coal and less gas and generate our electricity from a small amount of material indeed. A kilogram of uranium-235 fuel contains approximately 2–3 million times as much energy as the same mass of coal or oil. According to one estimate, the total amount of energy that humans consume each year could be supplied by just seven thousand tons of uranium fuel.

Third, companies can use **fewer molecules** overall by making better use of the materials they **already own**. Improving CNW’s railcar utilization from 5 percent to 10 percent would mean that the company could cut its stock of these thirty-ton behemoths in half. Companies that own expensive physical assets tend to be fanatics about getting as much use as possible out of them, for clear and compelling financial reasons. For example, the world’s commercial airlines have improved their load factors—essentially the percentage of seats occupied on flights—from 56 percent in 1971 to more than 81 percent in 2018.

Finally, some materials get replaced by **nothing** at all. When a telephone, camcorder, and tape recorder are separate devices, three total microphones are needed. When they all collapse into a smartphone, only one microphone is necessary. That smartphone also uses no audiotapes, videotapes, compact discs, or camera film. The iPhone and its descendants are among the world champions of dematerialization. They use vastly less metal, plastic, glass, and silicon than did the devices they have replaced and don’t need media such as paper, discs, tape, or film.

If we use more renewable energy, we’ll be replacing coal, gas, oil, and uranium with **photons** from the **sun** (solar power) and the **movement** of **air** (wind power) and water (hydroelectric power) on the earth. All three of these types of power are also among dematerialization’s **champions**, since they use up essentially **no resources** once they’re up and running.

I call these four paths to dematerialization slim, swap, optimize, and evaporate. They’re not mutually exclusive. Companies can and do pursue all four at the same time, and all four are going on all the time in ways both obvious and subtle.

Innovation is **hard** to **foresee**. Neither the fracking revolution nor the world-changing impact of the iPhone’s introduction were well understood in advance. Both continued to be underestimated even after they occurred. The iPhone was introduced in June of 2007, with no shortage of fanfare from Apple and Steve Jobs. Yet several months later the cover of Forbes was still asking if anyone could catch Nokia.

Innovation is not **steady** and **predictable** like the orbit of the Moon or the accumulation of interest on a certificate of deposit. It’s instead inherently jumpy, uneven, and **random**. It’s also **combinatorial**, as Erik Brynjolfsson and I discussed in our book The Second Machine Age. Most new technologies and other innovations, we argued, are combinations or recombinations of preexisting elements.

The iPhone was “just” a cellular telephone plus a bunch of sensors plus a touch screen plus an operating system and population of programs, or apps. All these elements had been around for a while before 2007. It took the vision of Steve Jobs to see what they could become when combined. Fracking was the combination of multiple abilities: to “see” where hydrocarbons were to be found in rock formations deep underground; to pump down pressurized liquid to fracture the rock; to pump up the oil and gas once they were released by the fracturing; and so on. Again, none of these was new. Their effective combination was what changed the world’s energy situation.

Erik and I described the set of innovations and technologies available at any time as **building blocks** that ingenious people could combine and recombine into useful new configurations. These new configurations then serve as more blocks that later innovators can use. Combinatorial innovation is exciting because it’s unpredictable. It’s not easy to foresee when or where powerful new combinations are going to appear, or who’s going to come up with them. But as the number of both building blocks and innovators increases, we should have **confidence** that more breakthroughs such as fracking and smartphones are ahead. Innovation is highly decentralized and largely uncoordinated, occurring as the result of **interactions** among **complex** and **interlocking** social, technological, and economic systems. So it’s going to keep surprising us.

As the Second Machine Age progresses, dematerialization **accelerates**. Erik and I coined the phrase Second Machine Age to draw a contrast with the Industrial Era, which as we’ve seen transformed the planet by allowing us to overcome the limitations of muscle power. Our current time of great progress with all things related to **computing** is allowing us to **overcome** the **limitations** of our mental power and is **transformative** in a different way: it’s allowing us to **reverse** the Industrial Era’s bad habit of taking **more** and **more** from the earth every year.

Computer-aided design tools help engineers at packaging companies design generations of aluminum cans that keep getting lighter. Fracking took off in part because oil and gas exploration companies learned how to build **accurate** computer **models** of the rock formations that lay deep underground—models that predicted where hydrocarbons were to be found.

Smartphones took the place of many separate pieces of gear. Because they serve as GPS devices, they’ve also led us to print out many fewer maps and so contributed to our current trend of using less paper. It’s easy to look at generations of computer paper, from 1960s punch cards to the eleven-by-seventeen-inch fanfold paper of the 1980s, and conclude that the Second Machine Age has caused us to chop down ever more trees. The year of peak paper consumption in the United States, however, was 1990. As our devices have become more capable and interconnected, always on and always with us, we’ve sharply turned away from paper. Humanity as a whole probably hit peak paper in 2013.

As these examples indicate, computers and their kin help us with all four paths to **dematerialization**. Hardware, software, and networks let us slim, swap, optimize, and evaporate. I contend that they’re the **best tools** we’ve **ever invented** for letting us tread more **lightly** on our planet.

All of these principles are about the **combination** of technological **progress** and **capitalism**, which are the first of the two pairs of forces causing **dematerialization**.

#### Yes absolute decoupling – consumption is declining

Nordhaus 20 [Ted Nordhaus is an American author, environmental policy expert, and the director of research at The Breakthrough Institute, “Must Growth Doom the Planet?”, https://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/must-growth-doom-the-planet]

As both population and economic growth rates flatten out over the course of this century, it is likely that resource-productivity gains will overtake global economic growth rates, resulting in falling global demand for material resources over the long term. As a 2019 Breakthrough Institute report showed, global pasture land, the largest single human use of land, peaked in 2000 and continues to decline even as global beef production continues to rise. In a 2013 paper, Ausubel and colleagues argued that global cropland too appears close to peaking, even as global crop production continues to rise.

As with all growth curves, peak consumption of various material resources is not guaranteed to last. These trends could represent the top of a bell curve, the bottom of a new S-curve, or just a long plateau. But what they do demonstrate is that absolute decoupling of resources from economic growth is possible, even given a global economy today that still features robust population and income growth.

#### Capitalism avoids planetary extinction through Mars colonization.

Spring 16 (Todd, Writer, "A Case for Capitalism, In Regards to Space Travel – The Policy", Policy, 6-3-2016, https://thepolicy.us/a-case-for-capitalism-in-regards-to-space-travel-d77e50f8116e, DOA: 7-28-2017) //Snowball //strikethrough on gendered language

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 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.

#### Capitalism is the only system that can solve warming – we don’t have time for your alt.

Parenti 11 (Christian, PhD in Sociology from the London School of Economics, visiting fellow at CUNY's Center for Place, Culture and Politics, as well as a Soros Senior Justice Fellow, taught at the New College of California and at St. Mary's College, Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence, June 28, 2011)

There is one last imperative question. Several strands of green thinking maintain that capitalism is incapable of arriving at a sustainable relationship with nature because, as an economic system, capitalism must grow exponentially, while the earth is finite. You will find this argument in the literature of ecosocialism, deep ecology, and ecoanarchism. The same argument is often cast by liberal greens in deeply ahistorical and antitheoretical terms that, while critical of the economic system, often decline to name it. Back in the early 1970s, the Club of Rome’s book Limits to Growth fixated on the dangers of “growth" but largely avoided explaining why capitalism needs growth or how growth is linked to private ownership, profits, and interfirm competition. Whether these literatures describe the problem as “modern industrial society," “the growth cult," or the profit system, they often have a similar takeaway: we need a totally different economic system if we are to live in balance with nature. Some of the first to make such an argument were Marx and Engels. They came to their ecology through examining the local problem of relations between town and country—which was expressed simultaneously as urban pollution and rural soil depletion. In exploring this question they relied on the pioneering work of soil chemist Justus von Liebig. And from this small- scale problem, they developed the idea of capitalism’s overall “metabolic rift” with nature. Here is how Marx explained the dilemma: Capitalist production collects the population together in great centres, and causes the urban population to achieve an ever-growing preponderance. This has two results. On the one hand it concentrates the historical motive force of society; on the other hand, it disturbs the metabolic interaction between man and the earth, i.e. it prevents the return to the soil of its constituent elements consumed by man in the form of food and clothing; hence it hinders the operation of the eternal natural condition for the lasting fertility of the soil .... All progress in capitalist agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the worker, but of robbing the soil. From that grew the Marxist belief that capitalism, as a whole, is irreconcilably in contradiction with nature; that the economic system creates a rift in the balance of exchanges, or metabolism, connecting human society and natural systems. As with “soil robbing," so too with forests, fish stocks, water supplies, genetic inheritance, biodiversity, and atmospheric CO2 concentrations. The natural systems are out of sync; their elements are being rearranged and redistributed, ending up as garbage and pollution. As Mary Douglas, paraphrasing William James, put it, “Uncleanliness is matter out of place.”At a large enough scale, that disruption of elements threatens environmental catastrophe. It may be true: capitalism may be, ultimately, incapable of accommodating itself to the limits of the natural world. However, that is not the same question as whether capitalism can solve the climate crisis. Because of its magnitude, the climate crisis can appear as if it is the combination of all environmental crises—overexploitation of the seas, deforestation, overexploitation of freshwater, soil erosion, species and habitat loss, chemical contamination, and genetic contamination due to transgenic bioengineering. But halting greenhouse gas emissions is a much more specific problem; it is only one piece of the apocalyptic panorama. Though all these problems are connected, the most urgent and all encompassing of them is anthropogenic climate change. The fact of the matter is time has run out on the climate issue. Either capitalism solves the crisis or it destroys civilization. Capitalism begins to deal with the crisis now, or we face civilizational collapse beginning this century. We cannot wait for a socialist, or communist, or anarchist, or deep- ecology, neoprimitive revolution; nor for a nostalgia-based localista conversion back to the mythical small-town economy of preindustrial America as some advocate. In short, we cannot wait to transform everything—including how we create energy. Instead, we must begin immediately transforming the energy economy. Other necessary changes can and will flow from that. Hopeless? No. If we put aside the question of capitalism’s limits and deal only with greenhouse gas emissions, the problem looks less daunting. While capitalism has not solved the environmental crisis—meaning the fundamental conflict between the infinite growth potential of the market and the finite parameters of the planet— it has, in the past, solved specific environmental crises. The sanitation movement of the Progressive Era is an example. By the 1830s, industrial cities had become perfect incubators of epidemic disease, particularly cholera and yellow fever. Like climate change today, these diseases hit the poor hardest, but they also sickened and killed the wealthy. Class privilege offered some protection, but it was not a guarantee of safety. And so it was that middle-class do-gooder goo-goos and mugwumps began a series of reforms that contained and eventually defeated the urban epidemics. First, the filthy garbage-eating hogs were banned from city streets, then public sanitation programs of refuse collection began, sewers were built, safe public water provided, housing codes were developed and enforced. And, eventually, the epidemics of cholera stopped. So, too, were other infectious diseases, like pulmonary tuberculosis, typhus, and typhoid, largely eliminated. Thus, at the scale of the urban, capitalist society solved an environmental crisis through planning and public investment. Climate change is a problem on an entirely different order of magnitude, but past solutions to smaller environmental crises offer lessons. Ultimately, solving the climate crisis—like the nineteenth- century victory over urban squalor and epidemic contagions—will require a relegitimation of the state’s role in the economy. We will need planning and downward redistribution of wealth. And, as I have sketched out above, there are readily available ways to address the crisis immediately—if we make the effort to force our political leaders to act. We owe such an effort to people like Ekaru Loruman, who are already suffering and dying on the front lines of the catastrophic convergence, and to the next generation, who will inherit the mess. And, we owe it to ourselves.

#### No impact – your root cause claims are stupid.

Larrivee 10 PF ECONOMICS AT MOUNT ST MARY’S UNIVERSITY – MASTERS FROM THE HARVARD KENNEDY SCHOOL AND PHD IN ECONOMICS FROM WISCONSIN, 10 [JOHN, A FRAMEWORK FOR THE MORAL ANALYSIS OF MARKETS, 10/1, <http://www.teacheconomicfreedom.org/files/larrivee-paper-1.pdf>]

The Second Focal Point: Moral, Social, and Cultural Issues of Capitalism Logical errors abound in critical commentary on capitalism. Some critics observe a problem and conclude: “I see X in our society. We have a capitalist economy. Therefore capitalism causes X.” They draw their conclusion by looking at a phenomenon as it appears only in one system. Others merely follow a host of popular theories according to which capitalism is particularly bad. 6 The solution to such flawed reasoning is to be comprehensive, to look at the good and bad, in market and non-market systems. Thus the following section considers a number of issues—greed, selfishness and human relationships, honesty and truth, alienation and work satisfaction, moral decay, and religious participation—that have often been associated with capitalism, but have also been problematic in other systems and usually in more extreme form. I conclude with some evidence for the view that markets foster (at least some) virtues rather than undermining them. My purpose is not to smear communism or to make the simplistic argument that “capitalism isn’t so bad because other systems have problems too.” The critical point is that certain people thought various social ills resulted from capitalism, and on this basis they took action to establish alternative economic systems to solve the problems they had identified. That they failed to solve the problems, and in fact exacerbated them while also creating new problems, implies that capitalism itself wasn’t the cause of the problems in the first place, at least not to the degree theorized.

#### Suggesting capitalism is the root cause of oppression is counterproductive.

Swanson 05 Jacinda Swanson is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Western. Michigan University – Theory, Culture & Society August 2005 vol. 22 no. 4 87-118 – DOI: 10.1177/0263276405054992 –The online version of this article can be found – http://tcs.sagepub.com/content/22/4/87

It is thus misleading to suggest that social relations are ever solely economic, political or cultural, or that the causes of and remedies for unjust social arrangements are singular (see also Butler, 1997c: 273, 276; Young, 1997: 154–6; Sayer, 1999). Although Fraser insists on the thorough imbrication of culture and economics, her emphasis on the two categories of redistribution and recognition and on root causes undermines the more complex understanding she articulates elsewhere. Moreover, despite her commitment to perspectival dualism – and thus her rejection of substantive dualism and economism – in several instances Fraser describes the economy and capitalism in economically reductionist and determinist terms (2003: 53, 58, 214–18). For instance, although she correctly insists that capitalism and culture interact, she often appears to conceptualize capitalism and other economic activities as in themselves fundamentally economic practices that function independently of political and cultural processes, and, related, appears to conceive economic behavior/phenomena as devoid of values. To cite just a few examples, Fraser provides the following conceptualizations: ‘In this marketized zone, interaction is not directly regulated by patterns of cultural value. It is governed, rather by the functional interlacing of strategic imperatives, as individuals act to maximize self-interest’ (2003: 58); ‘system integration, in which interaction is coordinated by the functional interlacing of the unintended consequences of a myriad of individual strategies’; and ‘a quasi-objective, anonymous, impersonal market order that follows a logic of its own. This market order is culturally embedded, to be sure. But it is not directly governed by cultural schemas of evaluation’ (2003: 214). As the concept of overdetermination shows, ‘economic’ practices themselves depend on specific (cultural) knowledges, values and discourses, as well as specific (political) rules and regulations (and vice versa). Values are therefore not confined to the cultural status order.7 In addition to discourses and knowledges, values, for example, constitute ideas and behavior related to business enterprise success and purposes, rational considerations and calculations, individual self-interest, appropriate and desirable objects of economic production and exchange, etc. (Amariglio and Ruccio, 1994; Watkins, 1998). The theoretical perspective I am advocating here thus urges both the multiplication of analytical categories and concrete empirical investigations of the numerous conditions of existence (located throughout society) of any unjust practice (see also Smith, 2001: 121). It consequently suggests that overcoming any given form of oppression most likely will require transforming a wide range of cultural, economic and political practices.

#### Power Repetition DA – The revolution itself is violent – capitalism will re-form itself around regimes of accumulation.

Wendling 06 [Amy, professor of philosophy at Creighton College. 2006. “Reading Bataille Now.”]

Sovereignty and the Revolutionary Subject Bataille's discussion of "sovereignty" occupies the entire third volume of The Accursed Share. This volume explains the final two chapters of volume 1, in which Bataille sketches the forms of consumption characteristic of Soviet industrialization as a modality of the forms of consumption characteristic of the bourgeois world, as a cruel accumulation. In sovereign consumption, consumption is not subjected to an end outside of itself. In the terms of classical Marxism, to act sovereignly is to privilege use over exchange value, or individual over productive consumption. In a temporal schema, to act sovereignly is to privilege the present over the past or future. We might recognize sovereign consumption as noncoercive pleasure or play, consumption that exceeds a productive, work‑driven economy. A sovereign world would have the vision‑and the language‑to accommodate such a recognition and to accommodate it in a mode other than dubbing it irresponsible, irrational, childlike, or mad. Let me offer an example of sovereign consumption from the realm of sexuality, a realm that Bataille also highlights in both his fiction and his philosophy. The compulsory productive heterosexuality characteristic of bourgeois cultures is also part of the coercion to production. Bataille's por­ [p. 47] nography, all of which describes nonreproductive if mostly heterosexual sex, fits into his project for this reason. Nonreproducrive sex‑sex for sex's sake, queer sex, or sex for pleasure‑are all modes of nonproductive, or sovereign consumption: consumption that does no work, produces no new workers, and uses energy without recompense. All bourgeois cultural taboos about sexuality are rooted in the coercion to production. For Bataille, the sovereign individual, a version of the Nietzschean noble or Hegelian master (1991b, 219; 1973, 267), "consumes and doesn't labor" (199lb, 198; 1973, 248). Like Nietzsche, Bataille argues that bourgeois societies‑we readily recognize them as our own‑have made this sort of consumption impossible for us by inverting the values attached to it. Accumulation eclipses the character of the sovereign: we stockpile, hoard, and hold in reserve rather than use or enjoy. Our deepest pleasures derive from the hoarding itself: from the security of knowing it is there, should we want it. Because of this out pleasures remain vicarious, theoretical, indefinitely deferred and abstract. In an inversion of economic values, the pressure to accumulate eclipses Bataille's sovereign consumption. Similarly, in Nietzsche, the priest's inversion of moral values eclipses the goodness of nobility. For Bataille, the bourgeois class is the first‑and ultimately only‑ r revolutionary class: an ascetic class that revolts specifically against the sovereign nobility in favor of accumulation. The bourgeois revolution over against sovereignty conditions and inescapably schematizes all subsequent revolution and appeals to revolution. The very idea and practice of revolution is itself bourgeois. Revolution is a bourgeois concept, and the world in which Bataille finds himself continues to be the world of a feudal order that is breaking down. Bataille writes: 1 cannot help but insist on these aspects: I wish to stress, against both classical and present‑day Marxism, the connection of all the great modern revolutions, from the English and the French onward, with a feudal order that is breaking down. There have never been any great revolutions that have struck down an established bourgeois domination. All those that overthrew a regime started with a revolt motivated by the sovereignty that is implied in feudal society. (1991b, 279; 1973, 321) Conceptually, revolution demarcates the transition from sovereignty to accumulation. Revolution will always be connected with the dissolution of a feudal order and the privileges emblematized by such an order: access to nonproductive consumption, enjoyment, or use‑value itself, by right of birth. [p. 48] But why not, rather, a conception of plenitude and entitlement for all, also by right of birth, instead of competition and struggle for survival? Such a view is impossible when Nietzschean ressentiment is the impetus for liberation, because postrevolutionary subjects have learned to demonize the very things that they most desire. This point goes some distance toward explaining why revolutionary class hatred is insufficiently analytic and confuses the aristocracy with the bourgeoisie. It also explains why the revolution attempted in 1848 was a disaster. Bataille writes: The days ofJuue, the Commune, and Spartakus are the only violent convulsions of the working masses struggling against the bourgeoisie, but these movements occurred with the help of a misunderstanding. The workers were misled by the lack of obstacles encountered a little earlier when the bourgeoisie, in concert with them, rose up against men born of that feudality which irritated everybody. (1991b, 289) Under this historical error, born of the precipitous mixing of classes, the particularity of the bourgeoisie is misunderstood. The bourgeois is no lord or lady waited upon, but a money‑grubbing, guilt‑ridden, obsessive worker, too cheap to hire help, self‑righteously confirmed in his or her work ethic and ascetic way of life. I am not suggesting that the bourgeois does not have privileges. He or she does, but not in the same way as the feudal lord or lady. The bourgeois goal is always further accumulation, never consumption, and therefore never sovereignty. Bataille writes, "The masses have never united except in a radical hostility to the principle of sovereignty" (l99lb, 288; 1973, 329). The masses do not unite against accumulation, except when that accumulation is expressed as sovereignty, and therefore not as accumulation at all, but as consumption. The proletarian worker perceives an excessive consumption as the necessary result of the bourgeois accumulation of property. But this is a misperception, for the bourgeois does not enjoy but accumulates. When the proletarian worker comes to power, a bourgeois revolution recurs because this mass worker, the slave ascendant, forever operates in an economy of scarcity: hoarding resources from the memory of being deprived. The problem of accumulation begins again. The structure is of actual scarcity, followed by perceived scarcity and hoarding that holds on as a historical remainder. Never fully overcome, this remainder becomes part of the historically sedimented fear through which bourgeois cultures function. The problem is that a resentful revolutionary subject is unfit and unable to enjoy wealth and, by extension, political sovereignty. In The German Ideal­ [p. 49] ogy, Marx answers this criticism by claiming that through the process of revolutionary action, the proletariat is able to overcome accumulated habit and conditioning, learn to consume well, and thus become fit for rule (1978, 193). Only an upsurge of violent revolutionary action will be a sufficient lesson in consumption, a trial by violence that returns the bondsman back to the scene of the struggle to the death. For Marx, the emergent subject, baptized by fire, is transformed into a being capable of sovereignty‑or dead‑at the end of the process. But we have seen that the process of revolutionary action instills not liberation but a fearful repetition of servitude, now internal. In short, transformation is never so

#### Transition Wars DA – Rejection of capitalism causes massive transition wars.

Harris 03 Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe. Without this catastrophic upheaval, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

#### Extinction

Nyquist 05 [J.R., renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations, WorldNetDaily contributing editor. 02/04/2005. “The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash.”]

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs.

#### Independently turns their impact – the transition magnifies every flaw of capitalism.

Gurbud 97 [Mark, Graduate Research Assistant – Center for Superconductivity Research at the University of Maryland, “Nanotechnology and International Security”, http://www.foresight.org/Conferences/MNT05/Papers/Gubrud/]

With molecular manufacturing, international trade in both raw materials and finished goods can be replaced by decentralized production for local consumption, using locally available materials. The decline of international trade will undermine a powerful source of common interest. Further, artificial intelligence will displace skilled as well as unskilled labor. A world system based on wage labor, transnational capitalism and global markets will necessarily give way. We imagine that a golden age is possible, but we don’t know how to organize one. As global capitalism retreats, it will leave behind a world dominated by politics, and possibly feudal concentrations of wealth and power. Economic insecurity, and fears for the material and moral future of humankind may lead to the rise of demagogic and intemperate national leaders. With almost two hundred sovereign nations, each struggling to create a new economic and social order, perhaps the most predictable outcome is chaos: shifting alignments, displaced populations, power struggles, ethnic conflicts inflamed by demagogues, class conflicts, land disputes, etc. Small and underdeveloped nations will be more than ever dependent on the major powers for access to technology, and more than ever vulnerable to sophisticated forms of control or subversion, or to outright domination. Competition among the leading technological powers for the political loyalty of clients might imply reversion to some form of nationalistic imperialism.

#### Elite backlash turns the method

Kagarlitsky 96 [Boris](http://findarticles.com/p/search?tb=art&qa=Boris+Kagarlitsky), Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Comparative Political Studies – Russian Academy of Sciences “The Agony Of Neo-Liberalism Or The End Of Civilization?”, Monthly Review, June, <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_n2_v48/ai_18375973>//[edited for ableist language]

It would seem that the time for alternatives has now come. But where are these alternatives? When the American philosopher Francis Fukuyama declared that with the triumph of neo-liberalism the end of history had arrived, people first argued with him, then began laughing at him, and finally forgot about him. This, however, was a mistake. When Fukuyama declared the end of history, he did not by any means base his thesis on the economic or social successes of capitalism. In practice, he measured the success of the victorious ideology by a single criterion: the ability of the world ruling class to destroy, suffocate, corrupt or discredit any constructive alternative to itself. If there were no alternatives to capitalism, everything would stay the same whether capitalism was good or bad. In this sense, we are now even closer to the end of history than in 1989. The economic failure of neo-liberalism has not led and will not lead automatically to the collapse of its ideological hegemony. The elites of contemporary capitalism cannot resolve the system's objective contradictions, and cannot and do not want to solve its growing problems, but they are capable of [preventing] ~~paralyzing~~ any attempts to solve these problems on the basis of alternative approaches. Technological development is not paralyzed by social structures that are clearly outdated and increasingly absurd. This development continues; the only difference is that it ceases to improve people's lives. Indeed, technological development becomes a negative factor. With every turn in the spiral of technological revolution, more and more new contradictions and disproportions accumulate. Relationships become confused, the structures and systems of rule grow steadily more complex, and the processes become less and less predictable. The "repressive tolerance" of the 1960s has been replaced by repressive or coercive hegemony. The official ideologies no longer convince anyone, but this scarcely troubles the authorities, since they do not allow alternative ideologies to be propagated. Or else, such ideologies are disseminated in fragmentary form, and in this way simply demonstrate their inadequacy as genuine alternatives.