### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: Debaters must post links to all previous constructive speech docs read at the tournament at least 30 minutes prior to the round. To clarify, this means you must include full text, underlining, and highlighting of all cards as read in round.

#### Violation – this is disclosed

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### [C] Standards

#### [1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

Antonucci ‘5 [Michael (Debate coach for Georgetown; former coach for Lexington High School); “[eDebate] open source? resp to Morris”; December 8; http://www.ndtceda.com/pipermail/edebate/2005-December/064806.html //nick]

a. Open source systems are preferable to the various punishment proposals in circulation. It's better to share the wealth than limit production or participation. Various flavors of argument communism appeal to different people, but banning interesting or useful research(ers) seems like the most destructive solution possible. Indeed, open systems may be the only structural, rule-based answer to resource inequities. Every other proposal I've seen obviously fails at the level of enforcement. Revenue sharing (illegal), salary caps (unenforceable and possibly illegal) and personnel restrictions (circumvented faster than you can say 'information is fungible') don't work. This would - for better or worse. b. With the help of a middling competent archivist, an open source system would reduce entry barriers. This is especially true on the novice or JV level. Young teams could plausibly subsist entirely on a diet of scavenged arguments. A novice team might not wish to do so, but the option can't hurt. c. An open source system would fundamentally change the evidence economy without targetting anyone or putting anyone out of a job. It seems much smarter (and less bilious) to change the value of a professional card-cutter's work than send the KGB after specific counter-revolutionary teams.

#### 2] leads to higher quality engagement b/c I know exactly what the aff says which internal link turns the aff b/c it leads to net better discussion

#### 3] Evidence ethics – open source with highlighting is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut – full text doesn’t solve since you could have highlighted unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### Voter: Education is the only portable impact from debate – we care about what we learn rather than if we were fair.

#### Drop the debater - Sets a precedent that debaters cant run unfair arguments because they will be scared to lose.

#### Competing interps - Reasonability causes a race to the bottom because debaters keep being barely reasonable, magnifying abuse. Judge intervention

#### No RVIs - RVIs discourage checking abuse because debaters will be afraid to lose on theory: also forces me to go all in on theory which is terrible because 1ar can just dump

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution and may not defend the resolution as a “general principle”.

#### Resolved means a policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Violation: 1. Cross-ex proves shiftyness 2. Their advocacy states the aff as a general principle which is not the same as a policy action because we don’t get to use comparative worlds 3. AT BEST is extra-t because they also “rebel against the reactionary forces of capitalism” which is outside the scope of the resolution. Hold them to the text of the 1ac since anything else allows them to shift our of our offense in the 1ar.

#### Prefer spirit over text of the interp– text causes race to the bottom because there’s always something that isn’t going to be specific enough or a word with multiple meanings

#### Spirit ensures the debate is surrounded around rules instead of nitty gritty definition debates

#### Standards:

#### 1. Ground- we don’t get to read CPs or even DAs because those all are predicated upon the aff being a policy and they can spike out of links by saying we must prove the aff as a general principle is bad in a normative sense, kills fairness because none of my arguments stick and education because they can skirt questions of topic literature.

#### Even if they say they won’t do that in this round – it incentivizes debaters to be shifty

#### 2. Burden of Rejoinder- the burden of the neg is to prove that the aff is a bad idea but we can’t do this when they’re a general principle because we become constrained to solely normative indicts and can’t test the aff from multiple angles. Kills neg flex and our ability to engage.

#### 3. Engagement—they transform debate into a monologue where we can’t read CPs which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subjected to well researched scrutiny.

#### TVA: Literally just defend the aff as a policy plan.

#### Vote neg – they’ve destroyed the round from the beginning and topicality’s key to set the correct model of debate which means it comes first.

#### Voter:

#### Evaluate T through competing interps—it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for. Reasonability is arbitrary and unpredictable

#### Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse

#### Fairness is an impact and comes before substance – deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it – any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, since it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it. This means they don’t get to weigh the aff.

#### Education is an impact – it’s the only reason schools fund debate

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad. 2] incentivizes baiting theory

### 1NC – OFF

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Extinction comes first!

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### Intuitions outweigh - since they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why

### Case

#### IP is worse for innovation— vote neg!

Chao and Mody 15 – Tiffany E, Department of Surgery, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; Gita N, Program in Global Surgery and Social Change, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; “The impact of intellectual property regulation on global medical technology innovation”; BMJ Journals; 3/5/15’ <https://innovations.bmj.com/content/1/2/49> //advay

Technology innovation has the potential to expand equitable healthcare to underserved populations in global health. At the same time, device patents and their legislation can be barriers to innovation for developing countries. For example, the WHO has developed a ‘Compendium of innovative health technologies for low-resource settings’.1 Most of these technologies are inexpensive to develop, inexpensive to manufacture and relatively easy to use. Nevertheless, the WHO clearly states that inclusion in their Compendium does not necessarily mean “the use of the technologies is…in accordance with the national laws and regulations of any country, including…patent laws.” Of course, it would be a challenge to innovate in the absence of legislation on trademark laws and trade secrets. Since the profitability of devices depends on leveraging existing pathways for device development, manufacturing and distribution, intellectual property (IP) protection is a major aspect of commercialisation of technologies. Certainly investors in new start-ups look for IP protection as a high priority. Regulation of IP, therefore, is necessary to stimulate invention and new technologies. However, for technologies in low-resource settings, IP protection has historically been sparse. The World Intellectual Property Organisation reports that in 2012, high-income countries shared 64.5% of the world's total number of patents, while lower-middle-income countries held only 2.9%, with low-income countries owning only 0.4%.2 This disparity clearly demonstrates limited IP support for frugal innovation emerging from developing countries. Ironically, inventors in low-resource settings are presented with an abundance of important clinical needs and fewer established infrastructure constraints, so that there is a vast untapped potential for innovations to originate in these settings and move to the more developed world (known as reverse innovation).3 Inventors of healthcare devices for the developing world have varying interest in pursuing patent protection of their devices.i High cost, time and logistics are oft-cited reasons for not pursuing patents. Factors influencing the cost include not just the expense of filing (which can be thousands of dollars) but also fees for legal counsel and maintenance of the patent. These costs are a barrier in their own right, and they can also lead to increases in the price of the end product, which can be significant in a highly cost-sensitive market. An additional barrier is limited knowledge of complicated international patent laws with inadequate access to qualified IP lawyers. In cases where out-of-country universities are involved in patenting the technologies, the bureaucracy involved in dealing with the technology transfer office and their inexperience in executing foreign filings is a barrier (though there are counterexamples of very significant university partnerships in developing bottom-of-the-pyramid technologies). Another major reason for limited IP protection of technology for low-resource settings is the spirit behind the innovation in the first place; inventors designing for low-resource settings are often interested in keeping their device design open source, to maximise spread and impact. Also, consumers of the technologies are highly focused on affordability. Prosecution of infringement of IP laws in low-resource settings is limited, and violating IP laws is a pragmatic way for ‘copycats’ to reduce their investment costs in research and development, and quickly sell products, getting healthcare technology to those who need it. Most countries do operate under patent laws compliant with the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement, a framework that requires IP laws to resemble those of developed areas. This agreement applies to all WTO member countries. Therefore, unless a developing country wishes to withdraw from the WTO, its IP laws are required to resemble those in the USA or Europe, leaving little flexibility to tailor to local needs.4 This means that international IP laws are often in the economic interests of developed countries rather than in the innovation interests of other countries.5 As a result of these issues, the most prevalent strategy among global health technologies has often been to develop without regard for IP protection. A major advantage of this approach is that it can allow for open-source innovation, permitting technological learning through imitation. This approach can also eliminate the many costs of foreign protection or patent enforcement, allowing for a frugal approach to the initial development of the technology itself. Furthermore, this approach is most in line with the collaborative spirit of global health innovation. Nevertheless, there do exist some opportunities for frugal approaches to IP. Simplified legislation or pro bono opportunities for counsel allow an effective system of justice for inventors to take full advantage of legislation to promote innovation.6 Grants and other forms of non-dilutive funding enable inventors to develop global health technologies without being overly concerned about licensing or investment opportunities. Some potential legislative changes also could be made, such as creation of public–private partnerships that could facilitate government-funded research to be protected and disseminated at affordable cost in such countries.7 Other existing exemptions in international agreements could be implemented, including research exemptions for experimental uses of IP or government imposed non-exclusive or compulsory licensing.8 While there remains potential for more imaginative IP legislation in developing countries, original technologies continue to be developed in these settings. On the international stage, forums such as the WHO Global Forum on Medical Devices highlight emerging technologies that “impact the continuum of care ranging from screening to diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation under the Universal Health Coverage Strategy.”9 These platforms demonstrate that despite the hurdles faced by developing economies in capturing the benefits of IP laws, global health technologies can be and will continue to be developed outside of these limitations.

#### 1. Neoliberalism is inevitable --- crises cause elites to double down on austerity measures and structural adjustment that hasten privatization --- if Bernie couldn’t win, how can the aff?

--Always assumed to be on its last legs but comes back - 2008 seen as comprehensive repudiation but still kicking

--“No alternative” is the reigning ideology – solution was austerity measures, taax cuts, structural adjsmtnet across the global South, challenges to public service provision/social security/healthcare, and financial elites got bailed out/deregulated

--Changes come and go – Dodd Frank and liquidity shock requirements got repealed – Syrizas in Greece still got austerity medicine and then wrecked in 2019 election by conservatives

Peck and Theodore, 19

Jamie Peck is Canada Research Chair in Urban & Regional Political Economy and Professor of Geography at the University of British Columbia, Canada. He is the Managing Editor of Environment and Planning A and the convenor of the Summer Institute in Economic Geography. Nik Theodore is a Professor, Urban Planning and Policy, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research, CUPPA. “Still Neoliberalism?” The South Atlantic Quarterly, 118, April 2019

Neoliberal, Neoliberalism, Neoliberalization: What’s in a Name?

That neoliberalism remains a circulating if contestable term, after decades of fitful and fickle usage, might be considered an achievement of sorts. Repeatedly disowned, denigrated, and dismissed, it nevertheless refuses to go away— at least circumstantial evidence, perhaps, that there is indeed “some there there.” This is not the place to revisit the extended genealogy of this troubled signifier and its contested historical geography (see Peck 2010; Cahill et al. 2018), except to observe that its turbulent fortunes, perhaps especially in the period since the Wall Street crash of 2008, have been revealing, while at the same time adding new layers of mystification and puzzlement to what has been a never-less-than-checkered history. What was to be a particularly heavyhanded reboot of this history began in the thick of that last crisis, a little over a decade ago. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Wall Street crash was at the time widely interpreted as both a comprehensive repudiation and a system failure of neoliberalism by key figures on the left, from Eric Hobsbawm to Naomi Klein, who read the moment as terminal for the rolling project of financial deregulation and for the small-state consensus more generally, a view that was echoed by center-left economists such as Joseph Stiglitz and, although not in so many words, by the likes of Paul Krugman. Rather more surprisingly, there were also some mainstream politicians on the right and left flanks of the center ground, from France’s Nicolas Sarkozy to Australia’s Kevin Rudd, who in this uniquely disorientating context were moved to utter the hitherto unspeakable term, albeit only to declare its graceless exit (see Erlanger 2008; Rudd 2009). A common refrain across much of the commentary at the time, when real economies around the world and the credibility of those charged with their stewardship were both in freefall, was that the much-maligned state would be (had to be) making a comeback—in its own way echoing the arch-neoliberal conceits of governmental withdrawal and free-market governance, as if the state had ever really gone away. Projects of neoliberalization, it has been fairly clear all along to those willing to see, have never been synonymous with a simple diminution, or withdrawal, of the state, but instead have been variously concerned with its capture and reuse, albeit in the context of a generalized assault on social-welfarist or leftarm functions, coupled with an expansion of right-arm roles and capacities in areas like policing and surveillance, incarceration and social control, and the military. Nevertheless, this kind of state project was widely believed to have met its end a decade ago in the Wall Street meltdown.

What followed certainly did not align with the script of a terminal, once-and-for-all collapse of neoliberalism represented (again, somewhat misleadingly) as a bracketable “era” of free-market governance. As if to affirm Thatcher’s premature dismissal that there was “no alternative” to market rule, what followed in the wake of the financial crisis was, far from a retreat of neoliberalism, more like an audacious exercise in doubling down. Longterm austerity measures were (re)imposed in nations rich and poor, including those countries once regarded as the tutelary “heartlands” of the project, and its proving grounds, the United States and the United Kingdom. A new generation of structural adjustment programs targeted not only populations across the global South but also Greece, Detroit, and elsewhere. There were sustained, if scattergun, assaults on many of the old targets—public services, public budgets, and public servants; social movements and labor unions; social security, socialized healthcare, and public-education systems; and undeserving classes, the poor, and racialized others. And all the while, financial and corporate elites got away with slaps on the wrist, if that, only to be compensated in due course with yet more deregulation and further rounds of tax cuts. This unapologetic mutation of late neoliberalism, back as it were from its own grave, may have been shorn of anything approaching credible claims to moral leadership and intellectual authority, but in this reconstituted form it would present a yet more brutal face in its dogged defenses of political power and institutional dominance, soon to be coupled with brazen reassertions of the manifestly dubious case for corporate liberty, financial freedom, and social-state retrenchment.

#### 2. Transition fails—lack of support for socialism, consumption habits, and elite power domination

* at Mallott

Burch-Hansen 18

(Hubert Buch-Hansen, Department of Business and Politics, Copenhagen Business School, “The Prerequisites for a Degrowth Paradigm Shift: Insights from Critical Political Economy,” Ecological Economics, Volume 146, April 2018, pp. 157-163)

Political projects do not become hegemonic just because they embody good ideas. For a project to become hegemonic, (organic) intellectuals first need to develop the project and a constellation of social forces with sufficient power and resources to implement it then needs to find it appealing and struggle for it. In this context, it is worth noting that degrowth, as a social movement, has been gaining momentum for some time, not least in Southern Europe. Countless grassroots' initiatives (e.g., D'Alisa et al., 2013) are the most visible manifestations that degrowth is on the rise. Intellectuals – including founders of ecological economics such as Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen and Herman Daly, and more recently degrowth scholars such as Serge Latouche and Giorgos Kallis – have played a major role in developing and disseminating the ideas underpinning the project. A growing interest in degrowth in academia, as well as well-attended biennial international degrowth conferences, also indicate that an increasing number of people embrace such ideas. Still, the degrowth project is nowhere near enjoying the degree and type of support it needs if its policies are to be implemented through democratic processes. The number of political parties, labour unions, business associations and international organisations that have so far embraced degrowth is modest to say the least. Economic and political elites, including social democratic parties and most of the trade union movement, are united in the belief that economic growth is necessary and desirable. This consensus finds support in the prevailing type of economic theory and underpins the main contenders in the neoliberal project, such as centre-left and nationalist projects. In spite of the world's multidimensional crisis, a pro-growth discourse in other words continues to be hegemonic: it is widely considered a matter of common sense that continued economic growth is required. It is also noteworthy that economic and political elites, to a large extent, continue to support the neoliberal project, even in the face of its evident shortcomings. Indeed, the 2008 financial crisis did not result in the weakening of transnational financial capital that could have paved the way for a paradigm shift. Instead of coming to an end, neoliberal capitalism has arguably entered a more authoritarian phase (Bruff, 2014). The main reason the power of the pre-crisis coalition remains intact is that governments stepped in and saved the dominant fraction by means of massive bailouts. It is a foregone conclusion that this fraction and the wider coalition behind the neoliberal paradigm (transnational industrial capital, the middle classes and segments of organized labour) will consider the degrowth paradigm unattractive and that such social forces will vehemently oppose the implementation of degrowth policies (see also Rees, 2014: 97). While degrowth advocates envision a future in which market forces play a less prominent role than they do today, degrowth is not an anti-market project. As such, it can attract support from certain types of market actors. In particular, it is worth noting that social enterprises, such as cooperatives (Restakis, 2010), play a major role in the degrowth vision. Such enterprises are defined by being ‘organisations involved at least to some extent in the market, with a clear social, cultural and/or environmental purpose, rooted in and serving primarily the local community and ideally having a local and/or democratic ownership structure’ (Johanisova et al., 2013: 11). Social enterprises currently exist at the margins of a system, in which the dominant type of business entity is profit-oriented, shareholder-owned corporations. The further dissemination of social enterprises, which is crucial to the transitions to degrowth societies, is – in many cases – blocked or delayed as a result of the centrifugal forces of global competition (Wigger and Buch-Hansen, 2013). Overall, social enterprises thus (still) constitute a social force with modest power. Ougaard (2016: 467) notes that one of the major dividing lines in the contemporary transnational capitalist class is between capitalists who have a material interest in the carbon-based economy and capitalists who have a material interest in decarbonisation. The latter group, for instance, includes manufacturers of equipment for the production of renewable energy (ibid.: 467). As mentioned above, degrowth advocates have singled out renewable energy as one of the sectors that needs to grow in the future. As such, it seems likely that the owners of national and transnational companies operating in this sector would be more positively inclined towards the degrowth project than would capitalists with a stake in the carbon-based economy. Still, the prospect of the “green sector” emerging as a driving force behind degrowth currently appears meagre. Being under the control of transnational capital (Harris, 2010), such companies generally embrace the “green growth” discourse, which ‘is deeply embedded in neoliberal capitalism’ and indeed serves to adjust this form of capitalism ‘to crises arising from contradictions within itself’ (Wanner, 2015: 23). In addition to support from the social forces engendered by the production process, a political project ‘also needs the political ability to mobilize majorities in parliamentary democracies, and a sufficient measure of at least passive consent’ (van Apeldoorn and Overbeek, 2012: 5–6) if it is to become hegemonic. As mentioned, degrowth enjoys little support in parliaments, and certainly the pro-growth discourse is hegemonic among parties in government.5 With capital accumulation being the most important driving force in capitalist societies, political decision-makers are generally eager to create conditions conducive to production and the accumulation of capital (Lindblom, 1977: 172). Capitalist states and international organisations are thus “programmed” to facilitate capital accumulation, and do as such constitute a strategically selective terrain that works to the disadvantage of the degrowth project. The main advocates of the degrowth project are grassroots, small fractions of left-wing parties and labour unions as well as academics and other citizens who are concerned about social injustice and the environmentally unsustainable nature of societies in the rich parts of the world. The project is thus ideationally driven in the sense that support for it is not so much rooted in the material circumstances or short-term self-interests of specific groups or classes as it is rooted in the conviction that degrowth is necessary if current and future generations across the globe are to be able to lead a good life. While there is no shortage of enthusiasts and creative ideas in the degrowth movement, it has only modest resources compared to other political projects. To put it bluntly, the advocates of degrowth do not possess instruments that enable them to force political decision-makers to listen to – let alone comply with – their views. As such, they are in a weaker position than the labour union movement was in its heyday, and they are in a far weaker position than the owners and managers of large corporations are today (on the structural power of transnational corporations, see Gill and Law, 1989). 6. Consent It is also safe to say that degrowth enjoys no “passive consent” from the majority of the population. For the time being, degrowth remains unknown to most people. Yet, if it were to become generally known, most people would probably not find the vision of a smaller economic system appealing. This is not just a matter of degrowth being ‘a missile word that backfires’ because it triggers negative feelings in people when they first hear it (Drews and Antal, 2016). It is also a matter of the actual content of the degrowth project. Two issues in particular should be mentioned in this context. First, for many, the anti-capitalist sentiments embodied in the degrowth project will inevitably be a difficult pill to swallow. Today, the vast majority of people find it almost impossible to conceive of a world without capitalism. There is a ‘widespread sense that not only is capitalism the only viable political and economic system, but also that it is now impossible to even imagine a coherent alternative to it’ (Fisher, 2009: 2). As Jameson (2003) famously observed, it is, in a sense, easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism. However, not only is degrowth – like other anti-capitalist projects – up against the challenge that most people consider capitalism the only system that can function; it is also up against the additional challenge that it speaks against economic growth in a world where the desirability of growth is considered common sense. Second, degrowth is incompatible with the lifestyles to which many of us who live in rich countries have become accustomed. Economic growth in the Western world is, to no small extent, premised on the existence of consumer societies and an associated consumer culture most of us find it difficult to completely escape. In this culture, social status, happiness, well-being and identity are linked to consumption (Jackson, 2009). Indeed, it is widely considered a natural right to lead an environmentally unsustainable lifestyle – a lifestyle that includes car ownership, air travel, spacious accommodations, fashionable clothing, an omnivorous diet and all sorts of electronic gadgets. This Western norm of consumption has increasingly been exported to other parts of the world, the result being that never before have so many people taken part in consumption patterns that used to be reserved for elites (Koch, 2012). If degrowth were to be institutionalised, many citizens in the rich countries would have to adapt to a materially lower standard of living. That is, while the basic needs of the global population can be met in a non-growing economy, not all wants and preferences can be fulfilled (Koch et al., 2017). Undoubtedly, many people in the rich countries would experience various limitations on their consumption opportunities as a violent encroachment on their personal freedom. Indeed, whereas many recognize that contemporary consumer societies are environmentally unsustainable, fewer are prepared to actually change their own lifestyles to reverse/address this. At present, then, the degrowth project is in its “deconstructive phase”, i.e., the phase in which its advocates are able to present a powerful critique of the prevailing neoliberal project and point to alternative solutions to crisis. At this stage, not enough support has been mobilised behind the degrowth project for it to be elevated to the phases of “construction” and “consolidation”. It is conceivable that at some point, enough people will become sufficiently discontent with the existing economic system and push for something radically different. Reasons for doing so could be the failure of the system to satisfy human needs and/or its inability to resolve the multidimensional crisis confronting humanity. Yet, various material and ideational path-dependencies currently stand in the way of such a development, particularly in countries with large middle-classes. Even if it were to happen that the majority wanted a break with the current system, it is far from given that a system based on the ideas of degrowth is what they would demand.

#### 3. CCS. Markets are key.

Gregory F. Nemet et al., Associate Professor, La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Martina Kraus, German Institute for Economic Research Vera Zipperer, German Institute for Economic Research, November, 2016, The Valley of Death, the Technology Pork Barrel, and Public Support for Large Demonstration Projects, La Follette School Working Paper No. 2016-007

Because the ultimate (but not immediate) goal of supporting demonstrations is to facilitate widespread adoption, demand and thus markets are of course key (Kingsley et al., 1996). In climate change, policies are central to those markets (Taylor et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2015), thus credibility in those policies is also central (Rai et al., 2010; Finon, 2012). But it is striking how many demonstration programs confronted markets that involved negative shocks around the time that projects came on-line—we see it in synfuels, biofuels, and solar thermal electricity (Figure 9), and CCS (Figure 10). The 1.9 year average lag from project initiation to time on-line is crucial. It would be a mistake to assume a Hotelling price path in which prices of an exhaustible resource (e.g. oil, atmospheric storage of CO2) rise at a constant pure rate of time preference. In this case the relevant price is the level at which avoided CO2 emissions are remunerated. Rather the experience of the past suggests we are more likely to see shocks and boom–bust cycles (Krautkraemer, 1998; Zaklan et al., 2011). We see it in our data in the prices related to each demonstration program (Figure 8). Lupion and Herzog (2013) attribute the failure of the NER300 program to stimulate the construction of any CCS projects to 4 factors: competition with renewables, project complexity, low carbon prices, and a combination of fiscal austerity and weak climate policy around the global financial crisis. Note that three of the four problems involved future demand, not the funding structure itself. Demonstrations need markets that pay off innovation investments not just under a steadily increasing Hotelling-style market, but under a broad range of market conditions. Features of robust demand pull include niche markets (Kemp et al., 1998), hedging across jurisdictions (Nemet, 2010), and flexible production (Sanchez and Kammen, 2016). Government price guarantees have played an important role as we have seen on synfuels, solar thermal electricity, and on a smaller scale, photovoltaics.

#### 4. Try or die for CCS to solve warming

Moniz 9/23/19 - 13th Secretary of Energy (2013 to 2017) and is the founder and CEO of the Energy Futures Initiative

Fredd Krupp is president of the Environmental Defense Fund, Ernest Moniz, “Cutting Climate Pollution Isn’t Enough — We Also Need Carbon Removal,” Text, TheHill, September 23, 2019, <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/462609-cutting-climate-pollution-isnt-enough-we-also-need-carbon-removal>.

It has been almost four years since the Paris climate agreement was signed. But as leaders gather in New York this week for the United Nations Climate Change Summit, the world remains far off track from meeting the Paris objective of limiting global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius -- and pursuing efforts at 1.5 degrees. To meet that target, the world must achieve a 100 percent clean economy — one that produces net zero emissions, or no more climate pollution than can be removed from the atmosphere — soon after mid-century, with the United States and other advanced economies reaching that milestone no later than 2050. It’s a daunting but doable task. The consequences of falling short are enormous. This year, the U.S. government’s fourth National Climate Assessment documented the huge economic and social impacts of unchecked warming. The Pentagon has repeatedly warned of the impacts on national security and our troops. Achieving a 100 percent clean economy will require a swift transition to renewables and other zero-carbon energy sources. But we also need to face the reality that meeting the Paris target will require taking carbon out of the atmosphere at massive scale. In part, that’s because eliminating emissions will be very challenging for some sectors, especially the transportation industry and agriculture. Removing carbon from the atmosphere would also bring concentrations down, helping to stabilize the climate at safer levels. So, the push for clean energy must be supplemented by a suite of technologies known as carbon dioxide removal (CDR). It is not a question of what we’d prefer. It’s a question of insurmountable math. The crucial role carbon removal must play is becoming more widely recognized. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report stressed the importance of carbon removal, and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine late last year estimated that ten billion tons of CO2 will need to be pulled from the atmosphere annually by 2050, and double that by 2100. For context, today’s global emissions are less than 40 billion tons per year. If the 10 billion tons of CO2 from CDR were stored underground, that would be roughly double the world’s annual oil production. The good news is that there are a surprisingly large number of promising pathways for carbon dioxide removal. Nature-based approaches include reforestation and forest management as well as agricultural practices that increase carbon stored in soils. Some of the attendant challenges include competition for land and permanence of the carbon sequestration. Technological approaches include direct air capture — machines that actually suck carbon from the air — and technologically-enhanced natural processes, such as plants genetically modified with deep roots to fix carbon in the soil; enhanced mineralization, which uses certain reactive rocks to bind with carbon from the air; and accelerated ocean uptake in phytoplankton. These technologies are immature and require considerable research, development and demonstration to ensure viability and affordability at very large scale. Despite the urgency, there is no dedicated federal effort to develop these crucial technologies; existing programs are piecemeal and largely focused on sequestering emissions from industrial and electricity generating sources. The National Academies recommended the rapid establishment of a robust, focused, scalable and accelerated federal research program spanning the Departments of Energy and Agriculture, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, among others. Such a program would encompass the full range of technological pathways that can remove CO2 from the environment. ‘’Clearing the Air,’’ an analysis of CDR’s value and a proposed plan to deploy it, has been completed by the Energy Futures Initiative. Over the next decade, the program scale would be about a billion dollars a year. Carbon dioxide removal is not a magic bullet. We must do everything we can to deploy innovative low- and zero-carbon methods to generate electricity, heat homes, fuel vehicles, and power industry, creating new economic opportunities in the process. Tackling the climate crisis also requires placing a declining limit and a price on carbon pollution, as well as a significant increase in energy technology innovation and deployment across the board. But CDR is also not a “Plan B.” It is a critical part of any “Plan A” for climate, a necessary complement to emission reduction. It can provide more flexibility and optionality in policy planning, which could ease the transition to a carbon-neutral economy while minimizing transition costs and providing greater assurance that science-based climate goals can be met in a timely manner. It would eventually enable a net negative global economy that could bring the atmospheric carbon concentrations down — and global temperatures with it. We have delayed meaningful action for far too long. As a result, the scale and urgency of the challenge is such that we cannot simply work on doing better in the future. We need to correct what we did in the past. Carbon removal is the enabler.

#### 5. Markets are effective and ethical methods of resolving climate change – commodity fetishism is wrong.

Monast ’17 – C. Boyden Gray Distinguished Fellow and Assistant Professor, University of North Carolina School of Law

Jonas. “On Morals, Markets, and Climate Change: Exploring Pope Francis' Challenge” LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS Vol. 80. HeinOnline

A. Argument 1: The Policy Instrument Is Intrinsically Immoral

For some, opposition to emissions trading is rooted in the view that allowing entities to buy and sell emissions credits is equivalent to licensing the "right to pollute."" Under this view, the market for units of emissions is objectionable on three grounds.45 First, emissions markets establish allowances or credits equal to a unit of pollution-typically the equivalent of a ton of carbon dioxide in the carbon market context. This view argues that the act of creating a tradable good out of an environmental harm-commodifying the environment and undermining the norm of pollution as intrinsically wrong-is itself immoral.

A second line of argument suggests that emissions markets conflict with a shared duty not to cause environmental harm." Rather than imposing mandatory emission reduction requirements at each source, emissions markets explicitly embrace compliance flexibility.47 At the end of a compliance period, entities subject to the emissions cap must submit the number of allowances equal to the corresponding units of pollution emitted. Emissions from an individual facility may increase, decrease, or remain unchanged, provided that: (1) each individual entity submits enough allowances to cover its actual emissions (or pay a heavy penalty); and (2) the cumulative emissions from all covered entities do not exceed the cap for that compliance period. 48 Because some emitters may avoid reducing the environmental harm caused by their facilities by purchasing allowances or credits-that is, extra reductions in emissions-from other emitters who therefore emit less, detractors of carbon markets view this compliance flexibility as allowing some polluters to avoid responsibility for reducing their contribution to harming public health or the environmental commons.4 9 If there is a universal duty to avoid environmental harm, the critics say, allowing some facilities to evade this responsibility by purchasing emission credits is wrong.

A third argument underlying the "inherent immorality" viewpoint rests on the view that national and international laws and treaties call for a clean and safe environment for all people." On this view, even if those laws have not achieved uniform protections, together they create a societal norm that pollution is bad and those responsible for emitting the pollution have a responsibility to reduce their impacts. According to Sandel, for example, the permits-and-fines-based environmental policy embedded in environmental statutes in the 1970s carried a "moral message" that polluting the environmental commons was wrong. These fines required companies to pay penalties for violating their legal and moral obligations. In contrast, some argue, using public policy to establish a market for emission credits undermines the societal norm of shared sacrifice to protect the environment, replacing it with the view "that nature is a dumping ground for those who can afford it."52 Sandel argues that this line of reasoning distinguishes carbon taxes from carbon trading -that taxing environmental harm conveys themoral stigma, while allowing emissions trading legitimizes the environmental harm provided the polluter is willing and able to purchase the permission to cause the harm.53

While Pope Francis does not invoke the "licensing the right to pollute" language, the encyclical's criticism of free market ideologies, of carbon credits, and of prioritizing profit maximization over personal responsibility, all suggest sympathy for the arguments that carbon markets are inherently immoral.

These arguments, however, are unpersuasive on several grounds. First, all environmental policies license some amount of pollution, except those rare cases that require a total ban. Alternatives to market-based instruments, such as traditional regulation via prescriptive technology standards or performance standards, also license residual pollution-indeed, for free-whereas marketbased instruments force the polluter to pay for each residual unit of emissions through an allowance obligation. This is true even if traditional policies are backed by heavy penalties for noncompliance, because even a firm in full compliance (for example, achieved by installing a scrubber), is permitted to continue to release residual (unabated) emissions (despite full compliance) at no penalty. On the other hand, under market-based policies, even firms in full compliance still must pay the allowance obligation (or tax, if applicable) on their residual emissions, or forego the proceeds they could have earned by selling their remaining allowances." Thus, traditional regulation may represent granting the right to pollute even more than market-based policies. Market-based policies can force the polluter-pays principle to apply to every unit of emissions, whereas traditional regulation exempts residual emissions for free. Imposing a penalty only on emissions above some permitted amount expresses the message that the permitted amount is legitimate, whereas an emissions tax or cap-and-trade expresses the message that the polluter must pay for every unit of emissions."

Second, if what is immoral is licensing pollution, or, licensing increased environmental harm, then a rejection of market-based approaches may itself be an immoral choice. This is particularly true where market-based instruments are more likely to address an environmental harm in a cost-effective manner, generate more pollution-control for a given expenditure, stimulate greater dynamic innovation in new methods of pollution reduction, or enable society to buy more environmental protection. 6 In such cases, the act of opposing market based instruments may actually license greater pollution, which would presumably be an immoral position (according to the critics).57 Third, this point is even stronger if morality includes concern for non-human life and the environment. Other life on earth suffers from climate change impacts and benefits from improving environmental quality and preventing damaging climate change-but presumably does not care about humans' moral scruples and norms about how humans prevent climate change. If market mechanisms offer an opportunity to achieve greater environmental benefits and successfully prevent climate change damages, then opposing market mechanisms in order to vindicate asserted human ethical scruples means thereby sacrificing some climate protection for the rest of life on earth, and is therefore at odds with a moral stance that includes concern for non-human life and the environment.

#### 6. Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts

Kaletsky ’11 (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21)

Democratic capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products. Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years. But regardless of the difference in timescale, capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

#### 7. Free market capitalism has drastically improved the world.

Horwitz 16 Steven Horwitz is the Schnatter Distinguished Professor of Free Enterprise in the Department of Economics at Ball State University, where he also is a Fellow at the John H. Schnatter Institute for Entrepreneurship and Free Enterprise. He is the author of Hayek’s Modern Family: Classical Liberalism and the Evolution of Social Institutions. “Capitalism Is Good for the Poor” June 09, 2016. IB

Critics frequently accuse markets and capitalism of making life worse for the poor. This refrain is certainly common in the halls of left-leaning academia as well as in broader intellectual circles. But like so many other criticisms of capitalism, this one ignores the very real, and very available, facts of history. Nothing has done more to lift humanity out of poverty than the market economy. This claim is true whether we are looking at a time span of decades or of centuries. The number of people worldwide living on less than about two dollars per day today is less than half of what it was in 1990. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets, such as China and India. If we look over the longer historical period, we can see that the trends today are just the continuation of capitalism’s victories in beating back poverty. For most of human history, we lived in a world of a few haves and lots of have-nots. That slowly began to change with the advent of capitalism and the Industrial Revolution. As economic growth took off and spread throughout the population, it created our own world in the West in which there are a whole bunch of haves and a few have-more-and-betters. For example, the percentage of American households below the poverty line who have basic appliances has grown steadily over the last few decades, with poor families in 2005 being more likely to own things like a clothes dryer, dishwasher, refrigerator, or air conditioner than the average household was in 1971. And consumer items that didn’t even exist back then, such as cell phones, were owned by half of poor households in 2005 and are owned by a substantial majority of them today. Capitalism has also made poor people’s lives far better by reducing infant and child mortality rates, not to mention maternal death rates during childbirth, and by extending life expectancies by decades. Consider, too, the way capitalism’s engine of growth has enabled the planet to sustain almost 7 billion people, compared to 1 billion in 1800. As Deirdre McCloskey has noted, if you multiply the gains in consumption to the average human by the gain in life expectancy worldwide by 7 (for 7 billion as compared to 1 billion people), humanity as a whole is better off by a factor of around 120. That’s not 120 percent better off, but 120 times better off since 1800. The competitive market process has also made education, art, and culture available to more and more people. Even the poorest of Americans, not to mention many of the global poor, have access through the Internet and TV to concerts, books, and works of art that were exclusively the province of the wealthy for centuries. And in the wealthiest countries, the dynamics of capitalism have begun to change the very nature of work. Where once humans toiled for 14 hours per day at backbreaking outdoor labor, now an increasing number of us work inside in climate-controlled comfort. Our workday and workweek have shrunk thanks to the much higher value of labor that comes from working with productive capital. We spend a much smaller percentage of our lives working for pay, whether we’re rich or poor. And even with economic change, the incomes of the poor are much less variable, as they are not linked to the unpredictable changes in weather that are part and parcel of a predominantly agricultural economy long since disappeared. Think of it this way: the fabulously wealthy kings of old had servants attending to their every need, but an impacted tooth would likely kill them. The poor in largely capitalist countries have access to a quality of medical care and a variety and quality of food that the ancient kings could only dream of. Consider, too, that the working poor of London 100 years ago were, at best, able to split a pound of meat per week among all of their children, which were greater in number than the two or three of today. In addition, the whole family ate meat once a week on Sunday, the one day the man of the household was home for dinner. That was meat for a week. Compare that to today, when we worry that poor Americans are too easily able to afford a meal with a quarter pound of meat in it every single day for less than an hour’s labor. Even if you think that capitalism has made poor people overweight, that’s a major accomplishment compared to the precapitalist norm of constant malnutrition and the struggle even 100 years ago for the working poor to get enough calories. The reality is that the rich have always lived well historically, as for centuries they could commandeer human labor to attend to their every need. In a precapitalist world, the poor had no hope of upward mobility or of relief from the endless physical drudgery that barely kept them alive. Today, the poor in capitalist countries live like kings, thanks mostly to the freeing of labor and the ability to accumulate capital that makes that labor more productive and enriches even the poorest. The falling cost of what were once luxuries and are now necessities, driven by the competitive market and its profit and loss signals, has brought labor-saving machines to the masses. When profit-seeking and innovation became acceptable behavior for the bourgeoisie, the horn of plenty brought forth its bounty, and even the poorest shared in that wealth. Once people no longer needed permission to innovate, and once the value of new inventions was judged by the improvements they made to the lives of the masses in the form of profit and loss, the poor began to live lives of comfort and dignity.