### 1

#### Interp - The letter “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” – the resolution must be proven true in all instances, not one particular instance

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

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 spec \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ country

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – they can spec 123 different governments - that’s supercharged by the ability to spec combinations of types of strikes. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of the 195 countries and worker types

ITUC 20**,** (International Trade Union Confederation, “World’s Worst Countries for Workers”), ITUC, 2020, https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/ituc\_globalrightsindex\_2020\_en.pdf // MNHS NL recut DD AG

In 2020, strikes have been severely restricted or banned in 123 out of 144 countries. In a significant number of these countries, industrial actions were brutally repressed by the authorities and workers exercising their right to strike often faced criminal prosecution and summary dismissals.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs

#### Drop the debater bc you can’t drop the arg on their advocacy

#### No rvis – they can dump on theory in the 1ar, chilling us from checking abuse

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbtiary and causes race to the bottom

#### 1ar theory ireresolvable their responses to counteirnteprs are always new

### 2

#### Counterplan text: The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should implement a $1000 per month universal basic income

Worstall 15

Tim Worstall, [Studied at London School of Economics. Senior Fellow of the Adam Smith Institute.], 18 September 2015, “The Real Value Of A Universal Basic Income Is That It Raises The Reservation Wage”, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2015/09/18/the-real-value-of-a-universal-basic-income-is-that-it-raises-the-reservation-wage/?sh=56b3995a7ca1> // AK

The usual answer to this is that we must therefore rebuild union power. Although I have to say that if the solution is to bring back Jimmy Hoffa to "invest" the workers' pensions funds I think we may well have mis-stated the question. For the thing is that we don't necessarily want to bring back the unions as the representatives of the workers' power. What we want to bring back is the workers' power. Specifically, we want the workers to be able to tell the employers to go take a hike if they offer insultingly low wages. And that's exactly the thing that a universal basic income does achieve: Improved worker bargaining power • Many of us consider the declining relative fortunes of the perfectly hardworking people who could once afford middle class lives and now cannot (without dodgy borrowing) to be a compelling social problem. • Reversing the decline of union power, or the degree to which middle class workers are now in competition with counterparts in lower-wage countries, or the potential for automation seems unlikely and arguably undesirable. Quite so. But the universal basic income rides to the rescue: A universal basic income creates bargaining power by increasing all workers’ capacity to refuse a raw deal. - A UBI increases workers’ “reserve price” — the minimum each worker must be paid before she is willing to accept a given job with particular working conditions • A UBI is a much more flexible means of enhancing labor bargaining power than unionization or a minimum wage. - All workers are able to drive a harder bargain with a UBI than without, shifting the distribution of behavior and effectively augmenting bargaining power. - Firms and individuals retain complete freedom to negotiate the terms of their own engagement, and to take into account unusually pleasant working conditions or nonpecuniary benefits of certain kinds of jobs that might be made untenable by a minimum wage. You don't have to be a member of a union to gain this increased bargaining power: there's no need for there to be a priestly caste standing between you and the employer, a priestly caste growing fat off your tithes (or, union dues) in order to stand up to The Man. Simply because everyone knows that they've got the minimum they can scrape by upon (and yes, is is scrape by upon, not live comfortably upon) then everyone has that greater market power. The other way around of putting this is that the reservation wage has gone up. Imagine that there's no welfare system at all: it would thus be possible, when there's high unemployment, for an employer to offer 2 lbs of bread a day as the wage. That was the deal in early Victorian times in England. And people took it because there was no alternative. With people getting $800 a month for just being a breathing adult then such tactics would not work. The amount that an employer must pay in order to convince someone to get up off the couch and come into work will rise. Those of us who are already higher paid already have that market power: that's why we get paid more than some subsistence amount. One of the things a universal basic income does is provide at least a modicum of that market power to the currently low skilled and low paid. A UBI therefore meets one of the demands of the liberal right (ie, the economically liberal), that if we're going to have some form of a welfare state, which we obviously are, then let's have the most efficient one we can. With the fewest distortions, with low marginal tax rates, fewest disincentives to work and lifestyle choice and so on. A UBI also meets the demands of the liberal left (ie, the not so economically liberal in the modern parlance) and aids in overturning the power imbalances that they see in the current society.

### 3

#### UK economy sucks now BUT has the potential to be better.

Greenhalgh 11-1 [Hugo Greenhalgh, Analysis: 'Perfect storm': Poor Britons caught in cost-of-living squeeze, 11-1-2021,Reuters,https://www.reuters.com/world/uk/perfect-storm-poor-britons-caught-cost-of-living-squeeze-2021-11-01/, 11-6-2021 amrita]

LONDON, Nov 1 (Thomson Reuters Foundation) - **Rising mortgage rates, fuel and grocery prices soaring, national insurance contributions going up and queues growing at charity food banks across Britain. Add fallout from COVID-19 and Brexit, and economic and policy analysts say the world's fifth-biggest economy faces a deepening cost-of-living crisis, despite measures in the government's new budget aimed at softening the blow.** "Everybody across the income spectrum in the UK is going to see increasing costs," said Garry Lemon, policy and research director at the Trussell Trust, which supports more than 1,300 food bank centres across Britain. "But if your income is extremely low, then these inflationary pressures ... are particularly worrying and are going to have a huge, disproportionate impact on those at the bottom," he told the Thomson Reuters Foundation. Inflation looks set to rise to 5% - more than double the Bank of England's 2% target. L8N2RS4BN **Rising living costs have been exacerbated by an increase in personal tax rates, driven by the government's attempts to claw back the costs of COVID-19 and fund long-term social care. "We've hit a perfect storm for many people," said Sue Weightman, project manager of the Trussell Trust food bank in the town of Taunton, in western England**. "(There are) just too many points of pressure financially for people on benefits and also low-income families." COVID has hugely exacerbated the situation. Another manager of a London-based food bank, who asked not to be identified, said before the pandemic her centre saw between 80 and 120 families a month. "Now we're feeding up to 2,000 people a month, probably up to 2,500," she said. LEVELLING UP? "Levelling up" has been a central plank of Conservative government thinking, with a raft of measures announced in last week's budget designed to help address economic inequality across Britain's regions. **But beyond ambitious infrastructure projects aimed at boosting local economies, concerns are growing about the personal tax burden, particularly on lower-income families.** Resolution Foundation, a think-tank, estimates that the tax burden on households by 2026-27 will be at its highest level since 1950 due to a combination of freezing threshold levels for income tax and higher national insurance contributions. **"That effectively increases the income tax people are paying over the next four years up until 2025," said Karl Handscomb, senior economist at the organisation. According to the Foundation's figures, this could mean as much as an additional 3,000 pounds ($4,103) - on average - in income levies per household by 2026-27. But it is not all bad news, particularly for lower-income families, Handscomb added.** On a sliding scale, the richest fifth of households are likely to see their incomes fall by 3% because of the tax measures, middle-income families by 2% and poorest fifth of households by less than 1%. But due to the changes announced in the budget to universal credit – Britain's main income-related benefit claimed by 4.4 million low-income families – poorer in-work households will see an income boost of around 3%. "Effectively, that's giving away money to families who are in work and on low incomes," he said, adding that lower-income families will be 2.8% better off by 2025-26.

#### Strikes deck economy– 3 warrants

#### 1] Stop investment

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004VS

These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty.

One of the measures that may boost the country's economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment.

#### 2] Strikes negatively impact labor and confidence, causing major economic losses

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004. VS

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers' downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that "the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession".7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers' stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty.

#### 3] Strikes harm key industries, stunting economic growth

McElroy 19 John McElroy [MPA at McCombs school of Business] 10/25/2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> VS

This creates a poisonous relationship between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also drives away customers. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent a loss of 340,000 sales. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to more plant closings and layoffs. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants. The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – into a recession. That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

#### Just the right to strike contributes to econ damage– the right to strike is accompanied with increased strikes, many of them being violent, devastating key industries and the economy

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004. VS

Economic growth is one of the most important pillars of a state. Most developing states put in place measures that enhance or speed-up the economic growth of their countries. It is believed that if the economy of a country is stable, the lives of the people improve with available resources being shared among the country's inhabitants or citizens. However, it becomes difficult when the growth of the economy is hampered by the exercise of one or more of the constitutionally entrenched rights such as the right to strike.1 Strikes in South Africa are becoming more common, and this affects businesses, employees and their families, and eventually, the economy. It becomes more dangerous for the economy and society at large if strikes are accompanied by violence causing damage to property and injury to people. The duration of strikes poses a problem for the economy of a developing country like South Africa. South Africa is rich in mineral resources, the world's largest producer of platinum and chrome, the second-largest producer of zirconium and the third-largest exporter of coal. It also has the largest economy in Africa, both in terms of industrial capacity and gross domestic product (GDP).2 However, these economic advantages have been affected by protracted and violent strikes.3 For example, in the platinum industries, labour stoppages since 2012 have cost the sector approximately R18 billion lost in revenue and 900 000 oz in lost output. The five-month-long strike in early 2014 at Impala Platinum Mine amounted to a loss of about R400 million a day in revenue.4 The question that this article attempts to address is how violent strikes and their duration affect the growth of the economy in a developing country like South Africa. It also addresses the question of whether there is a need to change the policies regulating industrial action in South Africa to make them more favourable to economic growth.

#### Econ collapse causes destroys medicine industry

Frank 18 – Robert A.University of Ottawa. [“Conflict and Disease: A Complex Relationship”, March 2018, [Lex AZ], 10.18192/riss-ijhs.v7i1.1895]

Impact of Economic Instability Financial crises hinder quality of life, **while** promoting **redistribut**ion of **funds away from areas** that are most **beneficial to citizens**. A common feature of economic crises is a rapid increase in unemployment, which **often results in** instability and mass protest (International Labour Organization, 2013). The uncertainty associated with financial loss is also a significant stressor that **can negatively impact** mental and physical health. **Throughout the economic crisis** in Greece, mental illness and suicide rates have increased significantly, while **HIV rates** have also **increased** due to intravenous drug utilization (Simou & Koutsogeorgou, 2014). Furthermore, many individuals are thrust into poverty and subsequently face the barriers associated with low socioeconomic status. Despite the **significant impact of** **economic collapse on** societal health, the **quality of healthcare** is often paradoxically sacrificed due to reallocation of limited funds, as **highlighted by** the funding cuts **to** mental **health** and drug abuse prevention **programs** in Greece during its economic struggles (Simou & Koutsogeorgou, 2014). A **society in economic crisis**, therefore, **faces a conflicting scenario with** increased demand for, but **reduced** supply of, health services.

#### Disease causes extinction

Millett 17 Piers Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population). In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

## Case

### General

#### Non-inherent—employees in Ireland already have a right to strike + unionize

MyWageIreland 9-23[MyWageIreland, Trade Unions, 9-23-2021,https://mywage.org/ireland/labour-law/trade-unions, 11-6-2021 amrita]

FREEDOM TO JOIN AND FORM A UNION **Employees in Ireland have a right set down in the Constitution to join a Trade Union** (Art. 40). A trade union can provide an important source of information and protection in relation to employment matters, **as well as negotiating with the employer for better pay and conditions**. The Irish Congress of Trade Unions is the single umbrella organisation for trade unions in Ireland, representing a range of interests of employees. The workers can be required to join as a pre-condition for employment and remain a member of the union to keep the job. However, if a worker is already working and is required at a later stage to join a union to keep his job, this would be considered unconstitutional. Dismissal for trade union activity or membership is automatically unfair and an employee dismissed in such circumstances can bring an unfair dismissal claim. FREEDOM OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING There is no legal obligation on an employer to negotiate with a union on behalf of an employee member, unless previously agreed. **Some employees are covered by other agreements regarding their employment. These agreements deal with the pay and working conditions of the employees concerned and may be included in an employee’s employment contract**. • The various agreements on pay and conditions made by Joint Labour Committees, as provided under section 44-55 of Industrial Relations Act of 1990 are known as Employment Regulation Orders (EROs). • Agreements which result from negotiations between trade unions and employers are called Collective Agreements. • If a Collective Agreement has been registered with the Labour Court it is known as a Registered Employment Agreement (REA). Following a High Court decision, all Employment Regulation Orders passed by JLCs ceased to have statutory effect from 7 July 2011. Similarly, all Registered Employment Agreements, registered with Labour Court, ceased to have statutory effect from 9 May 2013 following a Supreme Court decision. **Under the Industrial Relations Amendment Act 2015, collective bargaining is accepted as workers’ right.** It amends the earlier law with regard to collective bargaining and the power of Labour Court to issue legally binding (employment) orders for workplaces which do not have collective bargaining arrangements even if they are engaging in negotiations with staff groups. Workplace Relations Commission, established under the Workplace Relations Act 2015, is the only statutory body to which all industrial relations, employment law and employment equality disputes and complaints are now referred. Appeals can be made to the Labour Court in all cases. Under this law, there are now two bodies to deal with complaints and disputes regarding individual employment rights and collective rights/industrial relations disputes. Earlier, there were four bodies namely the National Employment Rights Authority, Labour Relations Commission including Rights Commissioners, Employment Appeals Tribunal including Equality Tribunal, and Labour Court. **The National Economic and Social Council (NESC) in Ireland was established in 1973 to advise the Prime Minister on strategic policy issues relating to sustainable economic, social and environmental development in the country.** The members of the Council are representatives of business and employers’ organisations, trade unions, agricultural and farming organisations, community and voluntary organisations, and environmental organisations as well as heads of Government departments and independent experts. The members are appointed by the Prime Minister for a three-year term. The Council meets on a quarterly basis.

### Climate adv

#### 1] None of their evidence is specific to the plan text – everything is in the context of bigger countries like the US and huge companies like Amazon – their aff is a drop in the bucket bc they don’t isolate how big UK’s emissions actually are and how much they can solve – that also proves no spillover since their spillover is about the US

#### 2] Their Green card talks about things like protesting, not actually whether or not we need to strike – the aff is non inherent since there’s literally protests happening in the squo – people like Greta Thunberg prove

#### 3] Non inherent – Ghaffary proves that strikes are already happening and are already moving the needle – they read uniqueness ev the wrong way

#### 4] No impact – their colback evidence concedes they solve at max 18% of UK emissios

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

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

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

### Democracy

#### 1] Don’t let them weigh the sum total of democratic participation – all that they do is make sure the UK doesn’t become authoritarian but that can’t solve things like Chinese spheres of influence increasing worldwide and increasing authoritarianism worldwide

#### 2] Alt solvency – the US is still super democratic

**Democracy causes war – prefer this evidence over cortright a] it’s a meta aalysis b] it’s the most recent**

Harald **Muller 15**, professor of International Relations at Goethe University, “Democracy, Peace, and Security,” Lexington Books pp. 44-49

My own proposal for solving the problem. developed together with my colleague Jonas Wolff (Müllcr 2004. Muller/Wolff 2006). **turns the issue upside down**: We do not start with explaining mutual democratic peacefulness, but its opposite. the proven capability of democracies to **act aggressively** against non-democracies. We note that—apart from **self-defense** where there is no difference between democracies and non-democracies——**democratic states go to war**—in contrast to non-democracies—to uphold **international law** (or their own interpretation thereof), **to prevent anarchy** through state failure, to **“save strangers”** when dictatorships massacre their own people, and to **promote democracy**. None of these acts is likely to find its target in a democracy. Since the use of force by democracies is hardly possible without public justification, even the rhetorical use of the said reasons will not stand public scrutiny when uttered against a democracy—people will not believe it, War **other than for self-defense** thus can only be fought **by democracies** against non-democracies because **against a fellow democracy** justification **would fail.** Because whether this is the case or not to a degree that justifies war as the ‘ultimate means” must rely on practical judgments. and practical judgments can differ among even reasonable people. democracies might disagree whether or not the judgment applies in specific cases. Democracies also show variance in that regard due (o a systematic. political-culturally rooted different propensity to judge situations as justifing war or not, and to participate in such wars (Gels et al, 2013). It should also be noted that, given the continuum between autocracy, anocracy and democracy, whether a given state is a democracy or not can be subject to interpretation. and this interpretation may even change over time (Oren 1995, Hayes 2013). The fact is that there are a couple of fairly warlike democracies, and that the democracies participating most frequently in military disputes (apart from the special case of Israel) are, by and large. major powers such as the United States, the United Kingdom. France. or India. This pattern is important to keep in mind when the question of the utility of democratic peace for today ‘s world problems is to be answered. Transnational terrorism, failed states, civil wars and the like dominate the international agenda on war and peace. At the classical level of international relations, in the relationships among major powers. developments arc undcr way which potentially pose an even greater threat than this diverse collection of non-interstate problems presently does. We are living in an era of rather rapid and disturbing power change (Tammcn et al. 2000). The United States are still the leading power of the world with unprecedented militany and economic poer. But others are coming closer: China. India. Braiil and Indonesia, China is at the top of this cohort, All major power changes chal lenge existing structures and thus contain the potential for great disturbance. The leading power may start to fear for its dominant position and take measures to ensure its position at the lop. These actions may frustrate emerging powers and even lead to the perception that their security is endangered. which would motivate counter-measures that further propel a political escala tion spiral. An increasingly focused competition in which a true power change appears increasingly possible. that is. a change of position at the top of the international hierarchy, has an even greater risk potential. If the inherent dangers are not contained—which remains always a possibility major power war may ensue defying all propositions that major war has become obsolete or that nuclear deterrence will prevent this calamity once and for all. Of course, states can grow peacefully into roles of higher responsibility. status and influence on the world stage. There arc no natural laws saving that changes in the world’s power structure must end in war, despite all distur bances and ensuing risks (Rauch 2014). The less conflict an emerging power experiences with established ones, and with peer challengers that emerge simultaneously, the better the chances that the rise will travel a peaceful trajectory. Looking through this lens. thc relations of only one emerging power with the present hegemon appear to be partially conflict-pronc. and seriously so: it concerns the pair China/United States. The Iwo great powers are rivals for preponderance in East and South East Asia and eventually for being the number one at the global level. There is also Chinese resentment stemming from the US role in China’s past as a victim of Western imperialism. On the other hand. China’s authoritarian system of rule and ensuing violations of human and political rights trigger the liberal resentment discussed in the first part of this chapter. which is rooted particularly strongly in US political culture. The Chinese—US relationship is thus thc key to a peaceful. tense or even violent future at the world stage. A small group of major powers. Including the United States and China, is interconnected today by a complex conflict system. China has territorial claims against Japan, South Korea, Vietnam. the Philippines. Brunci. and India which it pursues by a variety of means, not shying away from the limited, small scale usc of militan force in some cases, notably against obviously weaker counterparts (Ellcman ci al. 2012). China’s relation (o wards Japan is the one most burdened by China’s past as a victim of Japanese oppression and related cruelties, and the propcnsit of the conservative part of Japan’s elite to display cavalier attitudes towards this past or even sort of celebrate it (as through visits to the notorious Yasukuni shrine hosting the remnants of war criminals) only adds to anti-Japanese feelings in China (Russia. another great power. also openly pursues a revisionist agenda. as vividly shown in the recent Crimean move, but these territorial ambitions are not part of the most virulent conflict complex in Asia). Territorial claims are always emotionalized and dangerous. Territorial claims by a major power bear particular risks, because threatened countries look for protective allies which are, by necessity, **major powers** with the capability to project power into the region of concern. **The great power claimant and the great power protector then position themselves on the opposite sides of the conflict**. A classical constellation of great power conflict results that looks far more traditional than all the talk about post-modern global relations in which state power struggles fade into oblivion would suggest. In the Asian conflict complex that structures the shape of the US—Chinese contest (Foot/Walter 201 1). Japan. South Korea and the Philippines arc for mall allied ith the United Slates. India and Vietnam today entertain rda (ions ith the United States that can be depicted as cordial entente, already include military cooperation, and might move further towards an alliance. depending on deelopmens in Asia. The United States is also a protector of Taiwan. officially a Chinese province, factualh an independent political entity. and the main object of Chinese interest because of the unfinished agenda of national re-unification. Given the enormous asymmetries between China and Taiwan. the latter’s independence depends fully and unambiguously on the US guarantee. Russia and China have a **fairly ambivalent relation** with each other that is officially called a strategic partnership. Ambiguous as this relationship is, **it is predictable** that the more the West and Russia are at loggerheads, the closer the Russian—Chinese relations might become. On the other hand. Chi na is the stronger partner and harbors not completely friendly feelings to wards Moscow. as Russia took part in China’s humiliation during the imperi alist period no less than the United States did. Russian fears concerning covert immigration into Eastern Siberia and demographic repercussions and political consequences that might result therefrom add to the uneasiness. China and India arc natural rivals for regional preponderance in Asia (Gilbov/Hcginbotham 2012). Both arc developing rapidly. with China still ahead. Territorial disputes. India’s liospitalit Lo TibeLan exiles including the Dalai Lama. China’s close relation to Pakistan and a growing naval rivalry spanning the Indian Ocean from the Strait of Malacca to Iranian shores (Garofano/Dew 2013) run parallel to rapidly growing economic relations and ostensible efforts lo present the relationship if not as amiable then at least as partner-like. The United States, China, Russia and India even today conduct **a multi- pronged nuclear arms race** (Fingar 2011: Gangul /Thompson 2011: O’Neill 2013. Müllcr 2014). In this race, conventional components like missile de fense. Intercontinental strike options, space-based assets and the specter of cbcr war play their role, as does the issue of extended dcterrcncc The general US militar’ superiority induces Russia and China to improve their nuclear arsenals, while India tries not to be left too far behind the Chinese in terms of nuclear capability. Pakistan and North Korea ork as potential spoilers at the fringe of this arms race. They are not powerful but thc arc capable of stirring up trouble, whenever they move. In tems of the military constellation, the most disquieting development is the drafting of pre-emptive strategies of a first (most likely conventional) strike by the United States and China, on either side motivated by the per ceived need to keep the upper hand early in a potential clash close to Chinese shores (such as in the context of a Taiwan conflict). China is building up middle-range ballistic capabilities to pre-empt US aircraft carrier groups from coming into striking distance and to desiroy US Air Force assets in Okinawa. while the United States is developing means to neutralize exactly these Chinese capabilities. **They are steering towards a hair-trigger security dilemma** in which the mutual postures cry out for being used first before the enemy might destroy them (Goldstein 2013: Le Miôre 2012). It cannot be excluded that this whole conflict system might collapse into two opposing blocks one da the spark for a major violent cataclysm could even be lighted by uncontrolled non-state actors inside some of the powers. or—in analogy to the role of **Serbia in 1914**— **a ‘spoiler” state** with a particularly idios ncralic agenda. Pakistan. North Korea or Tai an arc con ceivable in this role. Even Japan might be considered, if nationalism in Nippon grows further and seeks confrontation with the old rival China. If anything. this constellation does not look much better than the one which drove **Europe into World War I** a century ago. and **it contains a nuclear component.** To trust in the infallibility of nuclear deterrence in this mufti- pronged constellation **needs quite a lot of optimism** Can democratic peace be helpful in this constellation? Our conflict system includes democracies—the United States, India, Japan. Indonesia and non- democracies such as China. Russia, and Vietnam, but not necessarily on the same side. Should the European theater become connected to the Asian one through continuous US—Russian disputes and a Russian—Chinese entente. defective democracies like Ukraine and Georgia may feature rather importantly as potential triggers for **a worsening of relationships.** While democracy is useful in excluding certain **conflict dyads** in the whole complex, such as **India** and the **U**nited **S**tates. Japan and the United States. Japan and India. from the risk that they might escalate into a violent conflict, and as democratic peace is pacifying parts of the world. such as South America or Europe. **it helps little in disputes between democracies and non-democracies.** To the contrary: as discussed above, democracies have a more or less **moral-emotional inclination** **to demonize non-democracies once they dis agree,** and to feel a missionary drive **to turn them democratic**. This might exacerbate **the existing**, more **interest-based conflicts** between democracies and non-democracies, and it **creates fears** in the hearts of **autocratic leaders** that **they might be up for democratization sooner or later**. The close inter- democratic relations which democratic peace **tends to produce**, in turn, only **exacerbate these fears** as democracies tend to be **rich**, **well organized**, and **powerful** and dispose together of much more potent military capabilities than their potential non-dcnwcratic counterparts. Rather than helping with peace. the inter-democratic consequences of the democratic peace tend to **exacerbate the security dilemma** which exists between **democracies and non-democracics** an way. This non-peaceful dark side of democratic peace has escaped the attention of most academic writings on this subject and certainly all political utterances about democratic peace in

#### Using unions to solve corruption opens a chicken and egg problem—corruption will always infect unions meaning that all the aff does is recreate the problem

**Union Facts 21**—UnionFacts [The Center for Union Facts (CUF) has compiled the single most comprehensive database of information about labor unions in the United States. The database contains more than 100 million facts, ranging from basic union finances and leader salaries, to political operations, to strikes and unfair labor practices, and much more.]; “CRIME AND CORRUPTION”; Oct 18 2021; <https://www.unionfacts.com/article/crime-and-corruption/>. (AG DebateDrills)

**Nearly fifty years after John F. Kennedy first condemned corrupt leadership in the American labor movement, it is still plagued by rampant corruption, embezzlement, racketeering and influence from numerous organized crime organizations**. From penny-ante theft to multi-million dollar embezzlement schemes, labor leaders continue to violate the trust of the members they claim to represent. The labor movement is nothing but the sum of its many parts—millions of working Americans who’ve entrusted union leaders to spend a portion of their hard earned salary for the benefit of the collective good. Financially speaking, the sum of the movement’s parts totals more than $10 billion dollars annually in mandatory dues and controls another $400 billion in financial assets in strike funds, pension plans, and health care benefits. In fact, in just the last five years, hundreds (maybe thousands) of labor leaders at all levels of the movement have been convicted of embezzlement, corruption, racketeering, or engaging in organized crime. **The problem is rampant, getting worse, and yet the unions seemingly refuse to address it.**

**KEY FINDINGS:**

**During fiscal years 2000–2019, OLMS investigations led to over $156.3 million dollars of restitution in over 2,100 criminal cases; OLMS investigations also led to 2,297 indictments and 2166 convictions**; The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act’s (LMRDA) reliance on self-government, public disclosure, and ultimately deterrence has failed; **The Department of Labor’s (DOL) Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) has investigated and prosecuted union leaders for embezzling more than $100 million in union dues since 2001;** Investigations by the DOL’s Office of Inspector General, which investigates labor racketeering and organized crime’s influence within the labor movement, has resulted in more than $1 billion in fines, restitutions, and forfeitures; Fewer than 5 percent of unions audited by the DOL received unqualified passes.

### 4

#### Our thesis is that the collapse of capitalism is inevitable, it is a question of now or later: you should frame your decision through an anti-capitalist lens by centering the valorization of productivity that aff’s logic is founded upon.

Kuang 20 [Da Kuang and Changyi Huang are professors at the Huazhong University of Science and Technology, College of Marxism in Wuhan 430074, China. A Study of Marx’s Thought on the Speed of Capital Accumulation, Presented at the 2020 International Conference on Social Science, Economics and Education Research (SSEER 2020), Atlantic Press: Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research Volume 455, 8-22-21, amrita]

III. CONTEMPORARY ENLIGHTENMENT: **CAPITALISM IS BOUND TO DIE OUT IN THE LONG-TERM STAGNATION OF CAPITAL ACCUMULATION** As we all know, Marx and Engels reached a most important scientific conclusion in the Manifesto of the Communist Party: **the death of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.** This is the famous “Two Necessities” principle of Marxism. If we study **Marx’s thought of the speed of capital accumulation, we will come to the conclusion that capitalism is bound to die out in the long-term stagnation of capital accumulation.** Wallerstein believes that **although the production for the purpose of pursuing profits has a history of thousands of years, this mode of production has never occupied a dominant position in these historical systems. Only capitalism regards the endless accumulation of profits as the fundamental feature of its own system**. Wallerstein pointed out that the capitalist system has been maintained for more than 500 years, and the fundamental policy of endless capital accumulation has been quite successful. However, **the historical stage based on this has come to an end, and the late capitalism is coming to an end.** Andrew Kleiman made **an empirical study on the change trend of American profit margin from 1929 to 2009. He believed that after the boom period of World War II, the capital profit margin of the whole economic system was indeed declining irreversibly.** Robert Brenner calculated the declining trend of manufacturing profit margin in the United States and Japan since the 1950s. Among them, **the average profit margin of manufacturing industry in the United States has more than doubled, and the average profit margin of manufacturing industry in Japan has more than tripled**. These empirical studies **confirm Marx’s idea that the rate of capital profit keeps falling and the rate of capital accumulation tends to stagnate.** The global financial crisis that broke out in 2007-2008 is the most serious crisis of capitalism since the great depression in the 1930s. **Although the crisis is presented in the form of finance, the underlying law is still “relative overproduction”, that is, trying to expand credit consumption to alleviate the contradiction between the expansion of production and the relative reduction of consumption capacity, accelerating the real estate and finance** The development of bubbles. But **this contradiction is only temporarily covered by bubbles, and after a long period of accumulation and fermentation, the crisis finally broke out**. After 10 years of evolution**, the capitalist world has not recovered from crisis and stagnation, but has expanded into a structural crisis of capitalism along the path of financial crisis → economic crisis → financial crisis → debt crisis.** At the same time, **contemporary capitalism also faces the absolute limit of capital accumulation caused by the crisis of population aging and ecological crisis**. According to statistics, in 2014, the total population of 28 countries in the EU was 508 million, of which 18.5% were aged over 65, 19.9% were aged between 50 and 64, and 38.4% were aged between 50 and 64. **The trend of population aging will inevitably lead to the extreme shortage of labor force, increase labor cost, and further reduce the profit margin of capital; and the ecological crisis will gradually become the same or even more serious problem as the economic crisis.** As the existing capital accumulation models all go bankrupt, **the speed of capital accumulation will inevitably further decline. The economic cycle theory of western mainstream economics interprets the capitalist economic crisis as a kind of normal economic fluctuation, and holds that capital can always overcome the crisis and stagnation, and then accelerate the accumulation again. This kind of circular movement, which only attributes capital accumulation to quantitative change, conceals a historical fact: the final result of the crisis and stagnation of capital accumulation is the qualitative change of capitalist ownership, which is an irreversible linear process**. Over the past 200 years, **the world economic crisis has occurred more than 20 times, some of which directly triggered the proletarian revolution**,

some of which first broke out in war and then triggered the proletarian revolution. **For example,** the result of **the capitalist economic crisis in 1847 was the final explosion of the French Revolution in June;** The capitalist economic crisis of 1867-1868 first triggered the Franco Prussian War, and finally triggered the Paris Commune Revolution; the capitalist economic crisis of 1907-1908 first triggered the first World War, and finally triggered the October Revolution of Russia which opened a new era of human history in 1917; the capitalist economic crisis of 1929-1933 gave birth to the second World War, and finally the war As a result, Eastern European countries including East Germany, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, Romania and other countries, as well as China, North Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Albania and other countries have embarked on the socialist road. **In addition to the proletarian socialist revolution caused by the economic crisis, the capitalist internal system of ownership has also made major adjustments in response to the economic crisis.** From individual private capital to stock system, this is the first adjustment of capitalist ownership; from stock system to monopoly, this is the second adjustment of capitalist ownership; from private stock monopoly to capitalist state monopoly, this is the third adjustment of capitalist ownership; from capitalist state monopoly to international monopoly, this is the fourth adjustment of capitalist ownership. As a result, the capitalist ownership of means of production is becoming more and more like public ownership rather than private ownership. It is getting further and further away from the original private ownership and closer to public ownership. It can be predicted **that capitalism will inevitably die out in the long-term stagnation of capital accumulation. The ultimate fate of capitalism is to be replaced** by socialism.

#### The aff’s insidious attempts to replace welfare with wage labor reinforces the idealization and social control of “work ethic”. Myths of work allow governments to blame systemic poverty on the behavior of the poor. Valorization of work and notions that you can resist via unionization deflates proletariat unity by turning workers against non-workers.

Frayne 15 Frayne, David. The Refusal of Work: The Theory and Practice of Resistance to Work . Zed Books, London (2015); 98-105; CE recut amrita

In The Problem With Work, Kathi Weeks explores the legacy of the work ethic in some detail, highlighting the ethic’s tremendous capacity for endurance and adaptation over the course of modern history (Weeks, 2011: Chapter 1). In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was religion that demanded a life devoted to work, but the religious element had largely withered away by the nineteenth century, where it was being replaced by the promise of social mobility: the promise that through the sweat of one’s brow, it might be possible to elevate the social status of oneself and one’s family. By the middle of the twentieth century, a different element had been foregrounded, as work came to be idealised as a route to self actualisation and personal development. As an ascetic ideal, the work ethic has displayed a remarkable staying presence, but no matter what its form, the behaviours which the ethic prescribes have remained consistent. In all its forms, the work ethic has promoted ‘the identification with and systematic devotion to waged work, the elevation of work to the centre of life, and the affirmation of work as an end in itself ’ (Weeks, 2011: 46). In today’s affluent societies, holding down a job is still commonly heralded as a signal of independence, maturity and good character, and hard work continues to represent a proper way of living, and proof of a commitment to the prosperity of one’s nation. If there are other ways to contribute and achieve, outside the realm of paid employment, then these are not nearly as well represented or widely recognised. For evidence of this, we need only observe the aggressive return of the work ethic in the context of neoliberalism. The British prime minister, David Cameron, came to power in 2010 relentlessly stressing the government’s commitment to ‘hardworking people’. In 2013 Cameron said: ‘We are building a country for those who work and want to get on. And we are saying to each and every hard-working person in our country: we are on your side … This is a government for hard-working people, and that’s the way it will stay’ (Huffington Post, 2013). Prior to this, Cameron had routinely depicted benefit claimants as wasters, ‘sitting on their sofas waiting for their benefits to arrive’ (Cameron, 2010). These references to ‘hardworking people’ were echoed in a speech delivered by the Chancellor George Osborne at the 2012 Conservative Party conference: ‘Where is the fairness, we ask, for the shift-worker, leaving home in the dark hours of the morning, who looks up at the closed blinds of their nextdoor neighbour sleeping off a life on benefits?’ (Jowitt, 2013). These repeated references to diligent work (defined always in terms of paid employment) function to construct a rigid dichotomy in the public imagination. On one side of this dichotomy are those upstanding, hardworking citizens who help secure the country’s future, whilst on the other are those morally dubious unemployed people who do nothing. Which are you? The sleeper or the employee, the shirker or the worker? Do you do something, or nothing? This technique of splitting the population into binary opposites has long been used as a method of social discipline, whether we are talking about the mad versus the sane, the normal versus the abnormal, or the dangerous versus the harmless. The New Economics Foundation has referred to this latest dichotomy as the binary of ‘strivers versus skivers’: a cultural myth which perpetuates the idea that those who exist outside the moral clique of ‘the hardworking’ are undeserving, morally suspect and likely to be criminals (Coote and Lyall, 2013). Imogen Tyler refers to these attempts to discredit non-workers in terms of a ‘culturalisation of poverty’ (Tyler, 2013: 162). In spite of the structural facts of mass unemployment and deepening social inequalities, issues such as poverty and worklessness continue to be framed by governments as cultural or behavioural issues. As the discussion on social class wanes, an appreciation of the structural causes of unemployment fades away and poverty becomes regarded as a deserved result of poor self-management. Even in regions where the number of unemployed people significantly outweighs the number of available jobs, it is still maintained that were a person to present themselves a little better, put a little more effort in, or just believe in themselves, he or she could find work and climb out of poverty. Society’s poorest are regarded as those who have failed to make the right choices in life, or who have shown an unwillingness to grasp the opportunities that society has presented to them. Financial poverty is blamed on a poverty of aspiration, and this continued foregrounding of cultural attitudes has allowed governments to ignore the structural causes of poverty and unemployment. In this new framing, society’s main enemies are no longer the structural pathologies of inequality, job scarcity and the dearth of attractive jobs, but the personal pathologies inherent in a so-called culture of laziness, entitlement and dependency. Aside from the personal misery and stigmatisation they cause, perhaps the biggest crime of these cultural explanations is that they keep society’s more structural or systemic issues off the table.

Mass unemployment should give us occasion to question the efficacy of work as a basis for social inclusion and solidarity, but the discussion that is actually taking place is much more blinkered. Not everybody will be convinced by the rhetoric of ‘strivers versus skivers’ of course, but its sheer ubiquity is cause enough for concern. The stigmatisation of unemployed people is infectious. Tabloid reports concerned with the wastage of public money seem almost uniformly obsessed with the comparatively minor cost of suspected benefit fraud. A benefits mythbuster published by Turn2Us (Turn2Us, 2012) suggested that the ‘welfare burden’ caused by UK unemployment has been grossly exaggerated. The report suggests that, contrary to popular opinion, public spending on welfare has stabilised since the economic crash of the year 2008/9, and was far lower in 2012 than it was in 1995, following the previous recession.1 There is notably less anger about the public funds spent on working tax credits (which compensate for miserly employers), the high rents that force many people to depend on housing benefit, or the criminally underpublicised problem of corporate tax evasion. The media pumps out a torrent of disgust towards unemployed people, who are typically portrayed as leading empty, morally rudderless lives. The case of Cait Reilly, unfolding in the UK over the course of 2012–13, offers a perfect example here, as a media event which brought the ‘striver versus skiver’ discourse to the fore. In 2012, the UK Coalition government attempted to tackle worklessness by forcing many benefit claimants to undertake periods of unpaid work. Under the rules of the new policy, Reilly, an unemployed geology graduate, was forced to leave a work experience placement in a museum, to instead work unwaged in a Poundland store. Reilly’s name hit the headlines after a lawyer heard about her story and volunteered to help establish a legal case against the government. The tabloid media exploded. Responding to the suggestion that Reilly’s forced labour was a violation of human rights, Jan Moir of the Daily Mail wrote: ‘It is hardly ten years’ imprisonment without charge in Guantanamo Bay. It is hardly like being incarcerated in a Nazi prisoner of war camp for five long years, never knowing each day if you would live or die’ (Moir, 2012). The Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, Iain Duncan Smith, joined the debate, labelling Reilly a ‘job snob’ and levelling a broader attack on those who defended her actions – a so-called ‘commenting elite’ who are unaware of their own intellectual conceit and sense of superiority (Holehouse, 2012). These bitter comments came just months after UK public sector workers conducted a mass strike in response to government proposals to modify pension schemes. Rather than reporting on the motivations for strike action, Tim Shipman, also reporting for the Daily Mail, belittled the cause by citing statistics which claimed that, on average, state workers get paid 7.5% more than private sector employees in the UK. He wrote that ‘[t]he findings are a blow to the credibility of union leaders who claim that public sector staff are hard done by’ (Shipman, 2011). These examples show us that the moral fence around the work ethic is not only high but also tremendously well-fortified. Any worker who steps out of line is quickly targeted as a dangerous outsider and denied a political voice. The political significance of the rebellious act is muted by portraying the rebel as pathological, diverting public attention away from the political cause and on to the supposedly deviant psychology of the rebel: Resistance in this context is not explained as something related to the inequality of the capitalist labour process, but rather a matter of personal problems within the worker – a negative attitude, an inability to be a team player or shirking one’s duties. In other words, the contemporary pathologies of work are pushed onto employees themselves and are internalised as personal demeanours and characteristics that must be ‘worked through’ in team meetings, development assessment seminars and ‘self-help’ consumption in the private sphere. (Fleming and Spicer, 2003: 174) In Cait Reilly’s case, commentators variously implied that Reilly was neurotic, weird, or suffered from an unhealthy sense of entitlement. Catch-all terms such as ‘job snob’ work in the same vein as older terms such as ‘hippy’, ‘wacko’ or ‘conspiracy theorist’, being deployed in order to discredit immediately any threat to orthodox ways of thinking. Another common media response to labour disputes is the deployment of the Could Be Worse argument. If Reilly thought she was hard done by, then it was said that she should be grateful not to be a captive prisoner of war. If the UK public sector workers who went on strike in 2012 believed that they were victims of injustice, then it was said that they should have considered those who were earning less, working in poorer conditions, or struggling to find work. By providing suggestive examples of situations that are worse than the insurgent’s, journalists once again peddle the message that it is individuals and their sense of entitlement that are at fault. Whilst the moralisation of work certainly gains purchase through its ubiquity in the media, perhaps its real power derives from its installation in a suite of workfare policies designed to encourage benefit claimants out of the welfare system and into paid employment. If the moralisation of work is powerful as a cultural device, it takes on an uglier, more coercive guise when enshrined in a modern policy agenda. In the UK, the New Labour government arrived in office in 1997, resolving to ‘rebuild the welfare state around work’ (Department for Social Security, 1998), and previously protected welfare claimants such as lone parents and people with disabilities were increasingly expected to seek employment. The legacy of workfare continued in the UK Coalition government’s ‘big bold plan to Get Britain Working’, which has since phased in a tightening set of conditions around who is entitled to claim benefits, along with an increasingly stringent set of audits and penalties for non-workers who fail to comply.2 These tightening conditions represent less a helping hand for the citizen in need than a stranglehold. In order to avoid sanctions, the claimants to Jobseeker’s Allowance have been required to display a fully accountable commitment to job hunting, to accept offers of employment judged reasonable by Jobcentre Plus bureaucrats, and to attend job-seeker’s training programmes deemed likely to increase the chances of finding work. The critic Ivor Southwood argues that, given the known shortage of jobs in many areas, these activities often have a performative quality, forcing claimants to project a phoney display of positivity and enthusiasm for low-status work roles: ‘To refuse to go along with this performance and its mutual suspension of disbelief risks bringing the full weight of the institution down on the “customer”’ (Southwood, 2011: 46). Among the most troubling developments of the big bold plan was the controversial policy to force benefit claimants to complete compulsory periods of unpaid work. Also, the Work Capability Assessment – a test undertaken by claimants with disabilities, to verify their eligibility for benefits – was handed over to the private company ATOS in 2011. Following the handover, a controversy unfolded based on credible allegations from public investigators, whistle-blowers and failed applicants, who claimed that the flawed methodology of the Work Capability test, coupled with a punitive auditing process, was strongly biased towards a rejection of benefit applications (Franklin, 2013). It is estimated that thousands of people have been declared erroneously ‘fit for work’ by a system which, instead of providing support, has aimed to cap the number of welfare recipients.3 Whilst workfare policies have undergone a complex series of changes, their underpinning morality remains consistent: paid employment is unambiguously promoted as the normal and superior state to which everybody should aspire. What all of this ultimately means is that although we have reached a point in history where a reduction and re-evaluation of work are urgently needed, powerful moral forces remain mobilised against the development of a genuinely open discussion. A range of personal, social and environmental crises give us strong occasion to question work’s function and importance in modern society, but the relentless moralisation of work is confining us to the usual circuits of thought. It is like a constant source of noise pollution – the equivalent to someone repeatedly flicking your earlobes when you are trying to think. I will show the effects of this in Chapter 7, where we will see that many of the non-workers I interviewed found it difficult to maintain conviction in their critical views inside this work-focused moral climate. Like Cait Reilly and the public sector workers mentioned here, they often found themselves stigmatised for their alternative views and actions. In a context where those who resist work are so readily disparaged, reviled and feared, it becomes increasingly difficult to foster an open-minded and intelligent debate on the future of work.

#### But capitalism can’t be saved. The short-term rejuvenation simply pushes back the long-term inevitable collapse which dooms us to death by climate change before the revolution can happen—this card is amazing and also preempts all their “cap solves climate change” answers.

Foster 18 [John Bellamy Foster, John Bellamy Foster is a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review. He writes about political economy of capitalism and economic crisis, ecology and ecological crisis, and Marxist theory. “Making War on the Planet.” Monthly Review. September 1, 2018. <https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/> recut 8-22-2021 amrita]

A short fuse is burning. At the present rate of global emissions, the world is projected to reach the trillionth metric ton of cumulative carbon emissions, breaking the global carbon budget, in less than two decades.[1](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en1) This would usher in a period of dangerous climate change that could well prove irreversible, affecting the climate for centuries if not millennia. Even if the entire world economy were to cease emitting carbon dioxide at the present moment, the extra carbon already accumulated in the atmosphere virtually guarantees that climate change will continue with damaging effects to the human species and life in general. However, reaching the 2°C increase in global average temperature guardrail, associated with a level of carbon concentration in the environment of 450 ppm, would lead to a qualitatively different condition. At that point, climate feedbacks would increasingly come into play threatening to catapult global average temperatures to 3°C or 4°C above preindustrial levels within this century, in the lifetime of many individuals alive today. The situation is only made more serious by the emission of other greenhouse gases, including methane and nitrous oxide. The enormous dangers that rapid climate change present to humanity as a whole, and the inability of the existing capitalist political-economic structure to address them, symbolized by the presence of Donald Trump in the White House, have engendered a desperate search for technofixes in the form of schemes for geoengineering, defined as massive, deliberate human interventions to manipulate the entire climate or the planet as a whole. Not only is geoengineering now being enthusiastically pushed by today’s billionaire class, as represented by figures like Bill Gates and Richard Branson; by environmental organizations such as the Environmental Defense Fund and the Natural Resources Defense Council; by think tanks like the Breakthrough Institute and Climate Code Red; and by fossil-fuel corporations like Exxon Mobil and Shell—it is also being actively pursued by the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, China, and Russia. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has incorporated negative emissions strategies based on geoengineering (in the form of Bio-energy with Carbon Capture and Storage, or BECCS) into nearly all of its climate models. Even some figures on the political left (where “accelerationist” ideas have recently taken hold in some quarters) have grabbed uncritically onto geoengineering as a deus ex machina—a way of defending an ecomodernist economic and technological strategy—as witnessed by a number of contributions to Jacobin magazine’s Summer 2017 Earth, Wind, and Fire issue.[2](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en2) If the Earth System is to avoid 450 ppm of carbon concentration in the atmosphere and is to return to the Holocene average of 350 ppm, some negative emissions by technological means, and hence geoengineering on at least a limited scale, will be required, according to leading climatologist James Hansen.[3](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en3) Hansen’s strategy, however, like most others, remains based on the current system, that is, it excludes the possibility of a full-scale ecological revolution, involving the self-mobilization of the population around production and consumption. What remains certain is that any attempt to implement geoengineering (even in the form of technological schemes for carbon removal) as the dominant strategy for addressing global warming, subordinated to the ends of capital accumulation, would prove fatal to humanity. The costs of such action, the burden it would put on future generations, and the dangers to living species, including our own, are so great that the only rational course is a long ecological revolution aimed at the most rapid possible reduction in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions, coupled with an emphasis on agroecology and restoration of global ecosystems, including forests, to absorb carbon dioxide.[4](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en4) This would need to be accompanied by a far-reaching reconstitution of society at large, aimed at the reinstitution on a higher level of collective and egalitarian practices that were undermined by the rise of capitalism. Geoengineering the Planet Under the Regime of Fossil Capital Geoengineering as an idea dates back to the period of the first discoveries of rapid anthropogenic climate change. Beginning in the early 1960s, the Soviet Union’s (and at that time the world’s) leading climatologist, Mikhail Budyko, was the first to issue a number of warnings on the inevitably of accelerated global climate change in the case of industrial systems based on the burning of fossil fuels.[5](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en5) Although anthropogenic climate change had long been recognized, what was new was the discovery of major climate feedbacks such as the melting of Arctic ice and the disruption of the albedo effect as reflective white ice was replaced with blue seawater, increasing the amount of solar radiation absorbed by the planet and ratcheting up global average temperature. In 1974, Budyko offered, as a possible solution to climate change, the use of high-flying planes to release sulfur particles (forming sulfate aerosols) into the stratosphere. This was meant to mimic the role played by volcanic action in propelling sulfur into the atmosphere, thus creating a partial barrier, limiting incoming solar radiation. **The rationale he offered was that capitalist economies, in particular, would not be able to curtail capital-accumulation-based growth, energy use, and emissions, despite the danger to the climate**.[6](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en6) Consequently, technological alternatives to stabilize the climate would have to be explored. But it was not until 1977 when the Italian physicist Cesare Marchetti proposed a scheme for capturing carbon dioxide emissions from electrical power plants and using pipes to sequester them in the ocean depths that the word “geoengineering” itself was to appear.[7](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en7) Budyko’s pioneering proposal to use sulfur particles to block a part of the sun’s rays, now known as “stratospheric aerosol injection,” and Marchetti’s early notion of capturing and sequestering carbon in the ocean, stand for the two main general approaches to geoengineering—respectively, solar radiation management (SRM) and carbon dioxide removal (CDR). SRM is designed to limit the solar radiation reaching the earth. CDR seeks to capture and remove carbon to decrease the amount entering the atmosphere. Besides stratospheric aerosol injection, first proposed by Budyko, another approach to SRM that has gained influential adherents in recent years is marine cloud brightening. This would involve cooling the earth by modifying low-lying, stratocumulus clouds covering around a third of the ocean, making them more reflective. In the standard scenario, a special fleet of 1,500 unmanned, satellite-controlled ships would roam the ocean spraying submicron drops of seawater in the air, which would evaporate leaving salty residues. These bright salt particles would reflect incoming solar radiation. They would also act as cloud condensation nuclei, increasing the surface area of the clouds, with the result that more solar radiation would be reflected. Both stratospheric aerosol injection and marine cloud brightening are widely criticized as posing enormous hazards on top of climate change itself, while simply addressing the symptoms not the cause of climate change. Stratospheric aerosol injection—to be delivered to the stratosphere by means of hoses, cannons, balloons, or planes—would alter the global hydrological cycle with enormous unpredictable effects, likely leading to massive droughts in major regions of the planet. It is feared that it could shut down the Indian monsoon system disrupting agriculture for as many as 2 billion people.[8](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en8) There are also worries that it might affect photosynthesis and crop production over much of the globe.[9](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en9) The injection of sulfur particles into the atmosphere could contribute to depletion of the ozone layer.[10](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en10) Much of the extra sulfur would end up dropping to the earth, leading to acid rain.[11](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en11) **Most worrisome of all, stratospheric aerosol injection would have to be repeated year after year. At termination the rise in temperature associated with additional carbon buildup would come almost at once with world temperature conceivably rising by 2–3°C in a decade—a phenomenon referred to as the “termination problem.”**[12](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en12) As with stratospheric aerosol injection, **marine cloud brightening would drastically affect the hydrological cycle in unpredictable ways**. For example, it could generate a severe drought in the Amazon, drying up the world’s most vital terrestrial ecosystem with incalculable and catastrophic effects for Earth System stability.[13](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en13) Many of the dangers of cloud brightening are similar to those of stratospheric aerosol depletion. Like other forms of SRM, it would do nothing to stop ocean acidification caused by rising carbon dioxide levels. The first form of CDR to attract significant attention from economic interests and investors was the idea of fertilizing the ocean with iron, thereby boosting the growth of phytoplankton so as to promote greater ocean uptake of carbon. There have been a dozen experiments in this area and the difficulties attending this scheme have proven to be legion. The effects on the ecological cycles of phytoplankton, zooplankton, and a host of other marine species all the way up to whales at the top of the food chain are indeterminate. Although some parts of the ocean would become greener due to the additional iron, other parts would become bluer, more devoid of life, because they would be deprived of the nutrients—nitrate, phosphorus, and silica—needed for growth.[14](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en14) Evidence suggests that the vast portion of the carbon taken in by the ocean would stay on the surface or the intermediate levels of the ocean, with only a tiny part entering the ocean depths, where it would be naturally sequestered.[15](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en15) Among the various CDR schemas, it is BECCS, because of its promise of negative emissions, which today is attracting the most support. This is because it seems to allow nations to overshoot climate targets on the basis that the carbon can be removed from the atmosphere decades later. Although BECCS exists at present largely as an untested computer model, it is now incorporated into almost all climate models utilized by the IPCC.[16](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en16) As modeled, **BECCS would burn cultivated crops in order to generate electricity, with the capture and underground storage of the resulting carbon dioxide. In theory, since plant crops can be seen as carbon neutral—taking carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and then eventually releasing it again—BECCS, by burning biomass and then capturing and sequestering the resulting carbon emissions, would be a means of generating electricity while at the same time resulting in a net reduction of atmospheric carbon. BECCS, however, comes into question the moment one moves from the abstract to the concrete.** The IPCC’s median-level models are projected to remove 630 gigatons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, around two thirds of the total emitted between the Industrial Revolution and 2011.[17](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en17) This would occur on vast crop plantations to be run by agribusiness. **To remove a trillion tons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere as envisioned in the more ambitious scenarios would take up a land twice the size of India (or equal to Australia), about half as much land as currently farmed globally, requiring a supply of freshwater equal to current total global agricultural usage.**[18](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en18) The costs of implementing BECCS on the imagined scales have been estimated by climatologist James Hansen—who critically notes that negative emissions have “spread like a cancer” in the IPCC climate models—to be on the order of hundreds of trillions of dollars, with “minimal estimated costs” ranging as high as $570 trillion this century.[19](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en19) The effects of BECCS—used as a primary mechanism and designed to avoid confrontation with the present system of production—would therefore be a massive displacement of small farmers and global food production. Moreover, the notion that the forms of large-scale, commercial agricultural production presumed in BECCS models would be carbon neutral and would thus result in negative emissions with sequestration has been shown to be exaggerated or false when the larger effects on global land use are taken into account. BECCS crop cultivation is expected to take place on vast monoculture plantations, displacing other forms of land use. Yet, biologically diverse ecosystems have substantially higher rates of carbon sequestration in soil and biomass than does monocrop agriculture.[20](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en20) An alternative to BECCS in promoting carbon sequestration would be to promote massive, planetary ecological restoration, including reforestation, together with the promotion of agroecology modeled on traditional forms of agriculture organized around nutrient recycling and improved soil management methods.[21](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en21)This would avoid the metabolic rift associated with agribusiness monocultures, which are less efficient both in terms of food production per hectare and carbon sequestration. Another commonly advocated technofix, carbon capture and sequestration (CCS), is not strictly a form of geoengineering since it is directed at capturing and sequestering carbon emissions of particular electrical plants, such as coal-fired power plants. However, **the promotion of a CCS infrastructure on a planetary scale as a means of addressing climate change—thereby skirting the necessity of an ecological revolution in production and consumption—is best seen as a form of planetary geoengineering due to its immense projected economic and ecological scale**. Although CCS would theoretically allow the burning of fossil fuels from electrical power plants with no carbon emissions into the atmosphere, **the scale and the costs of CCS operations are prohibitive.** As Clive Hamilton writes in Earthmasters: The Dawn of the Age of Climate Engineering, CCS for a single “standard-sized 1,000 megawatt coal-fired plant….would need 30 kilometers of air-sucking machinery and six chemical plants, with a footprint of 6 square kilometers.”[22](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en22) Energy expert Vaclav Smil has calculated that, “in order to sequester just a fifth of current [2010] CO2 emissions we would have to create an entirely new worldwide absorption-gathering-compression-transportation-storage industry whose annual throughput would have to be about 70 percent larger than the annual volume now handled by the global crude oil industry, whose immense infrastructure of wells, pipelines, compressor stations and storage took generations to build.”[23](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en23) **Capturing and sequestering current U.S. carbon dioxide emissions would require 130 billion tons of water per year, equal to about half the annual flow of the Columbia River. This new gigantic infrastructure would be placed on top of the current fossil fuel infrastructure—all in order to allow for the continued burning of fossil fuels**.[24](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en24) A Planetary Precautionary Principle for the Anthropocene If today’s planetary ecological emergency is a product of centuries of war on the planet as a mechanism of capital accumulation,

fossil-capital generated geoengineering schemes can be seen as gargantuan projects for keeping the system going by carrying this war to its ultimate level. Geoengineering under the present regime of accumulation has the sole objective of keeping the status quo intact—neither disturbing the dominant relations of capitalist production nor even seeking so much as to overturn the fossil-fuel industry with which capital is deeply intertwined. Profits, production, and overcoming energy poverty in the poorer parts of the world thus become justifications for keeping the present fossil-capital system going, maintaining at all cost the existing capitalist environmental regime. The Promethean mentality behind this is well captured by a question that Rex Tillerson then CEO of Exxon Mobil Corporation asked—without a trace of irony—at an annual shareholders meeting in 2013: “What good is it to save the planet if humanity suffers?”[25](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en25) The whole history of ecological crisis leading up the present planetary emergency, punctuated by numerous disasters—from the near total destruction of the ozone layer, to nutrient loading and the spread of dead zones in the ocean, to climate change itself—serves to highlight the march of folly associated with any attempt to engineer the entire planet. The complexity of the Earth System guarantees that enormous unforeseen consequences would emerge. As Frederick Engels warned in the nineteenth century, “Let us not…flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our human victories over nature. For each such victory nature takes its revenge on us. Each victory, it is true, in the first place brings about the results we expected, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel the first.”[26](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en26) In the face of uncertainty, coupled with an extremely high likelihood of inflicting incalculable harm on the Earth System, it is essential to invoke what is known as the Precautionary Principle whenever the question of planetary geoengineering is raised. As ecological economist Paul Burkett has explained, the strong version of the Precautionary Principle, necessarily encompasses the following: (1) The Precautionary Principle Proper, which says that if an action may cause serious harm, there is a case for counteracting measures to ensure that the action does not take place. (2) The Principle of Reverse Onus, under which it is the responsibility of those supporting an action to show that it is not seriously harmful, thereby shifting the burden of proof off those potentially harmed by the action (e.g. the general population and other species occupying the environment). In short, it is safety, rather than potential harm, that needs to be demonstrated. (3) The Principle of Alternative Assessment, stipulating that no potentially harmful action will be undertaken if there are alternative actions available that safely achieve the same goals as the action proposed. (4) All societal deliberations bearing on the application of features 1 through 3 must be open, informed, and democratic, and must include all affected parties.[27](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en27) It is clear that geoengineering promoted in a context of a capitalist regime of maximum accumulation would be ruled out completely by a strong Precautionary Principle based on each of the criteria listed above. There is a near certainty of extreme damage to the human species as a whole arising from all of the major geoengineering proposals. If the onus were placed on status quo proponents of capitalist geoengineering to demonstrate that great harm to the planet as a place of human habitation would not be inflicted, such proposals would fail the test. Since the alternative of not burning fossil fuels and promoting alternative forms of energy is entirely feasible, while planetary geoengineering carries with it immense added dangers for the Earth System as a whole, such a technofix as a primary means of checking global warming would be excluded by that criterion, too. Finally, geoengineering under the present economic and social system invariably involves some entity from the power structure—a single multi-billionaire, a corporation, a government, or an international organization—implementing such action ostensibly on behalf of humanity as a whole, while leaving most affected parties worldwide out of the decision-making process, with hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of people paying the environmental costs, often with their lives. In short, geoengineering, particularly if subordinated to the capital accumulation process, violates the most sacred version of the Precautionary Principle, dating back to antiquity: First Do No Harm. Eco-Revolution as the Only Alternative As an extension of the current war on the planet, a regime of climate geoengineering designed to keep the present mode of production going is sharply opposed to the view enunciated by Barry Commoner in 1992 in Making Peace with the Planet, where he wrote: “If the environment is polluted and the economy is sick, the virus that causes both will be found in the system of production.”[28](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en28) There can be no doubt today that it is the present mode of production, particularly the system of fossil capital, that needs to change on a global scale. In order to stop climate change, the world economy must quickly shift to zero net carbon dioxide emissions. This is well within reach with a concerted effort by human society as a whole utilizing already existing sustainable technological means—particularly when coupled with necessary changes in social organization to reduce the colossal waste of resources and lives that is built into the current alienated system of production. Such changes could not simply be implemented from the top by elites, but rather would require the self-mobilization of the population, inspired by the revolutionary actions of youth aimed at egalitarian, ecological, collective, and socialized solutions—recognizing that it is the world that they will inherit that is most at stake. Today’s necessary ecological revolution would include for starters: (1) an emergency moratorium on economic growth in the rich countries coupled with downward redistribution of income and wealth; (2) radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; (3) rapid phase-out of the entire fossil fuel energy structure; (4) substitution of an alternative energy infrastructure based on sustainable alternatives such as solar and wind power and rooted in local control; (5) massive cuts in military spending with the freed-up economic surplus to be used for ecological conversion; (6) promotion of circular economies and zero-waste systems to decrease the throughput of energy and resources; (7) building effective public transportation, together with measures to decrease dependence on the private automobile; (8) restoration of global ecosystems in line with local, including indigenous, communities; (9) transformation of destructive, energy-and chemical-intensive agribusiness-monocultural production into agroecology, based on sustainable small farms and peasant cultivation with their greater productivity of food per acre; (10) institution of strong controls on the emission of toxic chemicals; (11) prohibition of the privatization of freshwater resources; (12) imposition of strong, human-community-based management of the ocean commons geared to sustainability; (13) institution of dramatic new measures to protect endangered species; (14) strict limits imposed on excessive and destructive consumer marketing by corporations; (15) reorganization of production to break down current commodity chains geared to rapacious accumulation and the philosophy of après moi le déluge; and (16) the development of more rational, equitable, less wasteful, and more collective forms of production.[29](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en29) Priority in such an eco-revolution would need to be given to the fastest imaginable elimination of fossil fuel emissions, but this would in turn require fundamental changes in the human relationship to the earth and in the relationship of human beings to each other. A new emphasis would have to be placed on sustainable human development and the creation of an organic system of social metabolic reproduction. Centuries of exploitation and expropriation, including divisions on the basis of class, gender, race, and ethnicity, would have to be transcended. The historical logic posed by current conditions thus points to the necessity of a long ecological revolution, putting into place a new system of sustainable human development aimed at addressing the totality of needs of human beings as both natural and social beings: what is now called ecosocialism.

#### Endorse a dictatorship of the proletariat. Global capitalism’s inequities can only be fully purged once its intrinsic contradictions expose themselves and allow for the collapse of the bourgeoisie state. A dictatorship is required to solidify our transition to communism and is why you should reject any perm that attempts to preserve the state apparatus.

Revolution 73 Proletarian Dictatorship Vs. Bourgeois “Democracy”; Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line; Revolution; May 1973; Edited by Paul Saba; <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-1/pd-v-bd.htm>; CE recut amrita

This situation can only be reversed by socialist revolution to overthrow capitalist rule. The first task of this revolution is to smash the power of the bourgeois state through the armed might of the workers and their allies. The bourgeoisie and its armed forces are disarmed. The political structure and the courts and bureaucracies of the bourgeois state–and all its rules and regulations aimed at enslaving the people–are abolished. Once in power the working class moves to socialize the ownership of the means of production-making them the common property of society–to resolve the basic contradiction of capitalism, to break down the obstacles capitalism puts in the way of progress, and makes possible the rapid development of society. Socialism is a higher form of society than capitalism, and is bound to replace it all over the world, just as capitalism replaced the feudal system of landlords and serfs. In the process of socialist revolution the working class and its allies builds up their own state machine, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Workers are armed and organized into people’s militias and armed forces. The capitalists and their enforcers are punished for their crimes against the people. This dictatorship imposed by the working class on the former exploiters and over new capitalist elements who arise under socialism is absolutely necessary in order to crush their resistance and prevent them from wrecking socialism and restoring their rule. Although this country’s capitalists like to point to the Soviet Union today and say, “This is what communism means,” the dictatorship of the proletariat is not what exists in the Soviet Union today. The working class was once in power in the Soviet Union and was building a powerful socialist society which was the bright hope of workers around the world. But the capitalist class was able to stage a comeback, when a new bourgeoisie seized power in the mid-’50s and turned the Soviet Union back from a socialist country to a capitalist country. Today the Soviet Union, as well as Cuba and most Eastern European countries under its thumb, are examples of bourgeois dictatorships. They disguise themselves as socialist countries where the working class rules, but in reality a new capitalist class rules and enforces its strict dictatorship over the working class. The dramatic events in China since the death of Mao Tsetung and the arrest of those most closely associated with him are signs of the fact that a new bourgeoisie has seized the reins in China and is attempting to steer this country, too, down the capitalist road. The dictatorship of the proletariat is qualitatively different from the bourgeois state that exists in the U.S. and the Soviet Union and other capitalist countries. Its purpose is not to enforce exploitation and the rule of a tiny minority. The proletarian state for the first time in history means the rule of the majority, the working class, allied with all of the oppressed. At the same time that there is a dictatorship over the former capitalist exploiters there is the unparalleled extension of real democracy for those oppressed by capitalism–the working people. The proletarian state is a million times more democratic than even the most democratic capitalist state.

No longer do a handful of parasites run society for their own private profit and the working class sets out to transform all of society. To accomplish this the government is set up and run by workers, and the press, television stations, schools, etc., which the capitalists use to mold public opinion and shore up their rule, are stripped from them and become the common property of the working class and the masses of people. Since the working class and the socialist society built under its leadership represent the interests of the great majority of society, the workers openly proclaim their rule and openly dictate to their former exploiters and tormentors. The rule of the working class cannot be exercised by deceiving the masses of people, but only by their active involvement in every part of the political life of society and raising their political consciousness. But socialism is not a Utopia. It replaces capitalism, but cannot do away in one stroke with the inequalities, the old selfish ideas and the remnants of capitalism. Socialism itself is only the lower stage and transition to a still higher form of society, communism, where there will no longer be any classes, and, therefore, there will no longer be any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat. During this entire transition period, the working class must maintain and strengthen its rule over the former exploiters and the new bourgeois elements that arise under socialism, prevent them from subverting the new society and restoring the old, and overcome the remaining influences of their dog-eat-dog, “look out for number one” philosophy. When everyone in society can share equally in mental and manual work, in producing goods and services and managing the affairs of society; when the outlook of the working class, putting the common good above narrow, individual interests, has become “second nature” to members of society; when goods and services can be produced so abundantly that money is no longer needed to exchange them and they can be distributed to people solely according to their needs; then society will have reached the stage of communism. Classes will have been completely eliminated, and the state as such will be replaced by the common administration of society by all its members. As this happens, throughout the world, mankind will have scaled a great mountain and will look out on a whole new horizon. The experience of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin and the People’s Republic of China during the lifetime of Mao Tsetung, has shown that the working class can overthrow the exploiters and run society in the interests of the masses of people. The fact that the rule of the working class was overthrown in the Soviet Union and now temporarily in China also shows how stubborn the class struggle is under socialism and the need for the proletarian dictatorship to be maintained. Communism will show that the people can do away completely and forever with the institutions and influences of capitalism and all other forms of class society. Karl Marx, founder of communist philosophy and of the revolutionary workers movement, wrote, “The existence of classes is only bound up with particular phases in the development of production . . . the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . [and] this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of classes and to a classless society. ”